Normanhurst School
Examinations Policy

CONTENTS

This policy follows the latest JCQ publications on the JCQ website https://www.jcq.org.uk/. All JCQ documents are referred to in this policy and can be downloaded from the website, including:

- Access Arrangements, Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration
- Entries
- General Regulations for approved centres
- Information for Candidates documents
- Instructions for conducting examinations ('ICE')
- Key Dates and Timetables
- Malpractice

Section 1: Exam Policy

Policy Purpose

This exam policy will ensure that:
- all aspects of the centre's exams process is documented, supporting the exams contingency plan, and other relevant exams-related policies, procedures and plans are signposted to.
- the operation of an efficient exam system with clear guidelines for all relevant staff.
- that all exams and assessments are conducted in accordance with JCQ and awarding body. regulations, guidance and instructions so that the integrity and security is maintained at all times
- exam candidates understand the exams process and what is expected of them.

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the centre's exam processes to read, understand and implement this policy, which will be on our website. The exam policy will be reviewed every year by the group principal, Head of Centre and Exams Officer.

Roles and responsibilities overview

The Head of Centre must ensure compliance with the published JCQ regulations and awarding body requirements to ensure the security and integrity of the examinations/assessments:
- ensuring that appropriate accommodation to support the size of cohorts including AAO.
- understanding and follow all JCQ exam regulations (GR, ICE, AA, SM, NEA, SC).
- taking responsibility for confirming on an annual basis, that they are aware of and adhering to the latest version of the JCQ regulations by responding to the head of centre 's declaration which is managed as part of the NCNR annual update, which they cannot delegate and is aware failure to respond will result in the centre being suspended, unable to submit entries and receiving papers.
- ensuring that the Exams Officer, SLT, SENDCo and all staff receives appropriate support in order to facilitate the effective delivery of exams and assessments within the centre and compliant with JCQ published regulations, to maintain the integrity and security at all times throughout the exam series.
- ensuring that the location of the centre's secure storage facility is a secure room solely assigned to exams with only restricted to 2-4 key holders. Advise the awarding bodies immediately of any security risk with the question papers.
- ensuring that all risks to the exam process is assessed and is set out in the exam contingency in section 10 of this document.
- advising award bodies if any member of staff has conflict of interest and subject staff do not invigilate their own exam.
- ensuring that arrangements are in place for second pair of eyes to check exam papers before they are opened.

The Exams Officer is the person appointed by the head of centre to act on behalf of the centre manages the administration of GCSE exams and is responsible for:
- understands the contents of annually updated JCQ publications (GR, ICE, AA, SM, NEA, SC).
- is familiar with the contents of annually updated information from awarding bodies on administrative procedures, key tasks, key dates and deadlines.
- ensures key tasks are undertaken and key dates and deadlines are met.
- support Head of Centre to advise awarding bodies before deadline for entries regarding conflict of interest.
- train and keep record of all invigilator training.
- making the necessary announcements at the beginning and end of exams.
- the effective and efficient conduct of the exams.
- brief relevant staff regarding receipt of confidential exam material to maintain integrity and confidentiality.
- downloading results and prepared reports for pupils and staff.

The Senior Leadership Team is responsible for:
- organising the teaching and learning.
- being familiar with JCQ regulations (GR, ICE, AA, SM, NEA, SC,).

Teachers are responsible for:
- the guidance and pastoral oversight of candidates who are unsure about exam entries or amendments to entries.
- exam entries/registrations are completed within the deadlines set by the Exams Officer.
- advise the Exams Officer by July each year of any changes in the exam board or syllabus for their subject.
- ensuring that any official exam board non-examination is conducted in accordance with JCQ regulations.
- ensuring the accurate completion of mark sheets and declaration sheets.
- ensuring the accurate completion of entry and all other mark sheets and adherence to deadlines as set by the Exams Officer.
- submitting candidate names and entry codes including tiers to the Exams Officer.

The SENDCo is responsible for:
- identifying and arranging an appropriate assessor for candidates' testing requirements for access arrangements/reasonable adjustments.
- processing applications for access arrangements online within the deadlines set by the awarding bodies in accordance with the *JCQ Access arrangements, reasonable adjustments and special consideration*.
- ensuring pupils have signed a personal data consent form.
- ensuring that testing/assessments conducted are processed online and the outcomes made available to the exams office and all teaching staff before the candidates are due to sit their exams/ assessments.
- providing additional support with areas such as spelling, reading, mathematics, dyslexia or essential skills, hearing impairment, English speakers of other languages, IT equipment to help candidates achieve their course aims.
- providing additional support for the exam invigilation team to be available.

Invigilators are responsible for:
- observing, noting and reporting.
- making the necessary announcements at the beginning and end of exams.
- the effective and efficient conduct of the exams.
- supervising candidates in the exam room.
- collecting exam papers and other material from the exams office before the start of the exam.
- collecting all exam papers in the correct order at the end of the exam and their return to the exams office.
- being familiar with the contents of the JCQ Instructions for conducting examinations for the current year and the JCQ general regulations.
- displaying all JCQ notices/warnings to candidates.
- Sign a confidentiality declaration.

Candidates are responsible for:
- confirmation and checking of statements of entry and individual timetables.
- understanding non-examination assessment regulations and signing a declaration that authenticates the non-examination assessment as their own.
- reading notices/warnings to candidates and following the rules and regulations set by JCQ.

Parents/Guardians are responsible for:
- checking with their child to see that the correct details i.e. name, date of birth, exam entries including tiers are made correctly and to read through all the JCQ regulations with their child

Escalation Process

Purpose of the process
To confirm the main duties and responsibilities to be escalated should the head of centre, or a member of the senior leadership team with oversight of examination administration, be absent.

Before examinations (Planning)
In the event of the absence of the head of centre or the member of senior leadership with oversight of examination administration, responsibility for implementing JCQ regulations and requirements relating to activity prior to examinations will be escalated to our Head of Seniors or Assistant Head.

To support understanding of the regulations and requirements, the following JCQ publications will be referenced:
- General Regulations for Approved Centres
- Instructions for conducting examinations
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments
- Instructions for conducting coursework
- Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments
- Suspected Malpractice – Policies and Procedures
- A guide to the special consideration process

Main duties and responsibilities relate to:
- Centre status
- Confidentiality
- Communication
- Recruitment, selection and training of staff
- Internal governance arrangements
- Delivery of qualifications
- Public liability
- Conflicts of interest
- Controlled assessments, coursework and non-examination assessments
- Security of assessment materials
- National Centre Number Register
- Centre inspections
- Additional JCQ publication for reference Centre Inspection Service Changes
- Policies
- Specific JCQ publications for reference:
  - General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5)
  - Instructions for conducting examinations (section 25)
  - Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments (section 5)
- Personal data, freedom of information and copyright
- Additional JCQ publication for reference:
- Information for candidates – Privacy Notice

Before examinations (Entries and Pre-exams)
In the event of the absence of the head of centre or the member of senior leadership with oversight of examination administration, responsibility for implementing JCQ regulations and requirements relating to entries and exam preparation will be escalated to Head of Seniors or Assistant Head.

To support understanding of the regulations and requirements, sections of relevant JCQ publications will be specifically referenced including:

- General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5)
- Instructions for conducting examinations (sections 1-15)
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments (sections 6-8)

Main duties and responsibilities relate to:
- Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments
- Entries
- Additional JCQ publications for reference:
    - Key dates in the examination cycle
    - Guidance Notes for Transferred Candidates
    - Alternative Site guidance notes
    - Guidance notes for overnight supervision of candidates with a timetable variation
- Centre assessed work
- Additional JCQ publication for reference:
    - Guidance Notes – Centre Consortium Arrangements
- Candidate information
- Additional JCQ publications for reference:
    - Information for candidate's documents
    - Exam Room Posters

During examinations (Exam time)

In the event of the absence of the head of centre or the member of senior leadership with oversight of examination administration, responsibility for implementing JCQ regulations and requirements relating to during exam time will be escalated to Head of Seniors or Assistant Head.

To support understanding of the regulations and requirements, sections of relevant JCQ publications will be specifically referenced including:
- General Regulations for Approved Centres (sections 3, 5)
- Instructions for conducting examinations (sections 16-30)
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments (section 8)
- A guide to the special consideration process (sections 2-7)
- **Main duties and responsibilities relate to:**
- Conducting examinations and assessments
    - Additional JCQ publication for reference:
    - Guidance Notes – Very Late Arrival
- Malpractice
- Retention of candidates' work

After examinations (Results and Post-Results)

In the event of the absence of the head of centre or the member of senior leadership with oversight of examination administration, responsibility for implementing JCQ regulations and requirements relating to after examinations will be escalated to Head of Seniors or Assistant Head.

To support understanding of the regulations and requirements, sections of relevant JCQ publications will be specifically referenced including:
- General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5)

Main duties and responsibilities relate to:
- Results
    - Additional JCQ publication for reference:
    - Release of Results notice
- Post-results services and appeals

- o Additional JCQ publications for reference:
  - o Post-Results Services: *Information and guidance to centres*
  - o JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes)
- Certificates

There are regular update meetings between our Exams Officer, Head of Centre and Head of Seniors and Assistant Head, to ensure all procedures are carried out within the JCQ regulations and that all deadlines are completed on time.

Section 2: Qualifications

The qualifications offered at this centre are decided by the Group Managing Principal, Headmistress and Senior Leadership Team.

The qualifications offered are at GCSE level, informing the Exams Officer of changes to a specification is the responsibility of the Head of Centre and SLT. All candidates will be entitled, and enabled, to achieve an entry for qualifications from an external awarding body.

Decisions on whether a candidate should be entered for a particular subject will be taken in consultation with candidates, parents/guardians, subject teachers and the Head of Centre.

Section 3: Exam Series and Timetables

See the JCQ publication [Key Dates and Timetable](#) for full details.

Exam seasons
- Internal exams and assessments are scheduled every half term.
- External exams are scheduled in May and June.
- All internal exams are held under external exam conditions.

Timetables
- Once confirmed, the Exams Officer will circulate the exam timetables for external/internal exams to all relevant parties.

Section 4: Entries, Entry Details and Late Entries

See the JCQ publication [Entries](#) for full details.

- Candidates are selected for their exam entries by the subject teachers.
- Candidates or parents/carers can request a subject entry, change of level or withdrawal.
- The centre does not accept external entries from external candidates.
- The centre does not act as an exam centre for other organisations.
- Entry deadlines are circulated to subject teachers via email.
- Late entries are authorised by subject teachers and the Exams Officer.

Section 5: Exam Fees

- GCSE initial registration and entry exam fees are paid by the centre; any late entry or amendment fees are paid by the centre as determined by the Exams Officer.
- Candidates will not be charged for changes of tier, withdrawals made by the proper procedures or alterations arising from administrative processes, provided these are made within the time allowed by the awarding bodies.
- Fee reimbursements are sought from candidates who fail to sit an exam or meet the necessary assessment requirements without medical evidence or evidence of other mitigating circumstances.
- Candidates must pay the fee for a review of results before applied for, should the centre not uphold the enquiry and the candidate insist on pursuing the review.

Section 6: Verification of Candidates' Identity

The School does not accept external candidates to sit examinations, as all candidates are internal, their identities are automatically checked on entry to the school as part of the admissions procedures. This includes provision of a copy of each pupil's birth certificate. The pupils are known to all the staff and the Exam Officer will check before the exam starts that the candidates are sitting in the correct seat.

Section 7: The Equality Act 2010

The Head of Centre must ensure that the centre meets the requirements of the Equality Act 2010. The Equality Act 2010 aims to eliminate the discrimination often faced by disabled people. The main provisions of the Act to ensure the protection to disabled people in the areas of employment and education. A person has a disability for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010 if they have a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

The centre will meet the disability provisions under the Equality Act 2010, by ensuring that the exams centre is accessible and improving candidate experience. This is the responsibility of the Head of Centre.

Section 8: Equalities Policy

Purpose of the policy
This document is provided as an exams-specific supplement to the centre-wide equalities/disability/accessibility policy/plan which details how the centre:
"recognises its duties towards disabled candidates, ensuring compliance with all aspects particularly section 20 (7) of the Equality Act 2010. This must include a duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, through the access arrangements process submit applications for reasonable adjustments and make reasonable adjustments to the service the centre provides to disabled candidates. Where the centre is under a duty to make a reasonable adjustment, the centre must not charge a disabled candidate any additional fee in relation to the adjustment or aid" **(From the JCQ General Regulations for approved centres)**

This policy details how the centre facilitates access to exams and assessments for disabled candidates, as defined under the terms of the Equality Act 2010, by outlining staff roles and responsibilities in relation to:
- identifying the need for appropriate arrangements, reasonable adjustments and/or adaptations (referred to in this policy as 'access arrangements').
- requesting access arrangements.
- implementing access arrangements and the conduct of exams.

- good practice in relation to the Equality Act 2010.

The Equality Act 2010 definition of disability
A definition is provided on page 4 of the current JCQ publication: *Adjustments for candidates with disabilities and learning difficulties Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2021-22*

Identifying the need for access arrangements
Head of Centre
- Is familiar with the entire contents, refers to and directs relevant centre staff to the annually updated JCQ publications *General Regulations* and *Access Arrangements.*
Senior leaders
- Are familiar with the entire contents of the annually updated JCQ publications *General Regulations* and *Access Arrangements.*
Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (SENDCo)
- Has full knowledge and understanding of the contents, refers to and directs relevant centre staff to the annually updated JCQ publication *Access Arrangements.*
- Ensures an appropriately qualified assessor(s) is appointed, evidence of the assessor's qualification(s) is obtained before she assesses candidates and that evidence of the qualification is held on file.
- Ensures the assessment process is administered in accordance with the regulations and the correct procedures are in place.
Teaching staff
- Inform the SENDCo of any support that might be needed by a candidate.
Assessor of candidates with learning difficulties
(An assessor of candidates with learning difficulties will be an appropriately qualified access arrangements assessor/psychologist/specialist assessor)
- Has detailed understanding of the current JCQ publication *Access Arrangements.*
- Has the correct qualifications in place to be an assessor and complete a form 8.

Requesting access arrangements
Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (SENDCo)
- Determines if the arrangements identified for a candidate require prior approval from the awarding bodies before the arrangements are put in place or if approval is centre-delegated.
- Follows AA in section 8, have all appropriate evidence is on file, completed original form 8 is held signed and dated.
- Apply online for AAO with Exams Officer.
Exams Officer
- Is familiar with the entire contents of the annually updated JCQ publication *General Regulations* and is aware of information contained in *Access Arrangements* where this may be relevant to the EO role.
- Assists SENDCo to ensure all paperwork is in place before applying online for AAO.

Implementing access arrangements and the conduct of exams
External assessments
These are assessments which are normally set and marked/examined by an awarding body which must be conducted according to awarding body instructions and/or the JCQ publication *Instructions for conducting examinations* (ICE).

Head of Centre
- supports the SENDCo, the Exams Officer and other relevant centre staff in ensuring appropriate arrangements, adjustments and adaptations are in place to facilitate access for disabled candidates to exams.

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (SENDCo)
- ensures appropriate arrangements, adjustments and adaptations are in place to facilitate access for candidates where they are disabled within the meaning of the Equality Act (unless a temporary emergency arrangement is required at the time of an exam).

Exams Officer
- is familiar with and follows the *Checklist for heads of Centre and examination officers – The Equality Act 2010 and conduct of examinations* provided in the current ICE.

Other relevant centre staff
- support the SENDCo and the Exams Officer to ensure appropriate arrangements, adjustments and adaptations are in place to facilitate access for disabled candidates to exams.

Internal assessments
These are non-examination assessments (NEA) which are normally set by a centre/awarding body, marked and internally verified by the centre and moderated by the awarding body.

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (SENDCo)
- liaises with teaching staff to implement appropriate access arrangements for candidates.
Teaching staff
- support the SENDCo in implementing appropriate access arrangements for candidates.

Internal exams
These are exams or tests which are set and marked within the centre; normally a pre-cursor to external assessments.

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (SENDCo)
- liaises with teaching staff to implement appropriate access arrangements for candidates.
Teaching staff
- support the SENDCo in implementing appropriate access arrangements for candidates.

Facilitating access - examples
The following information confirms the centre's good practice in relation to the Equality Act 2010 and the conduct of examinations. On a candidate by candidate basis, consideration is given to
- adapting assessment arrangements.
- adapting assessment materials.
- the provision of specialist equipment or adaptation of standard equipment.
- adaptation of the physical environment for access purposes.

The table below provides example arrangements, adjustments and adaptations that are considered to meet the need(s) of a candidate and the actions considered/taken by the centre for the purposes of facilitating access.

Example of candidate need(s)	Arrangements explored	Centre actions
A medical condition which prevents the candidate from taking exams in the centre	Alternative site for the conduct of examinations Supervised rest breaks	*SENDCo gathers evidence to support the need for the candidate to take exams at home* *Pastoral head provides written statement for file to confirm the need* *Approval confirmed by SENDCo; AAO approval for both arrangements not required*

		Pastoral head discussion with candidate to confirm the arrangements should be put in place
		EO submits appropriate 'Alternative site for the conduct of exams form' online CAP
		EO provides candidate with exam timetable and JCQ information for candidates
		Pastoral head confirms with candidate the information is understood
		Pastoral head agrees with candidate that prior to each exam will call to confirm fitness to take exam
		EO allocates invigilator(s) to candidate's timetable; confirms time of collection of exam papers and materials
		Invigilator monitors candidate's condition for each exam and records any issues on incident log
		Invigilator records rest breaks (time and duration) on incident log and confirms set time given for exam
		Invigilator briefs EO after each exam on how candidate's performance in exam may have been affected by his/her condition
		EO discusses with pastoral head if candidate is eligible for special consideration (candidate present but disadvantaged)
		EO processes request(s) for special consideration where applicable; incident log(s) provides supporting evidence
		Pastoral head informs candidate that special consideration has been requested
Persistent and significant difficulties in accessing written text	Reader/computer reader 25% Extra time Separate invigilation within the centre	*Confirms candidate is disabled within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010* *Papers checked for those testing reading* *Computer reader sourced for use in papers (or sections of papers) testing reading OR up to 50% extra time awarded* *A short concise file note produces on centre headed paper signed and dated kept on file, confirming the nature of the candidate's impairment and that the use of a computer reader and/or a reader reflects his/her normal and current way of working within the centre* *(25% Extra time- Form 8 completed as appropriate)* *Supporting evidence AAO approval and signed candidate personal data consent form kept on file*
Significant difficulty in concentrating	Prompter Separate invigilation within the centre	*Gathers evidence to support substantial and long term adverse impairment* *Confirms with candidate how and when they will be prompted* *Briefs invigilator to monitor candidate and the method of prompting (call out his name to bring his attention back to the paper - confirms requirement for separate room)*
A wheelchair user	Desk Rooms Facilities Seating arrangements Practical assistant	*Applies for practical assistant to help candidate set up wheelchair and other equipment in a practical assessment; approval automatically fails so awarding body referral lists the tasks that will be performed* *Provides height adjustable desk in exam room* *Allocates exam room on ground floor near adapted bathroom facilities* *Spaces desks to allow wheelchair access*

		Seats candidate near exam room door
		Confirms arrangements in place to assist the candidate in case of emergency evacuation of the exam room
		Practical assistant cover sheet printed from AAO; to be completed by facilitator and inserted inside the candidate's work where this may be applicable to the assessment

Section 9: Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments

This policy follows JCQ's publication [Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments](). Follow this link for the latest full information.

Access Arrangements allow candidates/learners with special educational needs, disabilities or temporary injuries to access the assessment without changing the demands of the assessment. For example, readers, scribes and Braille question papers. In this way Awarding Bodies will comply with the duty of the Equality Act 2010 to make 'reasonable adjustments'.

Reasonable Adjustments
The Equality Act 2010 requires an Awarding Body to make reasonable adjustments where a disabled person would be at a substantial disadvantage in undertaking an assessment.

A reasonable adjustment for a particular person may be unique to that individual and may not be included in the list of available Access Arrangements.

How reasonable the adjustment is will depend on a number of factors including the needs of the disabled candidate/learner. An adjustment may not be considered reasonable if it involves unreasonable costs, timeframes or affects the security or integrity of the assessment.

Whether an adjustment will be considered reasonable will depend on several factors which will include, but are not limited to:
   • the needs of the disabled candidate;
   • the effectiveness of the adjustment;
   • the cost of the adjustment; and
   • the likely impact of the adjustment upon the candidate and other candidates.

An adjustment will not be approved if it:
   • involves unreasonable costs to the awarding body;
   • involves unreasonable timeframes; or
   • affects the security and integrity of the assessment.

This is because the adjustment is not 'reasonable'. There is no duty on the Awarding Bodies to make any adjustment to the assessment objectives being tested in an assessment.

Special Consideration
Special Consideration is a post examination adjustment to a candidate's mark or grade to reflect temporary injury, illness or other indisposition at the time of the examination/assessment.

The SENDCo is responsible for ensuring that all assessments are carried out by an appropriately qualified assessor <u>known</u> to the school. This is by having regular communication meetings with them and also checking their qualifications before any assessments are taken and keeping copies of these documents. These will be held on

record for inspection reasons, to confirm that they are authorised to carry out the relevant tests for which various access arrangements might be applied for.

The SENDCo will ensure that all Form 8s are fully completed and signed correctly in accordance with the JCQ regulations, pupils must sign a personal data consent form before access arrangement can be applied for online with the Exams Officer.

It is the responsibility of the Exams Officer to provide a separate room and invigilator for an individual or small group of candidates that require a reader/scribe. The Exams Officer may need to liaise with the IT Team to provide laptops for candidates with relevant access arrangements. Spell check and internet facility must be disabled in accordance with JCQ instructions.

It is the responsibility of the SENDCo to allocate a suitable member of staff to support the candidate e.g. to read/scribe/etc.

Information of any candidates with access arrangements e.g. extra time, must be available to the invigilator in the examination room and recorded on the official seating plan.

Access Arrangements
Access arrangements are agreed before an assessment. They allow candidates with specific needs, such as special educational needs, disabilities or temporary injuries to access the assessment and show what they know and can do without changing the demands of the assessment. The intention behind an access arrangement is to meet the needs of an individual candidate without affecting the integrity of the assessment. Access arrangements are the principal way in which awarding bodies comply with the duty under the Equality Act 2010* to make 'reasonable adjustments'.

Section 10:   Exam Contingency Plan

Purpose of the plan
This plan examines potential risks and issues that could cause disruption to the exams process at our school. By outlining procedures to be invoked in case of disruption it is intended to mitigate the impact these disruptions have on our exam process.

Alongside internal processes, this plan is informed by the Ofqual *Exam system contingency plan: England, Wales and Northern Ireland* which provides guidance in the publication *What schools and colleges and other centre's should do if exams or other assessments are seriously disrupted* and the *JCQ Joint Contingency Plan in the event of widespread disruption to the Examination System in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*.

This plan also confirms our school is compliant with the JCQ regulation (section 5.3, *General Regulations for Approved Centre's 2021-2022*) that the centre *has in place a written examination contingency plan which covers all aspects of examination administration. This will allow members of the senior leadership team to act immediately in the event of an emergency or staff absence. The examination contingency plan should reinforce procedures in the event of the centre being unavailable for examinations, or on results day, owing to an unforeseen emergency;*

Possible causes of disruption to the exam process

Exams Officer extended absence at key points in the exam process
The Head of Centre and SLT will ensure that trained, knowledgeable staff are available to keep the exams office running without accruing late fees and disadvantaging students, if the need arises. This would include Roma Lafferty as the previous Exams Officer.

Potential problems include:

Planning
- Annual data collection exercise not undertaken to collate information on qualifications and awarding body specifications being delivered.
- Annual exams plan not produced identifying essential key tasks, key dates and deadlines.
- Sufficient invigilators not recruited and trained.

Entries
- Awarding bodies not informed of early/estimated entries which prompts release of early information required by teaching staff.
- Candidates not being entered with awarding bodies for external exams/assessment.
- Awarding body entry deadlines missed or late or other penalty fees being incurred.

Pre-exams
- Exam timetabling, rooming allocation, and invigilation schedules not prepared.
- Invigilators not trained or updated on changes to instructions for conducting exams.
- Candidates not briefed on exam timetables and awarding body information for candidates.
- Confidential exam/assessment materials and candidates' work not stored under required secure conditions.
- Internal assessment marks and samples of candidates' work not submitted to awarding bodies/external moderators.

Exam time
- Exams/assessments not taken under the conditions prescribed by awarding bodies.
- Required reports/requests not submitted to awarding bodies during exam/assessment periods, e.g.; very late arrival, suspected malpractice, special consideration.
- Candidates' scripts not dispatched as required to awarding bodies.

Results and post-results
- Access to examination results affecting the distribution of results to candidates.
- The facilitation of the post-results services.

In our exam cycle the Exams Officer is always preparing in advance of any deadlines, just in case, all important dates are put on our school calendar to flag up any issues. The school will always contact the relevant exam boards to advise them of the situation and request guidance. The Exams Officer will have regular communication with Head of Centre and suitable staff in case of an emergency and keep all paperwork in order and up to date with a full electronic secure back up.

All key dates and deadlines are marked on the school calendar and will show on the weekly bulletin. There is a step by step guide available to cover all the exam procedures to use. We have always got support from another Exams Officer within our Group for information and guidance.

SENDCo extended absence at key points in the exam cycle
Key tasks required in the management and administration of the access arrangements process within the exam cycle not undertaken including:

Planning
- Candidates not tested/assessed to identify potential access arrangement requirements.
- Centre fails to recognise its duties towards disabled candidates as defined under the terms of the Equality Act 2010.
- Evidence of need and evidence to support normal way of working not collated.

Pre-exams
- Approval for access arrangements not applied for to the awarding body.
- Centre delegated arrangements not put in place.
- Modified paper requirements not identified in a timely manner to enable ordering to meet external deadline.
- Staff (facilitators) providing support to access arrangement candidates not allocated and trained.
- Access arrangement candidate support not arranged for exam rooms.

Exam time
- Access arrangement candidate support not arranged for exams room.

The SENDCo, Head of Centre and Exams Officer will communicate regularly, we will always seek advice from the awarding bodies. We will always be able to have communication with members of SENDCo staff within our Group for guidance.

Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle
- Early/estimated entry information not provided to the Exams Officer on time; resulting in pre-release information not being received.
- Final entry information not provided to the Exams Officer on time; resulting in candidates not being entered for exams/assessments or being entered late or other penalty fees being charged by awarding bodies.
- Non-examination assessment tasks not set/issued/taken by candidates as scheduled.
- Candidates not being informed of centre assessed marks before marks are submitted to the awarding body and therefore not being able to consider appealing internal assessment decisions and requesting a review of the centre's marking.
- Internal assessment marks and candidates' work not provided to meet awarding body submission deadlines.

The Exams Officer starts gathering candidate information prior to candidates entering Year 11, to build a picture in advance so that deadlines are not missed and will have regular communication meetings with subject teachers, Head of Centre and SLT, keeping a detailed record of all the gathered information.

Invigilators – lack of appropriately trained invigilators absence
- Failure to recruit and train sufficient invigilators to conduct exams.
- Invigilator shortage on peak exam days.
- Invigilator absence on the day of an exam.

The Exams Officer will ensure all staff at seniors are trained as invigilators in case of emergency and will have a member of the SLT as stand by just in case, there is also a step by step guidelines in place to work alongside the ICE.

Exam rooms – lack of appropriate rooms or main venues unavailable at short notice
- Exams Officer unable to identify sufficient/appropriate rooms during exams timetable planning.
- Insufficient rooms available on peak day.
- Main exam venues unavailable due to unexpected incident at exam time.

The Exams Officer will plan well in advance rooms required and any room change that needs to be re-arranged with support from the SLT. Due to an unexpected incident we will use the Braeside School facilities, which are already ready for exams. We would use and a mini bus to take our candidates there and we will always contact the awarding bodies for full guidance and will always follow the JCQ regulations.

Emergency evacuation of the exam room or Centre lock down (Unforeseen Emergency)
In the event of the centre being unavailable for examinations owing to an unforeseen emergency, including whole centre evacuation or lock down during exam time due to candidates unable to start, proceed or complete exams.

The school will take immediate advice from JCQ and the awarding bodies concerned and act accordingly, keeping candidates and staff informed and full notes including times, details etc. We will follow our emergency evacuation policy in section 19. We will always maintain the security and integrity of the exam and where possible we will start/re-start the exam in the same venue or in a venue with our Group, apply for special consideration all under guidance from the awarding bodies.

Disruption of teaching time in the weeks before an exam - centre closed for an extended period
If the Centre is closed or candidates are unable to attend for an extended period during normal teaching or study supported time, interrupting the provision of normal teaching and learning, the centre will plan to facilitate teaching and learning in an alternative location within our Group. Alternatively, we have various remote learning platforms which we can use for a full timetable of home learning teaching. It is the responsibility of the school to prepare students, as usual, for examinations.

Candidates at risk of being unable to take examinations centre remain open
The Exams Officer can liaise with candidates to identify whether the examination can be sat at an alternative venue in agreement with the relevant awarding organisations. The Exams Officer can apply to awarding organisations for special consideration for candidates where they have met the minimum requirements. Candidates are only eligible for special consideration if they have been fully prepared and have covered the whole course but are affected by adverse circumstances beyond their control.

If possible the school may open for examinations and examination candidates only. JCQ guidance on alternative site arrangements can be accessed through the JCQ website. If a candidate chooses not to sit an examination for other reasons they will be informed that special consideration rules will not apply. If in any doubt Exams Officer will seek advice from awarding bodies.

Centre at risk of being unable to open as normal during the examination period
(including in the event of the centre being unavailable for examinations owing to an unforeseen emergency)
Awarding bodies will be contacted to advise immediately and guidance will be followed. We can use within our Group another hall and we will have the Group mini buses on standby to transfer candidates. Parents & staff will be advised of change of location and the exams will go ahead under the JCQ regulations. The focus on the integrity and security of the exams papers will be adhered to at all times.

Disruption to the distribution of examination papers in advance of the exams
Awarding bodies could source alternative couriers for delivery of hardcopies or could provide the centre with electronic access to examination papers via a secure external network or email. The Exams Officer must ensure that copies are received, made and stored under secure conditions and keep in contact with relevant awarding boards for updates.

Disruption to transporting completed examination papers/assessment evidence
For a delay in normal collection arrangements for completed examination papers/assessment evidence, the centre will seek advice from awarding bodies and the normal collection agency (Parcel Force) regarding collection. The centre will not make arrangements for transportation without approval from awarding bodies. We will ensure that completed examination papers/assessment evidence will be stored securely until collection. We always keep record of all completed examination papers/assessment evidence that is sent to the awarding organisations, this is so we have proof in case this is lost/misplaced in transportation. We will also request that

Centre assessed grades are used and apply for special consideration, so that our candidates are not disadvantaged.

Assessment evidence is not available to be marked
If there is large scale damage to, or destruction of, completed examination scripts/assessment evidence before it can be marked, the awarding bodies should generate candidate marks for affected assessments based on other appropriate evidence of candidate achievement as defined by the awarding bodies. The candidates should be able to retake affected assessment at a subsequent assessment window. Special Consideration maybe applicable.

School is unable to distribute results as normal
(including in the event of the centre being unavailable for examinations owing to an unforeseen emergency)
If the Centre is unable to distribute the results as normal, the Exams Officer/Head of Centre will always seek advice from awarding bodies. Our results are obtained from the website portals so we can always access these remotely. We have various alternative sites within the Group which we can use and our pupils, parents & staff will be advised of any alternative arrangement.

Section 11: Managing Invigilators and Exam Days

This policy follows JCQ's publication [Instructions for Conducting Examination ('ICE')](#). Follow this link for the latest full information.

Managing invigilators
- Both internal and external invigilators are used for exam supervision.
- The recruitment of invigilators is the responsibility of the Exams Officer.
- All invigilators are required to attend Safeguarding Inset Days.
- Securing the necessary DBS clearance for new invigilators is the responsibility of Head Office. The centre will pay for DBS fees.
- Invigilators are timetabled and briefed by the Exams Officer.

Exam days
- The Exams Officer will book all exam rooms after liaison with other users and make the question papers, other exam stationery and materials available for the invigilator.
- Site management is responsible for setting up the allocated rooms under guidance from the Exams Officer.
- The Exams Officer/invigilators will start all exams in accordance with JCQ guidelines.
- In practical exams subject teachers may be on hand in case of any technical difficulties, but may not assist with suggestions e.g.; of use of colour, materials or method.
- Exam papers must not be read by subject teachers or removed from the exam room before the end of a session, papers will be distributed to subject teachers 24 hours after the end of the exam session.

Invigilation Duties – Starting an Examination
- Arrive at the exam venue at least 15 minutes before the scheduled start time.
- Make sure the exam notices are displayed prominently.
- Check to see if laptops are needed and, if so, collect from the IT Manger or Exams Officer.
- Collect the exam papers from the Exams Officer.
- Place candidate numbers on the desks in order with the seating plan
- Put papers on desks, including any additional resources that may be required.
- Ensure that pupils enter the exam venue at least 5 minutes before the start of the exam.
- Start the exam formally.
- Write the day, date, exam title, start time, finish time and if necessary any extra time on the white board.

- Be prompt for your invigilation – especially when timings change halfway through break times.
- Patrol the exam venue at regular intervals.
- Be aware if pupils need additional exam answer sheets.

Invigilation Duties – Finishing an Exam
- End the exam formally and make sure that no further writing takes place.
- Exam papers must be collected before the candidate leaves the exam room.
- Dismiss the pupils in an orderly fashion, making sure that they move quietly from the hall and that they do not inadvertently take exam papers, paper or tissues with them.
- Collect candidate numbers.

Section 12:   Candidates, Clash Candidates and Special Consideration

Candidates
- The centre published rules on acceptable dress, behaviour and candidates' use of mobile 'phones and other electronic devices and watches apply at all times
- Candidates' personal belongings remain their own responsibility and the centre accepts no liability for their loss or damage.
- Disruptive candidates are dealt with in accordance with JCQ guidelines. The SLT will send a letter home to any student who is disruptive in external exams or mock exams.
- Candidates may leave the exam room for a genuine purpose requiring an immediate return to the exam room, in which case a member of the exam staff must accompany them at all times.
- The Exams Officer will attempt to contact any candidate who is not present at the start of an exam and deal with them in accordance with JCQ guidelines.

Clash candidates
- The Exams Officer will be responsible where necessary for supervising candidates with exam clashes.
- Overnight supervision may be organised in accordance with the JCQ rules and regulations.

Special consideration
- Should a candidate be too ill to sit an exam, suffer bereavement or other trauma or be taken ill during the exam itself, it is the candidate's responsibility to alert the centre, to that effect.
- The candidate must support any special consideration claim with appropriate evidence within 5 days of the exam, for example by providing a letter from the candidate's doctor.
- The Exams Officer will then apply on-line for special consideration to the relevant awarding body within the deadlines.

Section 13:   Non-examination Assessments Policy

This policy follows JCQ's publication [Non-examination Assessments](#). Follow this link for the latest full information.

This policy sets out to:
- cover procedures for planning and managing all types of non-examination assessments.
- define staff roles and responsibilities with respect to all types non-examination assessments.
- manage risks associated with all types of 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.

Procedures
Head of Centre
- Returns an online 'Head of Centre declaration' at the time of the Register annual update to confirm awareness that relevant centre staff are adhering to the latest version of NEA.
- Ensures that the Centre's Non-Examination Assessment Policy is fit for purpose.
- Ensures the centre's Internal Appeals Procedures clearly details the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against internally assessed marks.

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.

SLT
- 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.
- 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.
- Ensures appropriate procedures are followed to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers.

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

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

Task setting
Subject teacher
- Selects tasks to be undertaken where a number of comparable tasks are provided by the awarding body OR designs tasks where this is permitted by criteria set out within the subject specification.
- 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 ensures that materials are stored securely at all times.
- Ensures the correct task is issued to candidates.

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.
- Is confident where work may be completed outside of the centre without direct supervision, that the work produced is the candidate's own.
- Where candidates may work in groups, keeps a record of each candidate's contribution and it must be possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates.
- Ensures candidates are aware of the current JCQ documents *information for candidates - non-examination assessments* and *information for candidates - social media.*
- Ensures candidates understand and comply with the regulations in relevant JCQ documents *information for candidate's documents.*

Advice and feedback
Subject teacher
- Relevant to the subject/component, advises candidates on relevant aspects before candidates begin working on a task.
- Will not provide candidates with model answers or outlines/headings specific to the 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 takes it into account in the marking or submits it to the external examiner.
- Ensures when work has been assessed, candidates are not allowed to revise it.

Resources
Subject teacher
- Refers to the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation to determine if candidates have restricted/unrestricted access to resources when planning and researching their tasks.
- Ensures conditions for any formally supervised sessions are known and put in place.

- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place to keep the work to be assessed and any preparatory work, secure between any formally supervised sessions, including work that is stored electronically.
- Ensures conditions for any formally supervised sessions are understood and followed by candidates.
- Ensures candidates understand that they are not allowed to introduce 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 requesting 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.
- 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 a member of the SLT.
- 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

Presentation of work
Subject teacher
- Obtains informed consent at the beginning of the course from parents/carers if videos or photographs/images of candidates will be included as evidence of participation or contribution.
- Instructs candidates to present work as detailed in NEA 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.

- Follows secure storage instructions as defined in NEA 4.8.
- Takes sensible precautions when work is taken home for marking.
- Stores internally assessed work, including the sample returned after awarding body moderation, securely until all possible post-results services have been exhausted.
- If post-results services have not been requested, returns internally assessed work to candidates (if requested by a candidate) after the deadline for requesting a review of results for the relevant series
- If post-results services have been requested, returns internally assessed work to candidates (if requested by a candidate) once the review of results and any subsequent appeal has been completed.
- Reminds candidates of the need to keep their own work secure at all times and not share completed or partially completed work on-line, on social media or through any other means. Refer them to the JCQ Social Media document.
- Where work is stored electronically, liaises with the IT Manager to ensure the protection and back-up of candidates' work and that appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access to it between sessions.
- Understands that during the period from the submission of work for formal assessment until the deadline for requesting a review of results, copies of work may be used for other purposes, provided that the originals are stored securely as required.

IT Manager
- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates' work where work is stored electronically.
- Restricts access to this material and utilises appropriate security safeguards such as firewall protection and virus scanning software
- Employs an effective back-up strategy so that an up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained.
- Considers encrypting any sensitive digital media to ensure the security of the data stored within it and refers to awarding body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable.

Conduct of externally assessed work
Subject teacher
- Liaises with the Exams Officer regarding the arrangements for any externally assessed components of a specification which must be conducted within a window of dates specified by the award body according to JCQ instructions for conducting examinations.
- Liaises with the visiting examiner where this may be applicable to any externally assessed component.

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

Submission of work
Subject teacher
- Pays close attention to the completion of the attendance register if applicable.

Exams Officer
- Provides the attendance register to the subject teacher where applicable,
- Ensures the awarding body's attendance register for any externally assessed component is completed correctly.
- Where candidates' work must be dispatched to an awarding body's examiner, or uploaded electronically, ensures this is completed by the date specified by the awarding body.

- Keeps a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series.
- Packages the work as required by the awarding body and attaches the examiner address label.
- Ensures that the package in which the work is dispatched is robust and securely fastened.
- Dispatches the work to the awarding body's instructions by the required deadline.

Marking and annotation of internally assessed components
Head of Centre
- Makes every effort to avoid situations where a candidate is assessed by a person who has a close personal relationship with the candidate or close friends and their immediate family.
- Where this cannot be avoided, ensures the possible conflict of interest is declared to the relevant awarding body and the marked work is submitted for moderation even if not part of the sample.

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

Subject teacher
- Accesses awarding body training/updates as required to ensure familiarity with the mark scheme /marking process.
- Marks candidates' work in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body.
- 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 that could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process.
- Ensures candidates are informed to the timescale as indicated in the centre's internal appeals procedure to enable an internal appeal/request for a review of marking to be submitted by a candidate and the outcome known before final marks are submitted to the awarding body.

Internal standardisation
Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead internal verifier
- Ensures that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence.
- Supports staff not familiar with the mark scheme (e.g. NQTs, supply staff etc.).
- Ensures accurate internal standardisation – for example by:
    1. Obtaining reference materials at an early stage in the course.
    2. Holding a preliminary trial marking session prior to marking.
    3. Carrying out further trial marking at appropriate points during the marking period.
    4. After most marking has been completed holds a further meeting to make final adjustments.
    5. Making final adjustments to marks prior to submission.
    6. Retaining work and evidence of standardisation.
- Retains evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out.

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

Consortium arrangements
Head of Centre

- Ensures a consortium coordinator is nominated which will usually be the Exams Officer, who will notify the relevant awarding body is informed that the centre is part of a consortium by submitting form JCQ/CCA for each exam series affected.
- Ensures procedures for internal standardisation as a consortium are followed.

Subject teacher
- Provides marks to Exams Officer to the internal deadline.
- Provides the moderation sample to the Exams Officer to the internal deadline.
- Retains all candidates work in the consortium until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series concerned or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later.

Exams Officer
- Submits an online notification of Centre consortium arrangements for centre-assessed work to the relevant awarding body through the Centre Admin Portal (CAP) by no later than the published deadline for each exam series affected.
- Submits marks for home centre candidates to the awarding body deadline.
- Liaises with other consortium Exams Officers in the consortium to arrange dispatch of a single moderation sample to the award body deadline.

Submission of marks and work for moderation
Subject teacher
- Provides marks to the Exams Officer to the internal deadline, for them to submit online.
- Provides the moderation sample to the Exams Officer to the internal deadline.
- Ensures that where a candidate's work has been facilitated by a scribe or practical assistant, the relevant completed cover sheet is securely attached to the front of the work and sent to the moderator in addition to the sample request.
- 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.
- Provides the exams officer with any supporting documentation required by the awarding body.

Exams Officer
- Inputs and submits marks online via the awarding body secure extranet site, keeping a record of the marks submitted to the external deadline.
- 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.
- Ensures that for postal moderation:
  o Work is dispatched in packaging provided by the awarding body.
  o Moderator label(s) provided by the awarding body are affixed to the packaging.
  o 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.
- Through the subject teacher, submits any supporting documentation required by the awarding body.

Storage and retention of work after submission of marks
Subject teacher

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

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

External moderation – the process
Subject teacher
- Ensures that awarding body or its moderator receive the correct samples of candidate's work.
- Where relevant liaises with awarding body/moderator where the moderator visits the centre to mark the sample of work.
- Complies with any request from the moderator for remaining work for further evidence of the centre's marking.

External moderation - feedback
SLT
- Checks the final moderated marks when issued to the centre when the results are published.
- 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 and reasonable adjustments
Subject teacher
- Works with the sendco to ensure any access arrangements for eligible candidates are applied to assessments.

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (SENDCo)
- Follows the regulations and guidance in the JCQ publication *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments.*
- Where arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualification and is the candidate's normal way of working, will ensure access arrangements are in place and awarding body approval, where required, has been obtained prior to assessments taking place.
- Makes subject teachers aware of any access arrangements for eligible candidates which need to be applied to assessments.
- Works with subject teachers to ensure requirements for access arrangement candidates requiring the support of a facilitator in assessments are met.
- Ensures that staff acting as an access arrangement facilitator are fully trained in their role.

Special consideration
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.
- Liaises with the Exams Officer when special consideration may need to be applied for a candidate taking assessments.
- Liaises with the Exams Officer to report loss of work to the awarding body.

Exams Officer
- Refers to 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.
- Refers to form 15 where applicable submits to the relevant awarding body.

Malpractice
Head of Centre
- Understands the responsibility to immediately report to the relevant awarding body any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates, teachers, invigilators or other administrative staff.
- Is familiar with the JCQ publication *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures.*
- Ensures that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing non-examination assessment are aware of the potential for malpractice and ensures that teaching staff are reminded that failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself.

Subject teacher
- Is aware of the JCQ *Notice to Centre's - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work* to mitigate against candidate and centre malpractice.
- Ensures candidates understand what constitutes malpractice in non-examination assessments.
- Ensures candidates understand the JCQ document *Information for candidates - non-examination assessments.*
- Ensures candidates understand the JCQ document *Information for candidates - Social Media.*
- Escalates and reports any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates to the Head of Centre.

Exams Officer
- Signposts the JCQ publication *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures* to the Head of Centre.
- Signposts the JCQ *Notice to Centre's - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work* to subject heads.
- Signposts candidates to the relevant JCQ information for candidate's documents.
- Where required, supports the Head of Centre in investigating and reporting incidents of suspected malpractice.

Post-results services
Head of Centre
- Is familiar with the JCQ publication *Post-Results Services.*

- 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 a review of results or an appeal.

SLT
- Provides relevant support to subject teachers making decisions about review of results.

Subject teacher
- Provides advice and guidance to candidates on their results and the post-results services available.
- Provides the Exams Officer with the original sample or relevant sample of candidates' work that may be required for a review of moderation to the internal deadline.

Exams Officer
- Provides/signposts relevant centre staff and candidates to post-results services information.
- 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.*
- 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.

Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications designed for use in England
Head of Centre
- Returns an online 'Head of Centre declaration' at the time of the National Centre Number Register annual update, confirming that all reasonable steps have been or will be taken to ensure that all candidates at the centre have had, or will have, the opportunity to undertake the Spoken Language endorsement.

Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead internal verifier
- Ensures the appropriate arrangements are in place for internal standardisation of assessments.

SLT
- Confirms understanding of the *Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications designed for use in England* and ensures any relevant JCQ/awarding body instructions are followed.
- Ensures the required task setting and task taking instructions are followed by subject teachers.
- Ensures subject teachers assess candidates, either live or from recordings, using the common assessment criteria.
- Ensures for monitoring purposes, audio-visual recordings of the presentations of a sample of candidates are provided.

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

Exams Officer
- Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades and the storage and submission of recording.

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

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Centre staff malpractice	*Records confirm that relevant centre staff are familiar with and follow:* • *The current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments* • *The JCQ document Notice to Centres – Sharing NEA material and candidates' work*	HOC/EO
Candidate malpractice	*Records confirm that candidates are informed and understand they must not:* • *submit work which is not their own* • *make available their work to other candidates through any medium* • *allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material* • *assist other candidates to produce work* • *use books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution* • *submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement* • *include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material* *Records confirm that candidates have been made aware of the JCQ documents Information for Candidates NEA and Social Media*	**S**UBJECT TEACHER/ EO
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 TEAM
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*	SLT
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* *records confirm all candidates understand the marking criteria* *candidates confirm/record they understand the marking criteria*	SLT
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*	SLT
Issuing of tasks		
Awarding body set task not issued to candidates on time	*awarding body key date for accessing set task as detailed in the specification noted prior to start of course* *course information issued to candidates contains details when set task will be issued and needs to be completed by* *set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching*	SUBJECT TEACHER
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*	SUBJECT TEACHER
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*	SLT
A candidate (or parent/carer) expresses concern about safeguarding, confidentiality or faith in undertaking a task such as	*ensures the candidate's presentation does not form part of the sample which will be recorded* *contacts the awarding body at the earliest opportunity where unable to record the required number of candidates for the monitoring sample*	SLT/EO

a presentation that may be recorded		
Task taking		
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*	SLT
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)*	SLT
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* *confirm subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy*	EO/SLT
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 are followed* *an internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed*	EO/SLT
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 to determine the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for the candidate*	EO/SLT
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*	EO/SLT
Candidate claims no advice and feedback given by subject teacher during the task-taking stage	*ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to record all advice and feedback provided to candidates during the task-taking stage as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures* *regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity* *full records kept detailing all advice and feedback given to candidates during the task-taking stage as appropriate to the subject and component* *Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given during the task-taking stage*	EO/SLT
A third party claims that assistance was given to candidates by the subject teacher over and above that allowed in the regulations and specification	*an investigation is conducted; candidates and subject teacher are interviewed and statements recorded where relevant* *records as detailed above are provided to confirm all assistance given* *where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body*	EO/SLT
Candidate does not reference information from published source	*candidate is advised at a general level to reference information before work is submitted for formal assessment* *candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments* *candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion*	EO/SLT
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*	EO/SLT

	candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion	
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	SUBJECT TEACHER
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)	the awarding body specification is checked to determine if the specification is available to a candidate outside mainstream education if so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate	EO/SLT
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	EO/ SUBJECT TEACHER
A candidate fails to acknowledge sources on work that is submitted for assessment	candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is checked to confirm all the sources used, including books, websites and audio/visual resources awarding body guidance is sought on whether the work of the candidate should be marked where candidate's detailed records acknowledges sources appropriately where confirmation is unavailable from candidate's records, awarding body guidance is sought and/or a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body for the candidate	EO/ SUBJECT TEACHER
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	EO/ SUBJECT TEACHER
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	EO/ SUBJECT TEACHER
Authentication procedures		
A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment Candidate plagiarises other material	records confirm subject staff have been made aware of the JCQ document teachers sharing assessment material and candidates' work records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments candidates confirm/record that they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for non-examination assessments as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments the candidate's work is not accepted for assessment a mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body	EO/ SUBJECT TEACHER
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 candidates confirm/record they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment	EO/ SUBJECT TEACHER
Presentation of work		
Candidate does not fully complete the awarding body's cover sheet	cover sheet is checked to ensure it is fully completed before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment	EO/

that is attached to their worked submitted for formal assessment		SUBJECT TEACHER
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* *regular monitoring/internal audit ensures subject teacher use of appropriate secure storage*	EO/ SUBJECT TEACHER
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/SLT
Candidates work produced electronically is not securely stored	*records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments* *Internal processes and regular monitoring by IT Manager ensures:* • *access to this material is restricted by password protected* • *appropriate security safeguards are in place* • *an effective back up strategy is employed so that an up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained* • *any sensitive digital media is encrypted to ensure the security of the data stored within it*	IT TEAM
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*	EO/SLT
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason	*the candidate is marked absent on the attendance register*	EO/SLT
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*	EO/ SUBJECT TEACHER
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*	EO
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	*relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (section 8), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for lost or damaged work*	EO
Candidate malpractice is discovered	*instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments are followed* *investigation and reporting procedures in the current JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures are followed* *appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed*	EO/SLT
A teacher marks the work of a candidate with whom they have a close relationship e.g. member of their family	*a conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body that a teacher is preparing/teaching said child at the start of the course* *marked work of said child is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not*	EO/SLT
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
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/SLT

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* *records confirm candidates have been informed of their marks* *candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process* *candidates are informed of their marks at least two weeks prior to the internal deadline set by the Exams Officer for the submission of marks* *through the candidate exam handbook, candidates are made aware of the centre's internal appeals procedures and timescale for submitting an appeal prior to the submission of marks to the awarding body*	EO/SLT
Deadline for submitting work for formal assessment not met by candidate	*records confirm deadlines given and understood by candidates* *candidates confirm/record deadlines known and understood* *depending on the circumstances, awarding body guidance sought to determine if the work can be accepted late for marking providing the awarding body's deadline for submitting marks can be met* *decision made if the work will be accepted late for marking or a mark of zero submitted to the awarding body for the candidate*	EO
Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by subject teacher	*internal/external deadlines are published at the start of each academic year reminders are issued through senior leaders/subject heads as deadlines approach Records confirm deadlines known and understood by subject teachers where appropriate, internal disciplinary procedures are followed*	EO/SLT
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)*	SLT

Section 14:   Word Processor Policy

References to 'AA' relate to JCQ *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2021/22* and ICE to JCQ *Instructions for conducting examinations 2021/22*

Introduction
The use of a word processor in exams and assessments is an available access arrangement/reasonable adjustment.
(AA 4.2.1)
- The purpose of an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment is to ensure, where possible, that barriers to assessment are removed for a disabled candidate preventing them from being placed at a substantial disadvantage as a consequence of persistent and significant difficulties.
- The integrity of the assessment is maintained, whilst at the same time as providing access to assessments for a disabled candidate.
(AA 4.2.2)
- Although access arrangements/adjustments are intended to allow access to assessments, they cannot be granted where they will compromise the assessment objectives of the specification in question.
(AA 4.2.3)
- Candidates may not require the same access arrangements/reasonable adjustments in each specification. Subjects and their methods of assessments may vary, leading to different demands of our candidates, the need for the use of a word processor must be considered on a subject-by-subject basis.
(AA 4.2.1)
- SENDCo must ensure that the proposed access arrangement/reasonable adjustment does not disadvantage or advantage a candidate.
(AA 4.2.7)
- The candidate must have had appropriate opportunities to practice using the access arrangement(s)/reasonable adjustments before their first examination.

The use of a word processor

 (AA 5.8.1)
- Allocate the use of a word processor to a candidate with the spelling and grammar check/predictive text disabled (switched off) where it is their normal way of working within the centre.

(AA 5.8.2)
- Provides access to word processors to candidates in non-examination assessments components as standard practice unless prohibited by the specification.

(AA 5.8.4)
- The centre will not simply grant the use of a word processor to a candidate because they prefer to type rather than write or can work faster on a keyboard, or because they use a laptop at home.

Word processors and their programmes

Our centre complies with instructions by ensuring:
- word processors are used as a type-writer, not as a database, although standard formatting software is acceptable.
- word processors have been cleared of any previously stored data.
- an unauthorised memory stick is not permitted for use by a candidate.
- where required, candidates are provided with a memory stick, which has been cleared of any previously stored data, by a nominated member of centre staff.
- word processors are in good working order at the time of the examination.
- word processors are accommodated in such a way that other candidates are not disturbed and cannot read the screen.
- where a candidate using a word processor is accommodated separately, a separate invigilator is used.
- word processors are either connected to a printer so that a script can be printed off, or have the facility to print from a portable storage medium.
- documents are printed after the examination is over.
- candidates are present to verify that the work printed is their own.
- word processed scripts are inserted in/attached to any answer booklet which contains some of the answers (and according to instructions issued by the individual awarding body).
- word processors are used to produce scripts under secure conditions, and if they are not then the centre is aware that they may be refused by the awarding body.
- word processors are not used to perform skills which are being assessed.
- word processors are not connected to an intranet or any other means of communication.
- candidates are not given access to other applications such as a calculator (where prohibited in the examination), spreadsheets etc. when using a word processor.
- graphic packages or computer aided design software is not included on a word processor unless permission has been given to use these.
- predictive text software or an automatic spelling and grammar check is disabled unless the candidate has been permitted a scribe or is using voice recognition technology (the script must have a scribe cover sheet attached), or the awarding body's specification permits the use of automatic spell checking.
- voice recognition technology is not included on word processors unless the candidate has permission to use a scribe or relevant software.
- word processors are not used on the candidate's behalf by a third party unless the candidate has permission to use a scribe.

Laptops, Tablets and Word Processors

Our centre further complies with instructions by ensuring:
- tablets used during examinations/assessments are designed to run for a long period of time once fully charged and are 'free-standing'
- the battery capacity of all laptops and/or tablets is checked before the candidate's examination(s) with the battery sufficiently charged for the entire duration of the examination

- candidates with fully charged laptops or tablets are given the opportunity to be seated within the main examination hall without the need for separate invigilation and power points
- candidates are reminded that their Centre number, candidate number and the unit/component code must appear on each page as a header or footer
- candidates using Notepad or WordPad software (which do not allow for the insertion of a header or footer) are instructed to handwrite their details as a header or footer once they have finished the examination and printed off their typed script; candidates are also supervised to ensure that they are solely performing this task and not re-reading their answers or amending their work in any way
- each page is appropriately numbered.
- candidates are instructed to use a minimum 12pt font and double spacing
- invigilators remind candidates to save their work at regular intervals
- it is possible to set up 'auto save' onto each laptop/tablet
- candidates granted the use of a word processor are present at the end of the examination when their script is printed off so they can verify that the work printed off is their own.

Exceptions

The only exceptions to the above where the use of a word processor would be considered for a candidate would be in the event of a temporary injury or impairment, or a diagnosis of a disability or manifestation of an impairment relating to an existing disability arising after the start of a course

The criteria the School uses to award and allocate word processors for examinations

> *"A member of the centre's senior leadership team must produce a statement for inspection purposes which details the criteria the centre uses to award and allocate word processors for examinations."*   *[AA 5.8]*
>
> The 'normal way of working' for exam candidates, as directed by the Head of Centre, is that candidates handwrite their exams. An exception to this is where a candidate may have an approved access arrangement in place, for example the use of a scribe/speech recognition technology.
>
> **The use of word processors**
> There are also exceptions where a candidate may be allocated the use of a word processor in exams where they have a firmly established need, it reflects the candidate's normal way of working and by not being awarded a word processor would be at a substantial disadvantage to other candidates.
>
> This may include where a candidate has, for example:
> - a learning difficulty which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on their ability to write legibly
> - a medical condition
> - a physical disability
> - a sensory impairment
> - planning and organisational problems when writing by hand
> - poor handwriting
>
> The only exception to the above where the use of a word processor may be considered for a candidate would be:
> - on a temporary basis as a consequence of a temporary injury at the time of the assessment
> - where a subject within the curriculum is delivered electronically and the centre provides word processors to all candidates
>
> **Arranging for the use of word processors at the time of the assessment**
> Appropriate exam-compliant word processors will be provided by the IT department in liaison with the SENDCo and the Exams Officer.
>
> Statement produced by: **Mrs Jacqueline Job, Head of Centre**   Statement date: 30 November 2023

Section 15:   Exams Internal Appeals Procedure

This policy follows JCQ's publication [Appeals](#). Follow this link for the latest full information.

Appeals procedure against internal assessment decisions (Centre assessed marks)
Certain GCSE contain components of non-examination assessment which are internally assessed which are assessed by our School and internally standardised. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) which contributes to the final grade of the qualification are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderations.

This procedure confirms our centre is compliant with the JCQ regulations 2021/22:
- have in place and be available for inspection purposes, a written internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions and to ensure that details of this procedure are communicated, made widely available and accessible to all candidates
- before submitting marks to the awarding body inform candidates of their centre assessed marks and allow a candidate to request a review of the centre's marking

The School is committed to ensuring that internal assessments are marked and administered fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body specifications and subject-specific associated documents.

This is ensured by:
- Subject staff having the necessary and appropriate knowledge, understanding, skills, and training in this activity.
- Subject staff authenticating candidates work according to the requirements of the relevant awarding body.
- A process of internal moderation and standardisation led by subject staff.

The School ensures that all centre staff follow a robust Non-Examination Assessment Policy. This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments, including the marking and quality assurance processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow, with the appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill.

On being informed of their centre assessed marks, if a candidate believes that the above procedures where not followed in relation to the marking of their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the mark scheme to their marking, then they may make use of this appeals procedure to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

The school will inform candidates at the start of Year 10, using the JCQ 'Review of Marking' template, as follows:
- The School 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.
- The School will inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as review will only focus on the quality of their work in meeting the published assessment criteria.
- The School will inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (for example, as a minimum, a copy of their marked assessment material (work) and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment.
- The School will, having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate (or for some marked assessment materials, such as art work and recordings, inform the candidate that these will be shared under supervised conditions) within 7 calendar days.
- The School will inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material unless supervised.

- The School will provide candidates with sufficient time in order to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision, informing candidates that if their decision is to request a review they will need to explain what they believe the issue to be.
- The School for reviews of marking must be made in writing within 7 calendar days of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the internal appeals form. Requests after this time will not be accepted.
- The School will allow 7 calendar days 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.
- The School will ensure that the review of marking is 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.
- The School will instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.
- The candidate will be informed in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking.

The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre who will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request. The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review.

After candidates' work has been internally assessed, it is moderated by the awarding body to ensure consistency in marking between centres. The moderation may lead to mark changes which could go up or down by the awarding body, therefore the mark submitted should therefore be considered provisional until results day. This process is outside the control of the school and is not covered by this procedure.

Appeals procedure against centre decisions not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. Full details of these services, internal deadlines for requesting a service and fees charged will be provided by the Exams Officer.

Candidates are also informed of the arrangements for post-results services, before they sit any exam and the accessibility of senior members of centre staff immediately after the publication of results by regular communication meeting with the Exams Officer and Head of Seniors before they start study leave.

If the centre or candidate (or their parent/carer) has a concern and believes a result may not be accurate, post-results services may be considered.

Review of results
- Service 1 - clerical re-check (this service can only be requested for objective tests e.g. multiple choice)
- Service 2 - review of marking
- Service 3 – review of moderation (this service is not available to an individual candidate)

Access to Scripts
- Copies of scripts to support reviews of marking
- Copies of scripts to support teaching and learning

Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, the centre will look at the marks awarded for each component part of the qualification alongside any mark schemes, relevant result reports, grade boundary information etc. when made available by the awarding body to determine if the centre supports any concerns.

For written components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

- Collect informed written consent/permission from the candidate to access their script, accessing the script by (where the service is made available by the awarding body) requesting a priority copy of the candidate's script to support a review of marking by the awarding body deadline or
- On access to the script, consider if it is felt that the agreed mark scheme has been applied correctly in the original marking and if the centre considers there are any errors in the marking
- Support a request for the appropriate RoR service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified
- Collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the RoR service before the request is submitted
- Where relevant, advise an affected candidate to inform any third party (such as a sixth form or college) that a review of marking has been submitted to an awarding body
- Written candidate consent (informed consent via candidate email is acceptable) is required in all cases before a request for a RoR service 1 or 2 is submitted to the awarding body. Consent is required to confirm the candidate understands that the final subject grade and/or mark awarded following a clerical re-check or a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, may be lower than, higher than, or the same as the result which was originally awarded. Candidate consent must only be collected after the publication of results.

For any moderated components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:
- Confirm that a review of moderation cannot be undertaken on the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample submitted for moderation
- Consult the moderator's report/feedback to identify any issues raised
- Determine if the centre's internally assessed marks have been accepted without change by the awarding body – if this is the case, a RoR service 3 (Review of moderation) will not be available
- Determine if there are any grounds to submit a request for a review of moderation for the work of all candidates in the original sample

Where a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking or a review of moderation, the centre will:
- For a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2), first advise the candidate to access a copy of their script to support a review of marking by providing written permission for the centre to access the script (and any required fee) for this service for the centre to submit this request
- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2) is required, this must be submitted by the deadline set by the centre by providing informed written consent (and the required fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (RoR service 3) cannot be requested for the work of an individual candidate or the work of a candidate not in the original sample.

If the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support a review of results, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre completing the internal appeals form at least 15 working days prior to the deadline for submitting a review of results. The appellant will be informed of the outcome of their appeal at least 10 working days to the deadline for submitting a review of results.

Following the review of the results outcome, an external appeals process is available if the Head of Centre remains dissatisfied with the outcome and believes there are ground for appeal.

The JCQ publications Post-results Services and JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes) will be consulted to determine the acceptable grounds for a preliminary appeal.

Where the Head of Centre is satisfied after receiving the review of the results outcome, but the candidates and/or their parents/carers believes there are grounds for a preliminary appeal to the awarding body, a further internal appeal may be made to the Head of Centre. Following this, the Head of Centre's decision as to whether to proceed with a preliminary appeal will be based upon the acceptable grounds as detailed in the JCQ appeals booklet. Candidates, parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body.

The internal appeals form should be completed and submitted to the Exams Officer within 3 calendar days of the notification of the outcome of the Review of Results. Subject to the Head of Centre's decision, this will allow the centre to process the appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required 30 calendar days of receiving the outcome of the review of results process.

Awarding body fees which may be charged for the appeal must be paid by the appellant on submission on the internal appeals form. If the appeal is upheld by the awarding body, this fee will be refunded by the awarding body and repaid to the appellant.
The internal appeals procedures have been produced to demonstrate compliance with the following:

JCQ General Regulations for approved centres: http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations
JCQ Post-Results Services: http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services
JCQ A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes: http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals

Appellants should consult the full information in the above publications to be fully informed when stating their grounds for appeal. Further information can be obtained

Section 16:   Access to scripts, reviews of results and appeals procedures

- The Exams Officer will be responsible for the results download from the awarding bodies and will prepare all paperwork for both pupils and staff.
- Candidates will receive individual results slips on results days in person at the centre or by email at their request.
- Arrangements for the school to be open on results days are made by the Head of Centre and the provision of staff on results days will be their responsibility, they will ensure that senior members of centre staff are available immediately after the publication of examination results.
- Candidates will be advised before the exam season starts the arrangements for post-results services this includes: they are required to sign a consent form before the centre can apply for review of results or access to scripts, the services that will be made available by the awarding bodies, the deadlines that have to be met, the fees that will be charged, how they are informed of the outcome of their request and the internal appeals procedure to manage disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support review of results or an appeal.

Section 17:   Malpractice

This policy follows JCQ's publication Malpractice. Follow this link for full information. Follow this link for the latest full information.

The centre will take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after assessments have taken place. If suspected, it will inform the awarding body immediately of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or a member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation.

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

A failure by a centre to investigate allegations of suspected malpractice in accordance with the requirements of the Joint Council for Qualifications also constitutes malpractice. The centre will investigate and report to the appropriate awarding body all cases of suspected malpractice in accordance with the Joint Council's policies and procedures.

Where malpractice is discovered in external examinations, then the appropriate procedure as set out by the awarding body or examining body (Joint Council for Qualification) will be followed by the school.

Malpractice associated with external examination for the purposes of this policy includes the following:

- Unlawfully obtaining, selling, using or distributing examination papers prior to exam sessions.
- The use of mobile phones and other electronic devices during exams.
- The passing of information between students during an examination.
- Taking unauthorised material into the examination room.

Incidents of malpractice arise for a variety of reasons:

- some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment;
- some incidents arise due to a lack of awareness of the regulations, carelessness, or forgetfulness in applying the regulations (which may often be called 'maladministration');
- some occur as a result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved (e.g. a fire alarm sounds and the supervision of candidates is disrupted).

The individuals involved in malpractice also vary. They may be:

- candidates;
- teachers, lecturers, tutors, trainers, assessors or others responsible for the conduct, administration or quality assurance of examinations and assessments including examination officers, invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements (e.g. readers, scribes and practical assistants);
- assessment personnel such as examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers;
- other third parties (e.g. parents/carers, siblings or friends of the candidate).

Where malpractice is discovered in non-examination assessment, then the appropriate subject teacher will discuss the matter with the Headmistress and the Exams Officer. The action taken will depend on the severity of the malpractice that has taken place.

- In some circumstances, candidates will be required to re-submit the work.
- In some circumstances, the work will be destroyed and not entered for assessment. This will reduce the grade available to the candidate.
- In extreme circumstances, the incident will be reported to the relevant awarding body.

Where malpractice in non-examination assessment is discovered by the awarding body, then the awarding body will follow their own malpractice procedures.

All candidates must be aware that the awarding body has the right to invalidate any qualifications awarded by them to the candidate if malpractice is discovered.

- In addition, awarding bodies will report malpractice to the JCQ who may invalidate all qualifications awarded by all awarding Bodies.
- Candidates must therefore ensure that malpractice does not take place at any stage during the examination and assessment process.

Malpractice may or may not relate directly to sitting an examination. Awarding bodies are aware of the possibility of novel or unexpected forms of malpractice emerging as technologies and the nature and organisation of examination centres change.

Failure by a centre to notify, investigate and report to an awarding body all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself.

Also, failure to take action as required by an awarding body, as detailed in this document, or to co-operate with an awarding body's investigation, constitutes malpractice.

Preventing Malpractice
The regulators' Conditions of Recognition (A8.1) state that awarding bodies must take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice or maladministration in the development, delivery, and award of qualifications which it makes available or proposes to make available.

Centre must take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice. These can include but are not limited to:

Centre staff malpractice and maladministration.
- Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the JCQ documents above and any further awarding body guidance.
- Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the key dates and deadlines and that there are robust procedures in place to ensure these are met.
- Ensure that examination officers are appropriately trained, resourced and supported.
- Ensure that exams at alternative sites are conducted in accordance with JCQ ICE requirements.
- Ensure that all staff who manage and implement special consideration and access arrangements are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced.
- Ensure that members of staff do not communicate any confidential information about examinations and assessment materials, including via social media.
- Ensure that examination clash arrangements are planned and managed effectively.
- Ensure that staff delivering/assessing coursework or non-examination assessments have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism or other potential candidate malpractice.
- Ensure that the centre has a culture of honesty and openness so that any concerns of potential malpractice can be escalated appropriately without fear of repercussion.

Candidate malpractice
- Ensure that all JCQ notices, e.g.Information for candidates, non-examination assessments, coursework, on-screen tests, written examinations, social media, plagiarism are distributed to candidates prior to assessments/examinations taking place.
- Ensure candidates are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the introduction of prohibited materials and devices into the assessments, and access to restricted resources.
- Ensure that candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving (even if the information was not requested) confidential assessment materials.If a candidate receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.
- Ensure that candidates involved in examination clash arrangements are aware of appropriate behaviour during supervision, i.e.ensuring that candidates cannot pass on or receive information about the content of assessments, thereby committing candidate malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own.

Responsibilities

If there are instances of suspected malpractice (including involving private candidates entered through the centre), the head of centre must:

- notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate (see paragraph 4.5).If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s);
- report malpractice using the appropriate forms as detailed in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.6;
- be accountable for ensuring that the centre and centre staff comply at all times with the awarding body's instructions regarding an investigation;
- <u>ensure that where a candidate who is a child/vulnerable adult is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer/ appropriate adult is kept informed of the progress of the investigation;</u>
- ensure that if it is necessary to delegate the gathering of information to a senior member of centre staff, the awarding body's agreement is obtained and the senior member of centre staff chosen is independent and not connected to the department or candidate involved in the suspected malpractice. The head of centre should ensure there is no conflict of interest (see below) which might compromise the investigation;
- respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into an allegation of malpractice. This will be in the best interests of centre staff, candidates and any others involved;
- make information requested by an awarding body available speedily and openly;
- co-operate with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice and ensure that their staff do so also, whether the centre is directly involved in the case or not;
- ensure staff members and candidates are informed of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in this document;
- forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so;
- at all times comply with data protection law;
- pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of sanctions and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.

See the JCQ's publication [Malpractice](#) for all details about what to do if malpractice is suspected.

Section 18: Certificates

- Candidates will be advised by email when certificates will be available for them.
- Certificates may be collected on behalf of a candidate by a third party, provided they have been authorised to do so.
- Lost Certificates can be requested from the relevant exam boards but there will be a charge.

Section 19: Emergency Evacuation Policy

Purpose of the policy

This policy details how our School deals with an emergency evacuation of the exam room(s) by defining staff roles and responsibilities and confirming the emergency evacuation procedure.

When is an emergency evacuation required?

An emergency evacuation is required where it is unsafe for candidates to remain in the exam room. This might include a fire in the exam room, the fire alarm sounding to warn of fire bomb alert or other serious threat.

In exceptional situations, where candidates might be severely disadvantaged or distressed by remaining in the exam room, the emergency evacuation procedure may also need to be followed. This might include situations where there is severe disruption in the exam room, serious illness of a candidate or invigilator or similarly serious incidents.

As each incident may be different, advice will be sought from the relevant awarding body as soon as it is safe to do so, particularly where the centre is concerned about the security of the examination(s). Where candidates are unable to return to the building to complete the examination, the relevant awarding body will be contacted immediately for advice. The awarding bodies have procedures in place to ensure that candidates are not disadvantaged where they are unable to complete the examination due to circumstances beyond their control.

Roles and responsibilities

Head of Centre
- Ensures the emergency evacuation policy for exams is fit for purpose and complies with relevant health and safety regulation.
- Ensures any instructions from relevant local or national agencies are referenced and followed where applicable, including information from the **National Counter Terrorism Security Office** on the procedures for handling bomb threats.
- https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bomb-threats-guidance/procedures-for-handling-bomb-threats
- Where safe to do so, ensures candidates are given the opportunity to sit exams for their published duration.

Senior Leadership Team
- Where responsible for the centre-wide emergency evacuation procedure, ensures all staff and appointed fire marshals are aware of the policy and procedures to be followed when an emergency evacuation of an exam room is required.

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (sendco)
- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place for the emergency evacuation of a disabled candidate from an exam room where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for the candidate.
- Ensures the candidate is informed prior to taking their exams of what will happen in the event of an emergency evacuation.

Exams Officer
- Ensures invigilators are trained in emergency evacuation procedures and how an incident and actions taken must be recorded.
- Ensures candidates are briefed in the meeting held with the Head of Centre and Exam Officer prior to exams taking place, on what will happen in the event of an emergency in the exam room.
- Provides invigilators with a copy of the emergency evacuation procedures for every exam room.
- Provides a standard invigilator announcement for each exam room which includes appropriate instructions for candidates about emergency procedures and what will happen if the fire alarm sounds
- Provides an exam room incident log in each exam room.
- Liaises with the SENDCo and other relevant staff prior to each exam where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for a disabled candidate.
- Briefs invigilators prior to each exam where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for a disabled candidate.

- Ensures appropriate follow-up is undertaken after an emergency evacuation reporting the incident to the awarding body and the actions taken through the *special consideration* process where applicable (in case where a group of candidates have been disadvantaged by a particular event).

Invigilators
- By attending training and update sessions, ensure they understand what to do in the event of an emergency in the exam room.
- Follow the actions required in the emergency evacuation procedure issued to them for every exam room.
- Confirm with the Exams Officer, where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for a disabled candidate they are invigilating.
- Record details on the exam room incident log to support follow-up reporting to the awarding body by the Exams Officer.

Other relevant centre staff
- Support the senior leader, SENDCo, Exams Officer and invigilators in ensuring the safe emergency evacuation of exam rooms.

Recording details
As soon as practically possible and safe to do so, details should be recorded. Details must include:
1. The actual time of the start of the interruption.
2. The actions taken.
3. The actual time the exam(s) resumed.
4. The actual finishing time(s) of the resumed exam(s).

Further details could include
1. Report on candidate behaviour throughout the interruption/evacuation.
2. A judgement on the impact on candidates after the interruption/evacuation.

Section 20:   Exams Complaints and Appeals Procedures

Purpose of the procedure
This procedure confirms the School compliance with JCQ's *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2020-21.*

Grounds for complaint
A candidate (or their/parent/carer) may make a complaint on the grounds below (this is not an exhaustive list).

Teaching and learning
- Quality of teaching and learning, for example:
    - non-subject specialist teacher without adequate training/subject matter expertise utilised on a long-term basis
    - teacher lacking knowledge of new specification/incorrect core content studied/taught
    - core content not adequately covered
    - inadequate feedback for a candidate following assessment(s).
- Pre-release/advance material/set task issued by the awarding body not provided on time to an exam candidate.
- The taking of an assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not conducted according to the JCQ/awarding body instructions.
- The marking of an internal assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not undertaken according to the requirements of the awarding body (complainant should refer to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*).

- Centre fails to adhere to its *internal appeals procedure.*
- Candidate not informed of their centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body.
- Candidate not informed of their centre assessed marks in sufficient time to request/appeal a review of marking prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body.
- Candidate not given sufficient time to review materials to make a decision whether to request a review of centre assessed marks.

Access arrangements
- Candidate not assessed by the centre's appointed assessor.
- Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding their access arrangements.
- Candidate did not consent to personal data being shared electronically by the non-acquisition of a signed data protection notice/candidate data personal consent form.
- Candidate not informed/adequately informed of the arrangements in place and the subjects or components of subjects where the arrangements would not apply.
- Exam information not appropriately adapted for a disabled candidate to access it.
- Adapted equipment put in place failed during exam/assessment.
- Approved access arrangement(s) not put in place at the time of an exam/assessment.
- Appropriate arrangements not put in place at the time of an exam/assessment as a consequence of a temporary injury or impairment.

Entries
- Failure to clearly explain a decision of early entry for a qualification to candidate (or parent/carer).
- Candidate not entered/entered late (incurring a late entry fee) for a required exam/assessment.
- Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment.
- Candidate entered for a wrong tier of entry.

Conducting examinations
- Failure to adequately brief candidate on exam timetable/exam regulations prior to exam/assessment taking place.
- Room in which exam held did not provide candidate with appropriate conditions for taking the exam.
- Inadequate invigilation in exam room.
- Failure to conduct exam according to the regulations.
- Online system failed during (on-screen) exam/assessment.
- Disruption during exam/assessment.
- Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated/reported.
- Eligible application for special consideration for a candidate not submitted/not submitted to timescale.
- Failure to inform/update candidate on the outcome of a special consideration application.

Results and Post-results
- Before exams, candidate not made aware of the arrangements for post-results services and the accessibility of senior members of centre staff after the publication of results.
- Candidate not having access to a member of senior staff after the publication of results to discuss/make decision on the submission of a review/enquiry.
- Candidate request for return of work after moderation and work not available/disposed of earlier than allowed in the regulations.
- Candidate (or parent/carer) unhappy with a result (complainant to refer via Exams Officer to awarding body *post-results services*).
- Candidate (or parent/carer) unhappy with a Centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal.
- Centre applied for the wrong post-results service/for the wrong exam paper for a candidate.

- Centre missed awarding body deadline to apply for a post-results service.
- Centre applied for a post-results service for candidate without gaining required candidate consent/permission.

Complaints and appeals procedure

If a candidate (or their parent/carer) has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification they are following, our centre encourages them to try to resolve this informally in the first instance. A concern or complaint should be made in person, by telephone or in writing to the Head of Centre. If a complaint fails to be resolved informally the candidate (or their parent/carer) is then at liberty to make a formal complaint.

How to make a formal complaint?
- A formal complaint should be submitted in writing by completing a **complaints and appeals form**.
- Forms are available from the Exams Officer.
- Completed forms should be returned to the Exams Officer.
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 7 calendar days.

How a formal complaint is investigated?
- The Head of Centre will further investigate or appoint a member of the senior leadership team (who is not involved in the grounds for complaint and has no personal interest in the outcome) to investigate the complaint and report on the findings and conclusion.
- The findings and conclusion will be provided to the complainant within 2 working weeks.

Appeals

Following the outcome, if the complainant remains dissatisfied and believes there are clear grounds, an appeal can be submitted.
- Any appeal must be submitted in writing by again completing a **complaints and appeals form.**
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 7 calendar days.
- The appeal will be referred to Group Managing Principal.
- The Group Managing Principal will inform the appellant of the final conclusion in due course.

Section 21: Exams Whistleblowing Policy

Introduction

Whistleblowing is encouraged, not penalised, and staff are made aware that they have a duty to report any concerns they have about the conduct of examinations.

The head of centre and governing board aim to create and maintain an approach to examinations that reflects an ethical culture, and encourages staff and students to be aware of and report practices that could compromise the integrity and security of examinations.

In compliance with section 5.11 of the JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres**[1], the school will:
- take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after assessments have taken place
- inform the awarding body **immediately** of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or a member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation

---

[1] Reference www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/

- as required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**[2] and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require

This policy requirement has been added within **General Regulations for Approved Centres** in response to the recommendations within the report of the *Independent Commission on Examination Malpractice*[3]. This policy also sets out the principles which allow members of centre staff and students to feel confident in reporting instances of actual, alleged or suspected malpractice to relevant members of senior leadership.

Purpose of the policy
This policy:
- encourages individuals to raise concerns, which will be fully investigated by appropriately trained and experienced individuals
- identifies how to report concerns
- explains how such concerns will be investigated and sets expectations regarding the reporting of outcomes
- provides details of relevant bodies to whom concerns about wrongdoing can be reported, including awarding organisations and regulators
- includes a commitment to do everything reasonable to protect the reporter's identity, if requested
- sets out how those raising concerns will be supported.

This policy also details the steps that could be taken by an individual involved in the management, administration and/or conducting of examinations if the school fails to comply with its obligation to report any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration.

The Whistleblower
A whistleblower is defined as a person who reports an actual or potential wrongdoing and is protected by the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, providing they are acting in the public interest. If the person raising the issue is a worker, this will be considered as whistleblowing. This includes agency staff and contractors.

Reporting
If a member of centre staff involved in the management, administration and/or conducting of examinations (such as exams officer, exams assistant or invigilator), a student or a member of the public (such as a parent/carer) has a concern or reason to believe that malpractice has or will occur in an examination or assessment, concerns should normally be raised initially with the head of centre.

However, there may be times when it may be more appropriate to refer the issue direct to the governing board, most often when the allegation is against the head of centre.

Examples of malpractice
In addition to the centre wide Whistleblowing Policy, this exams-specific policy, includes reference to exams-related breaches including, but not limited to, the following:
- Failure to comply with exam regulations as set out by the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) and its awarding bodies
- A security breach of the examination paper
- Conduct of centre staff which undermines the integrity of the examination
- Unfair treatment of candidates by either giving an advantage to a candidate/group of candidates (e.g. by permitting a candidate an access arrangement which is not supported by appropriate evidence), or

---

[2] Reference www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/

[3] Reference www.jcq.org.uk/examination-system/imc-home/

- disadvantaging candidates by not providing access to the appropriate conditions (providing a 'level playing field')
- Possible fraud and corruption (e.g. accessing the exam paper prior to the exam to aid teaching and learning)
- Abuse of authority (e.g. the head of centre/members of the senior leadership team overriding JCQ and awarding body regulations)
- Other conduct which may be interpreted as malpractice/maladministration

Whistleblowing procedure

If the individual does not feel safe raising the issue/reporting malpractice within the centre, or they have done so and are concerned that no action has been taken, that individual could consider making their disclosure[4] to a malpractice expert at the awarding body for the qualification where malpractice is suspected.

For members of centre staff, it is likely that the Public Interest Disclosure Act (PIDA)[5] offers you legal protection from being dismissed or penalised for raising certain serious concerns ('blowing the whistle'). Whistleblowing rights under PIDA are day one rights[6]. This means that the worker does not need the same two years' service that is needed for other employment rights.

In order to investigate concerns effectively, the awarding body should be provided with as much information as possible/is relevant, which may include:

- The qualifications and subjects involved
- The centre involved
- The names of staff/candidates involved
- The regulations breached/specific nature of suspected malpractice
- When and where the suspected malpractice occurred
- Whether multiple examination series are affected
- If the issue has been reported to the centre and what the outcome was
- How the issue became apparent

Members of the public are not protected by PIDA, but the awarding body will make every effort to protect their identity if that is what they wish, unless the awarding body is legally obliged to release it[7].

Alternatively, a worker could consider making a disclosure to Ofqual[8] as a prescribed body for whistleblowing to raise a concern about wrongdoing, risk or malpractice.

Anonymity

In some circumstances, the whistleblower might find it difficult to raise concerns with the nominated member of the senior leadership team. If a concern is raised anonymously, the issue may not be able to be taken further if insufficient information has been provided. In such instances, and if appropriate, the allegation may be disclosed to a union representative, who could then be required to report the concern without disclosing its source. Alternatively, whistleblowers or others with concerns about potential malpractice can report the matter direct to Ofqual, who is identified as a 'prescribed body'[9]. Awarding organisations are not prescribed bodies

---

[4] Reference www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/public-interest-disclosure-act/

[5] Reference **Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998** www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/23/contents

[6] Reference https://protect-advice.org.uk/pida/

[7] Reference www.ocr.org.uk/administration/general-qualifications/assessment/malpractice/whistleblowing/

[8] Reference www.gov.uk/guidance/ofquals-whistleblowing-policy

[9] Reference www.gov.uk/government/publications/blowing-the-whistle-list-of-prescribed-people-and-bodies--2/whistleblowing-list-of-prescribed-people-and-bodies

under whistleblowing legislation; however, awarding organisation investigation teams do give those reporting concerns the opportunity for anonymity.

A whistleblower can give his/her name, but may also request confidentiality; the person receiving the information should make every effort to protect the identity of the whistleblower.

Students
Students are made to feel comfortable discussing/reporting malpractice issues of which they are aware. The regulations surrounding their assessments, and wider academic integrity, will be reiterated to students who are undertaking, or who are about to undertake, their courses of study.

Section 22: Cyber-Security/Cyber Attack

In order to mitigate the potential impact of disruption due to a cyber-attack, the school will:

- ensure that entries are final and ready to be sent 5 working days before the deadline.
- use cloud-based storage folders (such as OneDrive that are permanently backed up) to store seating plans and other administrative documentation.
- ensure that all school MIS systems are backed up continually (Group IT Manager).
- ensure that anti-ransomware, anti-spyware and ant-virus software run continually on school devices and is updated regularly (Group IT Manager).

In the event of a cyber-attack, the school will:

- contact its insurers, IT support company and Group IT Manager to investigate and solve the attack.
- access all cloud-based storage folders either remotely or from another site, depending on the severity.
- undertake any printing remotely from another site, depending on the severity.
- upload any documents to the relevant exam bodies remotely or from another site, depending on the severity.

In addition ,the school has considered the following:

- All exam payments are made off-site by the central Head Office accounts team and so will remain unaffected.
- All MIS systems for pupil data are backed up to cloud servers on a continuous basis.
- All cloud-based storage systems for administration documents are backed up on a continuous basis.
- All contact details for invigilation staff are able to be accessed remotely.

Section 23: Conflicts of Interest

It is the responsibility of the Head of Centre to ensure that the centre manages conflicts of interest by informing the awarding bodies, before the published deadline for entries for each examination series, of:

- any members of centre staff who are taking qualifications at their own centre which include internally assessed components/units;
- any members of centre staff who are teaching and preparing members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter) for qualifications which include internally assessed components/units; **and**

maintains clear records of **all instances** where:

- exams office staff have members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter) being entered for examinations and assessments either at the centre itself or other centres;
- centre staff are taking qualifications at their own centre which do not include internally assessed components/units;
- centre staff are taking qualifications at other centres.

The head of centre must ensure that the records include details of the measures taken to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the qualifications affected. The records may be inspected by a JCQ Centre Inspector and/or awarding body staff. They might be requested in the event of concerns being reported to an awarding body. The records must be retained until the deadline for reviews of marking has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later.

Section 24: Use of AI in Assessments

This section should be read in conjunction with Section 17, Malpractice.

While the potential for student artificial intelligence (AI) misuse is new, most of the ways to prevent its misuse and mitigate the associated risks are not; the school already has established measures in place to ensure that students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice. This guidance reminds teachers and assessors in centres of best practice in this area, applying it in the context of AI use.

The JCQ awarding organisations' staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for identifying, reporting and investigating student malpractice, including the misuse of AI.

Students complete the majority of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments should be unaffected by developments in AI tools as students must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments.

There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs), coursework and other internal assessments.

What is AI and what are the risks of using it in assessments?
AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.

While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are evolving quickly but there are still limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate. AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

Answering questions:
- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or formality

AI chatbots currently available include:
- ChatGPT (https://chat.openai.com/auth/login)
- Jenni AI (https://jenni.ai)
- Jasper AI (https://www.jasper.ai/)
- Writesonic (https://writesonic.com/chat/)
- Bloomai (https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom)
- Google Bard (https://bard.google.com/)
- Claude (https://claude.ai/)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate images, such as:
- Midjourney (https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/)
- Stable Diffusion (https://stablediffusionweb.com/)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (https://openai.com/dall-e-2/)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate music. These include:
- Soundraw (https://soundraw.io/)
- wavtool (https://wavtool.com/)
- Musicfy (https://create.musicfy.lol/)

The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments. As noted above, they have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. AI chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions and some can also produce fake references to books/ articles by real or fake people.

What is AI misuse?
As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(k) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ general-regulations/), students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words, and isn't copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work. See Section 17, Malpractice, for more information.

Students are expected to demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks students have been set. While AI may become an   established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it's important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Students should develop the   knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying.

Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

- AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of *'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism'* include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

School engagement with and discussion of AI
The school already has procedures relating to assessment in place to ensure the authenticity of assessments. These also address the risks associated with AI misuse.

Teachers, assessors and other staff must discuss the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree their approach to managing students' use of AI in their school, college or exam centre. Centres must make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment. They should also make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice. Centres should consider communicating with parents to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the centre's approach.

The school will do the following:
a) Explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;
b) Update the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy to acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged) – most simply by referencing this document;
c) Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites);
d) Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on Acknowledging AI use);
e) Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments? and What is AI misuse? sections);
f) Ensure that, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited;
g) Consider whether students should be required to sign a declaration that they have understood what

AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden in the learning agreement that is signed at enrolment in some centres;

h) Ensure that each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ *Information for Candidates* (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ information-for-candidates-documents);

i) Reinforce to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work they're submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject;

j) Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (see the Awarding Organisation actions section below and the examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations can be found in Appendix A: AI misuse examples at the end of this document); and

k) Ensure that teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work (see AI use and marking section below).

Acknowledging AI use

It remains essential that students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and that they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/ blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2024. The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non- editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

This must be submitted with the work the student submits for assessment, so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the school's malpractice policy at section 17 for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own.

Students should also be reminded that, as with any source, poor referencing, paraphrasing and copying sections of text may constitute malpractice, which can attract severe sanctions including disqualification – in the context of AI use, students must be clear what is and what is not acceptable in respect of acknowledging AI content and the use of AI sources. For example, it would be unacceptable to simply reference 'AI' or 'ChatGPT', just as it would be unacceptable to state 'Google' rather than the specific website and webpages which have been consulted;

AI use and marking

When marking student work in which AI use has been acknowledged, and there are no concerns of AI misuse, the assessor must still ensure that if the student has used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they are not rewarded. Depending upon the marking criteria or grade descriptors being applied, the assessor may need to take into account the failure to

independently demonstrate their understanding of certain aspects when determining the appropriate mark/ grade to be awarded. Where such AI use has been considered, and particularly where this has had an impact upon the final marks/grades awarded by the assessor, clear records should be kept – this provides feedback to the student and provides clarity in the event of an internal appeal or the work being selected for moderation/ standards verification.

Preventing AI misuse in assessments
While there may be benefits to using AI in some situations, there is the potential for it to be misused by students, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a student submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, can be considered a form of plagiarism.

JCQ has published guidance on plagiarism which provides guidance on what plagiarism is, how to prevent it, and how to detect it (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in- assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/).

Teachers and assessors must be assured that the work they accept for assessment and mark is authentically the student's own work. They are required to confirm this during the assessment process.

To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and students is likely to be key. Here are some actions which should be taken (many of these will already be in place in centres as these are not new requirements):

a) Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
b) Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;
c) Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
d) Where appropriate, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence;
e) Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;
f) Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material;
g) Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;
h) Do not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been taken from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice which can attract sanctions.
i) Issuing tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data.

Identifying misuse
Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own.

Comparison with previous work
When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Where the work is made up of writing, one can make note of the following characteristics:
• Spelling and punctuation
• Grammatical usage
• Writing style and tone
• Vocabulary

- Complexity and coherency
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)
  Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

Potential indicators of AI misuse
If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication that the student has misused AI:
a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations*
b) A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level*
c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected~
d) Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
e) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
f) Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
g) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
h) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
i) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
j) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
k) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
l) The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
m) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
n) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit
o) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
p) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content.
~However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

Reporting
If your suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents should be detailed in the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy. These should include ensuring that students are aware of what malpractice is, how to avoid malpractice, how to properly reference sources and acknowledge AI tools, etc.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that students do not submit inauthentic work.

If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/).