



Examinations Policy Directory

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Examinations - Emergency evacuation policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	Red Balloon Worthing
Date of meeting when version approved	
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	<i>K Anderson</i>
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	<i>Chair</i>
Date signed	6/3/24

Policy contents:
Purpose Policy statement, provision and safeguards Emergency evacuation procedure Legislation and guidance

Purpose of the policy

This policy details how Red Balloon of the Air 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, a 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.

Emergency evacuation of an exam room

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.
- Where safe to do so, ensures candidates are given the opportunity to sit exams for their published duration.

Senior leader

- 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 coordinator (SENCo)

- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place for the emergency evacuation of a candidate with a disability 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 through Candidate Information Pack sent to every candidate, 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 procedure 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 SENCo and other relevant staff prior to each exam where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for a candidate with a disability
- Briefs invigilators prior to each exam where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for a candidate with a disability
- 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 cases where a group of candidates have been disadvantaged by a particular event)

Invigilators

- By attending training and/or 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 candidate with a disability they are invigilating
- Record details on the exam room incident log to support follow-up reporting to the awarding body by the exams officer (see below)

Other relevant centre staff

- Support the senior leader, SENCo, 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:

- the actual time of the start of the interruption
- the actions taken
- the actual time the exam(s) resumed
- the actual finishing time(s) of the resumed exam(s)

Further details could include:

- report on candidate behaviour throughout the interruption/evacuation
- a judgement on the impact on candidates after the interruption/evacuation


Emergency evacuation procedure

Invigilators are trained in this procedure and understand the actions they must take in the event of a fire alarm or other emergency that leads to an evacuation of the exam room.

Emergency evacuation procedure
Actions to be taken (as detailed in current JCQ Instructions for Conducting Exams section 25, Emergencies)
Stop the candidates from writing
Collect the attendance register (in order to ensure all candidates are present)
Evacuate the examination room in line with the instructions given by the appropriate authority
Advise candidates to leave all question papers and scripts in the examination room Candidates must be advised to close their answer booklet
Candidates should leave the room in silence
Make sure that the candidates are supervised as closely as possible while they are out of the examination room to make sure there is no discussion about the examination
Make a note of the time of the interruption and how long it lasted
Allow the candidates the full working time set for the examination
If there are only a few candidates, consider the possibility of taking the candidates (with question papers and scripts) to another place to finish the examination (Candidates must be given the opportunity to sit the examination for its published duration)
Make a full report of the incident and of the action taken, and send to the relevant awarding body

Legislation and Guidance that inform this document

- Exams administration: information for exam centres (DfE 2014)
- Equality Act (2010)
- Disability Discrimination Act (2005)
- ICE Booklet

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Examinations Conflict of Interest Policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	Red Balloon Worthing
Date of meeting when version approved	
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	6/3/24

Policy contents:
Purpose Scope Policy statement, provision and safeguards Conflict of Interest Log Legislation and guidance

Purpose

This policy addresses how we are managing any potential conflicts of interest under the specific arrangements for delivery in Summer 2023.

Scope

Red Balloon manages conflicts of interest in accordance with the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres. Roles and responsibilities for normal delivery arrangements are detailed across several of our Examinations Policies to ensure that awarding bodies are informed (where required) of any relevant conflict declared by members of centre staff and records are maintained that confirm the measures taken/protocols in place to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the qualifications affected before the published deadline for entries.

General principles

A process is in place to collect any declaration of personal interest from all staff involved in the arrangements for Summer 2023 and to manage any potential conflicts of interest.

Where reference is made to candidates, this includes any private candidates accepted by the centre

Declaration process

- A Declaration of Personal Interest email detailing specific situations/questions which constitute potential conflict of interest for Summer 2023 will be sent by the Exams Manager/Exams Officers by email to all centre staff involved in the process
- Staff will be required to
 - (where applicable) declare a personal interest in a candidate and identify their role(s) in the arrangements
 - confirm awareness of the need to maintain the confidentiality of the grades and endorsements determined by the centre

Managing conflicts of interest

- A Conflicts of Interest log for Summer 2023 will be maintained to record any potential conflicts of interest declared by centre staff
- The log will record the nature of potential conflict and a decision by the Head of Centre, if this is deemed a potential risk to the integrity of the centre's assessments
- (where applicable) The log will record appropriate additional controls put in place to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the centre's assessments and to ensure fairness in later process reviews and appeals, carefully considering the need if to separate duties and personnel]

Conflicts of Interest log – Summer 2023

Date recorded	Staff name & role(s)
Nature of potential conflict	
Deemed a potential risk	Yes / No
Additional controls put in place to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the centre's assessments and/or to ensure fairness in later process reviews and appeals	

Date recorded	Staff name & role(s)
Nature of potential conflict	
Deemed a potential risk	Yes / No
Additional controls put in place to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the centre's assessments and/or to ensure fairness in later process reviews and appeals	

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Examinations Contingency Policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	RB Worthing
Date of meeting when version approved	
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	

Policy contents:
Purpose Scope Policy statement, provision and safeguards Contingency plans Legislation and guidance

Purpose

This policy ensures that, as far as possible, Red Balloon Worthing students have access to all relevant scheduled and planned external examination sessions and that all examinations are carried out in a professional manner, regardless of unexpected circumstances that may affect the examination processes.

Scope

The headteacher, supported by the exams manager/officer/s, is responsible for ensuring that examinations are available to all students and that there are a range of contingency procedures to ensure that exams can take place, regardless of unforeseen circumstances.

Policy statement, provision and safeguards

RB Worthing employs an Exams Manager, who has oversight of and responsibility for the running of external examinations.

Contingency plans

1. Examinations Officer absent for an extended period at key points in the exam process (cycle)

Required actions: Centres must ensure that other staff are sufficiently trained and informed, hence able to cover for the examinations officer under such circumstances.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

The Exams Officer is part of a team led by an experienced member of SLT. All members of the team have attended training to ensure that the absence of the Exams Officer is covered by those in the team and members of SLT.

*The Headteacher is the direct Exams Officer back up and acts as an EO in EO's absence.
Exams Officers from other RB centres act as cover EOs in EOs absence.*

2. Head of Centre absent - Escalation Process

Required actions: Centres must ensure that other staff are sufficiently trained and informed, hence able to cover for the Head of Centre under such circumstances.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

Before examinations (Entries and Pre-exams), during exams time and after examinations:

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 the Director of Education.

3. SENDCo has extended absence at key points in the exam cycle

Required actions: Trained / qualified staff must be available to cover - advice may be sought from other RB providers. Possibly appoint a qualified assessor to test candidates in place of the SENDCo or make alternative arrangements for testing.

4. Teaching staff have extended absence at key points in the exam cycle

Required actions: Heads of Centre must ensure that they, or other nominated persons, are aware of all planned entries and deadlines for coursework and are able to ensure appropriate cover is provided.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

The Head of Centre would delegate to others as necessary

5. Unavailability of invigilator(s) at last minute

Required actions: Heads of Centre or their examinations officer must ensure that another trained member of staff is available to invigilate.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

All staff are/are being invigilator trained.

6. Exam rooms - lack of appropriate rooms or main venues unavailable at short notice

Required actions:

Centres must plan well in advance of examinations re allocation of rooms. In the case of last-minute unavailability of a room (e.g., through flood or electrical hazard) use of other rooms for examinations must take precedence over all other activities even if that requires the cancellation of certain classes / activities.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

Exams would be moved to an appropriately sized room within the centre.

Chesswood primary school will provide a suitable room should the centre be unavailable

7. Failure of IT systems

Required actions:

Centres must ensure that all data is backed up and accessible regardless of IT failure.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

RB Worthing's MIS system is a cloud-based system backed up by the provider. Centre to contact the provider.

8. Emergency evacuation of the exam room (or centre lock down)

Invigilators are trained in this procedure and understand the actions they must take in the event of a fire alarm or other emergency that leads to an evacuation of the exam room.

Actions to be taken:

Stop the candidates from writing

Collect the attendance register (to ensure all candidates are present)

Evacuate the examination room in line with the instructions given by the appropriate authority

Advise candidates to leave all question papers and scripts in the examination room

Candidates must be advised to close their answer booklet

Candidates should leave the room in silence

Make sure that the candidates are supervised as closely as possible while they are out of the examination room to make sure there is no discussion about the examination

Make a note of the time of the interruption and how long it lasted

Allow the candidates the full working time set for the examination

If there are only a few candidates, consider the possibility of taking the candidates (with question papers and scripts) to another place to finish the examination

(Candidates must be given the opportunity to sit the examination for its published duration)

Make a full report of the incident and of the action taken, and send to the relevant exam board

9. Disruption of teaching time – i.e. centre closed for an extended period or candidates unable to attend for an extended period during normal teaching or study thus interrupting the provision of normal teaching and learning.

Required actions:

Where there is disruption to teaching time and students miss teaching and learning, it remains the responsibility of the centre to prepare students, as usual, for examinations. Centres must ensure alternative arrangements (e.g., alternative building, online learning) are made under such circumstances.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

RB Worthing to communicate with parents, carers and students about any unforeseen disruption to teaching time and provide appropriate work via Google Classroom/email

10. Centre unable to open as normal during the exams period

Required actions:

The relevant awarding body must be informed as soon as possible. Awarding bodies will be able to offer advice regarding the alternative arrangements for conducting examinations that may be available and the options for candidates who have not been able to take scheduled examinations.

Centres might use alternative venues in agreement with relevant awarding organisations (e.g., share facilities with other centres or use other public buildings, if possible). Centres may offer candidates an opportunity to sit any examinations missed at the next available series. Centres should apply to awarding organisations for special consideration for

candidates where they have met the minimum requirements.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

** Centre will communicate with relevant awarding organisations to make them aware of the issue.*

** Centre will then communicate solutions to parents/carers and candidates*

** In the event that the centre remains closed negotiations would take place with local schools/colleges or other suitable community venues*

** Centre to offer candidates an opportunity to sit any examinations missed at the next available series*

** Centre to apply to awarding organisations for special consideration for candidates where they have met the minimum requirements*

11. Candidates unable to take examinations because of a personal 'crisis'

Required actions:

Centres will offer candidates an opportunity to sit any examinations missed at the next available series. Centres will 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 a candidate chooses not to sit an examination for other reasons, they should be aware that special consideration rules will not apply.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

**Centre will communicate with relevant awarding organisation to make them aware of the issue.*

**Centre will then communicate solutions to parents/carers and candidates*

**Centre to offer candidates an opportunity to sit any examinations missed at the next available series*

**Centre to apply to awarding organisations for special consideration for candidates where they have met the minimum requirements*

12. Examination papers not arrived in time / students issued with wrong exam papers

Required actions:

Centres must check all exam papers upon arrival in school and will alert the appropriate awarding body of any discrepancies.

If this happens on the day of the exam, the exam board will be contacted immediately. Awarding organisations will be able to provide centres with electronic access to examination papers via a secure link or to fax examination papers to centres if electronic transfer is not possible. The examinations officer would need to ensure that copies are received, made, and stored under secure conditions.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

Centre to discuss alternative delivery of papers to the centre

13. Disruption to the transportation of completed examination scripts

Required actions:

In the first instance centres will seek advice from awarding organisations and/or the normal collection agency regarding collection. Centres must not make their own arrangements for transportation without approval from awarding organisations. Centres must ensure secure storage of completed examination papers until collection. All examination scripts must be stored in the secure safe.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

**Centre will communicate with the awarding organisation and organise alternative arrangements for transport of scripts.*

14. Assessment evidence is not available to be marked ie scripts or other assessment evidence are destroyed, lost, or damaged before being marked

Required actions:

Centres must notify awarding bodies immediately. Awarding organisations may then generate candidate marks for affected assessments based on other appropriate evidence of candidate achievement as defined by the awarding organisations. Candidates should retake affected assessment(s) at a subsequent assessment window.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

**Immediate communication to be made with relevant awarding body*

**Students, parents and carers to be informed by letter*

**Students retake the assessment that has been affected at a subsequent assessment window, if possible*

15. Centre unable to distribute results as 'normal'

Required Actions:

Centres should notify awarding bodies and seek to make arrangements to access results at an alternative site (possible to access from home).

Actions specific to RB Centre:

**Centre to contact awarding bodies and discuss alternative means of distribution*

**Centre to make arrangements to access results at an alternative site*

**Centre to distribute results via electronic routes having previously obtained written candidate consent*

16. Conflict of Interests

Required Actions:

Centres must ensure that awarding bodies are informed (where required) of any relevant conflict declared by members of centre staff and records are maintained that confirm the measures taken/protocols in place to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the qualifications affected before the published deadline for entries.

Actions specific to RB Centre:

**Centre to ask all staff about potential conflict of interest on a regular basis throughout the year, and report any relevant Conflict of Interest to the appropriate Awarding Bodies*

**Centre to keep clear records of all Conflict of Interest cases including the measures taken to mitigate the risks*

17. Cyber Attack

Where it is identified that a cyber-attack may compromise any aspect of the delivery of examinations:

Actions specific to RB Centre:



Exams Officer will work with IT and contact the relevant Awarding Body to seek further guidance. Senior Leaders will monitor the situation and take any action required as directed by the Awarding Bodies.

18. Artificial Intelligence in Exams

Our Examinations Contingency Policy, in strict accordance with JCQ regulations, states that candidates are not permitted to access or utilize AI for any aspect of the assessment or examination process. The use of AI is exclusively reserved for examination administration and monitoring, and candidates are expected to rely solely on their own knowledge and abilities during the assessment. Any attempt by candidates to use AI or any unauthorized technological assistance will be considered a breach of examination rules, subject to disciplinary actions, and may result in the disqualification of their results. This prohibition on candidate access to AI reinforces the principle of fairness, ensuring that all individuals are assessed on a level playing field based on their own capabilities and knowledge.

Legislation and Guidance that inform this document

- Exams administration: information for exam centres (DfE 2014)
- JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Examinations Policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	RB Worthing
Date of meeting when version approved	
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	6/3/24

Policy contents:
Purpose Scope Policy statement, provision and safeguards Legislation and guidance

Purpose

This policy enshrines that Red Balloon aims to ensure that all students have access to an appropriate range of external accreditation and that all examinations are carried out in a professional manner.

Scope

The Head of Centre is responsible for ensuring that an appropriate range of external accreditation is available to students, and that examination procedures are followed rigorously. RB Worthing employs an Examinations Manager.

Policy statement, provision and safeguards

The purpose of the policy is to ensure that:

- the planning, and management of examinations and external assessment processes are conducted in the best interests of students;
- all examinations and external assessment processes are conducted in line with national and examining body regulations;
- all those involved in all aspects of examinations and external assessment processes are familiar with their roles and responsibilities.

The Examinations Manager is responsible for examination practice.

The Examinations Manager is responsible for ensuring that:

- all examinations and external assessment processes are conducted in accordance with national and awarding body regulations;
- an appropriate range of examinations and accreditation is available to students;
- students are provided with the opportunity to undertake all external assessments in an organised, well-controlled and supportive environment, enabling them to achieve their potential;
- students, parents, teachers and all relevant parties are aware of key dates and details regarding all course entries and external examinations;
- all results are conveyed to students, and other appropriate agencies, such as referring schools and commissioning agents;
- any access arrangements are applied for at the appropriate time - this should be done by SENCo qualified members of staff;
- a summary of student performance in external accreditation is sent annually to parents / carers.

The tasks involved in meeting these responsibilities may be delegated to other staff.

The Exams Manager will:

- maintain systems and processes to support the timely entry of students for their examinations;
- ensure submission of students' coursework and controlled assessment marks;
- Ensure dispatch and storage of returned coursework and any other material required by the appropriate awarding bodies correctly and on schedule;

- arrange for dissemination of examination results, any appeals/re-mark requests and certification;
- produce a timetable of examinations and ensure it is appropriately circulated;
- ensure any necessary information is added to the centre website;
- receive, check and securely store all examination papers;
- ensure all examination fees are paid on time.

All teaching staff will strive to ensure that students for whom they are responsible are given the best possible opportunity to succeed and to achieve appropriate external accreditation.

Each member of staff will:

- liaise with the examinations manager and inform them of any new qualifications being considered or offered;
- provide all necessary information to the examinations manager concerning entries, forecast grades and coursework;
- ensure that they are familiar with the relevant assessment frameworks and objectives for all relevant examinations;
- maintain accurate records of student progress to facilitate accurate prediction of results;
- ensure that students are well prepared for external assessments through long and medium term planning, regular monitoring and formative assessment and practice and intervention strategies;
- ensure that all examination entries and coursework or controlled assessment procedures are administered in a timely and efficient manner through accurate completion of coursework mark sheets and declaration sheets, accurate completion of entry forms and all other mark sheets and adherence to required deadlines (see later in this document re plagiarism);
- analyse examination performance data in their subject area(s) and review practice in the light of that analysis.

Invigilation

The examinations manager will ensure that a responsible invigilator is identified for each examination. The invigilator will:

- collect examination papers and other material from the examinations manager before the start of the examination;
- oversee the examination, in line with national and examination body regulations;
- take an accurate register of all students sitting examinations;
- collect all examination papers in the correct order at the end of the examination and ensure their return to the examinations manager;
- ensure that students do not have access to any information or support that is not specifically identified as being required or allowed for that examination.

In accordance with the requirements of The Equality Act (2010) and Disability Discrimination Act (2005), all staff must ensure that the access arrangements and special consideration regulations and guidance are consistent with the law.
Making special arrangements and arranging support for candidates to take examinations is the responsibility of the examinations manager.

Entries

Subject teachers select students for examination entries.
Students or parents may request a subject entry, change of tier or withdrawal.

Examination fees

The Centre will pay all normal examination fees for students on roll.

'Special consideration'

Should a student be ill before an examination, suffer bereavement or other trauma, be taken ill during the examination itself or otherwise be disadvantaged or disturbed during an examination, then it is the student's parent's / parents' (or carer's / carers') responsibility to alert the examinations manager or the Head of Centre to that effect.

The student must support any special consideration claim with appropriate evidence within three days of the examination, e.g. a doctor's letter. The Examinations Manager must then forward a completed special consideration form to the relevant awarding body within seven days of the examination.

If an unforeseen event affects the running of an exam (eg a fire alarm), this instance will be reported to the appropriate examining board and agreed action taken.

Controlled assessments / NEAs

Please refer to the Non-Examination Assessment Policy

Controlled assessments are the responsibility of the teachers, who must ensure that:

- all controlled assessments are run in line with the relevant awarding body's regulations;
- any special arrangements are met;
- they complete the relevant mark sheets and ensure they are sent together with any other required items to the moderator;
- A comprehensive record is kept of what was sent, who it was sent to and when it was sent.

Teachers must provide the examinations manager with marks for all internally assessed work and estimated grades.

Coursework

The submission of coursework is the responsibility of teachers.

All coursework should be completed in line with the relevant awarding body's regulations. Students should submit coursework before the deadlines given to them by teachers. Teachers will complete and pass relevant mark sheets and samples to the Examinations Manager.

Plagiarism

Red Balloon staff will attempt to ensure that no student achieves an 'unwarranted' grade through plagiarism. There are many definitions of plagiarism, but they all have in common the idea of taking someone else's intellectual effort and presenting it as one's own. JCQ defines plagiarism as, "the failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the candidate's own". Most usually plagiarism refers to copying from published texts whether these are in print or on the internet, but it can also refer to copying from manufactured artefacts, or essays or pieces of work previously submitted for examinations.

A strict interpretation of the term "work" in the above definition would include the original ideas, as well as the actual words or artefacts produced by another. However all work relies at least to some degree upon previous sources: only if the candidate has submitted an extensive and unacknowledged paraphrase (amounting to more than 50% of the total) of another person's writings will this be deemed as plagiarism / malpractice.

By virtue of its definition, plagiarism is restricted to those examination components where students undertake examination work in unsupervised conditions, such as coursework, pre-release work, or the compilation of research notes which can be used in the examination. It can also occur when candidates are permitted to annotate texts and take them into the examination room.

Copying from another student during an examination is not strictly defined as plagiarism, but necessary action (informing the appropriate awarding body) will always be taken.

Working jointly with other students is to be commended, *but* any eventual submission must be solely the work of the candidate or indicate clearly where collaborative working has taken place. Staff must ensure that this is the case.

All Red Balloon staff entering candidates for a qualification with a coursework component must accept the obligation to authenticate the work submitted for assessment. Staff must confirm that the work produced is solely that of the candidate concerned. Staff will not accept work which is not the candidate's own. If plagiarism is discovered prior to the signing of a declaration of authentication, the incident need not be reported to the awarding body; it may be dealt with internally. If discovered after this point, the awarding body must be notified.

Given the close working relationship between Red Balloon staff and students, it is expected that staff would quickly know (different style, unusual vocabulary etc) if work submitted is not that of the candidate i.e. has been plagiarised and must take appropriate action.

In order to reduce the likelihood of students resorting to such practice staff:

- should consider incorporating an awareness raising session on academic honesty when students begin examination courses;

- must ensure that where an awarding body has issued guidance on submissions, all students have been issued with (and internalised) that guidance;
- must ensure that each candidate understands the contents of any such guidance particularly the meaning of plagiarism and what penalties may be applied;
- should reinforce to a candidate the significance of their signature on any form stating they have understood and followed the coursework and portfolio requirements for the subject;
- should make clear what is and what is not acceptable in respect of plagiarism and the use of sources, including the use of websites... it is unacceptable to simply state 'Internet' as a reference, just as it would be unacceptable to state 'library' rather than the title of the book, name of the author, the chapter and page reference. It is similarly unacceptable to list search engines such as Google, Ask Jeeves etc - candidates must provide details of any web pages from which they are quoting or paraphrasing;
- should teach the use of quotation marks when sources are quoted directly (a suggested guideline for the need to put items in quotation marks would be the use of more than six words in unchanged form);
- should set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and provide reminders;
- should give time for sufficient work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow themselves to authenticate each candidate's whole work with confidence;
- should examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that the work is underway in a planned and timely manner;
- should introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the coursework thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material;
- could ask students to make a short verbal presentation to the rest of the group on their work;
- should stress to students and their parents/carers the penalties of malpractice;
- must take care to ensure that work undertaken in previous years' examinations by other students is not submitted as their own by candidates for the current examination - the safekeeping of such earlier work is of great importance, and its issue to candidates for reference purposes should be carefully monitored;
- must not accept, without further investigation, any work which they suspect has been plagiarised.

Management of controlled assessments - specific staff responsibilities

Head of Centre and Examinations Manager

The Head of Centre and examinations manager are responsible for the safe and secure conduct of controlled assessments. In meeting this responsibility they will:

- ensure assessments comply with JCQ guidelines and awarding bodies' subject-specific instructions;
- work with subject teachers to schedule controlled assessments... and ensure that:

- clashes/problems over the timing or operation of controlled assessments are foreseen and resolved;
- all staff involved have a calendar of events;
- an internal appeals policy for controlled assessments is available.

The Head of Centre and examinations manager will work with subject area leads and teachers to ensure that they are able to meet the responsibilities detailed below.

Subject Leads

Subject Leads, or Teachers in Charge of a subject, and teachers must:

- decide on the awarding body and specification for a particular GCSE;
- ensure that marking is standardised internally;
- ensure that they fully understand their responsibilities with regard to controlled assessments;
- ensure they fully understand the requirements of the awarding body's specification, are familiar with the relevant teachers' notes and any other subject specific instructions;
- where appropriate, develop new assessment tasks or adapt sample awarding body assessment tasks to meet local circumstances, in line with the awarding body's specification and control requirements;
- understand and comply with the general guidelines detailed within the JCQ publication *Instructions for conducting controlled assessments*;
- understand and comply with the awarding body's specification for conducting controlled assessments, including any subject-specific instructions, teachers' notes or additional information on the awarding body's website;
- supply to the exams manager details of all unit codes for controlled assessments;
- obtain confidential materials/tasks set by awarding bodies in sufficient time to prepare for the assessment(s) and ensure that such materials are stored securely at all times;
- supervise assessments (at the specified level of control);
- undertake the tasks required under the regulations, only permitting assistance to candidates as the specification allows;
- ensure that candidates and supervising teachers sign authentication forms on completion of an assessment;
- mark internally assessed components using the mark scheme provided by the awarding body;
- submit marks to the awarding body by the published deadline, keeping a record of the marks awarded;
- retain candidates' work securely between assessment sessions (if more than one);
- post-completion, retain candidates' work securely until the closing date for enquiries about results;

- (in the event that an enquiry is submitted) retain candidates' work securely until the outcome of the enquiry and any subsequent appeal
- has been conveyed to the centre;
- ensure they are aware of any access arrangements for students and that those arrangements are carried out.

Exams Manager

Where confidential materials are directly received by the Exams Manager, s/he is responsible for receipt, safe storage and safe transmission, whether in CD or hard copy format. S/he will download and distribute marksheets for teaching staff to use.

Access Arrangements

The SENCo is responsible for ensuring that access arrangements are applied for in good time and that they are carried out appropriately. This person, supported by the exams manager, will ensure that all staff are aware of any arrangements made and that any equipment required is available in good time.

Results

Students will be notified (by email, post or in person - as requested by the student before the end of the preceding term) immediately results are published.

A summary of results will be posted on the Red Balloon Website.

Enquiries about results (EARs)

In any case where the subject teacher has reasonable grounds for believing there has been an error in marking, and the student concurs (the student's written consent must be obtained), the result will be queried. The examinations manager will seek a 'review of marking' at the centre's expense.

If a student wishes to challenge a result, but that wish is not supported by centre staff, that decision should be discussed with the student. Should the student still wish to submit an enquiry, s/he will be asked to pay the requisite amount to the centre before the EAR is lodged.

NB In those cases wherein the grade is raised, all costs will be reimbursed by the awarding body.


Certificates

The Examinations Manager will ensure that all certificates are presented or sent to students.

Legislation and Guidance that inform this document

- Exams administration: information for exam centres (DfE 2014)

- JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres 2022-2023
- Equality Act (2010)
- Disability Discrimination Act (2005)
- Adjustments for candidates with disabilities and learning difficulties, (section 5.8)
Word processor
- ICE (sections 14.20-25) Word processors (computers, laptops and tablets) when
awarding and allocating a candidate the use of word processor in examinations

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Examinations Word Processor Policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	RB Worthing
Date of meeting when version approved	
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	6/3/24

Policy contents:
Purpose Scope Policy statement, provision and safeguards Statement Access Arrangements Legislation and Guidance

Purpose

This policy ensures that RB Worthing provides students with use of a word processor in exams and assessments, compliant with JCQ regulations and as part of student access arrangements.

Scope

The Head of Centre, with the SENCo and Exams Manager, is responsible for ensuring that appropriate access arrangements are in place for those students who need them. The term 'word processor' here is used to describe, for example, the use of a computer, laptop or tablet.

Policy statement, provision and safeguards

Statement

JCQ regulations (Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments Booklet) state:
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.

The criteria used to award and allocate word processors for examinations

Red Balloon confirms the normal way of working in examinations for all our candidates is:

- Candidates use Word Processors (NWOW) (unless, for certain subjects like maths/science/music a candidate chooses to handwrite and then that is what is applied)

Awarding the use of word processors in other circumstances (e.g. private candidates):

Red Balloon may also award a candidate the use of a word processor in examinations where:

- the candidate has a firmly established need
- by not being awarded a word processor the candidate 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 his/her ability to write legibly
- a medical condition
- a physical disability
- a sensory impairment
- planning and organisational problems when writing by hand
- poor handwriting

(This list is not exhaustive)

The use of a Word Processor may also 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

Allocating the use of word processors at the time of the assessment

Appropriate exam-compliant word processors will be allocated by:

- the IT department in liaison with the Exams Officer

In exceptional circumstances where the number of compliant word processors may be insufficient for the cohort of candidates approved to use them in an exam session:

- the cohort will be split into two groups
- one group will sit the exam earlier than or later than the awarding body's published start time
- the security of the exam will be maintained at all times and candidates will be supervised in line with the ICE booklet

Access Arrangements

The following principles are applied to access arrangements at Red Balloon:

- The purpose of an access arrangement is to ensure, where possible, that barriers to assessment are removed for a candidate with a disability 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 providing access to assessments for a candidate with a disability.
- Although access arrangements are intended to allow access to assessments, they are not granted where they will compromise the assessment objectives of the specification in question.
- Candidates may not require the same access arrangements in each specification. Subjects and their methods of assessments may vary, leading to different demands of the candidate. SENCos must consider the need for access arrangements on a subject-by-subject basis.
- The SENCo must ensure that the proposed access arrangement does not disadvantage or advantage a candidate.
- The candidate must have had appropriate opportunities to practise using the access arrangement(s) before their first examination.

The use of a word processor

Red Balloon will:

- 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
- award the use of a word processor to a candidate if it is appropriate to their needs

Needs may include:

- a learning difficulty which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on his/her ability to write legibly
- a medical condition
- a physical disability
- a sensory impairment
- planning and organisational problems when writing by hand
- poor handwriting
- only permit the use of a word processor where the integrity of the assessment can be maintained
- not grant the use of a word processor where it will compromise the assessment objectives of the specification in question
- consider on a subject-by-subject basis if the candidate will need to use a word processor in each specification
- consider the needs of the candidate at the start of the candidate's course leading to a qualification based on evidence gathered that firmly establishes the candidate's needs and 'normal way of working' in the classroom, internal tests/exams, mock exams etc. and confirm arrangements in place before the candidate takes an exam or assessment
- provide access to word processors to candidates in non-examination assessment components as standard practice unless prohibited by the specification
- 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 the course
- where a subject within the curriculum is delivered electronically and the centre provides word processors to all candidates

Arrangements at the time of the assessment for the use of a word processor

A candidate using a word processor is accommodated as follows:

In all examination rooms across our premises.

In compliance with the regulations, Red Balloon:

- provides a word processor with the spelling and grammar check facility/predictive text disabled (switched off) unless an awarding body's specification says otherwise
- checks the battery capacity of the word processor before the candidate's exam to ensure that the battery is sufficiently charged for the entire duration of the exam
- ensures the candidate is reminded to ensure that their centre number, candidate number and the unit/component code appear on each page as a header or footer e.g. 12345/8001 – 6391/01
- if a candidate is using a software application that does not allow for the insertion of a header or footer, once the candidate has completed the examination and printed off their typed script, they are instructed to handwrite their details as a header or footer; the candidate is supervised throughout this process to ensure that they are solely performing this task and not re-reading their answers or amending their work in any way
- ensures the candidate understands that each page of the typed script must be numbered, e.g. page 1 of 6
- ensures the candidate is reminded to save their work at regular intervals (or where possible, an IT technician will set up 'autosave' on each laptop/tablet)
- instructs the candidate to use a minimum of 12pt font and double spacing to make marking easier for examiners

Red Balloon Worthing will ensure the word processor:

- is only used in a way that ensures a candidate's script is produced under secure conditions
- (added 2020/21) ensure the word processor is not used to perform skills which are being assessed
- (added 2020/21) ensure the word processor is not connected to an intranet or any other means of communication
- is in good working order at the time of the exam
- is accommodated in such a way that other candidates are not disturbed and cannot read the screen
- is used as a typewriter, not as a database, although standard formatting software is acceptable and is not connected to an intranet or any other means of communication
- is cleared of any previously stored data
- does not give the candidate access to other applications such as a calculator (where prohibited in the examination), spreadsheets etc.
- does not include graphic packages or computer aided design software unless permission has been given to use these
- does not have any predictive text software or an automatic spelling and grammar check enabled unless the candidate has been permitted a scribe or is using speech recognition technology (a scribe cover sheet must be completed), or the awarding body's specification permits the use of automatic spell checking
- does not include speech recognition technology unless the candidate has permission to use a scribe or relevant software

- is not used on the candidate's behalf by a third party unless the candidate has permission to use a scribe

Portable storage medium

Red Balloon will ensure that any portable storage medium (e.g. a memory stick) used:

- is provided by the centre
- is cleared of any previously stored data

Printing the script after the exam has ended


Red Balloon of the Air will ensure that:

- the word processor is either connected to a printer so that a script can be printed off, or have the facility to print from a portable storage medium
- the candidate is present to verify that the work printed is their own
- a word processed script is attached to any answer booklet which contains some of the answers
- (updated 2020/21) if an awarding body requires a cover sheet to be completed this is included with the candidate's typed script (according to the relevant awarding body's instructions)
- if a candidate omits to insert the required header or footer, he/she is instructed to handwrite their details as a header or footer; the candidate is supervised throughout this process to ensure that he/she is solely performing this task and not re-reading their answers or amending their work in any way

Legislation and Guidance that inform this document

- Exams administration: information for exam centres (DfE 2014)
- JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres 2022-2023
- Equality Act (2010)
- Disability Discrimination Act (2005)
- Adjustments for candidates with disabilities and learning difficulties, (section 5.8)
- Word processor
- ICE Booklet

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Exam Complaints & Appeals 2022/2023
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Exam Complaints & Appeals
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	RB Worthing
Date of meeting when version approved	
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	6/3/24

Policy contents:
Purpose Scope Policy statement, provision and safeguards Appendix 1 - Complaints/appeals form Appendix 2 - Complaints/appeals log

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms RB Worthing's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.8) that the centre will draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their written complaints and appeals procedure which will cover general complaints regarding the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification.

Grounds for complaint

A candidate (or his/her/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 (centre assessed work), 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 his/her centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body
- Candidate not informed of his/her 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
- Candidate unhappy with internal assessment decision (complainant to refer to the centre's internal appeals procedure)
- Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals procedure

Access arrangements and special consideration

- Candidate not assessed by the centre's appointed assessor
- Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding his/her 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 did not consent to record their personal data online (by the non-acquisition of a completed candidate personal data 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 candidate with a disability to access it
- Adapted equipment/assistive technology 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
- Candidate unhappy with centre decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration (complainant to refer to the centre's internal appeals procedure)
- Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals procedure

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 accepted/rejected outcome of a special consideration application if provided by awarding body

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 (complainant to refer to the centre's internal appeals procedure)
- Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals procedure
- Centre applied for the wrong post-results service/for the wrong script 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 his/her parent/carer) has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification he/she is following, RB Worthing encourages him/her 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 his/her parent/carer) is then at liberty to make a formal complaint.

How to make a formal complaint

- A formal complaint should be submitted by filling in the Complaints and appeals form (Appendix 1)
- Completed forms should be returned to the exams manager
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 14 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 4 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 (Appendix 1)
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 14 calendar days
- The appeal will be referred to the Director of Education
- The Director of Education will inform the appellant of the final conclusion in due course

Appendix 1 - Complaints/Appeals Form

Complaints and appeals form

Please delete as appropriate to indicate the nature of your complaint/appeal:

FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Reference No.	

Complaint/appeal against the centre's delivery of a qualification

Complaint/appeal against the centre's administration of a qualification

[illegible]

Detail any steps you have already taken to resolve the issue(s) and what you would consider to be a good resolution to the issue(s)

Complainant/appellant signature:

Date of signature:

This form must be completed in full; an incomplete form will be returned to the complainant/appellant

Appendix 2 - Complaints and Appeals Log

On receipt, all complaints/appeals are assigned a reference number and logged. Outcome and outcome date is also recorded.

Ref No.	Date received	Complaint or Appeal	Outcome	Outcome date

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Internal Appeals Policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	RB Worthing
Date of meeting when version approved	
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	6/3/24

Policy contents:
Purpose Scope Policy statement, provision and safeguards Appendix 1 - Internal appeals form

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms RBs compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.3) that the centre will:

- have in place and available for inspection a written internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, post-result services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

This procedure covers appeals relating to:

- Internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)
- Centre decisions not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal
- Centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration
- Centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

Certain GCSE, GCE and other qualifications contain components of non-examination assessment (or units of coursework) which are internally assessed (marked) by RB and internally standardised. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) which contribute to the final grade of the qualification are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderation.

This procedure confirms RBs compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.7) that the centre will:

- 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

Deadlines for the submission of marks

Qualification	Exam Series	Boards	Deadline
GCSE	Summer 2024	AQA/Pearson/OCR/WJEC	15th May 2024
GCE/FS	Summer 2024	AQA/Pearson/OCR/WJEC	5th May 2024

RB is committed to ensuring that whenever its staff mark candidates' work this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.

RB ensures that all centre staff follow a robust Non-examination Assessment Policy (for the management of GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments). This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments for GCSE/FS and Project qualifications.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. RB is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where more than one subject teacher/tutor is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

On being informed of their centre assessed marks, if a candidate believes that the above procedures were not followed in relation to the marking of his/her work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the marking standards to his/her marking, then he/she may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

RB Worthing will:

1. 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
2. inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of their work in meeting the published assessment criteria
3. inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (generally as a minimum, a copy of the 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
4. 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 the originals will be shared under supervised conditions) within 7 calendar days
5. inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material unless supervised
6. 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

7. provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking. Requests will not be accepted after this deadline.
8. 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 for the submission of marks
9. ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review
10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
11. inform the candidate 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. The moderation process carried out by the awarding bodies may result in a mark change, either upwards or downwards, even after an internal review. The internal review process is in place to ensure consistency of marking within the centre, whereas moderation by the awarding body ensures that centre marking is in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.

Appeals relating to centre decisions not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

This procedure confirms RB compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.13) that the centre will:

- have available for inspection purposes and draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers, a written internal appeals procedure to manage disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support an online application for a clerical re-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 are provided by the exams officer.
- Candidates are made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results.
- Candidates are also informed of the periods during which senior members of centre staff will be available/accessible immediately after the publication of results so that

results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking.

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

The JCQ post-results services currently available are detailed below.

Reviews of Results (RoRs):

- Service 1 (Clerical re-check)

This is the only service that can be requested for objective tests (multiple choice tests)

- Service 2 (Review of marking)

- Priority Service 2 (Review of marking)

This service is only available for externally assessed components of GCE A-level specifications (an individual awarding body may also offer this priority service for other qualifications)

- Service 3 (Review of moderation)

This service is not available to an individual candidate

Access to Scripts (ATS):

- 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:

1. Where a place a university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking
2. In all other instances, consider accessing the script by:
 - a) (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
 - b) (where the option is made available by the awarding body) viewing the candidate's marked script online to consider if requesting a review of marking is appropriate
3. Collect informed written consent/permission from the candidate to access his/her script
4. 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
5. Support a request for the appropriate RoR service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified

6. Collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the RoR service before the request is submitted
7. Where relevant, advise an affected candidate to inform any third party (such as a university 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 (including priority service 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:

[Insert how this works in your centre, for example –

- For a review of marking (RoR priority service 2), advise the candidate he/she may request the review by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for this service to the centre by the deadline set by the centre
- For a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2), first advise the candidate to access a copy of his/her 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 his/her 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 by completing the internal appeals form at least 10 calendar days prior to the deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of his/her appeal in writing.

Following the RoR outcome, an external appeals process is available if the head of centre remains dissatisfied with the outcome and believes there are grounds 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 RoR outcome, but the candidate (or his/her parent/carer) 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 or parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body.

The internal appeals form should be completed and submitted to the centre within 5 calendar days of the notification of the outcome of the RoR. Subject to the head of centre's decision, this will allow the centre to process the preliminary appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required 30 calendar days of the awarding body issuing the outcome of the review of results process. Awarding body fees which may be charged for the preliminary appeal must be paid to the centre by the appellant before the preliminary appeal is submitted to the awarding body (fees are available from the exams officer). If the appeal is upheld by the awarding body, this fee will be refunded by the awarding body and repaid to the appellant by the centre.]

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

This procedure confirms RB compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.3x) that the centre will:

- have in place and available for inspection a written internal appeals procedure which must cover appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration
- comply with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and special consideration as set out in the JCQ publications Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments and A guide to the special consideration process
- ensure that all staff who manage and implement access arrangements and special consideration are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced

Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

In accordance with the regulations, RB:

- recognises its 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.

- complies with its responsibilities in identifying, determining and implementing appropriate access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

Failure to comply with the regulations have the potential to constitute malpractice which may impact on a candidate's result(s).

Examples of failure to comply include:

- putting in place access arrangements/adjustments that are not approved
- failing to consider putting in place access arrangements (which may be a failure to comply with the duty to make reasonable adjustments)
- permitting access arrangements/adjustments within the centre which are not supported by appropriate evidence
- charging a fee for providing reasonable adjustments to disabled candidates AARA

Special consideration

Where RB can provide signed evidence to support an application, it will apply for special consideration at the time of the assessment for a candidate who has temporarily experienced illness, injury or some other event outside of their control when the issue or event has had, or is reasonably likely to have had, a material effect on the candidate's ability to take an assessment or demonstrate his or her normal level of attainment in an assessment.

Centre decisions relating to access arrangements, reasonable adjustments and special consideration

This may include RBs decision not to make/apply for a specific reasonable adjustment or to apply for special consideration, in circumstances where a candidate does not meet the criteria for, or there is no evidence/insufficient evidence to support the implementation of an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment or the application of special consideration.

Where RB makes a decision in relation to the access arrangement(s), reasonable adjustment(s) or special consideration that apply for a candidate or candidates:

- If a candidate who is the subject of the relevant decision (or the candidate's parent/carer) disagrees with the decision made and reasonably believes that the centre has not complied with its responsibilities or followed due procedures, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted
- An internal appeals form should be completed and submitted within 7 calendar of the decision being made known to the appellant.

To determine the outcome of the appeal, the head of centre will consult the respective JCQ publication to confirm the centre has complied with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and/or special consideration and followed due procedures.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 7 calendar days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

If the appeal is upheld, RB will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements/submit the necessary application.

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

Circumstances may arise that cause RB to make decisions on administrative issues that may affect a candidate's examinations/assessments.

Where RB may make a decision that affects a candidate or candidates:

- If a candidate who is the subject of the relevant decision (or the candidate's parent/carer) disagrees with the decision made and reasonably believes that the centre has not complied the regulations or followed due process, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted
- An internal appeals form should be completed and submitted within 7 calendar days of the decision being made known to the appellant.
- The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 7 calendar/working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

Appendix 1

Internal Appeals form

FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Reference No.	

Please tick box to indicate the nature of your appeal and complete all white boxes* on the form below

Appeal against an internal assessment decision and/or request for a review of marking


Appeal against the centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

Appeal against the centre's decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration

Appeal against the centre's decision relating to an administrative issue

*Where the nature of the appeal does not relate directly to an awarding body's specific qualification, indicate N/A in awarding body specific detail boxes

Name of appellant		Candidate name(if different to appellant)	
Awarding body		Exam paper code	
Qualification type Subject		Exam paper title	
Please state the grounds for your appeal below:			
(If applicable, tick below) ☐ Where my appeal is against an internal assessment decision, I wish to request a review of the centre's marking If necessary, continue on an additional page if this form is being completed electronically or overleaf if hard copy being completed			
Appellant signature:		Date of signature:	

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Non-examination assessment (NEA) policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	RB Worthing
Date of meeting when version approved	
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	6/3/24

Policy contents:
Contents Policy scope, purposes and processes Legislation and Guidance

Contents

Key staff involved in the conduct of non-examination assessments

What does this policy affect?

Purpose of the policy

What are non-examination assessments?

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

- The basic principles

- Task setting

- Issuing of tasks

- Task taking

Supervision

Advice and feedback

Resources

Word and time limits

Collaboration and group work

Authentication procedures

Presentation of work

Keeping materials secure

- Task marking – externally assessed components

Conduct of externally assessed work

- Task marking – internally assessed components

Marking and annotation

Internal standardisation

Submission of marks and work for moderation

Storage and retention of work after submission of marks

External moderation – the process

External moderation – feedback

- Access arrangements

- Special consideration and loss of work

- Malpractice

- Post-results services

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

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

- Private candidates

Qualification/Subject specific additional information

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

Legislation and guidance that inform this policy

Policy scope, purpose and processes

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

The regulator's definition of an examination is very narrow. In effect, any type of assessment that is not 'externally set and taken by candidates at the same time under controlled conditions' is classified as non-examination assessment (NEA). 'NEA' therefore includes, but is not limited to, internal assessment. Externally marked and/or externally set practical examinations taken at different times across centres are classified as 'NEA'.
[JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments, Foreword]
This publication is further referred to in this policy as NEA

Purpose of the policy

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

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

The policy will need to cover all types of non-examination assessment.

[NEA 1]

What are non-examination assessments?

Non-examination assessments measure subject-specific knowledge and skills that cannot be tested by timed written papers.

There are three assessment stages and rules which apply to each stage. These rules often vary across subjects. The stages are:

- task setting;
- task taking;
- task marking.

[NEA 1]

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

The basic principles

Head of centre

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

Subject leaders

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

Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead internal verifier

- Confirms with subject heads that appropriate awarding body forms and templates for non-examination assessments (including endorsements) are used by teachers and candidates
- Ensures appropriate procedures are in place to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers in line with awarding body criteria
- Ensures appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture/record relevant information given to candidates by subject teachers
- Ensures appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture/record relevant information is received and understood by candidates
- Where not provided by the awarding body, ensures a centre-devised template is provided for candidates to keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.

Subject head/lead

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

Subject teacher

- Understands and complies with the general instructions as detailed in NEA
- 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 in charge of subject / Subject Lead 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 requirements for legacy specification tasks and new specification tasks are distinguished between

Task taking

Supervision

Subject teacher

- Checks the awarding body's subject-specific requirements ensuring candidates take tasks under the required conditions and supervision arrangements
- Ensures there is sufficient supervision to enable the work of a candidate to be authenticated
- Ensures there is sufficient supervision to ensure the work a candidate submits is their own
- 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
- 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 candidates

Advice and feedback

Subject teacher

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

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

Resources

Subject teacher

- Refers to the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation to determine if candidates have restricted/unrestricted access to resources 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 reviews 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 senior leadership team
- Understands that if, during the external moderation process, it is found that the work has not been properly authenticated, the awarding body will set the mark(s) awarded by the centre to zero

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 written 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 (Reminds candidates of the contents of the JCQ document Information for candidates – Social Media)
- 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

Task marking – externally assessed components

Conduct of externally assessed work

Subject teacher

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

Exams officer

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

Submission of work

Subject teacher

- Provides the attendance register to a Visiting Examiner

Exams officer

- Provides the attendance register to the subject teacher where the component may be assessed by a Visiting Examiner
- Ensures the awarding body's attendance register for any externally assessed component is completed correctly to show candidates who are present and any who may be absent
- Where candidates' work must be despatched to an awarding body's examiner, ensures the completed attendance register accompanies the work
- Keeps a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series
- Packages the work as required by the awarding body and attaches the examiner address label
- Ensures that the package in which the work is despatched is robust and securely fastened
- Despatches the work to the awarding body's instructions by the required deadline

Task marking – internally assessed components

Marking and annotation

Head of centre

- Ensures where a teacher teaches his/her own child, a conflict of interest is declared to the awarding body and the marked work of the child submitted for moderation, whether it is part of the moderation sample or not

Subject lead

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

Subject teacher

- Attends awarding body training as required to ensure familiarity with the mark scheme/marketing 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 which could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process
- Ensures candidates are informed to the timescale set by the subject lead or as indicated in the centre's internal appeals procedure (included in RB Worthing's Complaints and Internal Appeals Policy) 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
- Ensures accurate internal standardisation is carried out by subject leads or subject teacher in charge
- 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

Submission of marks and work for moderation**Head of centre**

- Sets internal deadlines to allow candidate requests to review of marking and to meet deadlines for submission of candidate work and marks to awarding bodies.

Exams officer

- Follows the awarding body instructions regarding the submission of marks.
- Checks marks for accuracy/errors before submitting.
- Submits 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 lead / teacher i/c

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

External moderation – feedback

Subject lead / teacher i/c

- 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 exam series

Exams officer

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

Access arrangements

Subject teacher

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

Special educational needs coordinator (SENCo)

- Follows the regulations and guidance in the JCQ publication Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments in relation to non-examination assessments
- Where arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualification and is the candidate's normal way of working, will work with the exams officer to ensure access arrangements are in place and awarding body approval, where required, has been obtained prior to assessments taking place

- Makes subject teachers and the exams officer aware of any access arrangements for eligible candidates which need to be applied to assessments
- Works with subject teachers and the exams officer to ensure requirements for access arrangement candidates requiring the support of a facilitator in assessments are met
- Ensures that staff acting as an access arrangement facilitator are fully trained in their role

Special consideration and loss of work

Subject teacher

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

Exams officer

- Refers to/directs relevant staff to the JCQ 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/directs relevant staff to Form 15 – JCQ/LCW and 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 Centres - 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 contents of JCQ document Information for candidates - non-examination assessments
- Ensures candidates understand the contents of 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 Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work to subject heads
- Signposts candidates to the relevant JCQ information for candidates documents
- Where required, supports the head of centre in investigating and reporting incidents of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice

Post-results services

Head of centre

- Is familiar with the JCQ 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

Subject lead / teacher i/c

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

Subject teacher

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

Exams officer

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

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

Head of centre

- 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

Subject lead

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

Subject teacher

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

Exams officer

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

Private candidates

Subject lead

- According to centre policy, confirms if private candidates (including distance learners and home educated candidates) are accepted by the centre for entry for subjects containing components of non-examination assessment (where the specification may be made available to private candidates by the awarding body)
- Ensures relevant staff in the centre administer all aspects of the non-examination assessment process for a private candidate, according to the awarding body's specification

Qualification/Subject specific additional information

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

GCSE Art, GCSE Fine Art, GCSE Art and Design or Arts Award

It is the responsibility of the subject teacher and/or teacher i/c of Art to oversee the production of an Art coursework portfolio. Given the nature of RB Worthing's online teaching and learning programme, this presents some unique challenges. The Art teacher(s) must satisfy themselves fully that all work produced and submitted by the student is their own. The subject teacher will already have familiarity with the student's individual style and of their

artistic potential from their participation in online sessions and the work produced and shared therein (via Google Slides, uploaded photographs, screen shots and so forth). To authenticate the portfolio work, the teacher will follow the points below.

- If a student is able to access a local RB Worthing centre then the teacher's observation of the student working will take place at the centre.
- If a student lives within a reasonable travelling distance of their nearest RB Worthing centre then the teacher may arrange with the parent(s) to visit the student in their home to observe the student working. A teacher may enlist the support of a Link Mentor to assist with this.
- If the student lives at such a distance from an RB Worthing centre that visiting is impossible then the following procedure will apply:
 - the parent(s) and student will be contacted to ensure they understand the need for verification of students' work by the teacher;
 - the parent(s) and student will sign a consent form to allow live streaming observations of the student working;
 - the RB Worthing IT manager will activate the student's RB Worthing laptop video camera remotely for a fixed period agreed in advance with the student and family, solely for the purposes of GCSE Art verification;
 - during agreed periods, the Art teacher will remotely observe the student working in a live session.
 - The period of observation will continue for sufficient time to allow the Art teacher to fully endorse the student's portfolio work as the sole production of the candidate.

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	<i>Records confirm that relevant centre staff are familiar with and follow:</i> ● <i>the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments</i> ● <i>the JCQ document Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work - http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/non-examination-assessments</i>	Head of centre
Candidate malpractice	<i>Records confirm that candidates are informed and understand they must not:</i> ● <i>submit work which is not their own</i> ● <i>make available their work to other candidates through any medium</i> ● <i>allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material</i> ● <i>assist other candidates to produce work</i> ● <i>use books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution</i> ● <i>submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement</i>	Teachers

	include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material Records confirm that candidates have been made aware of the JCQ documents Information for candidates - non-examination assessments and Information for candidates – Social Media - https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents and understand they must not post their work on social media	
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	Teacher, IT support, EO
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, colleague support and moderation sessions 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	Subject Lead
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	Teacher
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	
Issuing of tasks		
Task for legacy specification given to candidates undertaking new specification	Ensures subject teachers take care to distinguish between requirements/tasks for legacy specifications and requirements/tasks for new specifications Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved	Subject lead
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	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	Teacher, subject lead

Subject teacher long term absence during the issuing of tasks stage	<i>See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle</i>	
A candidate (or parent/carer) expresses concern about safeguarding, confidentiality or faith in undertaking a task such as a presentation that may be recorded	<i>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</i>	Subject Lead
Task taking		
Supervision		
Planned assessments clash with other centre or candidate activities	<i>Assessment plan identified for the start of the course Assessment dates/periods included in centre wide calendar</i>	Centre Lead
Rooms or facilities inadequate for candidates to take tasks under appropriate supervision	<i>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)</i>	EO
Insufficient supervision of candidates to enable work to be authenticated	<i>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</i>	Centre Lead, EO, Subject Lead
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	<i>Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (section 9 Malpractice) are followed An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed</i>	Centre Lead
Access arrangements were not put in place for an assessment where a candidate is approved for arrangements	<i>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (section 2), to determine the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for the candidate</i>	Centre Lead, EO, SENCo
Advice and feedback		
Candidate claims appropriate advice and feedback not given by subject teacher prior to starting on their work	<i>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</i>	Centre Lead Subject Lead Teachers
Candidate claims no advice and feedback given by subject teacher during the task-taking stage	<i>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</i>	Centre Lead

	<i>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity</i> <i>Full records kept detailing all advice and feedback given to candidates during the task-taking stage as appropriate to the subject and component</i> <i>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given during the task-taking stage</i>	Subject Lead Teacher
A third party claims that assistance was given to candidates by the subject teacher over and above that allowed in the regulations and specification	<i>An investigation is conducted; candidates and subject teacher are interviewed and statements recorded where relevant</i> <i>Records as detailed above are provided to confirm all assistance given</i> <i>Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body</i>	Centre Lead
Candidate does not reference information from published source	<i>Candidate is advised at a general level to reference information before work is submitted for formal assessment</i> <i>Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i> <i>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</i>	Teacher
Candidate does not set out references as required	<i>Candidate is advised at a general level to review and re-draft the set out of references before work is submitted for formal assessment</i> <i>Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i> <i>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</i>	Teacher
Candidate joins the course late after formally supervised task taking has started	<i>A separate supervised session(s) is arranged for the candidate to catch up</i>	Teacher
Candidate moves to another centre during the course	<i>Awarding body guidance is sought to determine what can be done depending on the stage at which the move takes place</i>	Centre Lead, EO
An excluded pupil wants to complete his/her non-examination assessment(s)	<i>The awarding body specification is checked to determine if the specification is available to a candidate outside mainstream education</i> <i>If so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate</i>	Subject Lead
Resources		
A candidate augments notes and resources between formally supervised sessions	<i>Preparatory notes and the work to be assessed are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions</i> <i>Where memory sticks are used by candidates, these are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions</i> <i>Where work is stored on the centre's network, access for candidates is restricted between formally supervised sessions</i>	Teacher

A candidate fails to acknowledge sources on work that is submitted for assessment	<i>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</i> <i>Awarding body guidance is sought on whether the work of the candidate should be marked where candidate's detailed records acknowledges sources appropriately</i> <i>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</i>	Teacher
Word and time limits		
A candidate is penalised by the awarding body for exceeding word or time limits	<i>Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if word or time limits are mandatory</i> <i>Where limits are for guidance only, candidates are discouraged from exceeding them</i> <i>Candidates confirm/record any information provided to them on word or time limits is known and understood</i>	Teacher
Collaboration and group work		
Candidates have worked in groups where the awarding body specification states this is not permitted	<i>Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if group work is permitted</i> <i>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</i>	Teacher
Authentication procedures		
A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment Candidate plagiarises other material	<i>Records confirm subject staff have been made aware of the JCQ document Teachers sharing assessment material and candidates' work</i> <i>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i> <i>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</i> <i>The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment</i> <i>A mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body</i>	Head of Centre, EO Subject Lead Teacher
Candidate does not sign their authentication statement/declaration	<i>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i> <i>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</i> <i>Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</i>	Teacher
Subject teacher not available to sign authentication forms	<i>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to sign authentication forms at the point of marking candidates work as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures</i>	Head of centre
Presentation of work		

Candidate does not fully complete the awarding body's cover sheet that is attached to their work submitted for formal assessment	Cover sheet is checked to ensure it is fully completed before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment	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	Teacher Subject lead
Adequate secure storage not available to subject teacher	Records confirm adequate/sufficient secure storage is available to subject teachers prior to the start of the course via RB Worthing's Google Drive cloud storage system	IT
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/internal audit by IT Manager ensures: - access to this material is restricted via use of secure Google Drive cloud storage permissions - 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 via cloud storage - any sensitive digital media is encrypted (according to awarding body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable) to ensure the security of the data stored within it, with appropriate support from IT department	Head of centre IT
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
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason	The candidate is marked absent on the attendance register	Head of centre
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	Teacher, Subject Lead
A candidate is unable to finish their work for an unforeseen reason	Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (section 5), to	EO

	<i>determine eligibility and the process to be followed for shortfall in work</i>	
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	<i>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</i>	EO
Candidate malpractice is discovered	<i>Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (section 9 Malpractice) are followed Investigation and reporting procedures in the current JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments are followed Appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed</i>	Head of centre
A teacher marks the work of his/her own child	<i>A conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body that a teacher is teaching his/her own child at the start of the course Marked work of said child is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not</i>	Head of centre, EO
An extension to the deadline for submission of marks is required for a legitimate reason	<i>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 (section 5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for non-examination assessment extension</i>	EO
After submission of marks, it is discovered that the wrong task was given to candidates	<i>Awarding body is contacted for guidance Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (section 2), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for candidates</i>	EO
A candidate wishes to appeal/request a review of the marks awarded for their work by their teacher	<i>Candidates are informed of the marks they have been awarded for their work prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body Records confirm candidates have been informed of their marks Candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process Candidates are informed of their marks to the timescale identified in the centre's internal appeals procedure and prior to the internal deadline set by the exams officer for the submission of marks Through the complaints and appeals policy, candidates are made aware of the centre's internal appeals procedures and timescale for submitting an appeal/request for a review of the centre's marking prior to the submission of marks to the awarding body</i>	EO
Deadline for submitting work for formal assessment not met by candidate	<i>Records confirm deadlines given and understood by candidates at the start of the course Candidates confirm/record deadlines known and understood Depending on the circumstances, awarding body guidance sought to determine if the work can be accepted late for marking providing the awarding body's deadline for submitting marks can be met</i>	Subject Lead

	<i>Decision made (depending on the circumstances) if the work will be accepted late for marking or a mark of zero submitted to the awarding body for the candidate</i>	
Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by subject teacher	<i>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</i>	EO, Head of centre
Subject teacher long term absence during the marking period	<i>See centre's exam contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle)</i>	

Legislation and Guidance that inform this policy

- Exams administration: Information for exam centres (DfE 2014)
- JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres 2022-2023
- JCQ Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2022-2023
- Equality Act (2010)
- Disability Discrimination Act (2005)

Policy contents:
Contents Policy scope, purposes and processes Legislation and Guidance

Introduction

Whistleblowing at RBAir 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 at RBair 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 , RBAir 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 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 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 .

This policy sets out the whistleblowing procedures at RB. It has been produced by the Head of Centre and also a member of the Senior Leadership Team responsible for handling any cases of whistleblowing. The Head of Centre is fully aware of the contents of this policy and will escalate any instances of malpractice to the relevant awarding body/bodies.

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 RB 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/carers) 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 directly 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 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 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) 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. 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 .


Alternatively, a worker could consider making a disclosure to Ofqual 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'. Awarding organisations are not prescribed 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 at RB 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.

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Conflict of Interest Policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	RB Worthing
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	6/9/24

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm how Red Balloon of the Air manages conflicts of interest under normal delivery arrangements in accordance with the regulations.

Introduction

It is the responsibility of the head of centre to ensure that Red Balloon of the Air has a written conflicts of interest policy in place available for inspection. This policy confirms that Red Balloon of the Air 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 (GR 5.3)

Roles and responsibilities

The role of the head of centre

- Ensure conflicts of interest are managed according to the requirements (GR 5.3)
- Ensure clear records are maintained and that the records include details of the measures taken to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the qualifications affected (GR 5.3)
- Ensure the records are available where they may be requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector and/or awarding body staff (GR 5.3)
- Ensure the records are 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 (GR 5.3)
- Ensure that entering members of centre staff for qualifications at this centre is as a last resort in cases where the member of centre staff is unable to find another centre
- Ensure that proper protocols are in place to prevent the member of centre staff having access to examination materials prior to the examination and that other centre staff are briefed on maintaining the integrity and confidentiality of the examination materials
- Ensure that during the examination series the member of centre staff is treated in the same way as any other candidate entered for that examination, does not have access to examination materials and does not receive any preferential treatment (GR 5.3)


Additional responsibilities:

The role of the exams manager/officer

- Ensure the process for collecting declarations of interest is undertaken
- Identify and follow the awarding body's administrative process for submitting details of members of staff who are:
 - Taking qualifications which include internally assessed components/units at their own centre

- 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 (GR 5.3)

- Retain the records of the measures taken to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the qualifications affected until the deadline for reviews of marking has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later (GR 5.3)

Policy document control box	
Policy title	Malpractice Policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson (Head of Centre)
Version	1.00
RB Worthing Approving body	RB Worthing
Date of next review	March 2025
Signed by Headteacher	
Date signed	
Signed by Chair of Governors	
Date signed	6/3/24

Introduction

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Red Balloon of the Air:

- has in place a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre and details how candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments, how suspected malpractice issues should be escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body (GR 5.3)

What is malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are related concepts, the common theme of which is that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy and procedure uses the word 'malpractice' to cover both 'malpractice' and 'maladministration' and it means any act, default or practice which is:

- a breach of the Regulations
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification

which:

- gives rise to prejudice to candidates

- compromises public confidence in qualifications 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 or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre (SMPP 1)

Candidate malpractice

'Candidate malpractice' means malpractice by a candidate in connection with any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper. (SMPP 2)

Centre staff malpractice

'Centre staff malpractice' means malpractice committed by:

- a member of staff, contractor (whether employed under a contract of employment or a contract for services) or a volunteer at a centre; or
- an individual appointed in another capacity by a centre such as an invigilator, a Communication Professional, a Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader or a scribe (SMPP 2)

Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice. (SMPP 2)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Red Balloon will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place (GR 5.11)
- 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 (GR 5.11)
- 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 and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Preventing malpractice

Red Balloon has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. (SMPP 4.3)
- This includes ensuring that all staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the following JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:

- General Regulations for Approved Centres 2023-2024
- Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2023-2024
- Instructions for conducting coursework 2023-2024
- Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2023-2024
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2023-2024
- A guide to the special consideration process 2023-2024
- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023-2024
- Plagiarism in Assessments
- AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
- A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2023-2024 (SMPP 3.3.1)

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

- Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report using appropriate channels, either by informing the Exams Officer/Manager and/or Head of Centre.

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body

- The head of centre will notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice, using the appropriate forms, and will conduct any investigation and gathering of information in accordance with the requirements of the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (SMPP 4.1.3)
- The head of centre will 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 (SMPP 4.1.3)
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of candidate malpractice. Form JCQ/M2 will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of suspected staff malpractice/maladministration (SMPP 4.4, 4.6)
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body but will be dealt with in

accordance with the centre's internal procedures. The only exception to this is where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has potentially been breached. The breach will be reported to the awarding body immediately (SMPP 4.5)

- If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual (a candidate or a member of staff) will be informed of the rights of accused individuals (SMPP 5.33)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed informationgatherer) will submit a written report summarising the information obtained and actions taken to the relevant awarding body, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (5.35)
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.37)
- The awarding body will decide on the basis of the report, and any supporting documentation, whether there is evidence of malpractice and if any further investigation is required. The head of centre will be informed accordingly (SMPP 5.40)


Communicating malpractice decisions

Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the head of centre as soon as possible. The head of centre will communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated. The head of centre will also inform the individuals if they have the right to appeal. (SMPP 11.1)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Red Balloon will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ publication A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes



Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy

POLICY DOCUMENT CONTROL BOX	
Policy title	Artificial Learning Policy
Policy owner (including job title)	Kim Anderson, Head of Centre
RB Worthing Approving Body	Governing Body
Policy created/updated	April 2024

Introduction

This policy outlines the guidelines for using artificial intelligence (AI) in the Centre. We recognise the potential benefits of technology, especially in supporting learners with special educational needs (SEN). However, we must ensure that we comply with guidelines on plagiarism and exam malpractice to maintain academic integrity.

Additionally, learner wellbeing and safe use of the internet are at the forefront of our considerations, whilst at the same time we are committed to developing our learners' IT skills and curiosity of the world.

Scope

This policy applies to all learners, teachers, and staff who use AI in our Centre.

Guidelines

For those over the age of 13:

Use of AI for Academic Purposes:

AI can be used as an aid for academic purposes, such as research, homework, and assignments. However, it is essential to note that learners should not solely rely on AI to complete their work. The use of AI must be in line with academic integrity guidelines, and learners must cite the sources used. Teachers and staff should monitor the use of AI and provide guidance where necessary.

Prohibition of AI During Exams:

AI must not be used during exams, or coursework as this constitutes exam malpractice. Learners must not use AI to answer exam questions or seek assistance during the exam. Teachers and staff should ensure that learners are aware of this policy and the consequences of violating it.

Plagiarism and Copyright Infringement:

The use of AI must not result in plagiarism or copyright infringement. Learners must understand the concept of plagiarism and be able to use AI ethically. Teachers and staff must educate learners on how to use AI without violating plagiarism guidelines and copyright laws.

Safeguarding and Safe Internet Use:

The Centre recognizes the importance of learner wellbeing and safe use of the internet. Learners should only use AI in a safe and responsible manner. Teachers and staff must educate learners on the safe use of AI and the internet. The Centre's safeguarding policies must be followed to ensure the safety and wellbeing of learners.

Developing Learners' IT Skills and Curiosity: The Centre is committed to developing learners' IT skills and curiosity about the world. AI can be used to develop these skills, and teachers and staff should encourage its use where appropriate.

Sanctions for Inappropriate Usage: Inappropriate usage of AI will be sanctioned in line with the Centre's behaviour policy. Any breaches of the policy will result in disciplinary action, which may include suspension or exclusion.

Conclusion

Our Centre recognises the benefits of using AI in education and is committed to providing a safe and supportive learning environment for our learners. The guidelines outlined in this policy are in place to ensure academic integrity, safeguarding, and maintain ethical standards.

All learners, teachers, and staff must adhere to this policy when using AI.

For more information on safeguarding, please visit:

<https://www.nspcc.org.uk/keeping-children-safe/>

and for safe internet use, please visit:

<https://www.internetmatters.org/>.

Related Policies

Safeguarding & Child Protection Policy

KCSIE 2024 [Keeping children safe in education - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/keeping-children-safe-in-education)

Behaviour policy

Date of next review	April 2025
Responsible Governor	Chair of Governors