



ST MICHAEL'S CATHOLIC COLLEGE

NON-EXAMINATION ASSESSMENT POLICY 2025 – 26

Incl. AI Addendum with JCQ AI addition

Contents

1. Aims	1
2. Legislation	1
3. Definition	2
4. Roles and responsibilities	2
5. Task setting	3
6. Task taking	4
7. Authentication	5
8. Task marking	5
9. Malpractice	6
10. Special Consideration	6
11. Enquiries about results	7
12. Monitoring	7
13. Links with other policies	7

1. Aims

This policy aims to:

- Cover procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments
- Define staff roles and responsibilities with respect to non-examination assessments
- Manage risks associated with non-examination assessments

2. Legislation

The Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) requires each exam centre to have a non-examination assessment policy. This is outlined in <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/non-examination-assessments/>

which we follow when carrying out non-examination assessments in our College.

This policy also takes into account the [JCQ's guidance on post-results services file:///N:/Post-Results-Service 24 FINAL.pdf](file:///N:/Post-Results-Service%20FINAL.pdf) and [general regulations for approved centres](#). This policy also complies with our funding agreement and articles of association.

3. Definition

The JCQ explains that non-examination assessments measure subject-specific knowledge and skills that cannot be tested by timed written papers. There are three assessment stages and rules which apply to each stage. The rules often vary across subjects. The stages are task setting, task taking and task marking.

4. Roles and responsibilities

This section sets out the key responsibilities of staff in relation to non-examination assessments. For more detailed guidance on the requirements for conducting non-examination assessments, staff should read the JCQ guidance referred to above.

4.1 Head of centre

In our College, the head of centre is Ms Felicity Corcoran.

The head of centre is responsible for:

- Ensuring that the centre's non-examination assessment policy is fit for purpose
- Ensuring that non-examination assessments comply with JCQ guidance and awarding body subject-specific instructions
- Ensuring that [JCQ's information for candidates](#) is distributed to all candidates prior to assessments taking place
- Ensuring the centre's internal appeals procedure clearly details the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against an internal assessment decision, and that details of this procedure are communicated and made widely available and accessible
- Drawing to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers the centre's complaints procedure, for general complaints about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification

4.2 Senior leaders

Senior leaders are responsible for:

- Ensuring that non-examination assessments comply with JCQ guidance and awarding body subject-specific instructions for the departments they line manage.

4.3 Subject leaders

Subject leaders are responsible for:

- Familiarising themselves with JCQ instructions for conducting non-examination assessment and the use of AI <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/>
- Understanding and complying with specific instructions relating to non-examination assessment for the relevant awarding body and ensuring that assessments are completed, marked and moderated in line with the review of marking policy and to ensure that the exam board deadline for submission is met.
- Ensuring that they follow the awarding body's guidance for issuing tasks.
- Ensuring that individual teachers understand their responsibilities with regard to non-examination assessment and are adequately trained in delivering the NEA.

- Ensuring that candidates understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for non-examination assessments. This is outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates – non-examination assessments.
- Ensuring that teachers use the correct task for the year of submission and take care to distinguish between tasks and requirements for legacy and new specifications, where relevant
- Obtaining confidential materials/tasks set by awarding bodies in sufficient time to prepare for the assessment(s), where relevant, and ensuring that such materials are stored securely at all times.
- Ensuring that candidates work is kept securely according to the requirements of the Awarding Body and JCQ guidance.
- Ensuring that the presentation of work meets JCQ and the awarding body guidance.
- Undertaking appropriate departmental standardisation of non-examination assessments
- Ensuring that signed candidate declarations are kept on file until the deadline for requesting a review of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later.
- Keeping a record of names and candidate numbers for candidates whose work was included in the sample. This information may be needed if a review of moderation is made
- Retaining marked work under secure conditions until after the deadline for review of results or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later. This applies to all work – whether or not it was part of the moderation sample.
- Where work is being stored electronically, take steps to protect it from corruption and have a back-up procedure in place.

4.4 Teachers

Teachers are responsible for:

- Understanding and complying with JCQ instructions for conducting non-examination assessment
- Understanding and complying with the awarding body's specification, where provided, for conducting non-examination assessments, including any subject-specific instructions, teachers' notes or additional information on the awarding body's website. This includes ensuring that no over direction is given to students.
- Completing all relevant training in delivering the NEA according to the set guidelines.
- Marking internally assessed work to the criteria provided by the awarding body

4.5 Exams officer

The exams officer is responsible for:

- Supporting the administration/management of non-examination assessment and ensuring that communication around the use of AI is clear.

4.6 Special educational needs and disabilities co-ordinator (SENDCO)

The SENDCO is responsible for:

- Ensuring that all relevant staff are aware of any access arrangements that need to be applied when completing the NEA

5. Task setting

Where the centre is responsible for task setting, in accordance with specific awarding body guidelines, heads of department will:

- Select from non-examination assessment tasks provided by the awarding body, or
- Design their own tasks, in conjunction with candidates where permitted, using criteria set out in the specification, ensuring that the relevant assessment criteria can be met and that tasks are accessible to candidates, with reference to the specification

Teachers will complete tasks as specified by the HOD and ensure that candidates understand the assessment criteria for any given assessment task.

6. Task taking

Where appropriate to the component being assessed, the following arrangements apply unless the awarding body's specification says otherwise.

6.1 Supervision

- Invigilators are not required
- Centres are not required to display the JCQ 'no mobile phone' poster or JCQ 'warning to candidates'
- Candidates do not need to be directly supervised at all times
- The use of resources, including the internet, is not tightly prescribed, but teachers will always check the subject-specific requirements issued by the awarding body
- Teachers will ensure that:
 - There is sufficient supervision of every candidate to enable work to be authenticated
 - The work that an individual candidate submits for assessment is his/her own
- Work may be completed outside of the centre without direct supervision provided that the centre is confident that the work produced is the candidate's own
- Where candidates work in groups, the teacher will keep a record of each candidate's contribution
- The teacher will also:
 - Ensure that candidates understand the need to reference work
 - Give guidance on how to do this, and
 - Ensure that candidates are aware that they must not plagiarise other material or make use of any AI such as Chat GPT and understand that this will count as malpractice and will be reported to the exam board as such, potentially resulting in disqualification from the exam. (see specific guidance relating to AI misuse section 9)

6.2 Advice and feedback

- Teachers will not provide model answers or writing frames specific to the task (such as outlines, paragraph headings or section headings)
- Unless specifically prohibited by the awarding body's specification, teachers may:
 - Review candidates' work and provide oral and written advice at a general level
 - Having provided advice at a general level, allow candidates to revise and redraft work
- Any assistance that goes beyond general advice will be recorded and either taken into account when marking the work or submitted to the external examiner for example:
 - providing detailed specific advice on how to improve drafts to meet the assessment criteria;
 - giving detailed feedback on errors and omissions which limits candidates' opportunities to show initiative themselves;
 - intervening personally to improve the presentation or content of work
- When marking work, teachers will use annotations to explain how marks were applied in the context of the additional assistance given
- Teachers will not provisionally assess work and then allow candidates to revise it
- Explicitly prohibited assistance will not be given
- Failure to follow this procedure constitutes malpractice

6.3 Resources

- Teachers will be aware of the awarding body's restrictions with regard to access to resources
- Unless otherwise specified by the awarding body, in formally supervised sessions candidates can only take in preparatory notes. They will not access the internet nor bring in their own computers or electronic devices
- Candidates will not introduce new resources between formally supervised sessions
- Preparatory work and the work to be assessed will be collected and stored securely at the end of each session and will not be accessible to candidates

6.4 Group work

- Unless the specification says otherwise, candidates are free to collaborate when carrying out research and preparatory work
- Where it is permitted, some assignments may be undertaken as part of a group
- Where an assignment requires written work to be produced, each candidate will write up his/her own account of the assignment. Individual contributions will be clearly identified
- Group assessment is not permitted

7. Authentication

Teachers will be sufficiently familiar with the candidate's general standard to judge whether the piece of work submitted is within his/her capabilities.

Where required by the awarding body's specifications:

- Candidates will sign a declaration to confirm that the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work
- Teachers will sign a declaration of authentication after the work has been completed confirming that:
 - The work is solely that of the candidate concerned
 - The work was completed under the required conditions

Signed candidate declarations are kept on file until the deadline for requesting a review of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later. Electronic signatures are acceptable.

If there is concern that malpractice may have occurred or the work is unable to be authenticated, the senior leadership will be informed.

8. Task marking

8.1 Internally assessed work

- Teachers are responsible for marking work in accordance with the relevant marking criteria. Annotation will be used to provide evidence to indicate how and why marks have been awarded.
- Internal standardisation will take place where there is more than one member of staff involved in assessing a component. Therefore, work must be submitted by deadlines stated by the head of department to allow for standardisation. Heads of department MUST ensure standardisation takes place in a timely manner.
- We will inform candidates of internally assessed marks as candidates are allowed to request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body.
- We will also make it clear to candidates that any internally assessed marks are subject to change during the moderation process.

8.2 Externally assessed work

- The format of external assessment will depend on the awarding body's specification and the component being assessed.

- Teachers will ensure the attendance register is completed, clearly indicating those candidates who are present or absent.
- Where candidates' work needs to be dispatched to an examiner, we will ensure it is sent by the date specified by the awarding body.

9. Malpractice

The head of centre and senior leaders will make sure teaching staff involved in supervising candidates are aware of the potential for malpractice.

Teachers will familiarise themselves with the [JCQ guidance on sharing assessment material and candidates' work](#).

Teachers will be vigilant in relation to candidate malpractice. Candidates must not:

- Submit work which is not their own, including the use of AI such as chat GTP
- Make their work available to other candidates through any medium, including social media
- Allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material
- Assist other candidates to produce work
- Use books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution
- Submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement
- Include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material

Failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself. Malpractice will be reported to senior leaders or directly to the awarding body.

Specific guidance in relation to AI misuse

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/>

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

• AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

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

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).

The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

10. Guidance in relation to AI

The Head of centre and exams Officer will ensure that:

- students are 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 as well as the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.

- Clear communication with parents makes them aware of the risks and issues and ensures they support the centre's approach.
- 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);
- Ensure that, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited;
- 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); 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;

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

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/>);

- Ensure that teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work

11. Special Consideration

The college will follow the JCQ guidance regarding the awarding of special consideration:

A guide to the special consideration process– <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration>

12. Enquiries about results

We will make candidates aware of the arrangements for enquiries about results before they take any assessments.

Senior members of staff will be accessible to candidates immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed and decisions made on the submission of enquiries.

A review of marking is available for externally assessed components. We will obtain written consent from candidates for reviews of marking, and inform candidates that their marks may be lowered as a result of a review of marking.

A review of moderation is available for internally assessed components only when marks have been changed by an awarding body during moderations. If marks have been accepted without change, this will not be available. A review of moderation is not available for an individual candidate.

13. Monitoring

This policy will be reviewed by the Governing Body at the beginning of each academic year. At every review, the policy will be shared with the governing board and approved by The Governing Body.

14. Links with other policies

This policy should be read in conjunction with the assessment policy.

July 2025



Signed:

Date: 25/09/25

Chair of the Curriculum Committee

Review Date June 2026