

# Queen Elizabeth's Grammar, Alford A Selective Academy



## Non-Examination Assessment Policy

At Queen Elizabeth's Grammar, Alford the named persons with responsibility for this policy are:

<b>Examination Officer</b>	Mrs E Kemp
<b>SLT</b>	Miss B Allen
<b>Head of Centre</b>	Mr G Thompson

# Queen Elizabeth's Grammar, Alford

## A Selective Academy



### 1. INTRODUCTION

---

NEA is a form of internal assessment where the control levels are set for each stage of the assessment process: task setting, task taking and task marking. In some subjects, work will be marked by the awarding body. For most subjects, however, work will be marked by the centre and moderated by the awarding body.

It is the responsibility of all subject leaders to familiarise themselves with the content of this policy and the examination board requirements.

**Coursework instructions from the boards are also available on Staffshare.** These instructions are additional to any guidelines or regulations an individual awarding body may issue. If there is a conflict between the awarding body's guidelines or regulations and these instructions, the awarding body and subject-specific instructions shall prevail.

Breaches of the regulations for the setting, supervision, authentication and marking of coursework may constitute malpractice as defined in the JCQ booklet *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures*. This booklet is available on the JCQ website - [http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams\\_office/malpractice/](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams_office/malpractice/).

### 2. TASK SETTING

---

- 2.1. Coursework components assess candidates' skills, knowledge and understanding that may not readily be assessed by timed written papers. Coursework will take many different forms. Evidence of participation that may be appended to the candidate's final work may include printouts, copies of presentations, charts, photographs, letters, artefacts, videos, recordings or transcripts of interviews, CDs or DVDs. This diversity will be reflected in any subject-specific requirements for coursework that have been issued by the awarding body.
- 2.2. The centre should ensure that candidates are clear about the assessment criteria which they are expected to meet in their coursework. Specifications usually explain the criteria in detail, but candidates may require some further explanation or interpretation before they fully understand the nature of the skills which they are expected to demonstrate. Any explanation or interpretation given by teaching staff **must** be general and not specific to a candidate's work.

### 3. MARKING, REVISION, RE-DRAFTING AND INTERIM REVIEW OF WORK

---

- 3.1. When marking the coursework, teachers/assessors **must not** give credit in regard to any additional assistance given to candidates beyond that which is described in the specification. Teachers/assessors **must** give details of any additional assistance on the appropriate record form(s).



- 3.2 Before giving additional assistance beyond that which is described in the specification, teachers should ensure that there is provision to record this assistance and take account of it in the marking, **as there are a few coursework components in which no additional assistance is allowed.**
- 3.3 Teachers must keep live coursework secure and confidential at all times whilst in their possession. **It is not acceptable for teaching staff to share 'live' coursework with other candidates.**

#### 4. PRESENTATION AND SUBMISSION OF COURSEWORK

---

- 4.1 All coursework submitted for assessment must be the candidate's own work. Written material may be handwritten using black ink **or, where possible, word-processed.**
- 4.2 Where appropriate, work submitted may also include printouts/copies of presentations, charts, artefacts, photographs, letters, videos, recordings or transcripts of interviews, as well as witness statements from supervising teachers to record what a candidate has demonstrated. **In the event that videos or photographs/images of candidates are included as evidence of individual participation or contribution, subject leaders must obtain informed consent from parents.**
- 4.3 **Coursework must include a title and, where relevant, a table of contents and a bibliography.** Material included as **appendices** (such as tables of statistics, diagrams, graphs, illustrations, photographs, maps etc) **will be given credit only if it is pertinent to the work and is referred to in the text.**
- 4.4 Where candidates produce coursework electronically, their work must be backed-up regularly and stored securely on the school's IT system.
- 4.5 For moderation or external marking purposes, typed or written work should be submitted on appropriately sized paper in a plain cover or folder, **together with** the cover sheets provided by the awarding body. The cover must be marked clearly with the candidate's name and number, the number of the centre, the specification title or code and the component/unit title or code. Bulky covers or folders must not be included. **If the coursework is word-processed, the candidate must ensure that his/her name appears on each page as a header or footer.**



### 5. INVOLVEMENT OF PARENTS/CARERS

---

- 5.1. Parents/carers should encourage their children to spend time on their coursework and to think about it as early as possible. They should discuss with their children the planning and timing of the work.
- 5.2. Parents/carers may provide their children with access to resource materials and discuss the coursework with their children, but they must not give direct advice on what should or should not be included.
- 5.3. A child who needs more specific help should be encouraged to speak to his/her teacher.

### 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SOURCES

---

- 6.1. In many subjects, candidates will need to use information from published sources (including the internet) when carrying out their coursework. However, candidates must not copy published material and claim it as their own work.
- 6.2. If candidates use the same wording as a published source, they must place quotation marks around the passage and state where it came from. Candidates **must** give detailed references even where they paraphrase the original material. A reference from a printed book or journal should show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number. For example: (Morrison, 2000 p 29). For material taken from the internet, the reference should show the date when the material was downloaded and must show the precise web page, not the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example:  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/16/sosteacher/history/40766.shtml>. Candidates should be encouraged, as a means of good practice, to state the actual date when the material was downloaded.
- 6.3. Candidates must also include a bibliography which lists the full details of publications used to research and support their coursework, even where these are not directly referred to, for example: Morrison, A (2000) 'Mary Queen of Scots', London: Weston Press.

### 7. MALPRACTICE IN COURSEWORK

---

- 7.1. Candidates must not:
  - submit work which is not their own;
  - lend work to other candidates or allow their work to be copied;
  - allow other candidates access to, or the use of, their own independently sourced material or assist others in the production of coursework (this does not mean that candidates may not lend their books to one another, but candidates must not plagiarise others' research)
  - use any books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution;
  - submit work word-processed by a third person without acknowledgement.

These actions constitute malpractice, for which a penalty (e.g. disqualification from the assessment) will be applied.



- 7.2 If irregularities in coursework are discovered **prior** to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication this should be referred to the Head of School and Headteacher and will be dealt with internally. It does not need to be reported to the awarding body.
- 7.3. If irregularities in coursework are identified by a centre **after** the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, the Headteacher/Examinations Officer **must** be informed and they will then need to submit full details of the case to the relevant awarding body at the earliest opportunity. Guidance is provided in the JCQ booklet *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures*, together with Form JCQ/M1. The booklet and the form can be found on the JCQ website [http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams\\_office/malpractice/](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams_office/malpractice/).

## 8. DETECTION OF PLAGIARISM

---

- 8.1. There are a number of clues that point to the possibility of plagiarism, and teachers should remain alert to these. Further guidance on the detection of plagiarism may be found in the JCQ document *Plagiarism in Examinations: Guidance for Teachers/Assessors*. This document can be found on the JCQ website ([www.jcq.org.uk/](http://www.jcq.org.uk/)).
- 8.2. The following guides, published by Ofqual, should also be consulted:  
<http://www.ofqual.gov.uk/for-students-and-parents/123-for-students-and-parents-main-box-2-no-image/268-plagiarism-guides-for-students-parents-and-teachers>.

## 9. AUTHENTICATION PROCEDURES

---

- 9.1. The Code of Practice requires **all candidates** to confirm that work they submit for assessment is their own. All candidates are required to sign a declaration of authentication (**see Appendix 1**) before submitting their coursework to their teacher/assessor for final assessment. This is to confirm that the work is their own and that any assistance given and/or sources used have been acknowledged. **Ensuring that they do so is the responsibility of the centre.** Centres should record marks of zero if candidates cannot confirm the authenticity of work submitted for assessment.
- 9.2. It is also a requirement of the Code of Practice that teachers/assessors confirm to the awarding body that all of the work submitted for assessment was completed under the required conditions and that they are satisfied the work is solely that of the individual candidate concerned. All teachers/assessors who have assessed the work of any candidate entered for each component must sign the declaration of authentication. Failure to sign the authentication statement may delay the processing of the candidate's results. **If, during the external moderation process, there is no evidence that the work has been properly authenticated, the awarding body will set the mark(s) awarded by the centre to zero.**
- 9.3. In all cases, some direct supervision is necessary to ensure that the coursework submitted can be confidently authenticated as the candidate's own.
- 9.4 Guidance on use of AI is covered in our school's Examinations Policy.



### 10. MARKING OF INTERNALLY-ASSESSED COURSEWORK

---

- 10.1. In marking coursework, teachers should pay close attention to the requirements of the specification. Teachers should note that it is their responsibility to award marks for coursework in accordance with the marking criteria detailed in the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents. Teachers must show clearly how the marks have been awarded in relation to these marking criteria. The centre's marks must reflect the relative attainment of all the candidates.
- 10.2. Where a teacher teaches his/her own child, the centre must declare the conflict of interest and send the marked work to the moderator whether it is part of the sample or not.

### 11. ANNOTATION

---

- 11.1. Any guidance given in the awarding body's specification on providing evidence to support the marks awarded must be followed.
- 11.2. Subject to any further guidance contained in specifications, one of the following approaches should be adopted:
- summary comments either on the work (usually at the end) or on a cover sheet
  - key pieces of evidence flagged throughout the work by annotation either in the margin or in the text
  - a combination of the above.
- 11.3. Indications as to how marks have been awarded should:
- be clear and unambiguous
  - be appropriate to the nature and form of the coursework
  - facilitate the standardisation of marking within the centre
  - enable the moderator to check the application of the assessment criteria to the marking
- 11.4. Where appropriate to the type of work, the evidence to support the marks awarded should:
- indicate where the assessment criteria have been met, e.g. by writing key phrases from the criteria (such as 'awareness of values', 'selects information', 'uses a variety of techniques') at the appropriate point in the work
  - indicate any planning and processing not undertaken individually, and provide details of any assistance or prompting given to the candidate.
- 11.5. Where a moderator cannot find evidence to justify the mark awarded to a candidate, the work may be returned to the centre for further explanation or the mark may be subject to adjustment.

### 12. JOINTLY-PRODUCED WORK

---

- 12.1. Where permitted by the specification, the work of individual candidates may be informed by working with others, for example in undertaking research, but candidates **must** provide an individual response as part of any task outcome. Where an assignment may be undertaken as



part of a group, for example undertaking field research, each candidate **must** write up his/her own account of the assignment. Even if the data the candidates have is the same, the description of how the data was obtained and the conclusions drawn from it must be in each candidate's own words. Alternatively, where candidates are required to construct a product, they may collaborate in the construction of the product but their responses **must** be their own and their individual contribution clearly identified.

### 13. STANDARDISATION OF MARKING

---

13.1. Subject Leaders should use reference and archive materials (such as exemplar material provided by the awarding body or, where available, work in the centre from the previous year) to help set the standard of marking within the centre.

13.2 **Prior to marking, it is useful to undertake a trial marking exercise. Teachers should mark the same relatively small sample of work to allow for the comparison of marking standards.** The exercise can take place at appropriate stages during the course and has three beneficial effects:

- it helps to bring about greater comparability in the marking standards;
- it may identify at an early stage any teachers whose standards are out of line with that of their colleagues;
- it alleviates a heavy marking load at the end of the course.

13.3 Where the work for a component has been marked by more than one teacher in a centre, standardisation of marking should normally be carried out according to one of the following procedures:

*Either* a sample of work which has been marked by each teacher is re-marked by the teacher who is in charge of internal standardisation;

*Or* all the teachers responsible for marking a component exchange some marked work, (preferably at a meeting led by the teacher in charge of internal standardisation) and compare their marking standards.

Where standards are found to be inconsistent, the relevant teacher(s) should make adjustments to their marks or re-consider the marks of all candidates for whom they were responsible. The new marks should be checked by the teacher in charge of internal standardisation.

13.4 **Following completion of the marking and internal standardisation, the coursework must be retained by the centre and not returned to the candidates until after the closing date for enquiries about results for the series concerned.**

13.5 Centres should retain evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out.



### 14. FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS ON CENTRE-ASSESSED MARKS AND REVIEWS

---

- 14.1 We will ensure that candidates are informed of their centre assessed marks so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body.
- 14.2 Candidates will be informed that they may request copies of materials to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment. If a request is received then these materials will be made available promptly.
- 14.3 Requests for reviews of marking **must** be made in writing.
- 14.4 Sufficient time will be allowed for the review to be carried out, to make any necessary changes to marks and to inform the candidate of the outcome, all before the awarding body's deadline.
- 14.5 The review of marking will be carried out by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate and has no personal interest in the review.
- 14.6. The candidate will be informed in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking.
- 14.7. The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre and will be logged as a complaint. A written record will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request. Should the review of the centre's marking bring any irregularity in procedures to light, the awarding body will be informed immediately.
- 14.8 After candidates' work has been internally assessed, it is moderated by the awarding body to ensure consistency in marking between centres. The moderation process may lead to mark changes. This process is outside the control of the school and is not covered by this procedure.

### 15. SUBMISSION OF MARKS FOR INTERNALLY-ASSESSED COMPONENTS

---

- 15.1 Awarding bodies will publish deadlines for the submission of marks.
- 15.2 Forms for recording final coursework marks are supplied by the awarding bodies. The forms and any other documentation provided must be completed in accordance with the instructions given and returned to the awarding bodies by the date specified. As an alternative, centres may submit their coursework marks electronically, as specified by the awarding body.
- 15.3 Where a centre has been affected by circumstances beyond its control it may, **in exceptional cases**, be possible to grant a short extension. This is at the discretion of the awarding body and the centre **must** contact the awarding body as soon as possible to request such an arrangement. It is important that centres are aware that the timely release of examination results will be put at risk if the deadlines for the submission of marks and samples are not adhered to.





- 15.4 Where centres submit their coursework marks electronically, the awarding body may also require a copy of the marks to be submitted to the moderator, along with any other documentation needed.
- 15.5 **The centre should inform candidates of the marks which will be submitted to the awarding body, but in doing so must make it clear that those marks are subject to change through the moderation process.**
- 15.6 Awarding bodies will not accept coursework from centres that arrives too late to be moderated.

### 16. INCOMPLETE COURSEWORK

---

- 16.1 In cases where the coursework element of the specification requires candidates to produce several distinct pieces of work (e.g. three assignments or ten essays), which are assessed separately, a candidate who fails to complete all parts of the work should be credited with the marks for the task carried out unless the specification says otherwise. In some subjects, the tasks may be inter-dependent and teachers should follow the instructions in the specification when assessing incomplete work.
- 16.2 **Candidates who fail to submit any coursework must be recorded as absent when mark sheets are completed or marks processed electronically.** Failure to submit coursework will not render a candidate ineligible for the award of a subject grade.
- 16.3 A mark of '0' (zero) should only be given in cases where a candidate has submitted work which is considered to be worthless or where the authenticity of the work cannot be confirmed. It should not be awarded to a candidate who does not submit any work at all. The candidate should be recorded as absent.

### 17. APPLICATIONS FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION IN RESPECT OF INCOMPLETE COURSEWORK

---

- 17.1 If a candidate has been subject to an unforeseen prolonged illness or other misfortune during the period when the coursework was produced, it may, in some subjects, be possible to accept a reduced quantity of coursework without penalty, **as long as all of the assessment objectives have been covered at least once.** This will not be possible if the specification requires only one piece. Where several pieces are required, the reduction will be accepted only if those pieces are testing the same criteria. It will not be possible to give this consideration in every case, for example, if work has not been submitted or the assessment objectives have not been satisfied.
- 17.2 No adjustment to the marks should be made by the centre. **Form 10 – JCQ/SC** should be submitted to the awarding body, attached to a breakdown of marks across the assessment objectives. **Candidates must have been fully prepared for the course but unable to finish the work.** Awarding bodies will not normally agree a reduced amount of coursework in advance. This arrangement does not apply when candidates join the course late.
- 17.3 Candidates will not be eligible for special consideration if preparation for, or performance in, coursework components is affected by failure to cover the course as a consequence of joining the class part way through. Candidates who change examination centres part way through a



course will either have to make up the work which has been missed or accept that there will be a gap in their coursework which may have consequences upon the grade issued.

- 17.4 For further information on special consideration please refer to the JCQ publication, *Access Arrangements, Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration 1 September 2012 to 31 August 2013*. This booklet is also available on the JCQ website [http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams\\_office/access\\_arrangements/](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams_office/access_arrangements/).

## 18. LOST COURSEWORK

---

- 18.1 If a candidate's work has been **lost within the examination centre** and, despite every effort it cannot be found, or it has been accidentally destroyed, the circumstances should be reported immediately to the awarding body on the JCQ form **JCQ/LCW**. This form is available from the JCQ website: [http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams\\_office/coursework/](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams_office/coursework/).

Guidance is provided in **section 10.6** of the JCQ publication *Access Arrangements, Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration 1 September 2023 to 31 August 2024*: [http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams\\_office/access\\_arrangements/](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams_office/access_arrangements/).

- 18.2 The awarding body will consider whether it is appropriate to accept a mark for which there is no available evidence of attainment. This might occur in the following circumstances:
- The centre **must** be able to verify that the work was done and that it was monitored whilst it was in progress
  - The loss **is not** the consequence of negligence on the part of the candidate.
  - **If only part of the work is lost and part of the work is available**, further guidance must be sought from the relevant awarding body.
  - **If the work was marked before it was lost or damaged**, marks should be submitted in the usual way. **Form 15 – JCQ/LCW** must be submitted both to the moderator and the awarding body by the deadline for the submission of internally assessed marks or by the date by which the work should be despatched for moderation. **No marks will be accepted after the issue of results.**
  - **If the work was not marked before it was lost or damaged**, an estimated mark may be submitted on **Form 15 – JCQ/LCW**, based on the teacher's knowledge of the work up to the point where it was lost. Estimates **must not** include any supposition as to what the candidate might have achieved if the work had been finished. Estimates **must not** be submitted on mark sheets, only on **Form 15 – JCQ/LCW**. **No estimated marks will be accepted after the issue of results.**



### 19. EXTERNAL MODERATION

---

- 19.1 The purpose of moderation is to bring the marking of internally-assessed components in all participating centres to an agreed standard. All centres are required by awarding bodies to submit to moderation as described below (except where centres are accredited for a specification or a unit, e.g. within Applied GCE specifications).
- 19.2 The normal procedure is postal moderation, where the centre submits a sample of work to the moderator. For certain components however, the moderator may visit the centre to moderate the sample of work.
- 19.3 By the date specified, each centre must submit to the awarding body:
- details of marks awarded
  - authentication of the work submitted for assessment
  - confirmation that internal standardisation has been carried out as required
  - any other information as the specification may require.
- 19.4 The awarding body (or the moderator on behalf of the awarding body) normally specifies the candidates whose work is required for moderation by name/number. The sample should include work from across the range of attainment at the centre.
- 19.5 For visiting moderation, a visit is arranged for a date and time convenient to both the centre and moderator.
- 19.6 For both postal and visiting moderation, the moderator assesses the sample work using the published marking criteria in the specification.
- 19.7 The moderator marks are compared with the centre marks for the sample of work. If a significant number of the differences between the moderator marks and the centre's marks exceed the specified tolerance, adjustments may be applied to the centre's marks.
- 19.8 If further evidence of the centre's marking is required, the moderator may request some or all of the remaining work which **must** have been kept securely and be available.
- 19.9 If there is a significant disagreement between the centre's rank order and the moderator's rank order, the moderator's marks may be implemented for all candidates entered for the component by the centre.
- 19.10 In certain circumstances (for example, if internal standardisation has not been carried out) the awarding body may ask the centre to re-consider its marks.

### 20. FEEDBACK TO CENTRES

---

- 20.1 Following moderation, the final marks are provided to centres electronically with the results. Feedback forms from the moderator are made available to centres, either in hard copy format or electronically, and provide advice on the following:

# Queen Elizabeth's Grammar, Alford

## A Selective Academy



- how appropriate the tasks were (where set by the centre) and the coverage of the assessment objectives
- the accuracy of the centre's assessments against the criteria and in relation to the agreed standard for the component
- the efficiency of the centre's administration.

### 21. EXTERNALLY-ASSESSED COURSEWORK

---

- 21.1 In some specifications, coursework is externally assessed. In such cases, the coursework of all candidates, together with the authentication statements, must be sent by a specified date to an awarding body/examiner for marking.
- 21.2 Externally-assessed coursework will not necessarily be returned to centres automatically. Where the work is not returned to centres, it is treated in the same way as examination scripts and centres will be required to request such work under access to scripts arrangements. For further information on access to scripts arrangements, centres should refer to the JCQ document *Post Result Services, Information and guidance for centres*. This booklet is available on the JCQ website: [http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams\\_office/postresult\\_services/](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams_office/postresult_services/).

Feedback forms will not accompany any externally assessed coursework returned to centres.

### 22. RETURN OF WORK TO CENTRES

---

- 22.1 Moderators will return work directly to centres where instructed to do so by the awarding body. Coursework assessments submitted electronically will not be returned to centres.
- 22.2 **Centres are required to retain candidates' marked coursework, under secure conditions, whether or not it was part of the moderation sample, until all possibility of enquiries about results have been exhausted.** Where retention is a problem, because of the nature of the coursework, some form of evidence (e.g. photographic, audio-taped or videotaped) must be available. Centres are requested to keep a record of the examination numbers and names of those candidates whose work is included in the sample sent to or seen by moderators. This information may be required if there are enquiries about results at a later date. In the case of coursework stored electronically within the centre, protection from corruption should also be taken into account.

### 23. ENQUIRIES ABOUT RESULTS

---

- 23.1 As part of the JCQ awarding bodies' enquiries about results services, centres can request a post-results review of moderation (Service 3) to ensure that the assessment criteria have been fairly, reliably and consistently applied. **This service is not available if the centre's coursework marks have been accepted without change by an awarding body.**

- 23.2 The review of moderation:



is a process in which a second moderator reviews the work of the first moderator. The second moderator sees the original marks and any annotations made by the first moderator to gain a full and clear understanding of whether the assessment criteria have been applied as intended *is a process to ensure that the first moderator has made an accurate judgement on the centre ability to mark the work to the agreed national standard*

- is undertaken on the original sample of candidates' work
- includes feedback similar to that provided following the original moderation. (If centre marks are reinstated, feedback may not be provided.)

23.3 A review of moderation will not be undertaken upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample (unless there was a fault in the selection of the original sample, e.g. insufficient candidates included).

23.4 The coursework submitted for review of moderation:

- must be despatched to the moderator within three working days – failure to meet this undertaking may delay the outcome of the enquiry or result in the enquiry being cancelled
- must be the original work submitted for moderation
- must have been kept under secure conditions
- must not have been returned to the candidates

*If appropriate and depending on the particular circumstances, an equivalent sample may be requested by the awarding body where the original sample of candidates' work has been lost*

23.5 **Externally assessed coursework** will be treated as examination scripts for the purposes of enquiries about results. Centres should request a post-results review of marking (Service 2) or a priority post-results review of marking (Priority Service 2) as appropriate to the level of the qualification.

23.6 For further information on the 'enquiries about results' process, please refer to the JCQ document *Post Result Services, Information and guidance for centres* and speak to the *Examinations Officer (EK)*

## 24. ACCESS ISSUES

---

24.1 It is possible for awarding bodies to agree arrangements so that candidates with particular requirements can access the assessment(s). These arrangements must be made in advance of examinations and assessments.

24.2 Centres **must** ensure that, where coursework is marked by teachers, credit is given only for skills demonstrated by the candidate working independently and that access arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualification.