WOODBRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

NON-EXAMINED ASSESSMENT POLICY
2026 - 2027

This policy affects the delivery of subjects of VTQ, GCE and GCSE qualifications which contain a component(s) of Non-Examination Assessment VTQ, GCE and GCSE specifications with one or more Non-Examination Assessment component, controlled assessments (where applicable) and coursework.

Any reference to Non-Examination Assessment in this policy is therefore intended to include VTQ, GCE and GCSE specifications with one or more Non-Examination Assessment component, controlled assessment (where applicable) and coursework.

What are non-examination assessments?

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)
- is classified as non-examination assessment (NEA).

'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'. *(JCQ's Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (GCE & GCSE), Foreword)*

(GCE and GCSE) Non-examination assessments measure subject-specific knowledge and skills that cannot be tested by timed written papers. There are three assessment stages and rules which apply to each stage. These rules often vary across subjects. The stages are:

- task setting
- task taking
- task marking (NEA 1)

(VTQs) 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 (NEA VTQs 1)

These instructions apply to the setting, supervision, authentication, marking, internal standardisation and external moderation/verification of non-examined assessment in Vocational and Technical Qualifications.

What is coursework?

Coursework components assess candidates' skills, knowledge and understanding that may not readily be assessed by timed written papers. Coursework will take many different forms. (ICC 1)

Internal Assessments for Qualifications with Awarding Bodies

Woodbridge High School is committed to ensuring that whenever staff mark candidates' Non-Examined Assessments (NEA)/coursework/controlled assessments, this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have access to relevant training as required. Woodbridge High School is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where a number of subject teachers are involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

Staff responsibilities

Senior Leadership Group, Heads of Department and teachers have a responsibility to ensure that all awarding body and JCQ requirements are met regarding non-examined assessment. This includes understanding and complying with the general guidelines contained in the JCQ publications Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (GCE & GCSE), Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (VTQs) and (where applicable) Instructions for conducting coursework. At the start of the academic year, the Heads of Department will ensure the timings of the Non-Examined Assessments to ensure resourcing and timings are sufficient to meet the specification requirements.

Managing Task Setting

Where the awarding body is responsible for task setting, the Head of Department will make their selection(s) from a number of comparable tasks provided by the awarding body.

Where the centre is responsible for task setting, centres may select from a number of comparable tasks provided by the awarding body; or design their own task(s), in conjunction with candidates where permitted, using criteria set out in the specification.

Where centres are responsible for task setting they must ensure that the assessment criteria, as detailed in the specification, can be met and tasks are accessible to candidates. Centres must refer to the awarding body's specification.

Subject teachers must ensure that candidates do not sign the declaration until they have completed their work and handed it in for final assessment.

Marking Criteria

The Head of Department will put in place processes to ensure that teachers and candidates are aware of the awarding body criteria used to assess the work. Specifications describe the marking criteria in detail.

Subject to awarding body requirements, teachers may produce a simplified candidate-friendly version, provided that it is not specific to the work of an individual candidate or group of candidates. It is the responsibility of the Head of Department to ensure that any guidance given ensures that the assessment criteria can be met in full.

Managing non-examination assessment

The Head of Department must consult the relevant awarding body's specification to obtain the date for the issuing of tasks. They must also identify the date(s) when tasks should be taken by candidates. Sufficient time should be allowed for the planning, resourcing and teaching of the task.

The Head of Department must take care to distinguish between requirements/tasks for legacy specifications and requirements/tasks for new specifications.

It is the responsibility of the Head of Department and teachers to ensure that the correct task is issued to the candidates. If the wrong task is issued to candidates it is the responsibility of the Head of Department to contact both the Exams Officer and awarding body for advice.

The Head of Department is responsible for liaising with the Exams Officer when the task to be taken requires external invigilation staff.

Supervision

The Head of Department must ensure that all teachers understand, and conform, to the awarding body's requirements for supervision levels.

The Head of department must ensure that there is sufficient supervision of every candidate to enable their work to be authenticated and that the work each individual candidate submits is their own.

The Head of Department and teachers must ensure that candidates:

- understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for non-examination assessments as outlined in the JCQ documents: Information for Candidates – non-examination assessments and Information for Candidates – social media
- understand that information from published 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

The Head of Department must ensure that all teachers understand, and conform, to the awarding body's requirements regarding collaboration and group work.

Where candidates work in groups the Head of Department and teachers are responsible for

ensuring that a record is kept of each candidate's contribution so that the candidate can be assessed individually and not as a group.

Advice and Feedback

As appropriate to the subject and component, centres should advise candidates on aspects in line with the requirements of the awarding body.

Unless specifically prohibited by the awarding body's specification teachers may review candidates' work and provide oral and written advice at a general level. Having provided advice at a general level, teachers may allow candidates to revise and re-draft work if this is in line with the guidance of the specification.

General advice of this nature does not need to be recorded or taken into account when the work is marked.

If teachers give any assistance which goes beyond general advice it must be recorded and either taken into account when marking the work or it must be submitted to the external examiner.

Failure to follow this procedure constitutes malpractice.

Resources

The Head of Department and teachers must refer to the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation regarding access to resources. They must also refer to the awarding body's specification to determine if any word and time limits apply or are mandatory.

For all formally supervised sessions:

- the use of resources is always tightly prescribed and normally restricted to the candidate's preparatory notes
- access to the internet is not permitted
- candidates are not allowed to bring their own computers or other electronic devices, e.g. mobile phones

Candidates are not allowed to augment notes and resources between sessions. When work for assessment is produced over several sessions, the following material must be collected and stored securely at the end of each session (and not accessible to candidates):

- the work to be assessed
- preparatory work

The Head of Department is responsible for ensuring that they have contacted IT support to create secure network accounts that can only be accessed by candidates during lesson time.

Authentication Procedures – how candidates' work is authenticated

Subject teacher

- Where required by the awarding body's specification:
  - ensures candidates do not sign the declaration until they have completed their work and handed it in for final assessment
  - 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 work is solely that of the candidate concerned, that the work was completed under the required conditions and that all requirements have been met

- Keeps signed candidate declarations 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
- Provides signed candidate declarations where these may be requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector (electronic signatures are acceptable)
- 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, NEA VTQs and 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

Task Marking

Teachers will mark internally assessed components in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body. It will be annotated to facilitate the internal standardisation of marking and enable external moderation to be undertaken to check that marking is in line with the assessment criteria. Teachers will inform candidates that their marks could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process. Candidates will be informed in a timely manner to enable an internal appeal to be submitted by the candidate before final marks are submitted to the awarding body.

Submission of marks and work for moderation

The Head of Department inputs and submits marks online via the awarding body secure extranet site. They will make sure that a check has been made that the marks submitted are correct to avoid inputting errors. Once the sample request has been received the Head of Department will ensure that the work is dispatched to the moderator within the deadline set by the awarding body. The Head of Department should take the work to Reception and ask for it to be sent via Royal Mail and ensure a certificate of posting is completed for our records. They should also inform the Exams Officer when the sample has been sent for their records.

The Exams Officer will be responsible for the despatch of any externally marked work using Parcelforce. The Exams Officer will also be responsible for forwarding on any sample requests to Head of Departments where they receive these via the email address registered with the awarding bodies.

Secure storage

The Head of Department must ensure that where candidates are producing work over a period of time under formal supervision that their work is stored securely at all times, in accordance with the secure storage instructions as defined in NEA 4.8. Once any work is handed in by the candidate for formal assessment it must be stored securely.

Where work is stored in hard copy format, secure storage is defined as a securely locked cabinet or cupboard. Where candidates are producing artefacts (e.g. Art and Design) secure storage may be defined as a classroom, studio or workshop which is locked or supervised from the end of one session to the start of the next.

Internally assessed work that is not required for moderation purposes and work returned to centres after moderation must be stored securely until all possible post-results services have been exhausted. Any returned work will be retained by the Exams Officer until such time that it can be returned to departments.

If post-results services have not been requested, internally assessed work may be returned to candidates after the deadline for enquiries about results for the relevant series.

If post-results services have been requested, internally assessed work may be returned once the enquiry about results and any subsequent appeal has been completed.

External moderation - feedback

The Head of Department will review the moderator feedback forms and ensure that any remedial action is undertaken, if necessary, before the next examination series. The Exams Officer may share

the feedback forms with the Senior Leadership Group should the feedback be of such a nature that follow up action is required.

Access arrangements

Teachers should work with the SENCo to ensure any access arrangements for eligible candidates are applied to assessments.

The Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCo) will:

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

Special consideration

The Exams Officer will submit applications for Special Consideration via the awarding bodies' extranet websites by the dates set, in line with the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process. Where this is not possible a paper submission will be made. Teachers will need to provide the necessary evidence to support the application, or ask the candidate to provide this, so that an application can be made.

Malpractice

Malpractice and Plagiarism Terms:

Malpractice

'Malpractice', which includes maladministration and non-compliance with the Regulations, means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations or which:

- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or

- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre

Plagiarism

The JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures define plagiarism as:

"Unacknowledged copying from, or reproduction of, third party sources or incomplete referencing (including the internet and artificial intelligence (AI) tools)"

Internal Procedures for Malpractice and Plagiarism:

All cases of malpractice or plagiarism where a student has submitted work and signed the candidate declaration form are dealt with in accordance with the latest guidance from the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures.

For all NEA/coursework/controlled assessment conducted prior to the signing of the candidate declaration form, cases of malpractice or plagiarism discovered are investigated by the school. The Head of the Centre or an appropriately delegated member of staff will conduct the investigation.

In an instance where malpractice or plagiarism has occurred, the school will apply an appropriate sanction. Any subsequent submission of work for that qualification or continuation with the programme of study will be decided by the school in accordance with the guidelines of the

appropriate awarding body. The school will not submit any work or sign any Centre Declaration forms for any work that is known to have been plagiarised or breached malpractice codes.

If the student has already signed the declaration of authenticity form, any cases of plagiarism or malpractice will be reported to the Exams Officer, who will then report this to the relevant awarding body at the earliest opportunity, in line with the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures. The Awarding Body will then notify the centre of any sanctions to be applied.

Further guidance can be found in the school's Plagiarism and Malpractice Policy on the school website.

Head of centre

- understands the responsibility to report to the relevant awarding body any suspected cases of malpractice involving candidates, teachers, invigilators or other administrative staff
- is familiar with the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures*

Subject teacher

- is aware of the JCQ Notice to Centres – Sharing NEA material and candidates' work
- ensures candidates understand the JCQ document *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*

Exams Officer

- Signposts the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures*
- to the head of centre
- Signposts the JCQ Notice to Centres – Sharing NEA material and candidates' work to Heads of Department
- Signposts candidates to the relevant JCQ Information for candidates documents
- Where required, supports the head of centre in investigating and reporting incidents of suspected malpractice

Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences designed for use in England

Head of centre

- Returns the '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 prescribed practical activities
- Ensures new lead teachers undertake the required training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement
- Ensures relevant centre staff liaise with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of the monitoring visit

Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead internal verifier (or equivalent role)

- Ensures arrangements are in place for implementing the requirements of the practical endorsement appropriately and applying the standards appropriately

Head of Department

- Confirms understanding of the *Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences designed for use in England* and ensures any relevant JCQ/awarding body instructions are followed
- Ensures where the centre intends to enter candidates for the first time for one or more of the A level subjects, the relevant awarding body will be contacted at the beginning of the course
- Undertakes any training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement

- Disseminates information to subject teachers ensuring the standards can be applied appropriately

- Liaises with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of a monitoring visit

Subject teacher

- Ensures all the JCQ/awarding body requirements/instructions in relation to the endorsement are known, understood and followed
- Ensures the required arrangements for practical activities are in place
- Provides all the required centre records
- Ensures candidates provide the required records
- Provides any required information to the subject lead regarding the monitoring visit
- Assesses candidates using *Common Practical Assessment Criteria (CPAC)*
- Applies for an exemption where a candidate cannot access the practical endorsement due to a substantial impairment
- Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates *Pass* or *Not Classified* assessment outcome/provides assessment outcomes to the Exams Officer to the internal deadline

Exams officer

- Accepts contact with the monitor and passes information to the subject lead for a visit to be arranged with at least two weeks notice
- Confirms with the subject teacher that assessment outcomes have been submitted to the awarding body to the external deadline/Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates *Pass* or *Not Classified* assessment outcome

Enquiries about results

The Head of Department will provide the relevant support to teachers regarding making decisions about enquiries about results.

Teachers will provide advice and guidance to candidates on their results and the post-results services available. They will support the Exams Officer by obtaining signed candidate consent forms or asking candidates to email their consent to the Exams Officer.

The Exams Officer will be familiar with the post-results services available for externally assessed and internally assessed components of non-examination assessments as detailed in the JCQ publication Post Results Services. They will produce a document that is placed inside candidate's results envelopes detailing the services available, the deadline date and the cost. A document will be emailed to the Head of Department detailing the same information. They will ensure that any requests for post-results services that are available to non-examination assessments are submitted online via the awarding body secure extranet site to deadline and that candidate consent has been obtained before processing the application.

Appeals

If a candidate believes that policy has not been applied in relation to their work, or if a candidate wishes to appeal against a decision to reject their work on the grounds of malpractice or not being able to confidently authenticate their work, they may make use of this appeals procedure.

N.B. an appeal may only be made against the process that led to the assessment and not against the mark submitted to the awarding body.

1. Appeals should be made as early as possible, and before the submission of grades as required by the relevant awarding body.
2. The marking, moderation and communication of grades must be completed two weeks before the awarding bodies submission deadline. This is to allow time for the appeals procedure.
3. Appeals must be made in writing by the candidate's parent/carer to the examinations

officer within 5 days of receiving the mark and before submission to the awarding body.

4. The Headteacher will appoint a senior member of staff, i.e. an Assistant Headteacher or a Deputy Headteacher, to conduct the review. The senior member of staff will not have had any involvement in the internal assessment process for that subject.
5. The purpose of the appeal will be to decide whether the process used for internal assessment conformed to the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.
6. The appellant will be informed in writing of the outcome of the appeal, including any relevant correspondence with the awarding body, and any changes made to internal assessment procedures.
7. The outcome of the appeal will be made known to the head of centre. A written record will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request. Should the appeal bring any significant irregularity to light, the awarding body will be informed.

After candidates' work has been assessed internally, it is moderated by the awarding body to ensure consistency between centres. The moderation process may lead to mark changes. This process is outside the control of Woodbridge High School and is not covered by this procedure.

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
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*	EO/ IT SUPPORT
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*	Head of Department
Candidates do not understand the marking criteria and what they need to do to gain credit	*Confirm all candidates understand the marking criteria* *Candidates confirm/record they understand the marking criteria*	Head of Department
Issuing of tasks		
Task for legacy specification given to candidates undertaking new specification	*Ensures subject teachers take care to distinguish between requirements/tasks for legacy specifications and requirements/tasks for new specifications* *Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved*	Head of Department Exams Officer/HOD
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* *Set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching*	Head of Department
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*	Head of Department Exams Officer/HOD
Subject teacher long term absence during the issuing of tasks stage	*See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle*	Head of Department/ Deputy Head
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*	Heads of Departments HOD'S to liaise with Director of Learning in charge of the School calendar
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)*	Exams Officer/HOD/ IT support

Insufficient supervision of candidates to enable work to be authenticated	*Confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments and (where applicable) Instructions for conducting coursework and any other specific instructions detailed in the awarding body's specification in relation to the supervision of candidates*	HOD

	Confirm subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy	HOD/EO
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	*Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (chapter 9 Malpractice) and (where applicable) Instructions for conducting coursework (chapter 6 Malpractice in coursework) are followed* *An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed*	Head Teacher/ EO to ensure relevant documents issued to staff Head teacher/ Dep Head)/ EO
Access arrangements were not put in place for an assessment where a candidate is approved for arrangements	*Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (chapter 2), to determine the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for the candidate*	SENCo to advise all subject staff of AA's EO to apply for SC
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*	HOD Subject teacher
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* *Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body*	Head teacher/EO
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 and (where applicable) Information for candidates – coursework assessments*	HOD EO
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 and (where applicable) Information for candidates – coursework assessments*	HOD/Subject teacher EO
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*	HOD
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*	EO
An excluded pupil wants to complete his/her non-examination assessment(s)	*If so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate*	Deputy head
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*	Subject teacher IT support
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*	Subject teacher/HOD EO/HOD

	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	
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*	Subject teacher/HOD
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*	HOD/Deputy Head HOD
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 and (where applicable) Information for candidates – coursework assessments* *The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment* *The school will follow the guidance in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures document*	EO to email doc at start of new academic year EO to email document to students at start of academic year HOD
Candidate does not sign their authentication statement/declaration	*Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments and (where applicable) Information for candidates – coursework assessments* *Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment*	EO to email students each year Subject teacher/HOD
Subject teacher not available to sign authentication forms	*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*	HOD
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*	Subject teacher/HOD
Keeping materials secure		
Candidates work between formal supervised sessions is not securely stored	*Records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments and (where applicable) Instructions for conducting coursework* *Regular monitoring ensures subject teacher use of appropriate secure storage*	JCQ docs to staff at the start of term by EO HOD/EO
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*	EO to remind staff at the start of the new term

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*	HOD EO to apply for SC
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason	*The candidate is marked absent on the attendance register*	Subject teacher/HOD

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*	Subject teacher/HOD
A candidate is unable to finish their work for unforeseen reason	*Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (chapter 5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for shortfall in work*	HOD/EO
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	*Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ documents Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (8) / VTQs (15) and (where applicable) Instructions for conducting coursework (16) to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for lost or damaged work*	HO/EO to complete lost cwk form
Candidate malpractice is discovered	*Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (chapter 9 Malpractice / VTQs chapter 15) and (where applicable) Instructions for conducting coursework (6. Malpractice in coursework) 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*	Deputy Head/Head Teacher/EO
A teacher marks the work of his/her own child	*A conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body that a teacher is teaching his/her own child at the start of the course* *Marked work of said child is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not*	Subject teacher/HOD/ EO to send conflict of interest to AB
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 publication A guide to the special consideration process (chapter 5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for non-examination assessment extension*	EO EO
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 publication A guide to the special consideration process (chapter 2), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for candidates*	EO
A candidate wishes to appeal 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* *Candidates are informed of their marks at least two weeks prior to the internal deadline set by the Exams Officer for the submission of marks, and that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process* *Internal appeals process*	Subject teacher Subject teacher Document on website – exams area

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* *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*	Subject staff EO EO/AB
Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by subject teacher	*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*	EO sends out schedule in timely manner.

Policy Reviewers: Mr T. Bhullar (Associate Headteacher) and Mrs J. Smith (Data and Examinations Assistant)

Approval: Approved by C&S Committee on 05 November 2026

Date of Next Approval: Autumn 2027