



# THE JUBILEE ACADEMY

*Aspire and Achieve*

**Title:** Non-examination Assessment Policy

**Date Approved:** October 2017

**Date Last Reviewed:** Sept 2025

**Status:** Statutory

**Delegation:** Headteacher

**Review Frequency:** Bi Annually

**Policy Locations:** Website/Staff Shared Drive/Hard Copy

**Next Review Date:** Sept 2026

DRAFT

**THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL JCQ GUIDANCE ON USING NEAS OR PARTIAL NEAS FOR TEACHER ASSESSED GRADES AND SPECIFIC EXAM BOARD GUIDANCE AND REGULATIONS**

**With respect to the 2025/26 qualifications:**

- All non-examination assessments will follow any JCQ guidelines specifically released for 25/26.

**1. Deadlines**

- Entries for non-examination assessments must be made at the appropriate time.
- The assessment marks must be submitted to the exam board by the appropriate date.
- Internal deadlines for marking must be set to allow time for any candidate requests for reviews of marking and still meet the deadline for the submission of marks and candidates work, as published by the awarding body – see Appendix C.

**2. Definition**

- Non-examination assessment is a form of internal assessment for reformed GCSE qualifications where it is the only valid means of assessing essential knowledge and skills that cannot be tested by timed written papers. Non-examination assessment applies control over internal assessment at three points: Task setting, task taking and task marking.

### **3. Task Setting**

- In accordance with specific GCSE awarding body guidelines, Heads of Department and Subject Teachers will be responsible for the selection of Non-examination assessment tasks from an approved list or for setting appropriate centre specific tasks.
- Subject Teachers will ensure that students understand the assessment criteria for any given assessment task.

### **4. Timetabling**

- The Heads of Department and Subject Teachers should choose the most appropriate time for the non-examination assessment to take place.
- The Heads of Department and Subject Teachers should complete a Non-Examination Assessment Plan' document and return to the Exams Office.
- The Non-Examination Assessment may take place during timetabled class time.
- Departments must plan when and how the assessment will take place, taking into account the accommodation and resources required. The Exams Manager should be notified when a high-level non-examination assessment is taking place.

### **5. Task Taking**

- Unless the awarding body's specification says otherwise, the following arrangements will apply.
- In accordance with JCQ regulations, invigilators and JCQ No Mobile Phone & Warning to Candidates posters are not required.
- Subject Teachers will ensure there is sufficient supervision (in accordance with awarding body requirements) to ensure that work can be authenticated as the candidate's own work.
- They will also ensure that they keep a record of each candidate's contribution in group work, where applicable.
- Teachers will also ensure candidates understand the need to reference work, give guidance on how to do this and make sure they are aware that they must not plagiarise other material.
- Teachers can provide candidates with general feedback and allow candidates to revise and re-draft work but must not provide model answers or writing frames specific to the task nor assess the work and then allow the candidate to revise it.
- Any assistance given must be recorded and taken into account when marking the work. Explicitly prohibited assistance must not be given and no assistance should be given if there is no means to record it and take account of it in the marking. Failure to follow this procedure constitutes malpractice.

- Teachers must be aware of the awarding body's restrictions with regard to access to resources. In formally supervised sessions candidates can only usually take in preparatory notes, they must not access the internet nor bring in their own computers or electronic devices. They must not introduce new resources between formally supervised sessions.

## **6. Security**

- All assessment materials must be locked in a suitable secure cabinet within the department at the end of each session.
- Separate user accounts for exam use must be used for high control level work. These must have no access to internet or e-mail and must only be accessible during the non-examination sessions. If work is saved on memory sticks these must be collected in after each session and locked away as in k) above.
- If suspected malpractice occurs, the Exams Officer, the SLT exams line manager and Headteacher must be informed.
- If a student's work is lost within the school this must be reported to the exam board via the relevant senior staff.
- Candidates' work must be securely stored as in k) above until all results have been verified.
- All staff must be aware of the relevant level of control permitted (high, medium or low) as this will determine the level of permitted supervision e.g. high control means that students are under exam conditions.

## **7. Authentication**

- Candidates and teachers must sign the appropriate authentication declarations and these must be kept on file until the deadline for enquiry about results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later.

## **8. Task Marking**

- Teachers are responsible for marking work in accordance with the marking criteria. Annotation should be used to provide evidence to indicate how and why marks have been awarded to facilitate the standardisation of marking within the centre – see Appendix C.
- The centre may disclose marks to candidates provided that it is made clear that the moderation process may result in changes to marks. Centres should not attempt to convert marks to grades in advance of the publication of results.

- Centres must ensure that the internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place. They should retain evidence of internal standardisation and keep candidates' work in secure storage until after the closing date for enquiries about results.

## **9. Enquiries about results**

- Internally assessed component results cannot be reviewed individually. A review of moderation of the cohort is possible but only if an adjustment was made to the centre's marks by the awarding body.

## **10. Factors affecting individual candidates**

- If a candidate misses part of a Non-examination assessment task through absence, an alternative supervised session will be organised.
- The school will follow the procedures set out in JCQ guidelines if assessment tasks are lost or accidentally destroyed at the school.
- Special Access Arrangements will be agreed according to the published JCQ guidance on Access Arrangements. The school will consider requests to repeat Non-examination assessment tasks if they are made before marks have been submitted to the relevant awarding body. Decisions will be made on an individual basis, by SLT in consultation with Subject Leaders.
- If a Non-examination assessment task was completed under formal supervision, a completely new task must be set under a new period of formal supervision

## **11. Disciplinary Procedures for Academic Misconduct**

- Academic misconduct is defined as any attempt by students to gain an unfair advantage in assessments. An allegation of academic misconduct may be made by a member of staff against a student.
- Academic misconduct may include though not be limited to:

### **Plagiarism**

- Plagiarism is using others' ideas and words without clearly acknowledging the source of that information.

### **Falsifying or fabricating data**

- Falsification or fabrication of data consists of the misrepresentation of the results of experimental work or the presentation of fictitious results.

### **Collusion**

- Collusion involves two or more students working together, without the prior authorisation of the subject teacher, to produce the same piece of work, and then attempting to present this as entirely their own work.

### **Copying**

- Copying is when one student copies work from another student, with or without the knowledge of the first student.

### **Personation**

Personation involves one person undertaking an assessment on behalf of another. This may involve the purchase of assessment material or downloading it from a website and then attempting to present this as entirely their own work.

- Any other wilful deception in any element of an assessment.
- A student who aids and abets a fellow student to commit academic misconduct shall be deemed to have committed academic misconduct and will be dealt with accordingly.
- When a case of suspected academic misconduct has been identified:
  - The teacher involved will collect the evidence and bring the matter to the attention of the Head of Centre and the Examinations Manager.
  - The Head of Centre and the Examinations Manager will examine the evidence, interview the student, consult with the teacher, the Head of Department and the relevant Head of Year and students as appropriate and establish the nature and extent of the misconduct.
  - If, as a result of this investigation, the Head of Centre and the Examinations Manager are satisfied that no academic misconduct has taken place, no further action will be taken against the student and the student and the subject teacher will be informed as soon as possible.
  - Where the student admits to the academic misconduct, the Head of Centre and the Examinations Manager will make a written record of the interview and request the student to sign the notes as representing an accurate record of the meeting.
  - The Head of Centre and the Examinations Manager/officer will decide the appropriate penalty in accordance with the previous practice, taking account of the extent of the misconduct, whether wilful deception was involved and the extent to which the assessment would have contributed to the final award.
  - The Exams Manager/officer will inform the Parent(s)/guardian(s) of the student by letter of the decision that has been agreed with the Head of Department and the Head of Year. Parent(s)/guardian(s) will have two weeks to appeal against the decision. If this is the case The Head of Centre and the Examinations Manager/officer will invite the Parent(s)/guardian(s) of the student to discuss the original decision. If no agreement can be made then two members of the Senior Leadership Team will hold a meeting with the Parent(s)/guardian(s) of the student,

- The Head of Pupil Assessment and other relevant parties to make a final decision. The penalty for academic misconduct will include a disciplinary sanction, such as a Headmaster's detention. Serious misconduct may lead to the student being given zero for that coursework/assessment and he may not be allowed to repeat it.

## **12. Appeals Procedure**

- This school is committed to ensuring that whenever it is teachers who assess students' work, this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the specification for the qualification concerned. However, to meet the requirements of the examination boards an internal appeals procedure is available.
- An appeal may only be made against the process that produced the grade or mark to be submitted to the examination board and not against the mark or grade, i.e. where the student or his parents believe that the procedures for managing, marking, moderating and standardising coursework have not been carried out within the procedures set out above.
- Internal marking, moderation and standardisation of coursework will always be conducted by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skills, and who have been trained in this activity.
- The marks submitted to the Examination Boards are subject to further external moderation and standardisation procedures and the final mark is decided by the Chief Moderator for each subject area
- If a student believes that his work has not been treated in accordance with the procedures outlined above he may make use of the School Appeals Procedure.
- After a student's work has been assessed and moderated internally it is moderated by the examinations board to ensure consistency between centres. Such moderation can change the marks awarded for internally assessed work, this is outside the control of the school and is not covered by the Internal Appeals Procedure

## **13. Compliance of staff**

- At the start of each academic year, staff will be required to sign the declaration of understanding of key responsibilities – Appendix D

### **Appendices**

- Appendix A – Outlining staff responsibilities.
- Appendix B – Risk Management process
- Appendix C – Review of marking – centre assessed marks
- Appendix D - Declaration of understanding key responsibilities.
- Appendix E – Use of AI

### Introduction

This policy outlines the guidelines for the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools in assessments within The Jubilee Academy. The aim is to balance the potential benefits of AI with the need to maintain academic integrity and ensure fair assessment practices. This policy aligns with the guidance provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ).

### AI – Use in Assessments

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

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

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

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

### What is AI Misuse

In accordance with the JCQ regulations, students must submit work for assessment which is their own

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.

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

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

### **Acknowledging AI use**

If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

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

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

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

See <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence> for further guidance and information.