

NON-EXAM ASSESSMENT (NEA) POLICY

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with all applicable awarding bodies' regulations relating to non-exam assessment (NEA), which includes members of the JCQ and others such as NCFE. In particular the policy complies with the JCQ Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessments and other published guidelines when available.

Also applicable is STCG's Examinations and Assessment Policy - Procedures which covers issues such as logging receipt of papers, storing secure materials, invigilation training.

Any type of assessment that is 'not externally set and taken by candidates at the same time under controlled conditions' is classified as NEA. It includes but is not limited to internal assessment. Also classified as NEA are externally marked and/or externally set practical examinations taken at different times across centres. This policy covers all types of NEA.

1. What does this policy affect?

This policy affects the delivery of all qualifications that contain an NEA component.

2. Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to:

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

3. What are non-examination assessments?

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

There are three assessment stages – *task setting, task taking and task marking*. Rules apply to each stage and vary by subject and qualification.

4. Procedures for planning and managing NEA identifying staff roles and responsibilities

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES

Head of Centre

- Returns a declaration (managed as part of the National Centre Number Register annual update) to confirm awareness of, and adherence to, the latest version of JCQ Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessments and other awarding bodies' requirements where applicable
- Ensures the STCG Non-Exam Assessment Policy is fit for purpose
- Ensures the STCG Internal Appeals Policy clearly details the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks) and requesting a review of any marking

Quality Lead (QL)/Lead internal verifier

- Confirms with subject heads that appropriate awarding body NEA forms and templates (including endorsements) are used by teachers and candidates

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

- Ensures appropriate procedures are in place to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers
- Ensures appropriate templates are provided to capture/record relevant information given to candidates by subject teachers and that the information is understood by candidates
- Ensures an appropriate template is provided for candidates to keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.

Subject head

- Ensures subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities within the NEA process
- Ensures JCQ and awarding body subject specific instructions are followed in relation to the conduct of NEA (including endorsements)
- Works with the QL/lead internal verifier to ensure appropriate procedures are followed to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers
- Ensures assessment schedules are published and circulated at the start of the academic year

Subject teacher

- Understands and complies with the NEA instructions as detailed by the JCQ and/or awarding body
- Understands and complies with JCQ’s ‘AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications’, and informs students of relevant requirements
- Understands and complies with awarding body subject-specific instructions, teachers’ notes or additional information on their website
- Provides students with the JCQ notice ‘Information for Candidates: Non-examination assessments’
- Marks internally assessed work to the criteria provided by the awarding body
- Ensures Exams is provided with relevant subject entry codes by the internal deadline for entries

Head of Exams

- Signposts the annually updated regulations applicable to NEA to relevant college staff
- Carries out tasks when applicable to the role in supporting the administration/management of NEAs

Subject teachers have the following responsibilities:

TASK SETTING

- Selects tasks to be undertaken from a number of options provided by the awarding body
- Makes candidates aware of the criteria used to assess their work

ISSUING OF TASKS

- Identifies date(s) when tasks should be taken by candidates
- Ensures that materials are stored securely at all times

TASK TAKING - Supervision

- Ensures candidates take tasks under the required conditions and supervision arrangements
- Ensures there is sufficient supervision to enable the work of a candidate to be authenticated and to ensure the work a candidate submits is their own
- Is confident that work completed outside the college without direct supervision is the candidate’s own
- Ensures candidates are aware of, understand and comply with current awarding body and JCQ documents such as Information for candidates - non-examination assessments and Using social media and examinations/assessments

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

ADVICE AND FEEDBACK

- Advises candidates on relevant aspects before candidates begin working on a task
- Does not provide candidates with model answers or outlines/headings specific to the task
- When reviewing candidates' work, provides oral and written advice at a general level to candidates
- Allows candidates to revise and re-draft work after advice has been given at a general level
- During the working period, monitors progress as specified in order to be able to authenticate the work as the learner's own
- Records any assistance given beyond general advice and takes it into account in the marking
- Ensures when work has been assessed, candidates are not allowed to revise it

RESOURCES

- Refers to the awarding body specifications and/or associated documentation to determine if candidates have restricted/unrestricted access to resources when planning and researching their tasks
- Ensures appropriate arrangements are in place to ensure security of the work to be assessed, and any preparatory work, including work that is stored electronically
- Ensures that where appropriate to include references, candidates keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.
- If candidates use material from a source, or generated from a source which is not their own work, they must indicate the particular part, element or phrase and state where it came from. Candidates must give detailed references even where they paraphrase the original material.
- A reference from a printed book or journal should show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number. For example: (Morrison, 2000 p 29).
- For material taken from the internet, the reference should show the date when the material was downloaded and must show the precise web page, not the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid_2621000/2621915.stm
downloaded 5 February 2026
- Where computer-generated content has been used (such as an AI chatbot), the reference must show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2026.
- Candidates should also reference the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content. Candidates 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 candidate's work for final assessment so that the teacher can review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. If this is not submitted and the teacher suspects the candidate has used AI tools, they will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for the next steps and assure themselves that the work is the candidate's own. Further guidance on how this can be done is set out in the JCQ document Plagiarism in Assessments. The document can be found on the JCQ website: [Plagiarism in Assessments - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications](#)

WORD AND TIME LIMITS

- Refers to the awarding body specifications to determine where word/length/time limits apply and ensures students' work complies

AUTHENTICATION PROCEDURES

- ensures candidates sign a declaration confirming the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work as soon as the candidate has completed the assessment
- the teacher signs the declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

- Keeps signed candidate declarations on file until the deadline for requesting reviews of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed
- Provides signed candidate declarations upon request
- Where there may be doubt about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or if malpractice is suspected, follows the authentication procedures and malpractice information in the awarding body Instructions as well as STCG suspected malpractice procedures
- If, during the moderation process, it is found that the work has not been properly authenticated, the awarding body will take steps to determine the appropriate action, including potentially setting the mark(s) at '0; (zero)

PRESENTATION OF WORK

- Obtains informed consent at the beginning of the course from parents/carers if videos or photographs/images of candidates are to be included as evidence of participation or contribution
- Instructs candidates to present work as detailed in the awarding body Instructions unless specifications give subject-specific instructions
- Instructs candidates to add their name, candidate number, centre number and the component code of the assessment as a header/footer on each page of their work or other details when applicable

KEEPING MATERIALS SECURE

- Keeps 'live' coursework secure and confidential whilst in their possession. The sharing of 'live' coursework with other candidates or posting candidates' work on social media by teaching staff will constitute malpractice
- When work is submitted by candidates for final assessment, ensures work is securely stored
- Directs candidates to store digital work as agreed protocols on college systems to ensure all normal IT backups and security measures are implemented
- Follows secure storage instructions as defined in awarding body Instructions
- Takes sensible precautions when work is taken home for marking
- Stores internally assessed work securely, including the sample returned after moderation by the awarding body, until the closing date for reviews of results or until the outcome of a review or any subsequent appeal has been completed
- Reminds candidates of the need to keep their own work secure at all times and not share completed or partially completed work on-line, on social media or through any other means
- Understands that during the period from the submission of work for formal assessment until the deadline for requesting a review of results, copies of work may be used for other purposes, provided that the originals are stored securely as required

TASK MARKING

i) Marking and annotation

Head of Centre

- Ensures where a teacher is teaching, preparing and assessing a candidate with whom they have a close relationship e.g. members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter) a conflict of interest is declared to the awarding body and the marked work of the student is submitted for moderation, whether part of the moderation sample or not

Subject head/lead

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

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

Subject teacher

- Accesses awarding body training/updates as required to ensure familiarity with the mark scheme/marketing process
- Marks candidates' work in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body
- Annotates candidates' work as required to facilitate internal standardisation of marking and enable external moderation to check that marking is in line with the assessment criteria
- Informs candidates of their marks in time to enable an internal appeal/request for a review of marking to be submitted by a candidate and the outcome known before final marks are submitted to the awarding body
- Informs candidates their marks could be subject to change during an awarding body's moderation process

ii) Internal standardisation

Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead internal verifier

- Ensures that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence
- Supports staff not familiar with the mark scheme
- Ensures accurate internal standardisation, e.g. by:
 - obtaining reference materials at an early stage in the course
 - holding a preliminary trial marking session prior to marking
 - carrying out further trial marking at appropriate points during the marking period
 - after most marking has been completed, holds a further review meeting, making final adjustments to marks prior to submission
 - retaining work and evidence of standardisation
- Retains evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out

Subject teacher

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

SUBMISSION OF MARKS AND WORK FOR MODERATION

Subject teacher

- Inputs and submits marks online via the awarding body's secure site and by their deadline, keeping a record of the marks awarded
- Ensures checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensures mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors
- Provides the moderation sample to Exams by the internal deadline
- Ensures that where a candidate's work has been facilitated by a scribe or practical assistant, the relevant completed cover sheet is securely attached to the front of the work and sent to the moderator in addition to the sample requested
- Ensures the moderator is provided with authentication of candidates' work, confirmation that internal standardisation has been undertaken and any other subject-specific information where this may be required

Exams

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

- Confirms with subject teachers that marks have been submitted by the awarding body deadline
- Submits the requested samples of candidates' work to the moderator by the awarding body's deadline, keeping a record of the work submitted
- Ensures that for postal moderation:
 - work is dispatched in packaging provided by the awarding body
 - moderator label(s) provided by the awarding body are affixed to the packaging
 - proof of dispatch is obtained and kept on file until the issue of final results
- Through the subject teacher, ensures the moderator is provided with authentication of candidates' work, confirmation that internal standardisation has been undertaken and any other subject-specific information where this may be required

STORAGE AND RETENTION OF WORK AFTER SUBMISSION OF MARKS

Subject teacher

- Keeps a record of names and candidate numbers for candidates whose work was included in the moderation sample
- Retains all marked candidates' work (including any sample returned after moderation) under secure conditions for the required retention period
- Takes steps to protect any work stored electronically from corruption and has a back-up procedure in place
- Retains evidence of work where retention may be a problem (for example, photos of artefacts etc.)

Exams

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

EXTERNAL MODERATION - PROCESS

Subject teacher

- Ensures that awarding body moderators receive the correct samples of candidates' work
- Follows awarding body's instructions if submitting work electronically, either directly to an awarding body's digital platform or to an examiner/moderator
- Where relevant, liaises with the awarding body/moderator where the moderator visits the centre to mark the sample of work
- Complies with any request from the moderator for remaining work or further evidence of the centre's marking

EXTERNAL MODERATION FEEDBACK

Subject head/lead

- Checks the final moderated marks when results are published and issued to the centre
- Checks moderator reports and ensures that any remedial action, if necessary, is undertaken before the next exam series

Exams

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

ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS

Subject teacher

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

- Works with the Access Arrangement Assessors to ensure any access arrangements (AAs) for eligible candidates are applied to assessments

Access Arrangement Assessors

- Follows the regulations and guidance in the JCQ publication Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments in relation to NEA and other awarding bodies' publications
- Where arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualification and are the candidate's normal way of working, ensures AAs are in place and awarding body approval if relevant has been obtained prior to assessments taking place
- Makes subject teachers aware of any AAs for eligible candidates which need to be applied to assessments
- Works with subject teachers to ensure requirements for AA candidates requiring the support of a facilitator in assessments are met
- Ensures that staff acting as an AA facilitator are fully trained in their role

SPECIAL CONSIDERATION/LOSS OF WORK

Subject teacher

- Understands that candidates may be eligible for special consideration in assessments in certain situations where they are absent and/or produce a reduced quantity of work
- Liaises with Exams when special consideration may need to be applied
- Liaises with Exams to report loss of work to the awarding body

Exams

- Refers to/directs relevant staff to awarding body guidance on the special consideration process
- Where a candidate is eligible, applies for special consideration to the prescribed timescale
- Keeps required evidence on file to support the application
- Refers/directs relevant staff to awarding body lost work processes and where applicable submits applications to the relevant awarding body

MALPRACTICE

Head of centre

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

Subject teacher

- Is aware of awarding body regulations relating to sharing NEA material and candidates' work to mitigate against candidate and centre malpractice
- Ensures candidates are made aware of and understand Information to Candidates relating to non-examination assessments and specific topics such as the use of social media
- Escalates and reports any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates who have signed the authentication statement to the head of centre
- Is aware that where suspected candidate malpractice relates to a breach of the conditions of the assessment e.g. possession of notes, communication with other candidates, or where the awarding

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

body's confidential assessment material has been breached this must be escalated to the head of centre regardless of whether the candidate authentication statement has been completed or not

Exams

- Disseminates documentation relevant to NEA to the required audiences
- Where required, supports the head of centre in investigating and reporting incidents of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice

POST-RESULTS SERVICES

Head of centre

- Is familiar publications relating to Post-Results Services
- Ensures STCG's Internal Appeals Policy clearly details the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against a centre decision not to support a review of results or an appeal

Subject head/lead

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

Subject teacher

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

Exams

- Is aware of the individual post-results services available for externally assessed and internally assessed components of NEAs
- Provides/signposts relevant centre staff and candidates to post-results services information
- Ensures any requests for post-results services that are available for NEAs are submitted online via awarding body's secure site within deadlines

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language Specifications

Head of centre

- Provides a signed declaration as part of the National Centre Number Register Annual Update, that all reasonable steps have been or will be taken to ensure that all candidates at the centre have had, or will have, the opportunity to undertake the Spoken Language endorsement

Quality assurance (QA) lead/Lead internal verifier

- Ensures the appropriate arrangements are in place for internal standardisation of assessments

Subject head/lead

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

Subject teacher

- Ensures all the requirements in relation to the endorsement are known and understood
- Follows the required task setting and task taking instructions
- Assesses candidates, either live or from recordings, using the common assessment criteria
- Provides audio-visual recordings of the presentations of a sample of candidates for monitoring purposes following the awarding bodies requirements relating to cohort size and numbers for each grade
- Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades (*Pass, Merit, Distinction or Not Classified*) by set deadlines, and the storage and submission of recordings
- Ensures the carry forward process for this unit is completed

Exams officer

- Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades and recordings
- Disseminates relevant documents to subject staff for circulation to students

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

Management of issues and potential risks associated with NEAs

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Task setting		
Awarding body set task: IT failure/corruption of task details where set task details accessed from the awarding body online	<p><i>Awarding body key date for accessing/downloading set task noted prior to start of course</i></p> <p><i>IT systems checked prior to key date</i></p> <p><i>Alternative IT system used to gain access</i></p> <p><i>Awarding body contacted to request direct email of task details</i></p>	
Centre set task: Subject teacher fails to meet the assessment criteria as detailed in the specification	<p><i>Ensures that subject teachers access awarding body training information, practice materials etc.</i></p> <p><i>Records confirmation that subject teachers understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification</i></p> <p><i>Samples assessment criteria in the centre set task</i></p>	
Candidates do not understand the marking criteria and what they need to do to gain credit	<p><i>A simplified version of the awarding body's marking criteria described in the specification that is not specific to the work of an individual candidate or group of candidates is produced for candidates</i></p> <p><i>Records confirm all candidates understand the marking criteria</i></p> <p><i>Candidates confirm/record they understand the marking criteria</i></p>	
Subject teacher long term absence during the task setting stage	<i>See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle</i>	
Issuing of tasks		
Awarding body set task not issued to candidates on time	<p><i>Awarding body key date for accessing set task as detailed in the specification noted prior to start of course</i></p> <p><i>Course information issued to candidates contains details when set task will be issued and needs to be completed by</i></p> <p><i>Set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching</i></p>	
The wrong task is given to candidates	<p><i>Ensures course planning and information taken from the awarding body's specification confirms the correct task will be issued to candidates</i></p> <p><i>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</i></p>	
Subject teacher long term absence during the issuing of tasks stage	<i>See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle</i>	
A candidate (or parent/carer) expresses concern about safeguarding, confidentiality or faith in undertaking a task such as a presentation that may be recorded	<p><i>Ensures the candidate's presentation does not form part of the sample which will be recorded</i></p> <p><i>Contacts the awarding body at the earliest opportunity where unable to record the required number of candidates for the monitoring sample</i></p>	
Task taking		
Supervision		
Planned assessments clash with other centre or candidate activities	<p><i>Assessment plan identified for the start of the course</i></p> <p><i>Assessment dates/periods included in centre wide calendar</i></p>	
Rooms or facilities inadequate for candidates to take tasks under appropriate supervision	<p><i>Timetabling organised to allocate appropriate rooms and IT facilities for the start of the course</i></p> <p><i>Staggered sessions arranged where IT facilities insufficient for number of candidates</i></p> <p><i>Whole cohort to undertake written task in large exam venue at the same time (exam conditions do not apply)</i></p>	

Insufficient supervision of candidates to enable work to be authenticated	<p><i>Confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow specific instructions detailed in the awarding body's specification in relation to the supervision of candidates</i></p> <p><i>Confirm subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy</i></p>	
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	<p><i>Instructions and processes as required by awarding bodies are followed</i></p> <p><i>An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed</i></p>	
Access arrangements were not put in place for an assessment where a candidate is approved for arrangements	<p><i>Relevant staff are signposted to guidance on special consideration processes, to determine the routes to be followed to apply for special consideration for the candidate</i></p>	
Advice and feedback		
Candidate claims appropriate advice and feedback not given by subject teacher prior to starting on their work	<p><i>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to record all information provided to candidates before work begins as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures</i></p> <p><i>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity</i></p> <p><i>Full records kept detailing all information and advice given to candidates prior to starting on their work as appropriate to the subject and component</i></p> <p><i>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given prior to starting on their work</i></p>	
Candidate claims no advice and feedback given by subject teacher during the task-taking stage	<p><i>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to record all advice and feedback provided to candidates during the task-taking stage as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures</i></p> <p><i>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity</i></p> <p><i>Full records kept detailing all advice and feedback given to candidates during the task-taking stage as appropriate to the subject and component</i></p> <p><i>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given during the task-taking stage</i></p>	
A third party claims that assistance was given to candidates by the subject teacher over and above that allowed in the regulations and specification	<p><i>An investigation is conducted; candidates and subject teacher are interviewed and statements recorded where relevant</i></p> <p><i>Records as detailed above are provided to confirm all assistance given</i></p> <p><i>Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body</i></p>	
Candidate does not reference information from published source	<p><i>Candidate is advised at a general level to reference information before work is submitted for formal assessment</i></p> <p><i>Candidate is referred to awarding body information for candidates relating to non-examination assessments</i></p> <p><i>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</i></p>	
Candidate does not set out references as required	<p><i>Candidate is advised at a general level to review and re-draft the set out of references before work is submitted for formal assessment</i></p> <p><i>Candidate is referred to awarding body information for candidates relating to non-examination assessments</i></p> <p><i>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</i></p>	

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

Candidate joins the course late after formally supervised task taking has started	<i>A separate supervised session(s) is arranged for the candidate to catch up</i>	
Candidate moves to another centre during the course	<i>Awarding body guidance is sought to determine what can be done depending on the stage at which the move takes place</i>	
An excluded pupil wants to complete his/her non-examination assessment(s)	<i>The awarding body specification is checked to determine if the specification is available to a candidate outside mainstream education If so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate</i>	
Resources		
A candidate augments notes and resources between formally supervised sessions	<i>Preparatory notes and the work to be assessed are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions Where memory sticks are used by candidates, these are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions Where work is stored on the centre's network, access for candidates is restricted between formally supervised sessions</i>	
A candidate fails to acknowledge sources on work that is submitted for assessment	<i>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is checked to confirm all the sources used, including books, websites and audio/visual resources Awarding body guidance is sought on whether the work of the candidate should be marked where candidate's detailed records acknowledges sources appropriately Where confirmation is unavailable from candidate's records, awarding body guidance is sought and/or a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body for the candidate</i>	
Word and time limits		
A candidate is penalised by the awarding body for exceeding word or time limits	<i>Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if word or time limits are mandatory Where limits are for guidance only, candidates are discouraged from exceeding them Candidates confirm/record any information provided to them on word or time limits is known and understood</i>	
Collaboration and group work		
Candidates have worked in groups where the awarding body specification states this is not permitted	<i>Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if group work is permitted Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</i>	
Authentication procedures		
A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment Candidate plagiarises other material	<i>Records confirm subject staff have been made aware of rules relating to Teachers sharing assessment material and candidates' work Candidates confirm/record that they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for non-examination assessments The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment A mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body</i>	
Candidate does not sign their authentication statement/declaration	<i>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with information for candidates relating to non-examination assessments Candidates confirm/record they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations relating to non-examination assessments</i>	

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

	<i>Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</i>	
Subject teacher not available to sign authentication forms	<i>Ensures a centre-wide process is in place for subject teachers to sign authentication forms at the point of marking candidates work as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures</i>	
Presentation of work		
Candidate does not fully complete the awarding body's cover sheet that is attached to their worked submitted for formal assessment	<i>Cover sheet is checked to ensure it is fully completed before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</i>	
Keeping materials secure		
Candidates work between formal supervised sessions is not securely stored	<i>Records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow awarding body instructions for conducting non-examination assessments Regular monitoring/internal audit ensures subject teacher use of appropriate secure storage</i>	
Adequate secure storage not available to subject teacher	<i>Records confirm adequate/sufficient secure storage is available to subject teacher prior to the start of the course Alternative secure storage sourced where required</i>	
Task marking – internally assessed components		
A candidate submits little or no work	<i>Where a candidate submits no work, the candidate is recorded as absent when marks are submitted to the awarding body Where a candidate submits little work, the work produced is assessed against the assessment criteria and a mark allocated appropriately; where the work does not meet any of the assessment criteria a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body</i>	
A candidate is unable to finish their work for unforeseen reason	<i>Relevant staff are signposted to awarding body guidance on the special consideration process to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for shortfall in work</i>	
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	<i>Relevant staff are signposted to awarding body instructions for conducting non-examination assessments to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for lost or damaged work</i>	
Candidate malpractice is discovered	<i>Awarding body instructions and processes are followed Appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed</i>	
A teacher marks the work of a candidate with whom they have a close relationship e.g. members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter)	<i>A conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body that a teacher is preparing/teaching said young person at the start of the course Marked work of said young person is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not</i>	
An extension to the deadline for submission of marks is required for a legitimate reason	<i>Awarding body is contacted to determine if an extension can be granted Relevant staff are signposted to awarding body guidance on the special consideration process to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for non-examination assessment extension</i>	
After submission of marks, it is discovered that the wrong task was given to candidates	<i>Awarding body is contacted for guidance Relevant staff are signposted to awarding body guidance on the special consideration process to determine eligibility and the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for candidates</i>	
A candidate wishes to appeal/request a review of the marks awarded for their work by their teacher	<i>Candidates are informed of the marks they have been awarded for their work prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body Records confirm candidates have been informed of their marks</i>	

Policy Title: Non-Exam Assessment (NEA) Policy	Staff Members Responsible: Heads of Exams; Director Quality & Development
Approval Date: October 2025	

	<p><i>Candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process</i></p> <p><i>Candidates are informed of their marks to the timescale identified in the centre's internal appeals procedure and prior to the internal deadline set by the exams officer for the submission of marks</i></p> <p><i>Through the candidate exam handbook, candidates are made aware of the centre's internal appeals procedures and timescale for submitting an appeal/request for a review of the centre's marking prior to the submission of marks to the awarding body</i></p>	
<p>Deadline for submitting work for formal assessment not met by candidate</p>	<p><i>Records confirm deadlines given and understood by candidates at the start of the course</i></p> <p><i>Candidates confirm/record deadlines known and understood</i></p> <p><i>Depending on the circumstances, awarding body guidance sought to determine if the work can be accepted late for marking providing the awarding body's deadline for submitting marks can be met</i></p> <p><i>Decision made (depending on the circumstances) if the work will be accepted late for marking or a mark of zero submitted to the awarding body for the candidate</i></p>	
<p>Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by subject teacher</p>	<p><i>Internal/external deadlines are published at the start of each academic year</i></p> <p><i>Reminders are issued through senior leaders/subject heads as deadlines approach</i></p> <p><i>Records confirm deadlines known and understood by subject teachers</i></p> <p><i>Where appropriate, internal disciplinary procedures are followed</i></p>	
<p>Subject teacher long term absence during the marking period</p>	<p><i>See centre's Exam Contingency Plan (Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle)</i></p>	