**BABINGTON ACADEMY**

# Non-Examination Assessment Policy 2026-27

Implemented September 2018

Reviewed: November 2026

Next Review October 2027

# Contents


BABINGTON ACADEMY ..... 0
What does this policy affect? ..... 2
Purpose of the policy ..... 2
What are non-examination assessments? ..... 2
Procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments identifying staff roles and responsibilities ..... 2
The basic principles ..... 2
Task setting ..... 3
Issuing of tasks ..... 3
Task taking ..... 4
Supervision ..... 4
Advice and feedback ..... 4
Resources ..... 4
Word and time limits ..... 4
Collaboration and group work ..... 4
Authentication procedures ..... 5
Presentation of work ..... 6
Keeping materials secure ..... 6
Task marking – externally assessed components ..... 6
Conduct of externally assessed work ..... 6
Submission of work ..... 6
Task marking – internally assessed components ..... 7
Marking and annotation ..... 7
Internal standardisation ..... 7
Consortium arrangements ..... 7
Submission of marks and work for moderation ..... 7
Storage and retention of work after submission of marks ..... 8
External moderation - feedback ..... 8
Access arrangements ..... 9
Special consideration ..... 9
Malpractice ..... 9
Enquiries about results ..... 10
Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications designed for use in England ..... 10
GCSE Computer Science requirements ..... 11
Management of issues and potential risks associated with non-examination assessments ..... 11

## What does this policy affect?

This policy affects the delivery of subjects of reformed GCSE qualifications which contain a component(s) of non-examination assessment.

> *"The regulator's definition of an examination is very narrow and in effect any type of assessment that is not 'externally set and taken by candidates at the same time under controlled conditions' 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'."*
>
> [Definition taken directly from the JCQ publication *Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments*– *Foreword*, *page 3*]

This publication is further referred to in this policy as NEA

## Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy, as defined by JCQ, is to

- *cover procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments*
- *define staff roles and responsibilities with respect to non-examination assessments*
- *manage risks associated with non-examination assessments*

[*NEA*– *The basic principles*, *page 4*]

## What are non-examination assessments?

*"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*– *The basic principles*, *page 4*]

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

### The basic principles

**Head of centre**

- Ensures that the centre's *non-examination assessment policy* is fit for purpose
- Ensures the centre's *internal appeals procedures* clearly detail the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against an internal assessment decision

**Senior leaders**

- Ensure the correct conduct of non-examination assessments which comply with NEA 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 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.

**Subject head/lead**

- Ensures subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities within the non-examination assessment process
- Ensures NEA and relevant awarding body subject specific instructions are followed in relation to the conduct of non-examination assessments
- 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 NEA
- 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 or is made as a separate component/unit entry code) to the internal deadline for entries

**Exams officer**

- 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 from a choice provided by the awarding body OR designs tasks where this is permitted by criteria set out within the subject specification
- Makes candidates aware of the criteria used to assess their work

## Issuing of tasks

**Subject teacher**

- 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 ensure that materials are stored securely at all times
- Ensures requirements for legacy specification tasks and new specification tasks are distinguished between

## Task taking

### Supervision

**Subject teacher**

- 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
- Where candidates may work in groups, keeps a record of each candidate's contribution
- Ensures candidates are aware of the JCQ documents *Information for candidates - non-examination assessments* and *Information for candidates - Social Media*
- Ensure candidates understand and comply with the regulations in relevant JCQ documents *Information for candidates*

### Advice and feedback

**Subject teacher**

- As relevant to the subject/component, advises candidates on relevant aspects before candidates begin working on a task
- When reviewing candidates' work, unless prohibited by the specification, provides oral and written advice at a general level to candidates
- Allow candidates to revise and re-draft work after advice has been given at a general level
- Records any assistance given beyond general advice and take it into account in the marking or submit 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 when planning and researching their tasks
- Ensures conditions for any formally supervised sessions are known and put in place
- Ensures conditions for any formally supervised sessions are understood and followed by candidates
- Ensures candidates understand that they are not allowed to introduce improved 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.

### Word and time limits

**Subject teacher**

- Refers to the awarding body's specification to determine where word and time limits apply/are mandatory

### 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
- 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

**Subject teacher**

- 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
  - signs the teacher declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met
- Keeps signed candidate declarations on file until the deadline for enquiries about 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
- 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* and informs the exams officer

### Authentication of students work from Suspected AI misuse:

**Phase 1: Prevention & Early Detection**

1. **Set Clear Expectations:** Before assignments, explicitly define what AI use is and isn't allowed, and how to cite it.
2. **Familiarize Yourself:** Learn common signs of AI text, like perfect structure, repetitive phrasing, lack of personal voice, or sudden jumps in writing quality.
3. **Compare Work:** Review previous assignments to spot drastic, uncharacteristic improvements in writing style or complexity.
4. **Request Process Statements:** Ask students to submit a brief note detailing their brainstorming, drafting, and revision process.

**Phase 2: Investigation & Evidence Gathering**

1. **Use Detection Tools as a Starting Point:** Run suspicious work through AI detectors (like Turnitin, GPTZero) but remember they aren't foolproof and should be used alongside other methods.
2. **Analyse "Tells" in a student's work:** Look for specific indicators:
    1. **Language:** Too advanced or inconsistent with the student's typical level.
    2. **Content:** Generic, lacking depth, or containing subtle factual errors.
    3. **Structure:** Formulaic, overly polished, or with awkward transitions.
    4. **Citations:** Fabricated or misattributed sources.
3. **Document Everything:** Teachers will keep detailed records of their suspicions, evidence, and interactions.

**Phase 3: Student Engagement & Formal Process**

1. **Hold a Meeting (with support):** Invite the student to discuss the work, ask probing questions about their reasoning, process, and specific concepts.
2. **Challenge for Deeper Understanding:** Ask them to explain complex parts of their work or elaborate on a point in real-time to test genuine comprehension.
3. **Formal Reporting:** If evidence points to misuse, follow Babington's formal process, referring to SLT and the Exams Officer in order to report to the relevant examining body.

### Presentation of work

**Subject teacher**

- Instructs candidates to present work as detailed in *NEA* 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

### 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
- Secure storage instructions are followed 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 enquiries about results or until the outcome of an enquiry or any subsequent appeal has been conveyed to the centre
- 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
- 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

**IT Manager**

- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates' work where work is stored electronically

## Task marking – externally assessed components

### Conduct of externally assessed work

**Subject teacher**

- Liaises with the EO regarding arrangements for the conduct of any externally assessed non-examination component of a specification
- Liaises with the Visiting Examiner where this may be applicable to any externally assessed component

**Exams officer**

- Arranges timetabling, rooming and invigilation where 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
- Conducts the externally assessed component according to the JCQ publication *Instructions for conducting examinations*

### Submission of work

**Subject teacher**

- Provides the attendance register to a Visiting Examiner

**Exams officer**

- Provides the attendance register to the subject teacher where the component may be assessed by a Visiting Examiner

- Ensures the awarding body's attendance register for any externally assessed component is completed correctly to show candidates who are present and any who may be absent
- Where candidates' work must be despatched to an awarding body's examiner, ensures the completed attendance register accompanies the work
- Keeps a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline for enquiries about results for the exam series
- Packages the work as required by the awarding body and attaches the examiner address label
- Despatches the work to the awarding body's instructions by the required deadline

## Task marking – internally assessed components

### Marking and annotation

**Subject teacher**

- Marks candidates' work in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body
- 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 in a timely manner to enable an internal appeal 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 internal verifier**

- Ensures that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence

**Subject teacher**

- Indicates on work (or cover sheet) the date of marking
- Marks to common standards

### Consortium arrangements

**Subject head/lead**

- Ensures a consortium co-ordinator is nominated (where this may be required as the consortium lead)
- Liaises with the EO to ensure form JCQ/CCA is submitted to the awarding body 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

**Exams officer**

- Arranges completion of form JCQ/CCA *Centre consortium arrangements for centre - assessed work*
- Submits form JCQ/CCA to the deadline for each exam series affected
- Submits marks to the awarding body deadline
- Where relevant, liaises with other consortium exams officers to arrange despatch of a single moderation sample to the awarding body deadline
- Where relevant (as the consortium lead), retains all candidates' work in the consortium until after the deadline for enquiries about results for the exam series

### 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 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

**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 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

## 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 until after the deadline for enquiries about results
- Takes steps to protect any work stored electronically from corruption and has a back-up procedure in place
- Retains evidence of work where retention may be a problem (for example, photos of artefacts etc.)

**Exams officer**

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

## External moderation - feedback

**Subject head/lead**

- Checks moderator reports and ensures that any remedial action, if necessary, is undertaken before the next examination series

**Exams officer**

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

## Access arrangements

**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 publication *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments*
- Where arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualifications 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
- Work 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

**Subject teacher**

- Understands that a candidate may be eligible for special consideration in assessments in certain situations where a candidate
    - is absent
    - produces a reduced quantity of work
    - work has been lost
- Liaises with the exams officer when special consideration may need to be applied for a candidate taking assessments

**Exams officer**

- Refers to/directs relevant staff to the JCQ publication *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

## Malpractice

**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 publication *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures*

**Subject teacher**

- Is aware of the JCQ *Notice to Centres - Teachers sharing assessment material and candidates' work*
- Ensures candidates understand of the JCQ document *Information for candidates - non-examination assessments*
- Ensures candidates understand the JCQ document*Information for candidates - Social Media*

**Exams officer**

- Signposts the JCQ publication *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures* to the head of centre
- Signposts the JCQ *Notice to Centres - Teachers sharing assessment 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 suspected malpractice

## Enquiries about results

**Head of centre**

- Ensures the centre's *internal appeals procedures* clearly detail the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against a centre decision not to support an enquiry about results request or not supporting an appeal following the outcome of an enquiry about results

**Subject head/lead**

- Provides relevant support to subject teachers making decisions about enquiries about 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 an enquiry about results 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 of non-examination assessments as detailed in the JCQ publication *Post Results Services, Information and guidance for centres*
- Provides/signposts relevant centre staff and candidates to post-results services information
- Ensures 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
- Collects candidate consent where required

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

**Head of centre**

- Provides a signed declaration as part of the National Centre Number Register Annual Update, 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*
- 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 the storage and submission of recordings

## GCSE Computer Science requirements

**Student accounts**

- Students are given exam accounts to use on the computers for all NEA work.
- These special student accounts have no internet access and have access to a prepared resource folder as required by examination body. This access is on a read only basis.
- The resource folder is set as read only for all students and the class teacher(s) by 1st September each academic year as required by examination body.
- Student accounts are locked when not being used for an NEA lesson and students are unable to access them.

**Administration of NEA lessons**

- Attendance of students to NEA lessons is recorded on a spreadsheet to enable students to have access to the full amount of time required to complete this element.
- Students are sat in a seating plan for NEA sessions and work in controlled conditions.

## Management of issues and potential risks associated with non-examination assessments

| 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<br>IT systems checked prior to key date<br>Alternative IT system used to gain access<br>Awarding body contacted to request direct email of task details | AH/BD |
| 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.<br>Records confirmation that subject teachers understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification<br>Samples assessment criteria in the centre set task | EGH |
| 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<br>Records confirm all candidates understand the marking criteria<br>Candidates confirm/record they understand the marking criteria | EGH |
| Subject teacher long term absence during the task setting stage | See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle | EGH |
| **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<br>Use line management meeting to ensure that these assessments have been chosen properly<br>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved | EGH |
| 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<br>Assessment weeks published for all subjects and year groups<br>Course information issued to candidates contains details when set task will be issued and needs to be completed by<br>Set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching | EGH |
| 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<br>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved | EGH |
| 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 | EGH |
| **Task taking** | | |
| **Supervision** | | |
| Planned assessments clash with other centre or candidate activities | Assessment plan identified for the start of the course<br>Assessment dates/periods included in centre wide calendar | EGH |
| 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<br>Staggered sessions arranged where IT facilities insufficient for number of candidates<br>Whole cohort to undertake written task in large exam venue at the same time (exam conditions do not apply) | EGH |
| 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 any other specific instructions detailed in the awarding body's specification in relation to the supervision of candidates<br>Confirm subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy | EGH |
| 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) are followed<br>An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed | EGH/FL |
| 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 | EGH/FL |
| **Advice and feedback** | | |
| Candidate claims appropriate advice and feedback not given by subject teacher prior to starting on their work | Subject teachers to record all information provided to candidates before work begins as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures<br>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity<br>Full records kept detailing all information and advice given to candidates prior to starting on their work as appropriate to the subject and component<br>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given prior to starting on their work | EGH/FL |
| Candidate claims no advice and feedback given by subject teacher during the task-taking stage | 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<br>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity | EGH |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Full records kept detailing all advice and feedback given to candidates during the task-taking stage as appropriate to the subject and component<br>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given during the task-taking stage | |
| 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<br>Records as detailed above are provided to confirm all assistance given<br>Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body | EGH/FL |
| 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<br>Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments<br>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion | EGH |
| 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<br>Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments<br>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion | EGH |
| 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 | EGH |
| 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 | EGH |
| 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<br>If so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate | EGH |
| **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<br>Where memory sticks are used by candidates, these are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions<br>Where work is stored on the centre's network, access for candidates is restricted between formally supervised sessions | EGH |
| 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<br>Awarding body guidance is sought on whether the work of the candidate should be marked where candidate's detailed records acknowledges sources appropriately<br>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 | EGH |
| **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<br>Where limits are for guidance only, candidates are discouraged from exceeding them<br>Candidates confirm/record any information provided to them on word or time limits is known and understood | EGH |
| **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<br>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved | EGH |
| **Authentication procedures** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment<br><br>Candidate plagiarises other material | Subject staff have been made aware of the JCQ document and there is a signed document confirming they have read the document<br>Teachers sharing assessment material and candidates' work<br>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments<br>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 candidates: non-examination assessments<br>The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment<br>A mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body | EGH |
| 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<br>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<br>Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment | EGH |
| 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 | EGH<br>AH/BD |
| **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 | EGH |
| **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<br>Regular monitoring ensures subject teacher use of appropriate secure storage | EGH |
| Adequate secure storage not available to subject teacher | Adequate/sufficient secure storage is available to subject teacher prior to the start of the course<br>Alternative secure storage sourced where required | EGH |
| **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<br>If not, eligibility for special consideration is explored and a request submitted to the awarding body where appropriate | AH/BD |
| A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason | The candidate is marked absent on the attendance register | AH/BD |
| **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<br>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 | EGH |
| 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 | EGH |
| The work of a candidate is lost or damaged | 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 lost or damaged work | EGH |
| Candidate malpractice is discovered | /nstructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (chapter 9 Malpractice) are followed | EGH/FL |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Investigation and reporting procedures in the current JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments are followed<br>Appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed | |
| 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<br>Marked work of said child is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not | EGH |
| 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<br>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 | EGH |
| After submission of marks, it is discovered that the wrong task was given to candidates | Awarding body is contacted for guidance<br>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 | EGH |
| 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<br>Records confirm candidates have been informed of their marks<br>Candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process<br>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<br>Through the candidate exam handbook, candidates are made aware of the centre's internal appeals procedures and timescale for submitting an appeal prior to the submission of marks to the awarding body | EGH |
| 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<br>Candidates confirm/record deadlines known and understood<br>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<br>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 | EGH |
| 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<br>Reminders are issued through senior leaders/subject heads as deadlines approach<br>Records confirm deadlines known and understood by subject teachers<br>Where appropriate, internal disciplinary procedures are followed | EGH/FL |
| Subject teacher long term absence during the marking period | See centre's exam contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle) | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Babington Academy | Policy/Procedure |
| Title: Non-Examination Assessment Policy | File Ref: O:\Staff\Exams\Policy Docs 25-26\Policy Docs 25-26 |
| Prepared by: F. Laywood | No of Pages: 15 |
| Approved by: Ed Herbert | Date last modified: October 2025 |
| Date approved: 30th Oct 2025 | Review date: October 2026 |

Policy Approved (date) …….

Signed ……..……

Chair of Governors

Review date October 2026 or earlier as required