WIRRAL HOSPITALS' SCHOOL

EXAMINATIONS POLICY

INCLUDING
Word Processor Policy
Risk Management
Contingency Plan
Non Assessment Risk Management template
BTEC Policies x 4
Reviews of marking - centre assessed marks
(GCE coursework,

GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments,
Project qualifications)

Guidance on AI

June 2023

Robin McMillan

Adopted Summer 2020 Ref G42.20
Adopted Summer 2023 Ref 32.23
Reviewed mid term spring 2021 Ref G06.21
Updated Summer 22 Ref 20.22
Review date: Summer 2026

R.McMillan

Contents

The purpose of this exam policy is:

- to ensure the planning and management of exams is conducted efficiently and in the best interest of candidates
- to ensure the operation of an efficient exam system with clear guidelines for all relevant staff.

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the centre's exam processes to read, understand and implement this policy.

This exam policy will be reviewed every three years.

This exam policy will be reviewed by the Deputy Head and the Exams Officer.

1. Exam responsibilities

Head of Centre / principal

Overall responsibility for the school as an exam centre:

- advises on appeals and re-marks
- the Head of Centre is responsible for reporting all suspicions or actual incidents of malpractice. Refer to the JCQ document *Suspected malpractice in examinations and assessments* and Appendix 2 BTEC Assessment, Internal Verification and Malpractice Policy.

Exams Officer:

- Identification of Candidates – all candidates are known by sight and name by the Examination Officer or the assistant to the exams officer.
- Manages the administration of public and internal exams and supplies exam results to SLT for analysis..
- Advises the senior leadership team, subject leaders and other relevant support staff on annual exam timetables and application procedures as set by the various exam boards.
- Oversees the production and distribution to staff, governors and candidates of an annual calendar for all exams in which candidates will be involved and communicates regularly with staff concerning imminent deadlines and events.
- Ensures that candidates and their parents are informed of and understand those aspects of the exam timetable that will affect them.
- Consults with teaching staff to ensure that necessary Controlled Assessment is completed on time and in accordance with JCQ guidelines (See Wirral Hospitals' School Policy for the Management of Controlled Assessments).
- Provides and confirms detailed data on estimated entries.
- Receives, checks and stores securely all exam papers and completed scripts.
- Liaises with the SENCO to administer access arrangements and makes applications for special consideration using the JCQ *Access arrangements and special considerations regulations* and *Guidance relating to candidates who are eligible for adjustments in examinations and BTEC Reasonable Adjustment and Special Consideration Policy.*
- Identifies and manages exam timetable clashes.
- Accounts for income and expenditures relating to all exam costs/charges.
- Line manages the exams invigilators and organises the recruitment, training and monitoring of a team of exams invigilators responsible for the conduct of exams.

- Prepares and presents reports to the SLT and Governing Body on the running of exams and issues arising. Submits candidates' Controlled Assessment marks, tracks, despatches and distributes returned Controlled Assessment to subject leaders and any other material required by the appropriate awarding bodies correctly and on schedule.
- Arranges for dissemination of exam results and certificates to candidates and forwards, in consultation with the SLT, any appeals/re-mark requests.
- Maintains systems and processes to support the timely entry of candidates for their exams.

Deputy Head:

- Organisation of teaching and learning.
- External validation of courses followed at key stage 4.

Assistant Head:

- Prepares and presents reports to the SLT and Governing Body showing results achieved in relation to expected grades and comparable data for previous years, indicating where future procedural improvements might be made.

Curriculum Leaders:

Guidance and pastoral oversight of candidates who are unsure about exam entries or amendments to entries.

- Involvement in post-results procedures, eg. analysis of data.
- Accurate completion of Controlled assessment mark sheets and declaration sheets.
- Accurate completion of entry and all other mark sheets and adherence to deadlines as set by the Exams Officer / Exam Boards

Head of careers

- Guidance and careers information.

Teachers:

- Notification of r*easonable adjustments required as possible following registration of students.*
- Submission of candidate names to heads of department / faculty.

SENCO:

- Administration of reasonable adjustments and access arrangements for all the courses taken by students.
- Identification and testing (arrangement of appropriate testing) of candidates' requirements for reasonable adjustments and access arrangements.
- Provision of additional support — with spelling, reading, mathematics, dyslexia or essential skills, hearing impairment, English for speakers of other languages, IT equipment — to help candidates achieve their course aims.

Lead Internal Verifier/s (BTEC Courses)

- Verify assignment briefs prior to distribution to learners.
- Verify a sample of assessment decisions.
- Develop the skills of assessors, especially those new to assessment.
- Maintain the consistency of assessment decisions by holding standardisation meeting of assessors.

Quality Nominee (BTEC Courses) At present this is the Exams Officer.

- To act as Quality Nominee for the School, to act as a conduit for information from awarding bodies to course teams, and to ensure standardisation of processes and

  documentation across the programmes.

- To ensure all BTEC Processes are carried out in line with the Awarding body's specifications and requirements.
- To ensure all course marks are submitted to the awarding body by the appropriate deadlines published by the awarding body.

(For full details see Appendix 2 BTEC Courses - Assessment, Internal Verification and Malpractice Policy

Invigilators:

- Collection of exam papers and other material from the exams office before the start of the exam.
- Conduct Examination under conditions approved by the Examination Board.
- Collection of all exam papers in the correct order at the end of the exam and their return to the main office.

Candidates

- Confirmation and signing of entries.
- Understanding Controlled Assessment regulations and signing a declaration that authenticates the Controlled Assessment as their own.

Administrative staff

- Support for the input of data.
- Posting of exam papers.

2. The statutory tests and qualifications offered

The statutory tests and qualifications offered at this centre are decided by the Head of Centre, heads of curriculum and subject leaders.

The statutory tests and qualifications offered include GCSE, BTEC, Functional Skills, Entry Level Certificate and AQA Unit Award Scheme.
The subjects offered for these qualifications in any academic year may be found in the centre's published prospectus for that year. If there has been a change of syllabus from the previous year, the exams office must be informed by December of the current school year.

At key stage 4

All candidates will be entitled, and enabled, to achieve an entry for qualifications from an external awarding body.

3. Exam seasons and timetables

3.1 Exam seasons

Internal exams are scheduled twice a year.

External exams are scheduled in November and May/June.

All internal exams are held under exam conditions.

Which exam series are used in the centre is decided by the Head of Centre.

3.2 Timetables

The Exams Officer will ensure the circulation of the exam timetables for both external and internal exams once these are confirmed.

4. Entries, entry details, late entries and retakes

4.1 Entries

Candidates have been recruited onto GCSE, BTEC, Functional Skills and AQA Unit Award Scheme courses with integrity. They have been given accurate information about the requirements for each course and have been advised to ensure that their choice of courses meets their needs.
The appropriate level of examinations and, if relevant, tiers for each individual candidate are selected by the heads of subject and in discussion with appropriate senior leaders.

A candidate or parent/carer can request a subject entry, change of level or withdrawal.

4.2 Late entries

Entry deadlines are circulated to subject leaders via email and notice board. However, due to the nature of the entry to the school, it is accepted that there may be a legitimate reason for a candidate to be entered for an examination late or in some circumstances very late.

Late and very late entries are authorised by Exams Officer and a member of SLT.

5. Exam fees

GCSE, BTEC, Functional Skills, Entry Level Certificate and AQA Unit Award Scheme initial registration and entry exam fees are paid by the centre.

Late entry or amendment fees are paid by the centre.

Candidates or departments will not be charged for changes of tier, withdrawals made by the proper procedures or alterations arising from administrative processes, provided these are made within the time allowed by the awarding bodies.

Wirral Hospitals' School reserves the right to seek reimbursement from candidates who fail to sit an exam or meet the necessary Controlled Assessment requirements.

Candidates must pay the fee for an enquiry about a result, should the centre not uphold the enquiry and the candidate insist on pursuing the enquiry.
(See also section 11.2: Enquiries about results [EARs])

6. The Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), special needs, Reasonable Adjustments (Access Arrangements) and Special Consideration

6.1 DDA

The Disability Discrimination Act 2010 extends the application of the scope of the Act to general qualifications namely GCSE, BTEC, Functional Skills, Entry Pathways and AQA Unit Award Scheme. All exam centre staff must ensure that the access arrangements and special consideration regulations and guidance are consistent with the law.

6.2 Special needs

A candidate's special needs requirements are determined by the SENCO, doctor and the educational psychologist / specialist teacher.

The SENCO will inform subject teachers of candidates with special educational needs who are embarking on a course leading to an exam. The SENCO can then inform individual staff of any special arrangements that individual candidates may be granted during the course and in the exam.

6.3 Access arrangements

Reasonable Adjustment
This is agreed at the pre-assessment planning stage and is any action that helps to reduce the effect of a disability or difficulty, which places the learner at a substantial disadvantage in the assessment situation. Reasonable adjustments must not, however, affect the reliability or validity of assessment outcomes, nor must they give the learner an assessment advantage over other learners undertaking the same or similar assessments.

At Wirral Hospitals' School:
- Making special arrangements for candidates to take exams is the responsibility of the SENCO in liaison with the Exams Officer.
- Submitting completed access arrangement applications to the awarding bodies is the responsibility of the SENCO.
- Rooming for access arrangement candidates will be arranged by the Exams Officer in liaison with the SENCO.
- Invigilation and support for access arrangement candidates will be organised by the Exams Officer in liaison with the SENCO.

Special Consideration

This is a post-assessment allowance to reflect temporary illness, injury or indisposition that occurred at the time of assessment. Any special consideration granted cannot remove the difficulty the learner faced at the time of assessment and can only be a relatively small adjustment to ensure that the integrity of the assessment is not compromised. Special

consideration **cannot** apply to "licence to practise" units within a qualification, or to "licence to practise" qualifications.

At Wirral Hospitals' School:

The Exams Officer will:
- Complete and send the necessary JCQ form to apply for Special Consideration to all the relevant awarding bodies within the time scale of application within 7 days of the last exam.
- Keep the medical evidence letter securely until the relevant awarding body requests it
- Arrange for the dispatch of relevant documents to the awarding bodies.

(For further guidance please refer to JCQ Document Access Arrangements, Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration and Pearson Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration Policy for Vocational Qualifications)

7. Recognition of Prior Learning

7.1 Key stage 4 students may join Wirral Hospitals' School at various points during the academic year having already completed work towards GCSE, BTEC, Functional Skills, Entry Pathways, Entry Level Certificate and AQA Unit Award Scheme courses at their previous school. Where ever possible completed or partially completed Controlled Assessments, coursework and BTEC units/part awards will be used towards the qualification students undertake at this school.

7.2 In the case of completed BTEC units or completed parts of units, this will be through one of the following routes:

a. The student's previous school may continue to support them through the BTEC qualification in co-operation and liaison with Wirral Hospitals' School

b. In exceptional circumstances, Wirral Hospitals' School will take over responsibility for the completion of the units/part awards/qualification and will adhere to the Pearson Recognition of Prior Learning Policy and Practice document.

8. Estimated grades

Estimated grades are submitted to examination boards where necessary.

The subject leaders will submit estimated grades to the Exams Officer when requested by the Exams Officer.

9. Managing invigilators and exam days

9.1 Managing invigilators

Exam invigilators who are familiar to the candidates will be used for exam supervision, as much as possible, in order to minimise the disadvantage students may experience from unfamiliar personnel. They will be used for all exams if possible.

The recruitment of invigilators is the responsibility of the Exams Officer.

Securing the necessary Debarring and Disclosure Service Bureau (DBS) clearance for new invigilators is the responsibility of the Exams Officer and the Business Manager.

CRB fees for securing such clearance are paid by the centre.

Training for new invigilators and refresher courses for more experienced invigilators will be the responsibility of the Exams Officer.

Invigilators are timetabled and briefed by the Exams Officer.

Invigilators' rates of pay are set by the centre.

9.2 Exam days

The Exams Officer will book all exam rooms after liaison with other users and make the question papers, other exam stationery and materials available for the invigilator.

The site manager is responsible for setting up the allocated rooms.

The nominated lead invigilator(nominated by the Exams officer) will start all exams in accordance with JCQ guidelines.

Subject staff may be present at the start of the exam to assist with identification of candidates but must not advise on which questions are to be attempted.

In practical exams, subject teachers may be on hand in case of any technical difficulties.

Exam papers must not be read by subject teachers or removed from the exam room before the end of a session. Papers will be distributed to heads of department/faculty at the end of the exam session.

10. Candidates, clash candidates and special consideration

10.1 Candidates

The centre's published rules on acceptable dress, behaviour and candidates' use of mobile phones and all electronic devices apply at all times.

Candidates' personal belongings remain their own responsibility and the centre accepts no liability for their loss or damage.

Candidates may leave the exam room for a genuine purpose requiring an immediate return to the exam room, in this case they must be accompanied.

For exams longer than one hour, candidates will not be allowed to complete their exam and leave the room until at least one hour after the published starting time, unless supervised by a member of staff and without access to any smart phones, watches or any devise that can access the internet. As they have decided that they have completed the exam to the best of their ability they will not be allowed to return.

The Exams Officer will attempt to contact any candidate who is not present at the start of an exam and deal with them in accordance with JCQ guidelines.

Disruptive candidates are dealt with in accordance with JCQ guidelines.

10.2 Clash candidates

The Exams Officer will be responsible as necessary for identifying escorts, identifying a secure venue and arranging overnight stays.

10.3 Special consideration

Should a candidate be too ill to sit an exam, suffer bereavement or other trauma or be taken ill during the exam itself, it is the candidate's responsibility to alert the centre, or the exam invigilator, to that effect.

Any special consideration claim must be supported by appropriate evidence within five days of the exam, for example a letter from the candidate's doctor.

The Exams Officer will then forward a completed special consideration form to the relevant awarding body within seven days of the exam.

10.4 Candidates who arrive late

A candidate who arrives after the start of the examination may be allowed to enter the examination room and to sit the examination. This is entirely at the discretion of the Exams Officer and Head of Centre.

A candidate who arrives after the start of the examination should be allowed the full time for the examination, depending on the centre's organisational arrangements and provided adequate supervision arrangements are in place.

A candidate will be considered **very late** if they arrive more than one hour after the awarding body's published starting time for an examination which lasts one hour or more.

For examinations that last less than one hour, a candidate will be considered very late if they arrive after the awarding body's published finishing time for the examination or 30 minutes after the awarding body's published starting time, whichever is later.

Where a candidate arrives very late for an examination the Exams Officer will ensure:

• The script is sent to the examiner/awarding body in the normal way.

• A full written report is sent to the awarding body, on Form JCQ/VLA Report on Candidate Admitted Very Late to Examination Room, as soon as possible and in any event within 7days from the date of the relevant examination. (Form JCQ/VLA may be downloaded from the JCQ website:

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams_office/instructions_for_conducting_examinations/).

The report will contain the following information:

- The reason the candidate arrived late, including any details of
- special arrangements made for the candidate to reach the centre.
- The actual starting and finishing times of the examination.
- The time the candidate started the examination.
- The time the candidate finished the examination.
- A statement on whether security may have been broken due to the
- candidate arriving late, including information about the extent to
- which the candidate was under supervision from the actual starting
- time of the examination.

Again, the candidate will be warned that the awarding body is unlikely to accept the work.

Reports or Form JCQ/VLA is NOT sent to examiners.

There is no longer a requirement to complete the JCQ/LA form for those candidates who arrive within one hour of the awarding body's published starting time for the examination.

11. Controlled Assessment and appeals against internal assessments

11.1 Controlled Assessment

Candidates who have to prepare portfolios should do so by the end of the course or centre-defined date.

Subject leaders will ensure all controlled assessment is ready for despatch at the correct time and the Exams Officer will keep a record of what has been sent when and to whom.

Marks for all internally assessed work are provided to the Exams Officer by the subject teachers and the subject leaders.

See Appendix 3 for full details of Risk Management Process.

11.2 Appeals against internal assessments

The centre is obliged to publish a separate procedure on this subject. (See Appendix 1)

The main points are:

- Appeals will only be entertained if they apply to the process leading to an assessment. There is no appeal against the mark or grade awarded except in the case of review of marking – centre assessed marks as specified in Appendix 3.
- Candidates may appeal if they feel their controlled assessment has been assessed unfairly, inconsistently or not in accordance with the specification for the qualification.
- Appeals should be made in writing by 30 June to the Head of Centre (or other nominee) who will decide whether the process used conformed to the necessary

requirements. Unless under the policy stipulated regarding Review of Marking - Centre Assessed marks. Appendix 3. Then the appeal will need to be in the time frame stipulated in the letter sent to candidates with their internally assessed mark. Wirral Hospitals' School will ensure that a reasonable amount of time being no less than 48 hours will be given from the receipt of the letter to appeal in writing.

- The Head of Centre's findings will be notified in writing, copied to the Exams Officer and recorded for awarding body inspection.

12. Results, enquiries about results (EARs) and access to scripts (ATS)

12.1 Results

Candidates will receive individual results slips on results days in person at the centre or by post to their home addresses, if requested (candidates to provide sae).

Arrangements for the school to be open on results days are made by the Head of Centre.

The provision of staff on results days is the responsibility of the Exams Officer.

12.2 EARs

EARs may be requested by centre staff or candidates if there are reasonable grounds for believing there has been an error in marking.

When the centre does not uphold an EAR, a candidate may apply to have an enquiry carried out. If a candidate requires this against the advice of subject staff, they will be charged. (See section 5: Exam fees)

12.3 ATS

After the release of results, candidates may ask subject staff to request the return of papers within three days' scrutiny of the results.

If a result is queried, the Exams Officer, teaching staff and Head of Centre will investigate the feasibility of asking for a re-mark at the centre's expense.

Centre staff may also request scripts for investigation or for teaching purposes. For the latter, the consent of candidates must be obtained.

GCSE re-marks cannot be applied for once a script has been returned.

13. Claiming BTEC Part Awards and Units

In order to ensure a secure, accurate and transparent audit trail to ensure that individual learner registration and certification claims can be tracked to the certificate which is issued for each learner, Wirral Hospitals' School will:

- Register each learner within the awarding body requirements.
- Provide a mechanism for programme teams to check the accuracy of learner registrations.

- Make each learner aware of their registration status.
- Inform the awarding body of withdrawals, transfers or changes to learner details.
- Ensure that certificate claims are timely and based solely on internally verified assessment records.
- Audit certificate claims made to the awarding body.
- Audit the certificates received from the awarding body to ensure accuracy and completeness.
- Keep all records safely and securely for three years post certification.

14. Certificates

Certificates are collected and signed for.

Certificates may be collected on behalf of a candidate by a third party, provided they have been authorised to do so in writing in advance.

Certificates are not withheld from candidates who owe fees.

The centre retains certificates for one year, after which they will be shredded. Candidates must then obtain certificates directly from the exam board.

15. General Data Protection.

All data held on candidates that is required for registration and entering examinations is protected and stored in line with the schools **Data Protection Policy** which complies with the 2018 Data Protection Act, (The Act) and The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (EU) 2016/679.

All exams office staff responsible for collecting and sharing candidates' data are required to follow strict rules called 'data protection principles' ensuring the information is:

▶ used fairly and lawfully;
▶ used for limited, specifically stated purposes;
▶ used in a way that is adequate, relevant and not excessive;
▶ accurate;
▶ kept for no longer than is absolutely necessary;
▶ handled according to people's data protection rights;
▶ kept safe and secure;
▶ not transferred outside the European Economic Area without adequate protection.

Section 1 – Exams-related information
There is a requirement for the exams office(r) to hold exams-related information on candidates taking external examinations. For further details on the type of information held please refer below – **Candidate information, audit and protection measures**.
Candidates' exams-related data may be shared with the following organisations:

- Awarding bodies
- Joint Council for Qualifications
- Local Authority – Wirral Council

Press releases concerning exceptional grades. Students would consent to this being published
Department for Education
This data may be shared via one or more of the following methods: GDPR policy (exams) –

- hard copy
- email
- secure extranet site(s) – eAQA; OCR Interchange; Pearson Edexcel Online; City & Guilds Walled Garden; NCFE Portal, Access Arrangements Online etc.
- Management Information System (MIS) provided by Capita SIMS sending/receiving information via electronic data interchange (EDI) using A2C (https://www.jcq.org.uk/about-a2c) to/from awarding body processing systems; etc.

This data may relate to exam entries, access arrangements, the conduct of exams and non-examination assessments, special consideration requests and exam results/post-results/certificate information.

Candidate information, audit and protection measures.
For the purposes of this policy, all candidates' exam-related information – even that not considered personal or sensitive under the DPA/GDPR – will be handled in line with DPA/GDPR guidelines.

The table below details the type of candidate exams-related information held, and how it is managed, stored and protected.
Protection measures may include:

- password protected area on the centre's intranet
- secure drive accessible only to selected staff
- information held in secure area
- updates undertaken every12 months or as necessary (this may include updating antivirus software, firewalls, internet browsers etc.)

16. Cyber Attack Procedure.
Wirral Hospitals' School will follow the procedure as proscribed in the school Cyber Attack policy as suppiled and recommended by the schools IT providers Hi Impact.

17. Use of AI in coursework towards examinations.
Wirral Hospitals' School will follow the guidance as laid out in JCQ document AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications as Appendix 4 .Wirral Hospitals' School will continue to monitor and implement all new and relevant guidance from JCQ regarding AI.

Head of Centre

Exams Officer

June 2019

Date

APPENDIX 1

Exams policy – Internal Appeals

INTERNAL APPEALS PROCEDURE for complaints concerning the procedures used in internal assessment of GCSE or equivalent coursework.

(Please note that appeals cannot be made regarding the actual marks or grades submitted by the school for moderation by the Awarding Bodies)

In accordance with the Code of Practice for the conduct of external qualifications produced by JCQ, Wirral Hospitals' School is committed to ensuring that:

- Internal assessments are conducted by staff who have the appropriate knowledge, understanding and skills.
- Assessment evidence provided by candidates is produced and authenticated according to the requirements of the relevant specifications for each subject.
- The consistency of internal assessment is assured through internal standardisation as set out by the Awarding Bodies.
- Staff responsible for internal standardisation and/or assessment attend any compulsory training sessions.

Written Appeals Procedure

Each Awarding Body publishes procedures for appeals against its decisions, and the Exams Officer will be able to advise students and parents of these procedures.

Appeals may be made to the school regarding the procedures used in internal assessment, but not the actual marks or grades submitted by the school for moderation by the Awarding Body.

Examination candidates with concerns about procedures used in internally assessing their work should firstly raise their concerns with the teachers concerned. If this does not resolve the issue the following procedure should be followed:

- The candidate should see the Exams Officer who will make a record of the concerns raised and will refer these on to the Head of Centre. This should be carried out as early in the exam cycle as possible and no later than one week before the final written exam in the subject concerned (where applicable).

- The appeal will be brought to the attention of the Head of Centre, who will arrange for a senior member of staff and another member of staff not involved in the assessment of the work to conduct an enquiry. This enquiry will consider whether the procedures used in the internal assessment conformed to the published requirements of the Awarding Body. The teacher involved in the assessment will be informed of this and

16

asked for their observations in writing. The candidate will be informed in writing of the outcome of this enquiry.

- If the candidate is unhappy with this written response they will be given the opportunity of a personal hearing with the staff who have conducted the enquiry. The candidate may be supported in the presentation of their case by a parent or other appropriate adult.

- A written record of all appeals will be kept in the Exams Office. This will include a record of the outcome, including the reasons for the outcome. A copy will be sent to the candidate.

- The findings will be binding.

- The school will inform the relevant Examination Board of the outcome of any appeal which has implications for the issue of results.

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

Statement for Students:

This information will be conveyed to students during the first term of KS4

"If at any stage during your exam courses you have concerns about the procedures used in assessing your internally marked work for public exams (e.g. coursework / portfolio / projects) you should see the Head of Centre as soon as possible."

Internal Assessment Procedure – Appeals

PLEASE NOTE: appeals may be made regarding the procedures used in internal assessment but not the actual marks or grades submitted by the school for moderation by the awarding body

This is to let you know how to appeal about the procedures used in internal assessment for work that contributes to a GCSE award.

- The procedure will be supervised by the Head of Centre (or other nominee).
- Any appeal will be considered by three members of staff, including the Examinations Officer and a member of the school's Leadership Team.

- You will be allowed to be supported in the presentation of your case by a parent, guardian.
- A written record of all appeals will be held in the Examinations Office. This will include a record of the outcome, including the reasons for that outcome. A copy will be sent to you.
- All appeals will include a review of the procedure used to award marks for internal assessments to ensure that this complies with the requirements of the Awarding Body, and the published Code of Practice.
- You must apply in writing to the Head of Centre (or other nominee) by 30th June.

Appendix 2

BTEC and all internally assessed courses - Assessment, Internal Verification and Malpractice Policy

1.   Aims and Objectives of the policy

Aims

Wirral Hospitals' School is committed to ensuring that standards of assessment are consistent, transparent and in line with the requirements of our awarding bodies. The way students' work is assessed must serve the stated learning objectives of the programmes we offer and facilitate the achievement and wider development of our students.

Objectives

a)   To assess students' work with integrity by being consistent and transparent in our assessment judgements and processes so that the outcomes are fair, reliable and valid.

b)   To ensure that assessment standards and specifications are implemented fully (both in spirit and in letter), so that no risk is posed to the reputation of the awarding bodies or the qualifications we offer.

c)   To establish quality control and recording mechanisms for assignments and their assessment through a system of sampling, moderation, internal verification and cross-departmental co-ordination as appropriate to the requirements of the programmes we offer.

d)   To provide learner-centred approaches to assessment, which provide opportunities for students to achieve at levels commensurate with the demands of their course.

2.   Range and scope of the policy.

The range of the policy covers all BTEC courses offered at Wirral Hospitals' School but may well apply to other assignment-based courses (Trinity College Arts Award).

3.   Assessment

Internal Assessment is defined as the process where staff make judgements on evidence produced by students against required criteria for the BTEC qualification. *All school devised assessment materials must be internally and/or externally verified before being issued to students.*

a)   Completed student assignments will be assessed internally, be subject to internal verification and external moderation by the awarding body.

b)   Students must be left in no doubt that any grade awarded will be subject to internal and/or external scrutiny, (moderation) and that ultimately the final decision rests with the awarding body.

c)   The Assessor is responsible for ensuring that assessment processes are consistent and transparent, that evidence is valid, sufficient and authentic and that judgement of evidence is valid and reliable.

d)   Students will be given an initial deadline for each assignment. Following feedback a new deadline will be set after which the work is assessed and the outcome entered on the student record sheet. The assessment decisions are then internally verified according to the procedure outlined below. There is a further opportunity to improve assignments before the final deadline.

e)   All coursework must be handed in on the date agreed by the assessor.

3.1   Role of the Assessor

The role of the Assessor is to:

a)   Set tasks which allow students to demonstrate what they know, understand and can do so that they have opportunities to achieve the highest possible grades on their BTEC courses.

b)   Ensure that learners are clear about the criteria they are expected to meet in their assignments and that they are fully briefed on the skills which need to be demonstrated in the coursework / portfolio components of a subject.

c)   Encourage students by giving detailed feedback and guidance on how to improve work.

d) Set interim deadlines for coursework and advise students on the appropriate amount of time to spend on the work, ensuring it is commensurate with the credit available.

e) Mark and return drafts within two weeks of submission.

f) Adhere to the Awarding Body's specification in the assessment of student assignments.

g) Record outcomes of assessment using appropriate documentation. Outcomes will be held secure for three years, measured from the point of certification. Associated Internal Verification records should also be kept, to support and verify the decisions that were made for the cohort.

h) Ensure each candidate signs to confirm that the work is their own and that it is endorsed by the teacher after marking the work. A completed original document must be securely attached to the work of each candidate and to that of each sample request.

i) Provide accurate records of internally assessed coursework marks to the Exams Officer in a timely manner.

3.2 Internal Verification

a) The Lead Internal Verifier is at the heart of quality assurance on BTEC programmes. The role is to ensure that internally assessed work consistently meets national standards.

b) Each course will have an identified Lead Internal Verifier (LIV) who is not otherwise involved in the assessing or setting of work which he or she is asked to verify.

c) Internal Verifiers may also be appointed who will have the knowledge and qualifications relevant to the qualification(s) and other competence-based award(s) for which they are responsible to enable accurate judgements to be made regarding candidate performance in relation to competence criteria.

d) Provision will be made for communication between 'course teams' to share best practice and areas of concern. Typically, this will be achieved through an annual meeting of Internal Verifiers at which standards and processes are discussed to maximise consistency between courses.

e)   **The role of the internal verifier:**

        The internal verifier should:

- Not verify their own work or assignments.
- Ensure that all assignment briefs are verified as fit for purpose prior to their being circulated to students. They should enable students to meet the unit grading criteria.
- Make all IV evidence available to the EV.
- Plan with the course team an annual internal verification schedule linked to assignment plans.
- Consider the assessment decisions of all units and all assessors to judge whether the assessor has assessed accurately against the unit grading criteria.
- Verify samples of work – one third of all students per unit and ensure all students' work is scrutinised throughout the duration of the course. New or inexperienced assessors may be given additional support by the IV.
- Consider alternative methods of moderation/verification as required for non-written (ephemeral) assessments (e.g. assessments of performance, oral presentations, and work placements). In most cases, the documentary record of the assessor(s) will provide the basis for verification.
- Maintain secure records of all work sampled as part of their verification process using a standard template.
- If a concern is raised the IV should discuss this with the assessor prior to the final confirmation of the marks for all the students taking the assignment. As a result of the IV process it may be necessary for the assessor(s) to reconsider the marks awarded for the entire cohort of students and, as a consequence, to make changes either to all marks or to some marks.
- Where re-sampling is necessary the work should be verified again before being sent to the EV and records kept.

3.3   Authentication of Candidate's Work

a) On each assignment students must sign that the work submitted is their own and teachers / assessors should confirm that the work assessed is solely that of the candidate concerned and was conducted under required conditions.

b) If the student hands in an assignment and teachers suspect it is not the student's own work, the matter should be reported to the Examinations Officer who will investigate the allegation.

3.4   Student Misconduct

Misconduct covers a range of offences, which can be collectively described as cheating. The following is not an exhaustive list and the School reserves the right to include any other type of cheating under the terms of this policy.

a) Plagiarism: taking someone else's work, images or ideas, whether published or not, and with or without their permission, and claiming that they are your own work: thereby not properly acknowledging the original source. This particularly relates to material downloaded from the Internet or copied from books.

b) Copying the work of other students with or without their permission and knowingly, allowing another student to copy one's own work.

c) Colluding with other students to produce work, which is then submitted individually, except where this is specifically required/allowed by the assessment criteria.

d) Falsely claiming extenuating circumstances to gain an unfair advantage in assessment outcomes.

e) Submitting work done by another student as your own.

3.5   Preventing Student Misconduct

The School will take positive steps to prevent and reduce the occurrence of malpractice by students. These will include:

a) Using the induction period and the course handbook to inform students of the School's policy on malpractice and consequent penalties.

b) Showing students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources including websites. Students should not be discouraged from conducting research; indeed evidence of relevant research often contributes to the achievement of higher grades. However, the submitted work must show evidence that the student has interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and has acknowledged any sources used.

c) Introducing procedures for assessing work in a way that reduces or identifies malpractice, e.g. plagiarism, collusion, cheating, etc. These procedures may include:

- The requirement for interim work to be handed in before final deadlines to give a picture of the student's progress.
- Periods of supervised sessions during which evidence for assignments/tasks/coursework is produced by the student.
- Altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis.
- The assessor assessing work for a single assignment/task in a single session for the complete cohort of students.
- Using oral questions with students to ascertain their understanding of the concepts, application, etc within their work.
- Assessors getting to know their students' styles and abilities.

d) Ensuring access controls are installed to prevent students from accessing and using other people's work when using networked computers.

3.6   Investigating Student Misconduct

There will be an investigation if student misconduct is suspected which may lead to disciplinary action.

a) Students who attempt to gain an award by deceitful means will automatically have their result(s) suspended pending a thorough investigation. Malpractice is considered to be a very serious matter at Wirral Hospitals' School and the Headteacher (or a senior member of staff delegated by the Headteacher) will carry out a thorough investigation. The student will be informed at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences.

b) The outcome of the investigation will determine the appropriate course of action to be taken by the School. Any case where student malpractice is found to be substantiated will be reported to the awarding body.

3.7   If no evidence is found that the student cheated, then the benefit of the doubt should be given to the student and the grade achieved should be awarded.

3.8   Staff Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by School staff. This list is not exhaustive.

a)   Failure to keep any awarding body mark schemes secure.
b)   Alteration of awarding body assessment and grading criteria.
c)   Assisting students in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves School staff producing work for the student.
d)   Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated.
e)   Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own, to be included in a student's assignment/task/portfolio/ coursework.
f)   Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
g)   Misusing the conditions for special student requirements.
h)   Failing to keep student computer files secure.
i)   Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.
j)   Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the student completing all the requirements of assessment.

Where staff malpractice is suspected, an investigation will take place by the Headteacher (or senior member of staff delegated by the Headteacher) under staff disciplinary procedures.

3.9 Appeals Procedures

a) It is the responsibility of the School as an assessment centre, to make all students aware of the appeals procedure and give them access to a copy of the procedure.

b) The Exams Officer is responsible for managing the formal appeals process. If deemed necessary, a formal appeals panel should be set up comprising at least three people, where at least one member is independent of the assessment process.

c) Written records of all appeals should be maintained by the School. These should include a description of the appeal, the outcome of the appeal and the reason for that outcome. A tracking document will be used to follow the course of an appeal, allowing it to be time tracked and verified at each stage.

3.10 Grounds for Appeal

A student/candidate would have grounds for appeal against an assessment decision in the following situations. This list is selective and not exhaustive.

a) The work is not assessed according to the set criteria or the criteria are ambiguous.
b) The final grade of the work does not match the criteria set for grade boundaries or the grade boundaries are not sufficiently defined.
c) The internal verification procedure contradicts the assessment grades awarded.
d) There is evidence of preferential treatment towards other students/candidates.
e) The conduct of the assessment did not conform to the published requirements of the Awarding Body.
f) Valid, agreed, extenuating circumstances were not taken into account at the time of assessment, which the School was aware of prior to the submission deadline.
g) The decision to reject coursework on the grounds of malpractice.

3.11 Formal appeal procedures

a) If, after informal discussion with the LIV, the candidate wishes to make a formal appeal, the candidate must ask the LIV, in writing, for a re-assessment. This must be done within 10 working days of receiving the original assessment result.
b) The Exams Officer with the Lead Internal Verifier, on receipt of the formal appeal from the candidate, will try to seek a solution negotiated between the relevant assessor and the candidate. If it is not possible to reach an agreement, the Examinations Officer and the LIV will set a date for an Internal Verification Appeals Panel to meet.

c) The Internal Verification Appeals Panel will normally meet within 2 weeks of the receipt of the appeal by the LIV, with re-assessment, if deemed necessary by the panel, taking place within 15 working days of the appeals panel meeting.

d) The outcome of the appeal may be:

- Confirmation of original decision.
- A re-assessment by an independent assessor.
- An opportunity to resubmit for assessment within a revised agreed timescale.

4 Responsibility

- Responsible for Policy: Exams Officer.
- Responsible for implementation: Course Assessors, IVs and Faculty Heads.

4.1 It is the responsibility of teachers to:

a) Provide assessment processes that are fair and meet the requirements of students and of the qualification.

b) Provide students with a schedule of assessment.

c) Provide accurate, timely and informative assessment feedback to inform students of their individual progress and tell them what they need to do to improve.

e) Record assessment decisions regularly, accurately and systematically, using agreed documentation.

f) Comply with the School and Awarding Body guidelines regarding work that is submitted after the submission date and work that is re-submitted following a referral decision.

g) Familiarise themselves and learners with the School Assessment Appeals procedure(s).

h) Be aware of and keep up-to-date with Awarding Body guidance in respect of assessment, standardisation, moderation and verification.

i) Ensure that the quality of assessment is assured by carrying out internal standardisation, moderation or verification as required by the School and

Awarding Body.

j)   Record internal standardisation, moderation and verification decisions
        accurately and systematically using agreed documentation.

k)   Provide special arrangements for learners with learning difficulties and or
        disabilities according to the regulations of the awarding body.

4.2   Internal verifiers are responsible for:

a)   Verifying assignment briefs prior to distribution to learners.

b)   Verifying a sample of assessment decisions.

c)   Developing the skills of assessors, especially those new to assessment.

d)   Maintaining the consistency of assessment decisions by holding standardisation
        meeting of assessors.

4.3   It is the responsibility of the Exams Officer:

a)   To facilitate the IV process.

b)   To meet the deadlines for registering learners with the awarding body.

c)   To ensure that awarding body data is kept up to date with timely withdrawal or
        transfer of learners.

d)   To claim learners' certificates as soon as appropriate.

e)   To claim unit certification when a learner has not been able to complete the full
        programme of study.

5   Access to Policy.

a)   Student induction programmes and course handbooks will highlight key aspects of this policy.

b)   Training for assessors will be given as part of staff induction if necessary.

Centre Number and Name (insert here)

Second pair of eyes check form

Two individuals **must** check the day, date, time, subject, unit/component and tier of entry, if appropriate, **immediately** before a question paper packet is opened.

Venue of check (secure room or exam room)	Date	Awarding Body and unit/component code	First individual – name, signature and role	Second individual – name, signature and role

Venue of check (secure room or exam room)	Date	Awarding Body and unit/component code	First individual – name, signature and role	Second individual – name, signature and role

Word Processor Policy (exams)

Key staff involved in awarding and allocating word processors for exams

SENCo	**Mrs A Owen – Petkova**
	Ms P Hoey
Exams officer	**Mr R McMillan**
Exam Support	**Mrs S Jones**
SLT member	**Ms S Marrion**

Contents

This policy is reviewed and updated annually on the publication of updated JCQ regulations and guidance on access arrangements and instructions for conducting exams.

References in this policy to AA and ICE relate to/are directly taken from the Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2018-2019 and Instructions for Conducting Examinations 2018-2019 publications.

Introduction

The use of a word processor in exams and assessments is an available access arrangement.

(AA 4.2.1)

The purpose of an access arrangement is to ensure, where possible, that barriers to assessment are removed for a disabled candidate preventing him/her 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 disabled candidate.

(AA 4.2.2)

Although access arrangements are intended to allow access to assessments, they cannot be granted where they will compromise the assessment objectives of the specification in question.

(AA 4.2.3)

Candidates may not require the same access arrangements in each specification. Subjects and their methods of assessments may vary, leading to different demands of the candidate. SENCos should consider the need for access arrangements on a subject-by-subject basis.

Purpose of the policy

This policy details how Wirral Hospitals' School, complies with AA (chapter 4) Adjustments for candidates with disabilities and learning difficulties and (chapter 5.8) Word processor when awarding and allocating a candidate the use of word processor in his/her exams.

The term 'word processor' is used to describe for example, the use of a computer, laptop or tablet.

The use of a word processor

The centre will

☐ allocate the use of a word processor to a candidate where it is their normal way of working within the centre (AA 5.8.1)

☐ 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 (AA 5.8.4)

☐ only permit the use of a word processor where the integrity of the assessment can be maintained (AA 4.2.1)

☐ not grant the use of a word processor where it will compromise the assessment objectives of the specification in question (AA 4.2.2)

☐ consider on a subject-by-subject basis if the candidate will need to use a word processor in each specification (AA 4.2.3)

☐ 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 (AA 4.2.4)

☐ provide access to word processors to candidates in non-examination assessment components as standard practice unless prohibited by the specification (AA 5.8.2)

The centre will not
☐ simply grant the use of a word processor to a candidate because he/she prefers to type rather than write or can work faster on a keyboard, or because he/she uses a laptop at home (AA 5.8.4)

Exceptions
The only exception to the above where the use of a word processor would be considered for a candidate would be
☐ in the event of a temporary injury or impairment, or a diagnosis of a disability or manifestation of an impairment relating to an existing disability arising after the start of the course (AA 4.2.4)
☐ where a subject within the curriculum is delivered electronically and the centre provides word processors to all candidates (AA 5.8.4)

Arrangements at the time of the assessment for the use of a word processor
A candidate using a word processor is accommodated in a different room or in the main room when it will not cause disruption to other candidates
To comply with ICE 14, the centre
☐ provides a word processor with the spelling and grammar check facility/predictive text disabled (switched off) (ICE 14.20)
☐ (where a candidate is to be seated with the main cohort without the use of a power point) 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 (ICE 14.21)

☐ ensures the candidate is reminded to ensure that his/her centre number, candidate number and the unit/component code appear on each page as a header or footer e.g. 12345/8001 – 6391/01 (ICE 14.22)
If a candidate is using the software application Notepad or WordPad these do not allow for the insertion of a header or footer. In such circumstances once the candidate has completed the examination and printed off his/her typed script, he/she must handwrite their details as a header or footer. The candidate must be supervised to ensure that he/she is 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 (ICE 14.23)
☐ ensures the candidate is reminded to save his/her work at regular intervals. (Or where possible, an IT technician will set up 'autosave' on each laptop/tablet)
☐ instruct the candidate to use a minimum of 12pt font and double spacing in order to assist examiners when marking (ICE 14.24)

(ICE 14.25)
The centre will ensure the word processor
☐ 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 type-writer, 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 be used on the candidate's behalf by a third party unless the candidate has permission to use a scribe

Portable storage medium
The centre 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 is over
The centre will ensure
☐ 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

☐ a word processed script is attached to any answer booklet which contains some of the answers

☐ a word processor cover sheet (Form 4) is completed and included with the candidate's typed script (according to the relevant awarding body's instructions)

☐ Wirral Hospital School only awards the use of word processors for examinations where it reflects the candidate's **normal way of working**.
☐ A word processor may be awarded to a candidate with:
☐ a learning difficulty which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on their ability to write legibly
☐ a medical condition
☐ a physical disability
☐ a sensory impairment
☐ planning and organisational problems when writing by hand
☐ poor handwriting

This list is not exhaustive.
☐ The awarding of a word processor for examinations can only be granted with the permission of the SENCo.

☐ When awarding the use of a word processor in examinations, the word processor will have the spelling and grammar check facility and predictive text *disabled* (switched off). The only exceptions to this are where a candidate also has approval for the use of a scribe. In these cases, as appropriate to his/her needs, the candidate may alternatively use:
☐ a word processor with the spelling and grammar check facility *enabled* (N.B. This arrangement will not be permitted in ELC, GCSE and GCE Modern Foreign Language specifications)
☐ a word processor with predictive text/spelling and grammar check facility *enabled* (N.B. This arrangement will not be permitted in ELC, GCSE and GCE Modern Foreign Language specifications)
☐ Speech recognition technology with predictive text when the candidate dictates into a word processor. Software (a screen reader) may be used to read back and correct the

candidate's dictated answers (N.B. This arrangement will not be permitted in ELC, GCSE and GCE Modern Foreign Language specifications)

☐ Computer software, producing speech, which is used to dictate to a scribe.

However, the candidate will not have access to marks awarded for spelling, punctuation and/or grammar unless he/she has independently dictated spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, and this has been recorded on the scribe cover sheet.

☐ *Example: A candidate cannot write legibly because she has significant learning difficulties asks to use a word processor in her examinations. It is her normal means of producing written work within the school because her teachers cannot read her writing. She is very proficient in using a word processor. The SENCo allows her to use a word processor for exams.*

RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS FOR WIRRAL HOSPITALS SCHOOL

2019/2020

GCSE / BTEC non exam assessments

Risk management process

This template examines potential risks and issues relating to the implementation of non exam assessment for GCSE and BTEC qualifications and how these might be managed and mitigated through forward planning and remedial actions.

It clarifies and sets out who is:

- **responsible** for the risk/issue;
- **accountable** for the risk/issue;
- who should be **consulted** about this risk/issue;
- who should be **informed** if the risk/issue arises;

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Timetabling			
Non exam assessment schedule clashes with other activities	Plan/establish priorities well ahead (e.g. at the start of the academic year)	Plan dates in consultation with school calendar – negotiate with other parties	HOD**/EO** SLT/**TEACHERS**
Too many non exam assessments close together across GCSE subjects	Plan non exam assessments so they are spaced over the duration of the course	Space controlled assessments to allow candidates some time between them	HOD/**EO** **TEACHERS**
Accommodation			
Insufficient space in classrooms for candidates	Once the size of the cohort is known at the start of the year, flag instances where regular classroom space may not be suitable to conduct non exam assessments	Use more than one classroom or multiple sittings where necessary	HOD/**EO**
Insufficient facilities for all candidates	Careful planning ahead and booking of rooms / centre facilities		HOD/**EO**

KEY

RESPONSIBLE

ACCOUNTABLE

CONSULTED

INFORMED

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	**Action**	
Downloading awarding body set tasks			
IT system unavailable on day of assessment	Download tasks well ahead of scheduled assessment date in all cases	Book IT equipment well ahead and download tasks before scheduled date of assessment	HOD/**EO** IT TECHNICIAN
Teaching staff unable to access task details	Test secure access rights ahead of non exam assessment schedule every year and every session	Ensure teaching staff have access rights for the correct area of awarding body secure extranet sites well ahead of the non exam assessment schedule	HOD/**EO** **TEACHERS**
Loss of task details in transmission	Download tasks well ahead of scheduled assessment date	Contact awarding body and ask for replacement task; download again	HOD/**EO**
Absent candidates			
Candidates absent for all or part of assessment (various reasons)	Plan alternative session(s) for candidates		**HOD** TEACHERS

KEY

RESPONSIBLE

ACCOUNTABLE

CONSULTED

INFORMED

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	**Action**	
Control levels for task taking			
The assessment is undertaken under incorrect level of control (time, resources, supervision and collaboration)	Ensure teaching staff know what level is applicable and understand what is involved. Provide training if required	Seek guidance from the awarding body	SUBJECT TEACHER/HOD **EO**
Supervision			
Student study diary/plan not provided or completed*	Ensure teaching staff are aware of the need for study diary/plans to be completed early in course	Ensure candidates start, continue and complete study diary/plans that are signed after every session	**HOD** where necessary **TEACHERS**
Teaching staff do not understand that the supervision of non exam assessments is their responsibility	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the nature of non exam assessments and their role in supervising assessments		SUBJECT TEACHER/HOD **EO**

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
			TEACHERS
A suitable supervisor has not been arranged for an assessment where teaching staff are **not** supervising	A suitable supervisor must be arranged for any non exam assessment session where a teacher is not supervising, in line with the awarding body's specification		**EO**

* Not all GCSE non exam assessments will require the completion of a study diary or study plans

KEY

RESPONSIBLE

ACCOUNTABLE

CONSULTED

INFORMED

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	**Action**	
Task setting			
Teaching staff fail to correctly set tasks	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification**	Seek guidance from the awarding body	SUBJECT TEACHER/**HOD**
Assessments have not been moderated in line with the awarding body's specification	Check specification and plan required moderation appropriately	Seek guidance from the awarding body	HOD/**EO** **TEACHERS**

Security of materials			
Assessment tasks not kept secure before assessment	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the importance of task security	Contact the awarding body to request/obtain different assessment tasks	SUBJECT TEACHER/HOD **EO** **TEACHERS**
Candidates' work not kept secure during or after assessment	Define the appropriate level of security, in line with the awarding body's requirements, for each department as necessary	Seek guidance from the awarding body	SUBJECT TEACHER/HOD **EO** **TEACHERS**
Insufficient or insecure storage space	Look at provision for suitable storage at the start of the GCSE course	Find alternative storage within the centre	**EO**

** All tasks whether set by the awarding body or the centre **must** be developed in line with the requirements of the specification.

KEY

RESPONSIBLE

ACCOUNTABLE

CONSULTED

INFORMED

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	**Action**	

Deadlines			
Deadlines not met by candidates	Ensure all candidates are briefed on deadlines and the penalties for not meeting them	Mark what candidates have produced by the deadline Seek guidance from awarding body on further action	SUBJECT TEACHER/**HOD** **CANDIDATES** **PARENTS/CARERS**
Deadlines for marking and/or paperwork not met by teaching staff	Ensure teaching staff are given clear deadlines (prior to the awarding body deadline) to complete marking/paperwork (Marks can then be processed and submitted ahead of awarding body deadlines)	Seek guidance from awarding body	SUBJECT TEACHER/**HOD** **TEACHERS**
Authentication			
Candidate fails to sign authentication form	Ensure all candidates have authentication forms to sign Ensure that the authentication form is securely attached to their work when it is completed and handed in for marking	Find candidate and ensure authentication form is signed	SUBJECT TEACHER/**HOD** **CANDIDATES**
Teaching staff fail to complete authentication forms or leave before completing the authentication process	Ensure teaching staff fully understand the importance of authentication forms and the requirement of a signature	Return the authentication form to the teacher for signature Ensure authentication forms are signed as work is marked	SUBJECT TEACHER/**HOD** **TEACHERS**

KEY

RESPONSIBLE

ACCOUNTABLE

CONSULTED

INFORMED Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff
	Forward planning	Action	
Marking			
Teaching staff interpret marking descriptions incorrectly	Ensure appropriate training and practicing of marking Plan for sampling of marking during the practice phase	Arrange for re-marking Consult the awarding body's specification for appropriate procedures	SUBJECT TEACHER/HOD **EO** SLT/**TEACHERS**
Centre does not run the standardisation activity as required by the awarding body	Plan against the awarding body's requirements for standardisation, i.e. when and how this activity must be conducted	Check with the awarding body whether a later standardisation event can be arranged	SUBJECT TEACHER/HOD **EO** SLT/**TEACHERS**

KEY

RESPONSIBLE

ACCOUNTABLE

CONSULTED

Wirral Hospitals' School
Contingency Plan for Examinations
2019/2020

Contents Purpose of the plan

Purpose of the plan

This plan examines potential risks and issues that could cause disruption to the management and administration of the exam process at Wirral Hospitals' School. By outlining actions/procedures to be invoked in case of disruption it is intended to mitigate the impact these disruptions have on our exam process.

Alongside internal processes, this plan is informed by scenarios contained in the '*Joint contingency plan in the event of widespread disruption to the examination system in England, Wales and Northern Ireland'.*

This plan complies with JCQ general regulations (section 5) in that:

> The centre agrees to "have in place a written examination contingency plan/examinations policy which covers all aspects of examination administration. This will allow members of the senior leadership team to have a robust contingency plan in place, minimising risk to examination administration, should the examinations officer be absent at a crucial stage of the examination cycle;"

Causes of potential disruption to the exam process

1) Exam officer extended absence at key points in the exam cycle.

Criteria for implementation of the plan

Key tasks required in the management and administration of the exam cycle not undertaken including:

Planning

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

Entries

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

Pre-exams

- exam timetabling, rooming allocation; and invigilation schedules not prepared
- candidates not briefed on exam timetables and awarding body information for candidates
- exam/assessment materials and candidates' work not stored under required secure conditions
- internal assessment marks and samples of candidates' work not submitted to awarding bodies/external moderators

Exam period

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

Results and post-results

- access to examination results affecting the distribution of results to candidates
- the facilitation of the post-results services

Centre actions:

Assistant Exams Officer to take over and SLT to nominate a deputy.

2) SENCo extended absence at key points in the exam cycle

Criteria for implementation of the plan

Key tasks required in the management and administration of the access arrangements process within the exam cycle not undertaken including:

Planning

- candidates not tested/assessed to identify potential access arrangement requirements
- evidence of need and evidence to support normal way of working not collated

Pre-exams

- approval for access arrangements not applied for to the awarding body
- modified paper requirements not identified in a timely manner to enable ordering to meet external deadline
- staff providing support to access arrangement candidates not allocated and trained

Exam period

- access arrangement candidate support not arranged for exam rooms

Centre actions

Immediately SEN Administrator to take control and SLT would nominate a permanent replacement   if necessary to cover role.

3) Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle

Criteria for implementation of the plan

Key tasks not undertaken including:

- Early/estimated entry information not provided to the exams officer on time; resulting in pre-release information not being received
- Final entry information not provided to the exams officer on time resulting in:

- o candidates not being entered for exams/assessments or being entered late
- o late or other penalty fees being charged by awarding bodies
- Internal assessment marks and candidates' work not provided to meet submission deadlines

Centre actions:

SLT to nominate an acting head of department to cover role/tasks.

4) Invigilators - lack of appropriately trained invigilators or invigilator absence

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Failure to recruit and train sufficient invigilators to conduct exams
- Invigilator shortage on peak exam days
- Invigilator absence on the day of an exam

Centre actions:

Internal invigilators to be utilised alongside the external team of trained staff.

5) Exam rooms - lack of appropriate rooms or main venues unavailable at short notice

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Exams officer unable to identify sufficient/appropriate rooms during exams timetable planning
- Insufficient rooms available on peak exam days
- Main exam venues unavailable due to an unexpected incident at exam time

Centre actions:

Alternative venues to be sourced from various areas in the school including offices and meeting rooms where necessary.

6) Failure of IT systems

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Management Information System (MIS) failure at final entry deadline
- MIS system failure during exams preparation
- MIS system failure at results release time

Centre actions:

The centre to communicate with relevant awarding organisations at the outset to resolve the issue.

7) Disruption of teaching time – centre closed for an extended period

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Centre closed or candidates are unable to attend for an extended period during normal teaching or study supported time, interrupting the provision of normal teaching and learning

Centre actions:

Centre to communicate with parents, carers and students about the potential for disruption to teaching time and plans to address this. [Joint Contingency Plan (JCP) scenario 1]

8) Candidates unable to take examinations because of a crisis – centre remains open

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Candidates are unable to attend the examination centre to take examinations as normal

Centre actions:

The centre to communicate with relevant awarding organisations at the outset to make them aware of the issue. The centre to communicate with parents, carers and candidates regarding solutions to the issue. [Joint Contingency Plan (JCP) scenario 2]

9) Centre unable to open as normal during the exams period

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Centre unable to open as normal for scheduled examinations

Centre actions:

A centre which is unable to open as normal for examinations must inform each awarding organisation with which examinations are due to be taken as soon as is possible. [JCP scenario 5]

In the event of school being unable to open for exams, the following steps will be taken:- As laid out in the the Government guidance document What schools, colleges and other centres should do if exams or other assessments are seriously disrupted

1. Contact the relevant awarding organisation and follow its instructions.

2. Take advice, or follow instructions, from relevant local or national agencies in deciding whether your centre is able to open.
3. Identify whether the exam or timetabled assessment can be sat at an alternative venue, in agreement with the relevant awarding organisation, ensuring the secure transportation of questions papers or assessment materials to the alternative venue.
4. Where accommodation is limited, prioritise students whose progression will be severely delayed if they do not take their exam or timetabled assessment when planned.

10) Disruption in the distribution of examination papers

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Disruption to the distribution of examination papers to the centre in advance of examinations

Centre actions:

The centre to communicate with awarding organisations to organise alternative delivery of papers. [JCP scenario 3]

11) Disruption to the transportation of completed examination scripts

Criteria for implementation of the plan

Delay in normal collection arrangements for completed examination scripts

Centre actions:

The centre to communicate with relevant awarding organisations at the outset to resolve the issue. [JCP scenario 4]

12) Assessment evidence is not available to be marked

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Large scale damage to or destruction of completed examination scripts/assessment evidence before it can be marked

Centre actions:

It is the responsibility of the head of centre to communicate this immediately to the relevant awarding organisation(s) and subsequently to students and their parents or carers. [JCP scenario 6]

13) Centre unable to distribute results as normal

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Centre is unable to access or manage the distribution of results to candidates, or to facilitate post-results services

<u>Centre actions:</u>

Centres to contact awarding organisations about alternative options. [JCP scenario 11]

Causes 7-13 – all scenarios, criteria and specific communications have been taken directly from the Joint contingency plan. In the event of widespread disruption to the examination system in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (details of which can be found on next page)

Further guidance to inform and implement contingency planning

Ofqual

Joint contingency plan in the event of widespread disruption to the examination system in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/exam-system-contingency-plan-england-wales-and-northern-ireland/jointcontingency-plan-in-the-event-of-widespread-disruption-to-the-examination-system-in-england-wales-and-northernireland

JCQ

General regulations

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations

Guidance on alternative site arrangements

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/forms

Instructions for conducting examinations

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ice---instructions-for-conducting-examinations

A guide to the special consideration process

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance

GOV.UK

Emergencies and severe weather: schools

https://www.gov.uk/emergencies-and-severe-weather-schools-and-early-years-settings

Teaching time lost due to severe weather conditions

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teaching-time-lost-due-to-severe-weather-conditions/teaching-time-lostdue-to-severe-weather-conditions

Dispatch of exam scripts guide: Ensuring the service runs smoothly; Contingency planning

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dispatch-of-exam-scripts-yellow-label-service/dispatch-of-exam-scriptsguide

Aim:

1. To ensure there is an accredited Lead Internal Verifier in each principal

    subject area (BTEC Entry Level-Level 3)

2. To ensure that Internal Verification is valid, reliable and covers all

    Assessors and programme activity.

3. To ensure that the Internal Verification procedure is open, fair and free

    from bias

4. To ensure that there is accurate and detailed recording of Internal

    Verification decisions.

In order to do this, Joseph Paxton Campus will:

• Where required by the qualification, a Lead Internal Verifier is appropriately
   appointed for each subject area, is registered with Pearson and has
   undergone the necessary standardisation processes

• Each Lead Internal Verifier oversees effective Internal Verification
   systems in their subject area

• Staff are briefed and trained in the requirements for current Internal

   Verification procedures

• Effective Internal Verification roles are defined, maintained and

   supported Internal Verification is promoted as a developmental process

   between staff

• Standardised Internal Verification documentation is provided and used

• All centre assessment instruments are verified as fit for purpose

• An annual Internal Verification schedule, linked to assessment plans, is

in place

- An appropriately structured sample of assessment from all

  programmes, units, sites and Assessors is Internally Verified, to ensure

  centre programmes conform to national standards

- Secure records of all Internal Verification activity are maintained

- The outcome of Internal Verification is used to enhance future

  assessment practice.

Joseph Paxton Procedures:

Internal Verification

- Each course will have an identified Lead Internal Verifier (LIV) who is not usually otherwise involved in the assessing or setting of work which he or she is asked to verify. NB. This is not always possible due to the size of the school.

- Internal Verifiers may also be appointed who will have the knowledge and qualifications relevant to the qualification(s) and other competence-based award(s) for which they are responsible to enable accurate judgements to be made regarding candidate performance in relation to competence criteria.

- Provision will be made for communication between 'course teams' to share best practice and areas of concern. Typically, this will be achieved through an annual meeting of Internal Verifiers at which standards and processes are discussed to maximise consistency between courses.

- All Internal Verifiers will undertake the required accreditation and standardisation activities as required by the awarding body.

- All IV's will adhere to timetables and deadlines as stipulated by the awarding body.

- All Internally Verified records will by archived and saved for 3 years minimum.

The role of the internal verifier:

The internal verifier should:

- Not verify their own work or assignments.
- Ensure that all assignment briefs are verified as fit for purpose prior to their being circulated to students. They should enable students to meet the unit grading criteria.
- Make all IV evidence available to the EV.
- Plan with the course team an annual internal verification schedule linked to assignment plans.
- Consider the assessment decisions of all units and all assessors to judge whether the assessor has assessed accurately against the unit grading criteria.

- Verify samples of work – one third of all students per unit and ensure all students' work is scrutinised throughout the duration of the course. New or inexperienced assessors may be given additional support by the IV.
- Consider alternative methods of moderation/verification as required for non-written (ephemeral) assessments (e.g. assessments of performance, oral presentations, and work placements). In most cases, the documentary record of the assessor(s) will provide the basis for verification.
- Maintain secure records of all work sampled as part of their verification process using a standard template.
- If a concern is raised the IV should discuss this with the assessor prior to the final confirmation of the marks for all the students taking the assignment. As a result of the IV process it may be necessary for the assessor(s) to reconsider the marks awarded for the entire cohort of students and, as a consequence, to make changes either to all marks or to some marks.
- Where re-sampling is necessary the work should be verified again before being sent to the EV and records kept.

Registration & Certification Policy

BTEC

January 2019

Aim:

1. To register individual learners to the correct programme within agreed timescales.
2. To claim valid learner certificates within agreed timescales.
3. To construct a secure, accurate and accessible audit trail to ensure that individual learner registration and certification claims can be tracked to the certificate which is issued for each learner.

In order to do this, Jospeh Paxton Campus will:

• Register each learner within the awarding body requirements
• Provide a mechanism for programme teams to check the accuracy of learner registrations
• Make each learner aware of their registration status
• Inform the awarding body of withdrawals, transfers or changes to learner details
• Ensure that certificate claims are timely and based solely on internally verified assessment records
• Audit certificate claims made to the awarding body
• Audit the certificates received from the awarding body to ensure accuracy and completeness
• Keep all records safely and securely for three years post certification.

Joseph Paxton Procedures:

- Register each learner within the awarding body requirements. (QN)
- Provide a mechanism for programme teams to check the accuracy of learner registrations. (QN)
- Make each learner aware of their registration status. (Subject Leaders / QN)
- Inform the awarding body of withdrawals, transfers or changes to learner details. (QN)
- Ensure that certificate claims are timely and based solely on internally verified assessment records. (QN)
- Audit certificate claims made to the awarding body. (QN)
- Audit the certificates received from the awarding body to ensure accuracy and completeness. (QN)
- Keep all records safely and securely for three years post certification. (QN)
- Update policies annually in accordance with awarding body guidelines (QN)

Assessment Policy

BTEC

January 2019

Aim:

1. To ensure that assessment methodology is valid, reliable and does not disadvantage or advantage any group of learners or individuals

2. To ensure that the assessment procedure is open, fair and free from bias and to national standards

3. To ensure that there is accurate and detailed recording of assessment decisions.

In order to do this, Joseph Paxton Campus will:

- Ensure that learners are provided with assignments that are fit for purpose, to enable them to produce appropriate evidence for assessment

- Produce a clear and accurate assessment plan at the start of the programme/academic year

- Provide clear, published dates for handout of assignments and deadlines for Assessment

- Assess learner's evidence using only the published assessment and grading criteria

- Ensure that assessment decisions are impartial, valid and reliable

- Not limit or 'cap' learner achievement if work is submitted late

- Develop assessment procedures that will minimise the opportunity for Malpractice

- Maintain accurate and detailed records of assessment decisions

- Maintain a robust and rigorous internal verification procedure

- Provide samples for standards verification/external examination as required by the awarding organisation

- Monitor standards verification/external examination reports and

undertake any remedial action required

- Share good assessment practice between all BTEC programme teams

- Ensure that BTEC assessment methodology and the role of the assessor

  are understood by all BTEC staff

- Provide resources to ensure that assessment can be performed accurately

  and appropriately.

  Joseph Paxton Procedures:

- Completed student assignments will be assessed internally, be subject to internal verification and external moderation by the awarding body.

- Students must be left in no doubt that any grade awarded will be subject to internal and/or external scrutiny, (moderation) and that ultimately the final decision rests with the awarding body.

- The Assessor is responsible for ensuring that assessment processes are consistent and transparent, that evidence is valid, sufficient and authentic and that judgement of evidence is valid and reliable.

- Students will be given an initial deadline for each assignment. Following feedback a new deadline will be set after which the work is assessed and the outcome entered on the student record sheet. The assessment decisions are then internally verified according to the procedure outlined below. There is a further opportunity to improve assignments before the final deadline.

- All coursework must be handed in on the date agreed by the assessor.

Role of the Assessor

The role of the Assessor is to:

- Set tasks which allow students to demonstrate what they know, understand and can do so that they have opportunities to achieve the highest possible grades on their BTEC courses.

- Ensure that learners are clear about the criteria they are expected to meet in their assignments and that they are fully briefed on the skills which need to be demonstrated in the coursework / portfolio components of a subject.

- Encourage students by giving detailed feedback and guidance on how to improve work.

- Set interim deadlines for coursework and advise students on the appropriate amount of time to spend on the work, ensuring it is commensurate with the credit available.

- Mark and return drafts within two weeks of submission.

- Adhere to the Awarding Body's specification in the assessment of student assignments.

- Record outcomes of assessment using appropriate documentation. Outcomes will be held secure for three years, measured from the point of certification. Associated Internal Verification records should also be kept, to support and verify the decisions that were made for the cohort.

- Ensure each candidate signs to confirm that the work is their own and that it is endorsed by the teacher after marking the work. A completed original document must be securely attached to the work of each candidate and to that of each sample request.

- Provide accurate records of internally assessed coursework marks to the Exams Officer in a timely manner.

- Update policies annually in accordance with awarding body requirements.

Assessment Malpractice Policy

January 2019

Aims:

1. To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners

2. To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively

3. To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness

4. To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where Incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven

5. To protect the integrity of this centre and BTEC qualifications.

In order to do this, Joseph Paxton Campus will:

• Seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the learner handbook to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice

• Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources

• Ask learners to declare that their work is their own

• Ask learners to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used

• Conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre / Principal / CEO and all personnel linked to the allegation. It will proceed through the following stages:

• Make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature

of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should

malpractice be proven

- Give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made

- Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment

   made

- Document all stages of any investigation.

Where malpractice is proven, this centre will apply the following penalties /

sanctions:

Where staff malpractice is suspected, an investigation will take place by the Headteacher (or senior member of staff delegated by the Headteacher) under staff disciplinary procedures.

Where student malpractice is suspected, the relevant exam board will be contacted.

Definition of Malpractice by Learners

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be

considered by this centre at its discretion:

- Plagiarism of any nature

- Collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce

   work that is submitted as individual learner work

- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying)

- Deliberate destruction of another's work

- Fabrication of results or evidence

- False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio

   or coursework

- Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce

   the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an

   assessment/examination/test.

Definition of Malpractice by Centre Staff

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:

- Improper assistance to candidates
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- Fraudulent claims for certificates
- Inappropriate retention of certificates
- Assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the learner
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/ coursework
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as an amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or

By fraud

- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment.

Joseph Paxton Procedures

Authentication of Candidate's Work

- On each assignment students must sign that the work submitted is their own and teachers / assessors should confirm that the work assessed is solely that of the candidate concerned and was conducted under required conditions.

- If the student hands in an assignment and teachers suspect it is not the student's own work, the matter should be reported to the Examinations Officer who will investigate the allegation.

Student Misconduct

- Misconduct covers a range of offences, which can be collectively described as cheating. The following is not an exhaustive list and the School reserves the right to include any other type of cheating under the terms of this policy.

- Plagiarism: taking someone else's work, images or ideas, whether published or not, and with or without their permission, and claiming that they are your own work: thereby not properly acknowledging the original source. This particularly relates to material downloaded from the Internet or copied from books.

- Copying the work of other students with or without their permission and knowingly, allowing another student to copy one's own work.

- Colluding with other students to produce work, which is then submitted individually, except where this is specifically required/allowed by the assessment criteria.

- Falsely claiming extenuating circumstances to gain an unfair advantage in assessment outcomes.

- Submitting work done by another student as your own.

Preventing Student Misconduct

The School will take positive steps to prevent and reduce the occurrence of malpractice by students. These will include:

- Using the induction period and the course handbook to inform students of the School's policy on malpractice and consequent penalties.

- Showing students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources including websites. Students should not be discouraged from conducting research; indeed evidence of relevant research often contributes to the achievement of higher grades. However, the submitted work must show evidence that the student has interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and has acknowledged any sources used.

- Introducing procedures for assessing work in a way that reduces or identifies malpractice, e.g. plagiarism, collusion, cheating, etc. These procedures may include:

1. The requirement for interim work to be handed in before final deadlines to give a picture of the student's progress.
2. Periods of supervised sessions during which evidence for assignments/tasks/coursework is produced by the student.
3. Altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis.
4. The assessor assessing work for a single assignment/task in a single session for the complete cohort of students.
5. Using oral questions with students to ascertain their understanding of the concepts, application, etc within their work.
6. Assessors getting to know their students' styles and abilities.

- Ensuring access controls are installed to prevent students from accessing and using other people's work when using networked computers.

Investigating Student Misconduct

- There will be an investigation if student misconduct is suspected which may lead to disciplinary action.

- Students who attempt to gain an award by deceitful means will automatically have their result(s) suspended pending a thorough investigation. Malpractice is considered to be a very serious matter at Wirral Hospitals' School and the Headteacher (or a senior member of staff delegated by the Headteacher) will carry out a thorough investigation. The student will be informed at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences.

- The outcome of the investigation will determine the appropriate course of action to be taken by the School. Any case where student malpractice is found to be substantiated will be reported to the awarding body.

- If no evidence is found that the student cheated, then the benefit of the doubt should be given to the student and the grade achieved should be awarded.

Staff Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by School staff. This list is not exhaustive.

- Failure to keep any awarding body mark schemes secure.
- Alteration of awarding body assessment and grading criteria.
- Assisting students in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves School staff producing work for the student.
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated.
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own, to be included in a student's assignment/task/portfolio/ coursework.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Misusing the conditions for special student requirements.
- Failing to keep student computer files secure.
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.
- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the student completing all the requirements of assessment.

Where staff malpractice is suspected, an investigation will take place by the Headteacher (or senior member of staff delegated by the Headteacher) under staff disciplinary procedures.

Appendix 3

Reviews of marking - centre assessed marks (GCE coursework,

GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments, Project qualifications)

Suggested template for centres

Wirral Hospitals' School 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.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. Wirral Hospitals' School is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where a number of subject teachers are involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

1. Wirral Hospitals' School will ensure that candidates are informed of their centre assessed marks so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body.

2. Wirral Hospitals' School will inform candidates that they may request copies of materials to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment.

3. Wirral Hospitals' School will, having received a request for materials, promptly make them available to the candidate. This will either be the originals viewed under supervised conditions or copies.

4. Wirral Hospitals' School will provide candidates with sufficient time, normally at least three working days, to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision.

5. Wirral Hospitals' School will 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. Requests **must** be made in writing and candidates **must** explain on what grounds they wish to request a review.

6. Wirral Hospitals' School will allow sufficient time 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.

7. Wirral Hospitals' School will 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.

8.   Wirral Hospitals' School will instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.

9.   Wirral Hospitals' School will inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking.

10.   The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request. The centre will inform the awarding body if it 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 the 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.

AI Use in Assessments:Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications

Guidance for Teachers & Assessors

Produced on behalf of:

Executive summary

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

The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/), all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the students' own;

- Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions;

- Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice;

- Students must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded (please see the *Acknowledging AI Use* section below);

- Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the students' own (in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres*); and

- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.

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

The JCQ awarding organisations are continuing to monitor developments in this area and will update this guidance when appropriate.[ii]

Contents

71

The assessments this guidance applies to

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

There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs) for General Qualifications, coursework and internal assessments. This document is primarily intended to provide guidance in relation to these assessments. [2]

What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.

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

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

- Answering questions

- Analysing, improving, and summarising text

- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction

- Writing computer code

- Translating text from one language to another

- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme

- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or formality

AI chatbots currently available include:

- ChatGPT (https://chat.openai.com)

- Jenni AI (https://jenni.ai)

- Jasper AI (https://www.jasper.ai/)

- Writesonic (https://writesonic.com/chat/)

- Bloomai (https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom)

- Google Bard

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate images, such as:

- Midjourney (https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/)

- Stable Diffusion (https://stablediffusionweb.com/)

- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (https://openai.com/dall-e-2/)

The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments. As noted above, they have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. AI chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions and some can also produce fake references to books/ articles by real or fake people.[3]

What is AI misuse?

As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ general-regulations/), students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words, and isn't copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work. Students are expected to demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks students have been set. Any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice. While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it's important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Students should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying.

AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and where the student is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the student's own

- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content

- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations

- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information

- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools

- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of *'making a false declaration of authenticity'* and *'plagiarism'* include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.[4]

Centre engagement with and discussion of AI

Centres will already have agreed policies and procedures relating to assessment in place to ensure the authenticity of assessments. Centres must now ensure that these can also address the risks associated with AI misuse.

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

Centres should do the following:

a) Explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;

b) Update the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy to acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged) – most simply by referencing this document;

c) Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites);

d) Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on acknowledging AI use);

e) Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the *What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?* and *What is AI misuse?* sections);

f) Consider whether students should be required to sign a declaration that they have understood what AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden in the learning agreement that is signed at enrolment in some centres;

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

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

i) Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (see the *Awarding Organisation actions* section below).[5]

Acknowledging AI use

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

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

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2023. The student must, retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

This must be submitted with the work so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own. Further guidance on ways this could be done are set out in the *JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments* guidance document (see link below).

The JCQ guidance on referencing can be found in the following:

- *Plagiarism in Assessments (*https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/ plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/*)*

- *Instructions for conducting coursework (*https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/ uploads/2022/08/Coursework_ICC_22-23_FINAL.pdf*)*

- *The Information for Candidates documents (*https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents*)*

Other actions which should be considered in relation to acknowledging AI use are:

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

b) Students should also be reminded that if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria they will not be rewarded.[6]

Other ways to prevent misuse

While there may be benefits to using AI in some situations, there is the potential for it to be misused by students, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a student submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, can be considered a form of plagiarism. JCQ has published guidance on plagiarism which provides guidance on what plagiarism is, how to prevent it, and how to detect it (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/). Teachers and assessors must be assured that the work they accept for assessment and mark is authentically the student's own work. They are required to confirm this during the assessment process.

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

a) Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;

b) Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;

c) Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;

d) Where appropriate, allocating time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence;

e) Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;

f) Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material;

g) Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;

h) Do not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been taken from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice which can attract sanctions.

i) Issuing tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data. [7]

Identifying misuse

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that can be used. We explore these different methods below.

Comparison with previous work

When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Where the work is made up of writing, one can make note of the following characteristics:

- Spelling and punctuation
- Grammatical usage
- Writing style and tone
- Vocabulary
- Complexity and coherency
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

Potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in student work, it may be an indication that they have misused AI:

a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations*

b) A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level*

c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected~

d) Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)

e) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects

f) Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered

g) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work

h) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this

i) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected

j) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge

k) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected

l) The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output [8]

m) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten

n) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit

o) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content

p) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style

*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content.

~However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

Automated detection

AI chatbots, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means that AI-generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who use a variety of words in their normal writing. Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI:

• OpenAI Classifier (https://openai.com/blog/new-ai-classifier-for-indicating-ai-written-text/)

• GPTZero (https://gptzero.me/)

• The Giant Language Model Test Room (GLTR) (http://gltr.io/dist/)

In addition, the JCQ awarding organisations are aware that AI detection will shortly be added to the existing tool Turnitin Originality (https://www.turnitin.com/ products/originality). This tool features an AI review of a student's work, reviewing a portfolio of evidence and, we understand, will indicate the likelihood of AI use.

These tools could be used as a check on student work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of student work. However, it should be noted that the above tools, as they base their scores on the predictability of words, will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students. The quality of these detection tools can vary and AI and detection tools will continue to evolve. The use of detection tools should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information should be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns.[9]

Reporting

If your suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. You can resolve the matter prior to the signing of the declarations.

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

If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/). [10]

Awarding Organisation actions

The JCQ awarding organisations ensure that their staff, moderators and examiners are appropriately trained in the identification of malpractice and have established procedures for reporting and investigating suspected malpractice.

If AI misuse is suspected by an awarding organisation's moderator or examiner, or if it has been reported by a student or member of the public, full details of the allegation will usually be relayed to the centre. The relevant awarding organisation will liaise with the Head of Centre regarding the next steps of the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained. The awarding organisation will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with the sanctions given in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (https://www.jcq. org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/). The sanctions applied to a student committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the student being barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time.

Awarding organisations will also take action, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where centre staff are knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments.