Non – Examination Assessment policy 2026/27

Approved……
Date for Review : October 2027

Key Staff involved in the conduct of Non-Examination Assessments

Head of Centre – Mr S Gilbert-Barnham
Exams Officer – Mrs L Abbotts-Freeman
Vice Principal – Mr D Richards
SENDCo – Mrs P Richards

Contents

Non – Examination Assessment policy 2025/26 1
Key Staff involved in the conduct of Non-Examination Assessments 2
What does this policy affect? 3
Purpose of the Policy 3
What are Non-Examination Assessments? ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Procedures for planning and managing non examination assessments identifying staff roles and responsibilities 4
The Basic Principles 4
Task Setting 5
Consortium Arrangements for centre assessed NEA components 12
Malpractice 16
Post results services 16
Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications designed for use in England 17
Qualification/Subject specific additional information 18
Management of issues and potential risks associated with Non-Examination Assessments 19

What does this policy affect?

This policy affects the delivery of specifications with one or more non examination assessment component, controlled assessments and coursework.
Non-examination assessments measure subject-specific knowledge and skills that cannot be tested by timed written papers.
The regulator's definition of an examination is very narrow and in effect, a non-examination assessment (NEA) is classified as any type of assessment that is not:

- Set by an awarding body
- Designed to be taken simultaneously by all relevant candidates at a time determined by the awarding body and
- Taken under conditions specified by the awarding body (including conditions relating to the supervision of candidates during the assessment and the duration of the assessment)

'NEA' therefore includes, but is not limited to, internal assessment. Externally marked and/or externally set practical examinations taken at different times across centres are classified as 'NEA'.
[Definition taken directly from the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments, GCSES]
This publication is further referred to in this policy as NEA

(VTQ) Non-examination assessment components assess candidates' knowledge, understanding and skills that may not readily be assessed by timed written papers. Non-examination assessment will take many different forms.

These instructions apply to the setting, supervision, authentication, marking, internal standardisation and external moderation/verification of non-examination assessment in Vocational and Technical Qualifications. (JCQ's **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (VTQs)**, Introduction)

(This document is further referred to in this policy as NEA VTQs)

Coursework components assess candidates' knowledge, understanding and skills that may not readily be assessed by timed written papers. Coursework will take many different forms.

These instructions are for use in ELC qualifications, Project qualifications and CCEA GCE unitised AS and A level qualifications.

These instructions are additional to any guidelines or regulations that an individual awarding body may issue. If there is conflict between the awarding body's guidelines or regulations and these instructions, the awarding body's guidelines and subject-specific instructions will take precedence. (JCQ's **Instructions for conducting coursework,** Introduction)

(This document is further referred to in this policy as ICC)

Purpose of the Policy

This policy confirms the JCQ requirement that Ormiston Venture Academy has in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework, which includes details on

how candidate's work will be authenticated with reference to the JCQ documents Instructions for conducting coursework and Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments.

Awarding bodies require each centre to have a non-examination assessment policy in place to:

- cover procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments
- define staff roles and responsibilities for non-examination assessments
- manage risks associated with non-examination assessments
- detail how candidates work will be authenticated

Each year, as part of the annual declaration, the head of centre must confirm that a policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments is in place which is reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre.

A JCQ Centre Inspector may ask the Head of centre to confirm that a policy is in place. Guidance provided in this document will help the head of centre to ensure that the centre's policy is robust and fit for purpose. (NEA 1)

Procedures for planning and managing non examination assessments identifying staff roles and responsibilities

The Basic Principles

Head of Centre:

- Returns an online Head of centre declaration at the time of the National Centre Number Register Annual Update to confirm awareness of and that relevant centre staff are adhering to the latest version of NEA ICC
- Ensures the centre's *policy* is robust and fit for purpose and covers all types of non-examination assessment
- Ensures the centre's *internal appeals procedures* clearly details the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks) and requesting a review of the centre's marking

Senior Leaders

- Ensure the correct conduct of non-examination assessments (including endorsements) which comply with NEA ICC and awarding body subject-specific instructions
- Ensure the centre-wide calendar records assessment schedules by the start of the academic year

Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead internal verifier

- Confirms with subject heads that appropriate awarding body forms and templates for non-examination assessments (including endorsements) are used by teachers and candidates
- Ensures appropriate procedures are in place to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers in line with awarding body criteria
- Ensures appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture/record relevant information given to candidates by subject teachers

- Ensures appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture/record relevant information is received and understood by candidates
- Where not provided by the awarding body, ensures a centre-devised template is provided for candidates to keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.

Head of faculty

- Ensures subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities within the non-examination assessment process
- Ensures NEA ICC and relevant awarding body subject specific instructions are followed in relation to the conduct of non-examination assessments (including endorsements)
- Works with the QA lead/Lead internal verifier to ensure appropriate procedures are followed to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers

Subject teacher

- Understands and complies with the general instructions as detailed in NEA ICC
- Where these may also be provided by the awarding body, understands and complies with the awarding body's specification for conducting non-examination assessments, including any subject-specific instructions, teachers' notes or additional information on the awarding body's website
- Marks internally assessed work to the criteria provided by the awarding body
- Ensures the exams officer is provided with relevant entry codes for subjects (whether the entry for the internally assessed component forms part of the overall entry code for the qualification or is made as a separate unit entry code) to the internal deadline for entries

Examinations Officer:

- Signposts the updated JCQ publication NEA ICC to relevant centre staff
- Carries out tasks where these may be applicable to the role in supporting the administration/management of non-examination assessment

Task Setting

Subject Teacher

- Selects tasks to be undertaken where a number of comparable tasks are provided by the awarding body or designs tasks where this is permitted by criteria set out within the subject specification
- Checks that the tasks being set and approach being taken are appropriate and in line with the awarding body's specification as well as ethical standards and the centre's safeguarding responsibilities
- Ensures that all candidates have read the JCQ document Information for candidates – non-examination assessments, Information for candidates – coursework assessments (where applicable) and the Candidate declaration prior to beginning their work
- Makes candidates aware of the criteria used to assess their work

- Ensures candidates do not sign the declaration until they have completed their work and handed it in for final assessment

Issuing of Tasks

Subject Teachers

- Determines when set tasks are issued by the awarding body
- Identifies date(s) when tasks should be taken by candidates
- Accesses set tasks in sufficient time to allow planning, resourcing and teaching and ensures that materials are stored securely at all times
- Ensures the correct task is issued to candidates

Task Taking

Supervision

Subject Teacher

- Ensures candidates understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for non-examination assessments outlined in the JCQ documents Information for candidates - non-examination assessments and Information for candidates - social media
- Checks the awarding body's subject-specific requirements ensuring candidates take tasks under the required conditions and supervision arrangements
- Ensures there is sufficient supervision to enable the work of a candidate to be authenticated
- Ensures there is sufficient supervision to ensure the work a candidate submits is their own
- Is confident where work may be completed outside of the centre without direct supervision, that the work produced is the candidate's own.
- Where candidates may work in groups, keeps a record of each candidate's contribution and it must be possible to attribute assessable outcome to individual candidates
- Ensures candidates:
    - understand that information from all sources must be referenced, including the use of AI and the sources resulting in the AI-generated content
    - receive guidance on setting out references and are made aware of the centre's policy on the use of AI
    - are aware that they must not plagiarise other material, including AI-generated content

Advice and Feedback

Subject teacher

- As relevant to the subject/component, advises candidates on relevant aspects before candidates begin working on a task
- Will not provide candidates with model answers or writing frames specific to the task
- When reviewing candidates' work, unless prohibited by the specification, provides oral and written advice at a general level to candidates
- Allows candidates to revise and re-draft work after advice has been given at a general level

- Records any assistance given beyond general advice and takes it into account in the marking or submits it to the external examiner
- Ensures when work has been assessed, candidates are not allowed to revise it

Resources

Subject teacher

- Refers to the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation to determine if candidates have restricted/unrestricted access to resources including the internet and AI when planning and researching their tasks
- Ensures candidates understand they must not copy such material and claim it as their own work and that any source material must be appropriately credited and referenced
- Refers to the JCQ document AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications (http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice) as well as the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation published by the awarding bodies and the regulator
- By referencing this document and the malpractice policy, makes candidates aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment
- Ensures conditions for any formally supervised sessions are known and put in place
- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place to keep the work to be assessed, and any preparatory work, secure between any formally supervised sessions, including work that is stored electronically
- Ensures conditions for any formally supervised sessions are understood and followed by candidates
- Ensures candidates understand that they are not allowed to introduce augmented notes or new resources between formally supervised sessions
- Ensures that where appropriate to include references, candidates keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc. including books websites audio visuals AI tools
- Ensures candidates understand how all sources included in work that is submitted for assessment must be acknowledged including where AI tools
- Refers to the following JCQ Documents to ensure their own Understanding in protecting the integrity of qualifications and preventing AI Misuse and Plagiarism in assessments
- AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications
- Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments - A summary for teachers
- AI and Assessments: A quick guide poster for students
- Plagiarism in Assessments

Word and Time Limits

Subject teacher

- Refers to the awarding body's specification to determine whether there are minimum and/or maximum time and word limits

Collaboration and Group Work

Subject teacher

- Unless stated otherwise in the awarding body's specification, and where appropriate, allows candidates to collaborate when carrying out research and preparatory work electronic signatures are acceptable typed names will be taken as being as binding as a handwritten signature
- Ensures that it is possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates
- Ensures that where an assignment requires written work to be produced, each candidate writes up their own account of the assignment
- Assesses the work of each candidate individually

Authentication Procedures - how candidates' work is authenticated

Subject teacher

The centre ensures that all non-examination assessment submitted is the candidate's own work through a combination of supervision, monitoring and formal authentication procedures.
Subject teachers will:

- Ensure candidates understand what constitutes authentic work, including plagiarism, collusion and the misuse of artificial intelligence (AI)
- Signs the teacher declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met
- Make candidates aware of the JCQ documents *Information for Candidates – Non-Examination Assessments* and *Information for Candidates – Social Media*
- Monitor candidates' progress throughout the assessment period to ensure the work produced is consistent with the candidate's ability
- Keep appropriate records of candidate progress and any assistance provided
- Where required by the awarding body's specification:
- Ensures candidates sign a declaration confirming the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work and ensures that this takes place as soon as the candidate has completed the assessment
- signs the teacher declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met
- Keeps signed candidate declarations on file until the deadline for requesting reviews of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later
- Ensures candidates work for assessment in English as specified by the awarding body and AI translation tools are not used to generate work
- Provides signed candidate declarations where these may be requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector
- Where there may be doubt about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or if malpractice is suspected, follows the authentication procedures and malpractice information in NEA ICC and informs a member of the senior leadership team
- Understands that if, during the external moderation process, it is found that the work has not been properly authenticated, the awarding body will set the mark(s) awarded by the centre to zero

For work completed outside the centre:

- Teachers will take reasonable steps to confirm authenticity, including reviewing drafts, discussing the work with the candidate and ensuring it reflects the candidate's standard of work

Candidates must:

- Acknowledge all sources used, including internet and AI-generated content
- Ensure all work submitted is their own and properly referenced

Final authentication and escalation

- Candidates must sign a declaration confirming the work submitted is their own
- Teachers must sign a declaration confirming they are satisfied the work is authentic and completed under the required conditions
- Signed declarations are retained securely until all post-results services and appeals processes are complete
- If there are concerns about authenticity:
- The subject teacher will investigate in line with JCQ requirements
- The issue will be escalated to senior leadership
- The centre will follow JCQ malpractice procedures and inform the awarding body where required
- The centre recognises that failure to properly authenticate candidates' work may result in marks being withdrawn by the awarding body and ensures robust procedures are followed at all stages.

Presentation of Work

Subject teacher

- Obtains informed consent at the beginning of the course from parents/carers if videos or photographs/images of candidates will be included as evidence of participation or contribution
- Instructs candidates to present work as detailed in NEA ICC unless the awarding body's specification gives different subject-specific instructions
- Instructs candidates to add their candidate number, centre number and the component code of the assessment as a header/footer on each page of their work
- Ensures if candidates work is to be submitted electronically, that meets the awarding body's specified requirements and AI Tool are not used to generate work for assessment

Keeping Materials Secure

Subject teacher

- When work is being undertaken by candidates under formal supervision, ensures work is securely stored between sessions (if more than one session)
- When work is submitted by candidates for final assessment, ensures work is securely stored
- Follows secure storage instructions as defined in NEA 4.8
- Takes sensible precautions when work is taken home for marking
- Stores internally assessed work, including the sample returned after awarding body moderation, securely until the closing date for reviews of results or until the outcome of a review or any subsequent appeal has been completed

- If post-results services have not been requested, returns internally assessed work to candidates (if requested by a candidate) after the deadline for requesting a review of results for the relevant series
- If post results services have been requested, returns internally assessed work to candidates (if been requested) once the review of results and any subsequent appeal has been completed
- Reminds candidates of the need to keep their own work secure at all times and not share completed or partially completed work on-line, on social media or through any other means (reminds candidates of the contents of the JCQ document Information for candidates – social media should be brought to the attention of candidates)
- Where work is stored electronically Liaises with the IT Manager to ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates' work where work is stored electronically to also ensure the protection and back up of candidates work and that appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access to it between sessions

IT Manager

- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates' work where work is stored electronically
- Restricts access to this material and utilises appropriate security safeguards such as firewall protection and virus scanning software
- Employs as effective back up strategy so that and up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained
- Considers the contingency of candidates' work being backed-up on two separate devices, including one off-site back-up and implementing appropriate security arrangements which protect candidates' work in the event of IT system corruption and cyber-attacks
- Considers encrypting any sensitive digital body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable

Task Marking – Externally Assessed Components

Conduct of externally assessed work

Subject teacher

- Liaises with the exams officer regarding the arrangements for any externally assessed components of a specification which must be conducted within a window of dates specified by the awarding body and according to JCQ Instructions for conducting examinations
- Liaises with the Visiting Examiner where this may be applicable to any externally assessed component

Exams officer

- Arranges timetabling, rooming and invigilation where and if this is applicable to any externally assessed non-examination component of a specification
- Conducts the externally assessed component within the window specified by the awarding body and according to JCQ Instructions for conducting examinations

Submission of work

Subject teacher

- Pays close attention to the completion of the attendance register

Exams officer

- Provides the attendance register to the subject teacher where applicable
- Ensures the awarding body's attendance register for any externally assessed component is completed correctly
- Where candidates' work must be despatched to an awarding body's examiner or uploaded electronically, ensures this is completed by the date specified by the awarding body
- Keeps a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series
- Packages the work as required by the awarding body and attaches the examiner address label
- Ensures that the package in which the work is despatched is robust and securely fastened
- Despatches the work to the awarding body's instructions by the required deadline

Task Marking – internally assessed components

Marking and Annotation

Head of centre

- Makes every effort to avoid situations where a candidate is assessed by a person who has a close personal relationship with the candidate, sample members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g son/daughter)
- Where this cannot be avoided, ensures the conflict of interest is declared to the relevant awarding body before the published deadline for entries for each examination series and the marked work is submitted for moderation whether or not it is part of the moderation sample

Subject head/lead

- Sets timescales for teachers to inform candidates of their centre-assessed marks that will allow sufficient time for a candidate to appeal an internal assessment decision/request a review of the centre's marking prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body external deadline

Subject teacher

- Attends awarding body training as required to ensure familiarity with the mark scheme/marking process
- Marks candidates' work in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body
- Does not use artificial intelligence as the sole means of marking candidates' work, reviews all the work in its entirety and determines the mark it warrants using their own professional judgement, regardless of the outcomes of the AI Tool, remaining responsible for the mark/grade awarded.
- Annotates candidates' work as required to facilitate internal standardisation of marking and enable external moderation to check that marking is in line with the assessment criteria

- Informs candidates of their marks which could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process
- Ensures candidates are informed of the timescale set by the subject lead or as indicated in the centre's *internal appeals procedure* to enable an internal appeal/request for a review of marking to be submitted by a candidate and the outcome known before final marks are submitted to the awarding body

Internal Standardisation

Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead

- Ensures that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence
- Supports staff not familiar with the mark scheme (e.g. NQTs, supply staff etc.)
- Ensures accurate internal standardisation - for example by:
  - obtaining reference materials at an early stage in the course
  - holding a preliminary trial marking session prior to marking
  - carrying out further trial marking at appropriate points during the marking period
  - after most marking has been completed, holds a further meeting to make final adjustments
  - making final adjustments to marks prior to submission, retaining work and evidence of standardisation
- Retains evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out

Subject teacher

- Indicates on work (or cover sheet) the date of marking
- Marks to common standards
- Keeps candidates work secure until after the closing date for review of results for the series concerned or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later

Consortium Arrangements for centre assessed NEA components

Subject head/lead

- Ensures a consortium co-ordinator is nominated (where this may be required as the consortium lead)
- If the consortium lead, liaises with the exams officer to ensure the relevant awarding body is informed that the centre is part of a consortium by submitting form JCQ/CCA for each exam series affected
- Ensures procedures for internal standardisation as a consortium are followed

Subject teacher

- Provides marks to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Provides the moderation sample to the exams officer to the internal deadline

- Retains all candidates' work in the consortium until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series concerned or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later

Exams officer

- Where the centre is the consortium lead
- Submits an online notification of Centre consortium arrangements for centre-assessed work to the relevant awarding body's Centre Admin Portal (CAP) to the deadline for each exam series affected
- submits marks for the home centre candidates to the awarding body deadline
- Where relevant liaises with the other consortium exams officers to arrange despatch of a single moderation sample to the awarding body deadline
- (where not the consortium lead centre) Submits marks for home centre candidates to the awarding body deadline

Submission of Marks and Work for Moderation

Subject teacher

- Inputs and submits marks online, via the awarding body secure extranet site, keeping a record of the marks awarded, to the external deadline/Provides marks to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Where responsible for marks input, ensures checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensures mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors
- Submits the requested samples of candidates' work to the awarding body moderator by the external deadline, keeping a record of the work submitted/Provides the moderation sample to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Ensures that where a candidate's work has been facilitated by a scribe or practical assistant, the relevant completed cover sheet is securely attached to the front of the work and sent to the moderator in addition to the sample requested
- Ensures the moderator is provided with authentication of candidates' work, confirmation that internal standardisation has been undertaken and any other subject-specific information where this may be required
- Submits any supporting documentation required by the awarding body/provides the exams officer with any supporting documentation required by the awarding body

Exams officer

- Inputs and submits marks online, via the awarding body secure extranet site, keeping a record of the marks submitted, to the external deadline/Confirms with subject teachers that marks have been submitted to the awarding body deadline
- Where responsible for marks input, ensures checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensures mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors

- Submits the requested samples of candidates' work to the moderator by the awarding body deadline, keeping a record of the work submitted/Confirms with Subject teacher that the moderation sample has been submitted to the awarding body deadline
- Ensures that for postal moderation
- work is dispatched in packaging provided by the awarding body
- moderator label(s) provided by the awarding body are affixed to the packaging
- proof of dispatch/postage is obtained and kept on file until the successful issue of final results
- Through the subject teacher, ensures the moderator is provided with authentication of candidates' work, confirmation that internal standardisation has been undertaken and any other subject-specific information where this may be required
- Through the subject teacher, submits any supporting documentation required by the awarding body

Storage and Retention of Work after Submission of Marks

Subject teacher

- Keeps a record of names and candidate numbers for candidates whose work was included in the moderation sample
- Retains all marked candidates' work (including any sample returned after moderation) under secure conditions for the required retention period
- In liaison with the IT Manager, takes steps to protect any work stored electronically from corruption and has a back-up procedure in place
- If retention is a problem because of the nature of the work, retains some form of evidence such as photos, audio or media recordings

Exams officer

- Ensures any sample returned after moderation is logged and returned to the subject teacher for secure storage and required retention

External Moderation – The Process

Subject teacher

- Ensures that awarding body or its moderator receive the correct samples of candidates' work
- Where relevant, liaises with the awarding body/moderator where the moderator visits the centre to mark the sample of work
- Complies with any request from the moderator for remaining work or further evidence of the centre's marking

External moderation – Feedback

Subject head/lead

- Checks the final moderated marks when issued to the centre when the results are published
- Checks moderator reports/feedback forms and ensures that any remedial action, if necessary, is undertaken before the next exam series

Exams officer

- Accesses or signposts moderator reports feedback forms to relevant staff
- Takes remedial action, if necessary, where feedback may relate to centre administration

Access Arrangements and reasonable adjustments

Subject teacher

- Works with the SENCo to ensure any access arrangements for eligible candidates are applied to assessments

Special educational needs coordinator (SENCo)

- Follows the regulations and guidance in the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments in relation to non-examination assessments including Reasonable Adjustments for GCE A-level sciences – Endorsement of practical skills
- Where arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualification and is the candidate's normal way of working, will ensure access arrangements are in place and awarding body approval, where required, has been obtained prior to assessments taking place
- Makes subject teachers aware of any access arrangements for eligible candidates which need to be applied to assessments
- Works with subject teachers to ensure requirements for access arrangement candidates requiring the support of a facilitator in assessments are met
- Ensures that staff acting as an access arrangement facilitator are fully trained in their role

Special consideration and loss of work

Subject teacher

- Understands that a candidate may be eligible for special consideration in assessments in certain situations where a candidate is absent and/or produces a reduced quantity of work
- Liaises with the exams officer when special consideration may need to be applied for a candidate taking assessments
- Liaises with the exams officer to report loss of work to the awarding body

Exams officer

- Refers to/directs relevant staff to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process
- Where a candidate is eligible, submits an application for special consideration via the awarding body's secure extranet site to the prescribed timescale
- Where application for special consideration via the awarding body's secure extranet site is not applicable, submits the required form to the awarding body to the prescribed timescale
- Keeps required evidence on file to support the application
- Refers to/directs relevant staff to Form 15 – JCQ/LCW and where applicable submits to the relevant awarding body (For coursework, AQA and OCR centres must not submit Form 15 – JCQ/LCW. Applications must be submitted online using AQA Centre Services or OCR Interchange as appropriate)

Malpractice

Head of centre

- Understands the responsibility to immediately report to the relevant awarding body any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates
- Ensures any irregularity identified by the centre before the candidate has signed the authentication statement (where required) are dealt with under its own internal procedures, with no requirement to report the irregularity to the awarding body (The exception being where the awarding body's confidential assessment materials have been breached, the breach must be report to the awarding body)
- Is familiar with the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures
- Ensures that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing non-examination assessment or coursework are aware of the potential for malpractice and ensures that teaching staff are reminded that failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself

Subject teacher

- Is aware of the JCQ Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work to mitigate against candidate and centre malpractice
- Ensures candidates understand the JCQ document Information for candidates - non-examination assessments
- Ensures candidates understand what constitutes malpractice in non-examination assessments and coursework Information for candidates - non-examination assessments and (where applicable) Information for candidates - coursework assessments
- Ensures candidates understand the JCQ document Information for candidates - Social Media
- Escalates and reports any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates to the head of centre

Exams officer

- Signposts the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures to the head of centre
- Signposts the JCQ Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work to subject heads
- Signposts candidates to the relevant JCQ information for candidates documents
- Where required, supports the head of centre in investigating and reporting incidents of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice

Post results services

Head of centre

- Is familiar with the JCQ document Post-Results Services

- Ensures the centre's *internal appeals procedures* clearly details the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against a centre decision not to support an application for a review of results or an appeal

Subject head/lead

- Provides relevant support to subject teachers making decisions about reviews of results

Subject teacher

- Provides advice and guidance to candidates on their results and the post-results services available
- Provides the exams officer with the original sample or relevant sample of candidates' work that may be required for a review of moderation to the internal deadline
- Supports the exams officer in collecting candidate consent where required

Exams officer

- Is aware of the individual post-results services available for externally assessed and internally assessed components as detailed in the JCQ document Post-Results Services (Information and guidance to centres...)
- Provides/signposts relevant centre staff and candidates to post-results services information
- Ensures any requests for post-results services that are available to centre assessed work are submitted online via the awarding body secure extranet site to deadline
- Collects candidate consent where required

Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications designed for use in England

Head of centre

- Returns the online Head of Centre declaration at the time of the National Centre Number Register Annual Update, confirming that all reasonable steps have been or will be taken to ensure that all candidates at the centre have had, or will have, the opportunity to undertake the Spoken Language endorsement

Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead internal verifier

- Ensures the appropriate arrangements are in place for internal standardisation of assessments

Subject head/lead

- Confirms understanding of the *Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications designed for use in England* and ensures any relevant JCQ/awarding body instructions are followed
- Ensures the required task setting and task taking instructions are followed by subject teachers

- Ensures subject teachers assess candidates, either live or from recordings, using the common assessment criteria
- Ensures for monitoring purposes, audio-visual recordings of the presentations of a sample of candidates are provided

Subject teacher

- Ensures all the requirements in relation to the endorsement are known and understood
- Follows the required task setting and task taking instructions
- Assesses candidates, either live or from recordings, using the common assessment criteria
- Provides audio-visual recordings of the presentations of a sample of candidates for monitoring purposes
- Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades (*Pass, Merit, Distinction* or *Not Classified*) and the storage and submission of recordings

Exams officer

- Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades and recordings

Qualification/Subject specific additional information

This section provides additional information/procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments in specific subjects of qualifications

GCSE Art & Design

- JCQ's Instructions for conducting examinations are followed for the conduct of externally set components.

Candidate Declaration

Subject teacher

- Ensures candidates read and understand the Notice to Candidates within the declaration form and understand what they will be declaring when signing
- Before signing the Teacher declaration within the form, ensures they have read and understood the guidance produced by JCQ on authenticating candidates' work, marking candidates' work and internal standardisation (ensuring they are familiar with the candidate's general standard of work)
- Keeps a copy of the Candidate declaration on file until the deadline for requesting a review of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later, as this may be subject to inspection by the awarding body and/or a JCQ Centre Inspector

Management of issues and potential risks associated with Non-Examination Assessments

Reference to non-examination assessment is intended to include any specifications with one or more non-examination assessment component or unit, controlled assessment (where applicable) and coursework.

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Centre staff malpractice	Records confirm that relevant centre staff are familiar with and follow: ▪ the current JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments ▪ the JCQ document Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work - http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/non-examination-assessments	LAF/SGB/DRI
Candidate malpractice	Records confirm that candidates are informed and understand they must not: ▪ submit work which is not their own ▪ make available their work to other candidates through any medium ▪ allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material ▪ assist other candidates to produce work ▪ use books, the internet, AI or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution ▪ submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement ▪ include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material Records confirm that candidates have been made aware of the JCQ documents Information for candidates - non-examination assessments and Information for candidates – Social Media - https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents and understand they must not post their work on social media	LAF/SGB/DRI
Task setting		
Awarding body set task: IT failure/corruption of task details where set task details accessed from the awarding body online	Awarding body key date for accessing/downloading set task noted prior to start of course IT systems checked prior to key date Alternative IT system used to gain access Awarding body contacted to request direct email of task details	IT/LAF
Centre set task: Subject teacher fails to meet the assessment criteria as detailed in the specification	Ensures that subject teachers access awarding body training information, practice materials etc. Records confirmation that subject teachers understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification Samples assessment criteria in the centre set task	HOF/DRI
Candidates do not understand the marking criteria and what they need to do to gain credit	A simplified version of the awarding body's marking criteria described in the specification that is not specific to the work of an individual candidate or group of candidates is produced for candidates	HOF/DRI

	Records confirm all candidates understand the marking criteria Candidates confirm/record they understand the marking criteria	
Subject teacher long term absence during the task setting stage	See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence	DRI
Issuing of tasks		
Awarding body set task not issued to candidates on time	Awarding body key date for accessing set task as detailed in the specification noted prior to start of course Course information issued to candidates contains details when set task will be issued and needs to be completed by Set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching	HOF
The wrong task is given to candidates	Ensures course planning and information taken from the awarding body's specification confirms the correct task will be issued to candidates. Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved	HOF/LAF
Subject teacher long term absence during the issuing of tasks stage	See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence	DRI
A candidate (or parent/carer) expresses concern about safeguarding, confidentiality or faith in undertaking a task such as a presentation that may be recorded	Ensures the candidate's presentation does not form part of the sample which will be recorded Contacts the awarding body at the earliest opportunity where unable to record the required number of candidates for the monitoring sample	NR/DRI
Task taking		
Supervision		
Planned assessments clash with other centre or candidate activities	Assessment plan identified for the start of the course Assessment dates/periods included in centre wide calendar	LAF
Rooms or facilities inadequate for candidates to take tasks under appropriate supervision	Timetabling organised to allocate appropriate rooms and IT facilities for the start of the course. Staggered sessions arranged where IT facilities insufficient for number of candidates. Whole cohort to undertake written task in large exam venue at the same time (exam conditions do not apply)	LAF/DRI/BCL
Insufficient supervision of candidates to enable work to be authenticated	Confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow the current JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments and any other specific instructions detailed in the awarding body's specification in relation to the supervision of candidates. Confirm subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy including controlled assessment and coursework	HOF/DRI
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	Confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments and any other specific instructions detailed in the awarding body's specification in relation to the supervision of candidates. Confirm subject teachers understand their role and	HOF/DRI/LAF

	responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy	
Access arrangements were not put in place for an assessment where a candidate is approved for arrangements	Instructions and processes in the current JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments followed. An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed	LAF/PR
Advice and feedback		
Candidate claims appropriate advice and feedback not given by subject teacher prior to starting on their work	Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to record all information provided to candidates before work begins as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures. Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity. Full records kept detailing all information and advice given to candidates prior to starting on their work as appropriate to the subject and component. Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given prior to starting on their work	DRI/HOF
Candidate claims no advice and feedback given by subject teacher during the task-taking stage	Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to record all advice and feedback provided to candidates during the task-taking stage as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures. Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity, full records kept detailing all advice and feedback given to candidates during the task-taking stage as appropriate to the subject and component Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given during the task-taking stage	DRI/HOF
A third party claims that assistance was given to candidates by the subject teacher over and above that allowed in the regulations and specification	An investigation is conducted; candidates and subject teacher are interviewed and statements recorded where relevant Records as detailed above are provided to confirm all assistance given Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body	LAF
Candidate does not reference information from published source	Candidate is advised at a general level to reference information before work is submitted for formal assessment Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion	HOF/DRI
Candidate does not set out references as required	Candidate is advised at a general level to review and re-draft the set out of references before work is submitted for formal assessment Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion	HOF/DRI

Candidate joins the course late after formally supervised task taking has started	A separate supervised session(s) is arranged for the candidate to catch up	HOF/NR/LAF
Candidate moves to another centre during the course	Awarding body guidance is sought to determine what can be done depending on the stage at which the move takes place	LAF/NB
An excluded pupil wants to complete his/her non-examination assessment(s)	The awarding body specification is checked to determine if the specification is available to a candidate outside mainstream education If so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate	NR/DRI/LAF
Resources		
A candidate augments notes and resources between formally supervised sessions	Preparatory notes and the work to be assessed are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions Where memory sticks are used by candidates, these are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions Where work is stored on the centre's network, access for candidates is restricted between formally supervised sessions	HOF/LAF/DRI
A candidate fails to acknowledge sources on work that is submitted for assessment	Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is checked to confirm all the sources used, including books, websites and audio/visual resources Awarding body guidance is sought on whether the work of the candidate should be marked where candidate's detailed records acknowledges sources appropriately Where confirmation is unavailable from candidate's records, awarding body guidance is sought and/or a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body for the candidate	HOF/LAF
Word and time limits		
A candidate is penalised by the awarding body for exceeding word or time limits	Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if word or time limits are mandatory Where limits are for guidance only, candidates are discouraged from exceeding them Candidates confirm/record any information provided to them on word or time limits is known and understood	HOF/LAF
Collaboration and group work		
Candidates have worked in groups where the awarding body specification states this is not permitted	Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if group work is permitted Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved	LAF/DRI
Authentication procedures		
A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment Candidate plagiarises other material	Records confirm subject staff have been made aware of the JCQ document Teachers sharing assessment material and candidates' work Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments Candidates confirm/record that they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for non-examination assessments as outlined in the JCQ document Information for	HOF/DRI/LAF

	candidates: non-examination assessments and the candidate declaration form The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment A mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body	
Candidate does not sign their declaration	Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments Candidates confirm/record they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment	HOF/LAF
Subject teacher not available to sign declaration	Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to sign authentication forms at the point of marking candidates work as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures	DRI/HOF
Presentation of work		
Candidate does not fully complete the awarding body's cover sheet that is attached to their worked submitted for formal assessment	Cover sheet is checked to ensure it is fully completed before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment	HOF/LAF
Keeping materials secure		
Candidates work between formal supervised sessions is not securely stored	Records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow current JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments Regular monitoring/internal audit ensures subject teacher use of appropriate secure storage	HOF/LAF/DRI
Adequate secure storage not available to subject teacher	Records confirm adequate/sufficient secure storage is available to subject teacher prior to the start of the course Alternative secure storage sourced where required	HOF/LAF
Candidates work produced electronically is not securely stored	Records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow current JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments Internal processes and regular monitoring/internal audit by IT Manager ensures: ▪ access to this material is restricted (insert how) ▪ appropriate security safeguards are in place (insert names/types of protection) ▪ an effective back-up strategy is employed so that an up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained (insert details of how work is backed up) ▪ any sensitive digital media is encrypted (according to awarding body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable) to ensure the security of the data stored within it (insert relevant details of how)	HOF/LAF
Task marking – externally assessed components		

A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an acceptable reason	Awarding body guidance is sought to determine if alternative assessment arrangements can be made for the candidate If not, eligibility for special consideration is explored and a request submitted to the awarding body where appropriate	HOF/LAF
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason	The candidate is marked absent on the attendance register	LAF
Task marking – internally assessed components		
A candidate submits little or no work	Where a candidate submits no work, the candidate is recorded as absent when marks are submitted to the awarding body Where a candidate submits little work, the work produced is assessed against the assessment criteria and a mark allocated appropriately; where the work does not meet any of the assessment criteria a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body	HOF
A candidate is unable to finish their work for unforeseen reason	Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process (section 5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for shortfall in work	HOF/LAF/DRI
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (section 8), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for lost or damaged work	LAF/DRI/HOF
Candidate malpractice is discovered	Instructions and processes in the current JCQ document Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (section 9 Malpractice) are followed Investigation and reporting procedures in the current JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments are followed Appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed	LAF/DRI/SGB
A teacher assesses the work of a candidate with whom they have a close personal relationship eg members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family(eg son/daughter)	A conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body before the published deadline for entries for each examination series. Marked work of said candidate is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not	LAF/DRi
An extension to the deadline for submission of marks is required for a legitimate reason	Awarding body is contacted to determine if an extension can be granted Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process (section 5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for non-examination assessment extension	LAF/HOF
After submission of marks, it is discovered that the wrong task was given to candidates	Awarding body is contacted for guidance Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process (section 2), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for candidates	LAF/DRI/HOF

candidate wishes to appeal/request a review of the marks awarded for their work by their teacher	Candidates are informed of the marks they have been awarded for their work prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body Records confirm candidates have been informed of their marks Candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process Candidates are informed of their marks to the timescale identified in the centre's internal appeals procedure and prior to the internal deadline set by the exams officer for the submission of marks Through the candidate exam handbook, candidates are made aware of the centre's internal appeals procedures and timescale for submitting an appeal/request for a review of the centre's marking prior to the submission of marks to the awarding body	DRI/LAF
Deadline for submitting work for formal assessment not met by candidate	Records confirm deadlines given and understood by candidates at the start of the course Candidates confirm/record deadlines known and understood Depending on the circumstances, awarding body guidance sought to determine if the work can be accepted late for marking providing the awarding body's deadline for submitting marks can be met Decision made (depending on the circumstances) if the work will be accepted late for marking or a mark of zero submitted to the awarding body for the candidate	HOF/LAF
Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by subject teacher	Internal/external deadlines are published at the start of each academic year Reminders are issued through senior leaders/subject heads as deadlines approach Records confirm deadlines known and understood by subject teachers Where appropriate, internal disciplinary procedures are followed	HOF/LAF
Subject teacher long term absence during the marking period	See centre's exam contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence)	DRI