



Meridian Trust

Access Arrangements Policy

Access Arrangements Policy

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	01/10/2024
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
SENCo (or equivalent role)	Parveen Jhali
Other staff (if applicable)	Rebecca Dear

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that access arrangements process at the Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to GR, ICE and AARA refer to the JCQ documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres**, **Instructions for conducting examinations** and **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments**.

References to legislation are to the Equality Act 2010. Separate legislation is in place for Northern Ireland (see AARA 1.8). The definitions and procedures in AARA relating to access arrangements and reasonable adjustments will also apply in Northern Ireland.

Introduction

AARA Definitions:

Access arrangements

Access arrangements are agreed before an assessment. They allow candidates with specific needs, such as special educational needs, disabilities or temporary injuries to access the assessment and show what they know and can do without changing the demands of the assessment. The intention behind an access arrangement is to meet the needs of an individual candidate without affecting the integrity of the assessment. Access arrangements are the principal way in which awarding bodies comply with the duty under the Equality Act 2010 to make 'reasonable adjustments'.

Reasonable adjustments

The Equality Act 2010 requires an awarding body to make reasonable adjustments where a candidate, who is disabled within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010, would be at a substantial disadvantage in comparison to someone who is not disabled. The awarding body is required to take reasonable steps to overcome that disadvantage. An example would be a Braille paper which would be a reasonable adjustment for a vision impaired candidate who could read Braille. A reasonable adjustment may be unique to that individual and may not be included in the list of available access arrangements.

Whether an adjustment will be considered reasonable will depend on several factors which will include, but are not limited to:

- the needs of the disabled candidate;
- the effectiveness of the adjustment;
- the cost of the adjustment; and
- the likely impact of the adjustment upon the candidate and other candidates.

An adjustment will not be approved if it:

- involves unreasonable costs to the awarding body;
- involves unreasonable timeframes; or
- affects the security and integrity of the assessment.

This is because the adjustment is not 'reasonable'.

The centre must ensure that approved adjustments can be delivered to candidates.

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm that the Academy has a written record which clearly shows the centre is leading on the access arrangements process and:

- is complying with its obligation to identify the need for, request and implement access arrangements (GR 5.4)
- has a written process in place to not only check the qualification(s) of its assessor(s) but that the correct procedures are followed as in Chapter 7 of the JCQ document *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments* (GR 5.4)

1. General principles

The head of centre/senior leadership team will appoint a SENCo, or an equivalent member of staff, who will coordinate the access arrangements process within the centre and determine appropriate arrangements for candidates with learning difficulties and disabilities, candidates for whom English is an additional language, as well as those with a temporary illness or temporary injury. (GR 5.4)

A centre **must** make decisions on appropriate access arrangements for their candidates. Although professionals from other organisations may give advice, they **cannot** make the decision for the centre. They will not have a working knowledge of an individual candidate's needs and how their difficulties impact in the classroom and/or in timed assessments. It is the responsibility of the SENCo to make appropriate and informed decisions based on the JCQ regulations. (AARA 4.2)

The principles for the Academy to consider include:

- The purpose of an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment is to ensure, where possible, that barriers to assessment are removed for a disabled candidate preventing them from being placed at a substantial disadvantage due to persistent and significant difficulties. The integrity of the assessment is maintained, whilst at the same time providing access to assessments for a disabled candidate (AARA 4.2)
- 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 (AARA 4.2)
- Candidates may not require the same access arrangements/reasonable adjustments in each specification. Subjects and their methods of assessments may vary, leading to different demands of the candidate. The need for access arrangements/reasonable adjustments must be considered on a subject-by-subject basis (AARA 4.2)
- Applications for access arrangements/reasonable adjustments should be processed at the start of or during the first year of a two-year the course having firmly established a picture of need and normal way of working (AARA 4.2)
- Arrangements **must** always be approved **before** an examination or assessment (AARA 4.2)
- The arrangement(s) put in place must reflect the support given to the candidate in the centre (AARA 4.2)
- The candidate must have had appropriate opportunities to practise using the access arrangement(s)/reasonable adjustment(s) before their first examination (AARA 4.2)

The main elements of the process detailing staff roles and responsibilities in identifying the need for, requesting and implementing access arrangements/reasonable adjustments and the conduct of examinations are covered in:

- The Equalities Policy (Exams)

2. The assessment process

At the Academy, assessments are carried out by:

- an appropriately qualified assessor(s) appointed by the head of centre in accordance with the JCQ requirements (AARA 7.3)

Details and qualification(s) of the current assessor(s)

Emma Heras: SpLD Assessment Practising Certificate

Appointment of assessors

At the point an assessor is engaged/employed at the Academy:

- Evidence of the assessor's qualification is obtained and checked against the current requirements (AARA 7.3)
- This process is carried out prior to the assessor undertaking any assessment of a candidate (AARA 7.3)
- Evidence of successful completion of a post-graduate course in individual specialist assessment at or equivalent to Level 7 or a printout of a screenshot of HCPC or SASC registration is held on file for inspection purposes to evidence that the assessor(s) is/ are suitably qualified (AARA 7.3, 7.4)

Additional information: None

Reporting the appointment of assessors

- Evidence that the assessor(s) is/are suitably qualified is held on file for inspection purposes (AARA 7.4) When requested, the evidence will be presented to the JCQ Centre Inspector by:
 - Parveen Jhali (Deputy Senco) or the Exams Officer
- In the case of appropriately qualified psychologists (registered with the Health & Care Professions Council), or specialist teacher assessors holding a current SpLD Assessment Practising Certificate, who are directly employed within the centre, there is no need to record the names of these individuals within *Access arrangements online*. (AARA 7.4)
- The names of all other assessors, who are assessing candidates studying qualifications as covered by the *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments* document must be entered into *Access arrangements online* to confirm their status (AARA 7.4)

Process for the assessment of a candidate's learning difficulties by an assessor

The Academy confirms:

- Guidelines for the assessment of the candidate's learning difficulties by an assessor will be followed and Form 8 (JCQ/AA/LD - Profile of Learning Difficulties) will be completed (AARA 7.5, 7.6)
- Arrangements must be made for the candidate to be assessed by the centre's appointed assessor (AARA 7.5)
- Assessors **must** personally conduct the assessments. They **must not** sign off assessments carried out by another professional (AA 7.5)
- The assessor **must** carry out tests which are relevant to support the application (AARA 7.5)
- A privately commissioned assessment, where the centre has not been involved, **cannot** be used to award access arrangements and cannot be used to process an application using *Access arrangements online* (AARA 7.3)
- Relevant staff working within the centre should always carefully consider any privately commissioned assessment to see whether the process of gathering a picture of need, demonstrating normal way of working within the centre and ultimately assessing the candidate themselves should be instigated (AARA 7.3)

Additional information: None

Picture of need/normal way of working

The Academy confirms:

- Before the candidate's assessment, the person appointed in the centre must provide the assessor with background information, i.e. a picture of need has been painted as required in Part 1 of Form 8. The centre and the assessor must work together to ensure a joined-up and consistent process. (AARA 7.5)

Additional information: None

3. Processing access arrangements and adjustments

Access arrangements online (AAO) is used to apply for approval of arrangements/adjustments for the qualifications listed within the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments.

AAO is accessed through the JCQ Centre Admin Portal (CAP) by using any of the awarding body secure extranet sites. A single application for approval is required for each candidate regardless of the awarding body used.

Deadlines apply for each examination series for submitting applications for approval using AAO.

Online applications **must** only be processed where they are supported by the centre and the candidate meets the published criteria for the arrangement(s) with the full supporting evidence in place

Centre delegated arrangements/adjustments

Decisions relating to the approval of centre delegated arrangements/adjustments are made by:

- Parveen Jhali, Deputy SENCo

Appropriate evidence, where required by the arrangement, is held on file by:

- Parveen Jhali, Deputy SENCo

- **The use of a word processor**

The Word Processor Policy (Exams) details the criteria the Academy specifically uses to award and allocate word processors for examinations and assessments.

- **Alternative rooming arrangements**

The Alternative Rooming Arrangements Policy details the criteria the Academy uses to award alternative rooming arrangements, e.g. a room for a smaller group of candidates with similar needs or 1:1 invigilation.

Additional information : None

Modified papers

Modified papers are ordered using AAO.

- Modified papers must be ordered in advance of a specific examination series, no later than the published deadline for the series concerned (AARA 6.1)
- Modified papers are prepared for candidates for whom other adjustments are unsuitable. The modification of papers involves additional resources. Therefore, centres must provide the awarding bodies with early notification that a candidate will require a modified paper. (AARA 6.1)
- Modified papers must not be ordered for candidates unless the centre intends to enter them for the relevant examination series (AARA 6.1)
- For the adjustment to be effective, the candidate must have had appropriate opportunities to practise using an awarding body's past modified papers before their first examination (AARA 6.1)

Roles and responsibilities

When an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment has been processed on-line and approved, the evidence of need (where required) must be made available to a JCQ Centre Inspector upon request. An awarding body may also request evidence of need when considered necessary. This can either be in hard copy paper format or electronically. (AARA 4.2)

Where documentation is stored electronically an e-folder for each individual candidate must be created. The candidate's e-folder must hold each of the required documents for inspection. (AARA 4.2)

It is the responsibility of:

- Parveen Jhali, Deputy SENCo to inform candidates that an application for access arrangements will be processed using *Access arrangements online*, complying with the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018
- Parveen Jhali, Deputy SENCo to submit applications for approval using AAO
- Parveen Jhali, Deputy SENCo to keep detailed records for inspection purposes, whether electronically or in hard copy paper format, of all the essential information on file. This includes a copy of the candidate's approved application,

appropriate evidence of need (where required) and evidence of the assessor's qualification (where required) (AARA 8.6)

- Parveen Jhali, Deputy SENCo to submit applications for approval directly to an awarding body for any qualification that does not fall within the scope of AAO
- The Exams Officer to order modified papers

Additional responsibilities: None

Changes 2025/2026

References to AA changed to AARA

(Added/Removed) Under heading **Roles and responsibilities:**

Added new bullet point to reference the requirement to comply with the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.

Removed reference to a signed candidate personal data consent form and Data protection confirmation by the examinations officer or SENCo form which are no longer required.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Access to Scripts, Reviews of Results and Appeals Procedures

Access to Scripts, Reviews of Results and Appeals Procedures

Centre name	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date procedures first created	22/12/2023
Current procedures approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current procedures reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/2025
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the procedures

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

These procedures are reviewed and updated annually to ensure that the Academy deals with candidates' requests for access to scripts, clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, reviews of moderation and appeals to the awarding bodies in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in these procedures to GR and PRS refer to the JCQ documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres and Post-Results Services**.

Introduction

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available.

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

Access to Scripts (ATS)

Centres may request copies of scripts to support:

- reviews of marking; and/or
- teaching and learning

Requests must be submitted online via the awarding bodies' extranet sites.

Information on deadlines for Access to Scripts is found on awarding bodies' websites.

Reviews of Results (RoRs)

- Service 1 (Clerical re-check): This is the only service that can be requested for multiple choice tests
- Service 2 (Review of marking): This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE AS, A-level and GCSE specifications. It is also available for Level 1, 2 and 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications.
- Priority Service 2 (Review of marking): This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE A-level specifications. It is also available for Level 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications. For NCFE this service only applies to T-levels.
- Service 3 (Review of moderation): A review of moderation cannot be undertaken upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample

Requests must be submitted online via the awarding bodies' extranet sites.

Appeals:

- The appeals process is available after receiving the outcome of a review of results

Purpose of the procedures

The purpose of these procedures is to confirm how the Academy deals with candidates' requests for access to scripts, clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, reviews of moderation and appeals to the awarding bodies in compliance with JCQ regulations (GR 5.13).

Details of these procedures are made widely available and accessible to all candidates by:

hosting an assembly for all students during the spring term to explain the process. It is also emailed to students and their families for reference. In addition, the online form and procedure document is included when results are emailed to the student.

Students are made aware of the opportunities for review of marking during the briefing they receive about exams, and the information that they are sent prior to the exams. After release of results students are emailed details of how to apply together with an online form which captures their details, the paper(s) concerned and required review(s).

The arrangements for post-results services

- Candidates must be made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results (GR 5.13)
- A review of moderation cannot be undertaken upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample (PRS 4.3)
- The appeals process is available after receiving the outcome of a review of results (PRS 5.1)

At the Academy:

- Candidates are made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results
- Candidates are also informed of the periods during which senior members of centre staff will be available immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking (GR 5.13, PRS 4.1) Candidates are made aware/informed by:

hosting an assembly for all students during the spring term to explain the process. It is also emailed to students and their families for reference. In addition, the online form and procedure document is included when results are emailed to the student.

Full details of the post-results services, internal deadline(s) for requesting a service and the fees charged (where applicable) are provided by:

- The senior leader responsible for exams
on results day who sends an electronic form by email. The forms are available when students collect their results in person and they are also emailed to the students with their results.

Dealing with requests

- All post-results service requests from internal candidates must be made through the centre (GR 5.13)

At the Academy the process to request a service is:

- by completing an online Post-results services request, consent and payment form sent to them and available from the member of SLT with responsibility for exams.

Candidate consent

- Candidates must provide their **written consent** for clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, and any subsequent appeal, and access to scripts services offered by the awarding bodies **after** the publication of examination results (GR 5.13)

(As applicable, it will be ensured that any private candidates are made aware that all post-results service requests can be made directly through the relevant awarding body)

The Academy will:

- Acquire written candidate consent (accepting informed consent via candidate email) in all cases before a request for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, or an access to scripts service request is submitted to the awarding body
- Acquire informed candidate consent to confirm the candidate understands that the final subject grade and/or mark awarded following a clerical re-check or a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, may be lower than, higher than, or the same as the result which was originally awarded
- Only collect candidate consent **after** the publication of results
- Retain consent forms or e-mails from candidates for at least six months following the outcome of a clerical re-check or review of marking or any subsequent appeal (PRS 4.2)
- Retain consent/permission forms or e-mails from candidates to request and use their scripts for at least six months (PRS Appendix B)

Additional centre-specific actions: None

Submitting requests

The Academy will:

- Submit requests electronically for clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, reviews of moderation and access to scripts by the published deadline(s) in accordance with the JCQ document **Post-results services** (GR 5.13)
- Submit requests for appeals in accordance with the JCQ document **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes** (GR 5.13)
- Confirm the awarding body's acknowledgement of receipt of a review of results request prior to the deadline for submission of post-results services and regularly check the progress of the request online (PRS 4.5)

Additional centre-specific actions: None

Dealing with outcomes

The Academy will:

- Ensure outcomes of clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, reviews of moderation and appeals are made known to candidates as soon as possible (GR 5.13)

Candidates will be notified by:

- being emailed a copy of the outcome notification from the awarding body.

Managing disputes

At the Academy any dispute/disagreement will be managed in accordance with the internal appeals procedure to manage disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal (GR 5.13).

Additional centre-specific actions: None

Changes 2025/2026

(Updated) Under heading Introduction wording updated in relation to the JCQ post-results services currently available.

(Reformatted) Under heading The arrangements for post-results services insert fields reformatted and require updating on reviewing and updating this procedure.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in October 2025, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Alternative Rooming Arrangements Policy (Exams)

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	22/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
SENCo (or equivalent role)	Parveen Jhali
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that alternative rooming arrangements at the Academy are awarded and managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to AARA and ICE refer to the JCQ documents **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** and **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Introduction

Alternative rooming arrangements (for example, a room for a smaller group of candidates with similar needs) is an available access arrangement as defined in the JCQ regulations. This is an arrangement where a candidate with an established difficulty may be eligible to take their examinations in a smaller environment away from the main examination room.

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm the criteria when these arrangements may be considered and granted for a candidate at the Academy in compliance with the regulations.

1. Decisions on the awarding of the arrangement

At the Academy, decisions on the awarding of the arrangement are made by:

The Deputy SENCo together with the Exams Officer and member of SLT with responsibility for exams.

Decisions are based on:

- Whether the candidate has a substantial and long-term impairment which has an adverse effect (AARA 5.16)
- The candidate's normal way of working within the centre (AARA 5.16)
- Ensuring the proposed arrangement does not unfairly disadvantage or advantage the candidate (AARA 4.2.1)
(In accordance with the regulations: A centre must make decisions on appropriate access arrangements for their candidates. Although professionals from other organisations may give advice, they cannot make the decision for the centre. They will not have a working knowledge of an individual candidate's needs and how their difficulties impact in the classroom and/or in timed assessments. It is the responsibility of the SENCo (or equivalent role within the centre) to make appropriate and informed decisions based on the JCQ regulations.)
- Nervousness, low level anxiety or being worried about examinations is not sufficient grounds for separate invigilation within the centre
- The use of an alternative room with one-to-one invigilation must only apply where the candidate has a serious medical condition such as frequent seizures, Tourette's or significant behavioural issues which would disturb other candidates in the examination room (AARA 5.16)
- Additional information: None

2. Criteria for the awarding of the arrangement

Alternative rooming arrangements will be considered where the arrangement would prevent a candidate from being placed at a substantial disadvantage and where the following conditions are met:

- The candidate has an established difficulty as defined in section 5.16 of the JCQ's **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** document (ICE 14.18)
- The candidate's disability is established within the centre and known to relevant staff or a senior member of staff with pastoral responsibilities (AARA 5.16)
- Alternative rooming arrangements reflects the candidate's normal and current way of working in internal tests and mock examinations (AARA 5.16)
- Where a candidate sits their examinations in a smaller environment away from the main examination room, the regulations and guidance within the JCQ publication **Instructions for conducting examinations** will be adhered to, particularly in relation to accommodation and invigilation arrangements (ICE 14.18)
- Additional information: None

3. Other rooming arrangements

At the Academy arrangements for seating candidates in rooms separate to the main cohort may be put in place in other circumstances.

As and when applicable, these circumstances include:

when possible, candidates using word processors are put in an access arrangements room or exceptionally are seated at the side of the main exam hall.

Candidates with scribes are sat in individual rooms or rooms with very few students.

Candidates with readers are sat in individual rooms or rooms with very few students that may share a reader.

Candidates with extra time may be sat in an access arrangements room or are seated at the side of the main exam hall.

Candidates that do not regularly attend classes with the main cohort may be sat in an individual room, an access arrangement room or in the main exam hall. This will be decided by the Deputy SENCo, or a member of the SLT Team.

Changes 2025/2026

In terms of JCQ regulations for 2025/2026, no changes are applicable to this policy.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Candidate Absence Policy

Candidate Absence Policy

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	22/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that candidate absence from examinations at the Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to ICE and SC refer to the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting examinations** and **A guide to the special consideration process**.

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm the arrangements for candidates who are absent from an examination at the Academy.

An absent candidate may subsequently arrive once the exam is underway, becoming a late or very late arrival, at which point the Academy reserves the right to exercise discretion whether to allow a candidate who arrives after the start of the examination to enter the examination room and sit the examination. (See **Candidate Late Arrival Policy**)

Based upon the circumstances for the absence, and subject to the required conditions being met, an application for special consideration may also be made to the relevant awarding body.

1. Identifying and dealing with candidate absence

A candidate will be considered absent from an examination if:

- The candidate is not present on completion of the attendance register once candidates are seated and have started the examination (ICE 22.5)

Once a candidate is identified as absent from an examination, the following action will be taken:

- The candidate will be contacted as to their whereabouts and as far as possible arrangements made to ensure their immediate arrival

If a candidate fails to sit an examination, the following action is taken:

- A confirmed candidate absence is clearly recorded on the attendance register which is sent to the examiner/marker
- The candidate absence is noted on the seating plan by crossing through the candidate details

2. Roles and responsibilities

Overview

It is the responsibility of the following member(s) of staff to deal with candidate absence once it has been identified:

- Student Support Assistants for each house will contact home if they haven't already received communication from the family to explain the absence.

It is the responsibility of the following member(s) of staff to deal with candidates who are persistently absent from examinations:

- Members of SLT

The role of invigilators

Invigilators will:

- Be informed of the process for dealing with absent candidates through training
- Ensure that absent candidates are clearly indicated on the attendance register (ICE 22.4)

Additional responsibilities: None

The role of candidates

Candidates will be:

- attending all examinations they have been entered for. They will ensure they arrive at the centre prior to the start of the exam.
- Re-charged any relevant entry fees for unauthorised absence from examinations

Additional responsibilities:

ensure that the centre is informed as early as possible if they are going to be absent from an exam for an unavoidable reason.

3. Special consideration

At the Academy if a candidate is absent from a timetabled written examination for an acceptable reason, the candidate may be eligible for special consideration. This is where an adjustment may be made to the candidate's grade by the awarding body, providing the following conditions are met:

- The examination is in the candidate's terminal exam series (SC 4.2)
- The candidate has completed or will be able to complete the required percentage of the assessment to meet the minimum requirements for enhanced grading in cases of acceptable absence (SC 4.5)
- The application for special consideration can be supported by the centre with appropriate evidence authorised by a member of the senior leadership team (SC 6)

It is the responsibility of the following member(s) of staff to deal with special consideration requests and applications:

- Exams Officer in consultation with the member of SLT with responsibility for exams.

Changes 2025/2026

(Changed) Under heading **Special Consideration**:

Changed bullet point: The application for special consideration can be supported by appropriate evidence signed by a member of the senior leadership team (SC 6) To: The application for special consideration can be supported by the centre with appropriate evidence authorised by a member of the senior leadership team (SC 6)

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Candidate Identification Procedure

Candidate Identification Procedure

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date procedure first created	22/12/2023
Current procedure approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current procedure reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that procedures to verify the identity of all candidates that are entered for examinations or assessments at the Academy are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this procedure to GR and ICE refer to the JCQ documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm that the Academy:

- verifies the identity of all students that it enters for examinations or assessments (GR 5.6)
- has processes in place to be satisfied that all candidate identities have been checked (GR 5.6)
- has written procedures in place to verify the identity of all candidates at the time of the examination or assessment (GR 5.9)

1. Process to check candidate identity

Internal candidates

The identity of students on roll at the Academy is checked as part of the initial registration process. (GR 5.6)

The process is:

- to ask to see some official identification e.g. passport, for new students that are not transferring from another UK school.
to ask for and obtain documentation from previous schools for all students transferring from a UK school.

Private candidates

The identity of any student who has not received any tuition at the Academy but who may be accepted to enter examinations as a private candidate will be checked by a verification process which involves photo-ID. (GR 5.6)

At the Academy:

- a copy of the private candidate's photo page of their passport or similar official document must be presented to the Exams Officer or member of SLT before entry for an exam. If they do not have a valid passport or similar document then exam boards have an identification form, which they need to complete and have witnessed.

Procedure detailing how the identity of all candidates sitting examinations is confirmed

Invigilators are able to establish the identity of all candidates sitting examinations in accordance with this procedure and by following the arrangements in place for them to carry out adequate checks. (ICE 16)

The process at the Academy is:

- A senior member of centre staff (approved by the head of centre, who has not taught the subject being examined) will bring the students to the exam hall and be present prior to the start of the examination to assist with the identification of candidates.
Additionally, the use of desk cards, which include the candidates photograph are placed on each desk so that the invigilators can correctly identify the candidates.

The following arrangements are also in place:

- A private or external candidate or a transferred candidate who is not known to the centre will be asked to show photographic documentary evidence to prove that they are the same person who entered or registered for the examination or assessment, e.g. a passport or photographic driving licence (ICE 16.5)
- Where it is impossible to identify a candidate due to the wearing of religious clothing, such as a veil, the candidate will be approached by a member of staff of the same gender and taken to a private room where they will be politely asked to remove the religious clothing for identification purposes (ICE 16.6)
- Invigilators will be informed of those candidates with access arrangements and made aware of the access arrangement(s) awarded (ICE 16.8)

2. Roles and responsibilities

The role of the exams office/officer

- Through training, ensure invigilators are aware of the procedure for confirming the identity of all candidates sitting examinations (ICE 16.1)
- Prior to the examination, inform a private or external candidate or a transferred candidate who is not known to the centre that they must show photographic documentary evidence to prove that they are the same person who entered or registered for the examination or assessment, e.g. passport or photographic driving licence. (ICE 16.5)
- Inform candidates prior to their first examination that where it is impossible to identify a candidate due to the wearing of religious clothing, such as a veil, the candidate will be approached by a member of staff of the same gender and taken to a private room where they will be politely asked to remove the religious clothing for identification purposes and that once identification has been established, the candidate should replace, for example, their veil and proceed as normal to sit the examination (ICE 16.6)
- Prior to the beginning of the examination, brief invigilators on those candidates with access arrangements and make them aware of the access arrangement(s) awarded (ICE 16.8)

Additional responsibilities: None

Changes 2025/2026

(Updated) Bullet points to reflect slight wording changes in ICE 16.5

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, the addition of candidate cards with the candidates photo on desks was introduced.



Meridian Trust

Candidate Late Arrival Policy

Candidate Late Arrival Policy

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	22/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that candidates who arrive late to examinations at the Academy are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to GR and ICE refer to the JCQ documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm the arrangements for candidates who arrive late for an examination at the Academy.

A candidate will be considered late if they arrive:

- after the start of the examination and (for an examination which lasts an hour or more) up to 10.00am for a morning examination or up to 2.30pm for an afternoon examination. 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, i.e. after 10.00am for a morning examination or after 2.30pm for an afternoon examination
- after the awarding body's published finishing time for an examination that lasts less than one hour (ICE 21.3)

This policy confirms that the Academy reserves the right to exercise discretion whether to allow a candidate who arrives after the start of the examination to enter the examination room and sit the examination, and confirms:

- the correct procedures are followed when dealing with a candidate who arrives late to an examination
- appropriate arrangements are in place for the management of late arrivals in order to maintain the security and integrity of the examination

1. Candidates who arrive late

The following procedures are applied at the Academy in relation to candidates who arrive late to examinations:

- A candidate who arrives after the start of the examination may be allowed to enter the examination room and sit the examination (ICE 21.1)
- A candidate who arrives late, and is permitted to sit the examination, will be allowed the full time for the examination (ICE 21.2)
- A candidate who arrives within one hour of the awarding body's published starting time for an examination which lasts an hour or more, i.e. a candidate arriving up to 10.00am for a morning examination or up to 2.30pm for an afternoon examination **will** be permitted by the centre to sit the examination
- A candidate who arrives after 10.00am for a morning examination will be considered very late (ICE 21.3) and **will** be permitted by the centre to sit the examination
- A candidate who arrives after 2.30pm for an afternoon examination will be considered very late (ICE 21.3) and **will** be permitted by the centre to sit the examination
- A candidate who arrives after the awarding body's published finishing time for an examination that lasts less than one hour will be considered very late (ICE 21.3) and **will** be permitted by the centre to sit the examination
- A candidate who arrives very late will be warned that the awarding body may not accept their script (ICE 21.4)
- A candidate who arrives in the afternoon for a paper that had been re-arranged for a morning session, may be allowed to take the paper at the published time as long as the candidate has not had any contact with candidates who sat the paper earlier. (ICE 21.5)

The awarding body will be informed of the situation and will decide whether to accept the script (ICE 21.6)

- In all cases the centre will submit declarations for the very late arrival of candidates for examinations, in accordance with the current JCQ document **Instructions for conducting examinations** (GR 5.9)

Other centre specific procedures: None

2. Roles and responsibilities

The role of the exams office/officer

- Inform invigilators of the policy/process for dealing with candidates who arrive late/very late through training
- Provide an exam room incident log for invigilators to record relevant information relating to candidates who arrive late/very late
- Warn a candidate who arrives very late that the awarding body may not accept their script (ICE 21.4)
- Send the script of a candidate who arrives late/very late to the awarding body/examiner in the normal way (ICE 21.4)

Submit on-line, using the Centre Admin Portal (CAP), Form JCQ/VLA - Report on candidate admitted very late to examination room within seven days of the examination having taken place, providing the following details:

- the time the candidate came under centre staff supervision
- 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
- any assurances that the candidate did not access and was not made aware of the paper's content prior to sitting the examination (ICE 21.4)

Additional responsibilities: None

The role of invigilators

- Ensure candidates who arrive late/very late are given the required instructions prior to starting the examination (the invigilator's announcement) without disturbing other candidates
- Ensure relevant information is recorded on the exam room incident log relating to candidates who arrive late/very late
- Allow a candidate who arrived late/very late, and is allowed the full working time to do the examination, to continue after the normal finishing time, instructing them to stop working after the full working time allowed has passed (ICE 26.2)

Additional responsibilities: None

Changes 2025/2026

In terms of JCQ regulations for 2025/2026, no changes are applicable to this policy.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Certificate Issue Procedure and Retention Policy

Certificate Issue Procedure and Retention Policy

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	31/10/2024
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	27/10/2025
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the procedure/policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson SLT (Exams)
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	Michelle Dodson (Senior Data Assistant)

This procedure/policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that certificates at the Academy are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in the procedure/policy to **GR** relates to relevant sections of the current JCQ document **General Regulations for Approved Centres**.

Introduction

Certificates are provided by awarding bodies after examination results have been confirmed. Certificates always remain the property of the awarding bodies.

Purpose of the procedure/policy

The purpose of this procedure/policy is to confirm how the Academy issues examination certificates to candidates and the policy for the retention of any unclaimed/uncollected certificates in compliance with JCQ regulations.

Issue of certificates

The Academy will:

- obtain and maintain accurate candidate contact information to ensure the correct and secure despatch of certificates (GR 5.14)
- distribute certificates to all candidates without delay and regardless of any disputes (GR 5.14)
- not withhold any certificate without prior permission from the relevant awarding body which will only be given in very exceptional circumstances (GR 5.14)
- keep a record of the certificates that are issued (GR 5.14)
- return any certificates requested by the awarding bodies as certificates always remain the property of the awarding bodies (GR 5.14)

The receipt of certificates from awarding bodies and arrangements for the issue of certificates to candidates is managed by Senior Data Assistant, Exams Officer and SLT Member (Exams)

Arrangements for the issue of certificates

Certificates are normally issued to students that have moved onto sixth form at an awards event hosted in December. If a candidate doesn't attend the awards event, they can collect their certificates in person from reception. If a candidate wants their certificate to be collected by a nominated person, they must provide consent and appropriate details before we will give the certificate to them. Candidates are asked to check their personal details (name, date of birth, etc.) are correct and that the correct final grade(s) is/are shown. Each candidate (or designated nominee) is required to sign that their certificates have been collected/confirming they are correct.

Candidates are informed of the arrangements for the issue of certificates as follows:

- Candidates are informed of the date of the award evening in the autumn term (normally October) via email. They are also advised that their certificates can be collected from reception if they do not attend the award evening. They are required to give written consent if they wish to nominate someone else to collect their certificates on their behalf.

Where unable to claim/collect certificates under the normal arrangements

Candidates may arrange for certificates to be collected on their behalf by providing the exams officer with written or email permission/authorisation. Authorised persons must provide ID evidence on collection of certificates.

Record of issued certificates

When certificates are collected by the candidate or an approved nominee, they are asked to sign and date for the qualifications that the certificate(s) cover. These records are retained so that we have a clear history of the certificates that were either collected or returned to the exam board/destroyed.

Additional information: None

Retention of certificates

The Academy will:

- retain all unclaimed certificates under secure conditions for a minimum of 12 months from the date of issue (GR 5.14)
- consider destroying any unclaimed certificates after retaining them for a minimum of 12 months (GR 5.14)
- destroy certificates in a confidential manner or may return them to the respective awarding body (GR 5.14)
- retain a record of certificates that have been destroyed for four years from their date of destruction (GR 5.14) (where applicable)
- (where applicable) inform candidates that some awarding bodies do not offer a replacement certificate service and in such circumstances the awarding body will issue a Certifying Statement of Results which will provide an accurate and complete record of results for all qualifications covered by the original certificate (GR 5.14)

The retention of unclaimed or uncollected certificates is managed by

Exams Officer and Senior Data Assistant

Retention policy

Currently certificates are retained not destroyed. However, after the minimum period they could be shredded. A record of the certificates destroyed would be held on file for a further 5 years.

Candidates are informed prior to leaving the school that certificates are important official documents, which are expensive to replace. They should be collected and filed safely.

Additional information: None

Changes 2025/2026

(Changed) Slight wording changes to prompts around what the records kept should list.

(Amended) The field against 'The retention of unclaimed or uncollected certificates is managed by' will need re-inserting.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document to reflect that certificates are typically retained not destroyed.

Link to Meridian Trust Complaints Policy

<https://www.meridiantrust.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Meridian-Trust-Complaints-Policy-v.11-September-2025.pdf>



Meridian Trust

Conflicts of Interest Policy (Exams)

Conflicts of Interest Policy (Exams)

Centre name	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	01/11/2024
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/2025
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that conflicts of interest are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in the policy to **GR** relates to relevant sections of the current JCQ document **General Regulations for Approved Centres**.

Introduction

It is the responsibility of the head of centre to ensure that the Academy has a written conflicts of interest policy for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually. This policy confirms that the Academy:

Manages conflicts of interest **by informing the awarding bodies**, before the published deadline for entries for each examination series, of:

- any members of centre staff who are taking qualifications at their own centre which include internally assessed components/units
- any members of centre staff who are teaching and preparing members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter) for qualifications which include internally assessed components/units, **and**

maintains internal records of all instances where:

- exams office staff have members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter) being entered for examinations and assessments either at the centre itself or other centres
- centre staff are taking qualifications at their own centre which **do not** include internally assessed components/units
- centre staff are taking qualifications at other centres (GR 5.3)

Purpose of the policy

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

General principles

A process is in place to collect any declaration of interest from all centre staff, including any teachers that work at the Academy, but it is not their main centre of employment, to identify and manage any potential conflicts of interest.

Declaration process

A Microsoft Forms declaration of interest form is sent to all centre staff in the Autumn term. Completed forms are then reviewed by the Exams Officer.

Mitigating controls are suggested by the Exams Officer and are signed off by the HoC.

Managing conflicts of interest

A conflicts of interest log is maintained and any potential conflict declared by centre staff is centrally recorded on the log. The relevant awarding body/bodies is/are informed (where required by the nature of the conflict) of specific conflicts of interest/centre staff declarations before the published deadline for entries for each examination series by identifying and following the individual awarding body's administrative process. The agreed measures/protocols taken/put in place to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the qualifications affected are recorded on the log and the affected member of staff informed of these measures/protocols.

Additional information: None

Roles and responsibilities

The role of the head of centre is to ensure:

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

Additional responsibilities: None

Ensure that centre staff are aware of the requirement to declare any interest - Ensure that declarations are recorded/logged as potential conflicts of interest.

The role of the exams office/officer

To ensure the process for collecting declarations of interest is undertaken.

To identify and follow the awarding body's administrative process for submitting details of members of staff who are:

- taking qualifications which include internally assessed components/units at their own centre
- teaching and preparing members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter) for qualifications which include internally assessed components/units

To retain the records of the measures taken to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the qualifications affected until the deadline for reviews of marking has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later.

Additional responsibilities: None

Changes 2025/2026

In terms of JCQ regulations for 2025/2026, no changes are applicable to this policy.

(Updated) The **General principles** section content has been reformatted and will require the user to edit and repopulate this section.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Exam Contingency Plan

Exam Contingency Plan

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date plan first created	29/12/2023
Current plan approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current plan reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the plan

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
SENCo (or equivalent role)	Parveen Jhali (Deputy SENCo)
Other staff (if applicable)	Rebecca Dear (SENCo)

This plan is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that contingency planning at the Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Purpose of the plan

This plan examines potential risks and issues that could cause disruption to the examination/assessment process.

By outlining actions/procedures to be invoked in case of disruption it is intended to mitigate the impact these disruptions have on the processes at the Academy.

Alongside internal processes this plan is informed by the Ofqual **Exam system contingency plan: England, Wales and Northern Ireland** which provides guidance in the publication, 'What schools and colleges and other centres should do if exams or other assessments are seriously disrupted', the **JCQ Joint Contingency Plan** for the Examination System in England, Wales and Northern Ireland and the JCQ document **Preparing for disruption to examinations** (Effective from 1 September 2024).

This plan details how the Academy complies with the JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (5.3 *Centre management*) by having in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written contingency plan which covers all aspects of examination/assessment administration and delivery.

Contingency arrangements

The centre **must** have an up to date written contingency plan.

The contingency plan **must** cover all aspects of examination/assessment administration and delivery. Senior leaders **must** have robust contingency arrangements in place that will minimise the risk to examination/assessment administration and delivery and any adverse impact on candidates. The plan must cover the following scenarios:

- the head of centre, relevant senior leader(s) with oversight of examination and assessment administration, SENCo (or equivalent role), examinations officer or any other key staff essential to the examination process being absent at a critical stage of the examination cycle
- the potential impact of other events such as flooding which could lead to all or parts of the centre becoming unavailable
- potential issues with the centre's IT systems

As part of the contingency plan the centre **must** identify an alternative site if examinations cannot be conducted at the registered address. Larger centres may require more than one potential alternative site or different sites for different Year Groups.

The centre **must** have at least one senior member of staff (senior designated contact) who is available to manage emergency requests from awarding bodies that are results related during the summer holidays. However, a number of contacts can be provided to reduce the risk of this falling on one individual throughout the summer holidays.

The centre **must** ensure where candidates' work is produced electronically it is backed-up and should consider the contingency of candidates' work being backed-up on two separate devices, including one off-site back-up via the Cloud. Appropriate security arrangements must be implemented which protect candidates' work in the event of IT system corruption and cyber-attacks. (GR 3.17-19)

Operating across more than one centre

(This does not apply to this centre)

National Centre Number Register and other information requirements

The head of centre will ensure that the centre completes the National Centre Number Register annual update by the end of October every year (even if there are no changes to centre details) which includes providing senior designated contact details (this might include a personal mobile number and/or email address). These must be the contact details of someone who can be reached in an emergency if the centre is closed over the summer and who can mobilise resources to respond to the issue. (GR 5.3)

Head of centre/senior leader(s) with oversight of examination and assessment administration absence at a critical stage of the exam cycle

Where the Head of Centre may be absent at a critical stage of the examination cycle, main duties and responsibilities will be escalated to the Deputy Head of Centre or another member of the SLT Team or to the Executive Head as appropriate.

Possible causes of disruption to the exam process

1. Exams officer extended absence at a critical stage of 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

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

- invigilators not trained or updated on changes to instructions for conducting exams
- exam timetabling, rooming allocation; and invigilation schedules not prepared
- candidates not briefed on exam timetables and awarding body information for candidates
- confidential 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 time

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

Results and post-results

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

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

The SLT member Assistant Head (Exams) will take responsibility, and will assist the Exams Assistant / Senior Data Assistant to carry out the tasks mentioned above and ensure that appropriate support is put in place to ensure that happens.

2. Deputy SENCo (or equivalent role) extended absence at a critical stage of 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
- centre fails to recognise its duties towards disabled candidates as defined under the terms of the Equality Act 2010
- 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
- centre-delegated arrangements not put in place
- modified paper requirements not identified in a timely manner to enable ordering to meet external deadline
- staff (facilitators) providing support to access arrangement candidates not allocated and trained

Exam time

- access arrangement candidate support not arranged for exam rooms

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

Ask the SENCo to carry out the tasks mentioned above and ensure that appropriate support is put in place to ensure that happens.

3. Teaching staff (or other key staff essential to the examination process) extended absence at a critical stage of 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 candidates not being entered for exams/assessments or being entered late/late or other penalty fees being charged by awarding bodies
- Non-examination assessment tasks (including controlled assessment and coursework) not set/issued/taken by candidates as scheduled

- Candidates not being informed of centre assessed marks before marks are submitted to the awarding body and therefore not being able to consider appealing internal assessment decisions and requesting a review of the centre's marking
- Internal assessment marks and candidates' work not provided to meet awarding body submission deadlines

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

Ensure that the Heads of Departments (or appropriate SLT member, if no HOD is identified) is asked to carry out the above tasks. SLT will ensure that appropriate support is given to the Head of Department to ensure that all tasks are completed.

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 to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

ensure that additional staff within the centre have been trained as invigilators so that they can step in and carry out the necessary tasks if required.

5. Exam rooms - lack of appropriate rooms or main venue(s) 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 to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- (where main exam venue(s) unavailable due to an unexpected incident at exam time) where possible, make use of other available rooms within the centre, prioritising candidates whose progression will be severely delayed if they do not take their exam or timetabled assessment when planned
- identify whether the exam or timetabled assessment can be sat at an alternative venue, in agreement with the relevant awarding body
- (where main exam venue(s) unavailable due to an unexpected incident at exam time) where possible, move to alternative venue, prioritising candidates whose progression will be severely delayed if they do not take their exam or timetabled assessment when planned

- **Alternative site(s)** details:

Venue	Location	Contact Number
Northstowe Secondary College	Northstowe	01223 343800

- communicate with candidates (and where appropriate, parents/carers) any changes to the exam or assessment timetable or to the venue
- **Communication** details:
If the change of venue is known in advance, then candidates will be informed via email and also in person by the subject teacher. Parents/carers will be informed via email and will include details of how and when the candidate should go to the alternative venue e.g. provision of a bus.
If the change of venue is last minute, then candidates will be informed via the most appropriate method based on the circumstances.
- ensure the secure transportation of question papers or assessment materials to the alternative venue
- (after the exam) consider whether any candidate's ability to take the assessment or demonstrate their level of attainment has been materially affected and, if so, apply for special consideration

6. Cyber-attack

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Where a cyber-attack may compromise any aspect of delivery, such as cyber attack

Access Issues Preventing Continuity of Exam process	Time Impact	Impact
Access to exam site & official documentation	1 wk	Medium
Access to exam & controlled assessment entries	1 day	Medium
Access to pupil data concerning special considerations	1 wk	Medium
Access to exam payment services	1 wk	Low
Administration of ongoing exams (timetabling, organising resources and submitting paperwork)	1 wk	Medium
Access to contact details of invigilation staff	1-2 wks	Low

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- Exams Officer can access the location where hard copies of documentation/evidence is kept in a secure and safe place. All subject heads save digital evidence to individual OneDrive/Teams. With the support of the IT team, our network is backed up in the Microsoft cloud and to Barracuda's cloud. The trust's general Cyber Attack process is to immediately

contact the NCSC, NCA, DfE and other local authorities as required.

- Exams Officer can access systems remotely and via the awarding bodies websites. Controlled assessment work is stored securely within Office 365. With the support of the IT team, our network is backed up in the Microsoft cloud and to Barracuda's cloud.
- SENCo has hard copies filed on-site. With the support of the IT team, our network is backed up in the Microsoft cloud and to Barracuda's cloud.
- The Trust's finance approach ensures that there is instant access to bank account functionality on and off site from other schools within the trust.
- Exams Officer has hard files for timetabling and resources. All that can be continued remotely. With the support of the IT team, our network is backed up in the Microsoft cloud and to Barracuda's cloud.
- Exams Officer & HR (SCR) has hard files on contact details.

7. Failure of IT systems

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- IT system corruption affecting candidates' work
- MIS/IT system failure at final entry deadline
- MIS/IT system failure during exams preparation
- MIS/IT system failure at results release time

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

MIS system failure at final entry deadline

- Use of IT equipment from other academy trust schools including mirror of backend equipment at our secondary datacentre,
- Restore MIS System using "live" backup system
- Use of same MIS System at another school within academy trust MIS system failure during exams preparation

MIS system failure during exams preparation

Use of IT equipment from other academy trust schools including mirror of backend equipment at our secondary data centre

- Restore MIS System using "live" backup system
- Use of same MIS system at another school within academy trust MIS system failure at results release time

MIS system failure at results release time

- Use of IT equipment from other academy trust schools including mirror of backend equipment at our secondary datacentre.
- Restore MIS system using "live" backup system
- Use of same MIS system at another school within academy trust

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

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Whole centre evacuation (or lockdown) during exam time due to serious incident resulting in exam candidates being unable to start, proceed with or complete their exams

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- refer to and invoke its (exams) emergency evacuation policy/procedure in line with JCQ's 'Centre emergency evacuation procedure' (or its (exams) lockdown policy)
- contact the relevant awarding body as soon as possible and follow its instructions
- where accommodation is limited, prioritise candidates whose progression will be severely delayed if they do not take their exam or timetabled assessment when planned
- (after the exam) consider whether any candidate's ability to take the assessment or demonstrate their level of attainment has been materially affected and, if so, apply for special consideration
 - Use alternative venues in agreement with relevant awarding organisations (e.g. share facilities with other centres or use public buildings if possible)
 - Apply to awarding organisations for special consideration for candidates where they have met the minimum requirements.

9. Disruption of teaching time in the weeks before an exam - 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 to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- recognise it remains the responsibility of the centre to prepare students, as usual, for examinations
- facilitate alternative methods of learning
- communicate with candidates (and where appropriate, parents/carers) information relating to alternative methods of learning
- **Communication** details: Candidates and parents/carer will be kept informed via email.
- take advice offered by the awarding body regarding alternative arrangements for conducting examinations that may be available
- take advice offered by the awarding body on the options for candidates who have not been able to take scheduled examinations
- advise candidates, where appropriate, of the opportunities to take their exam or assessment at a later date

10. Candidates may not be able to take examinations - centre remains open

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Candidates may not be able to attend the examination centre to take examinations as normal because of a crisis

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- focus on options that enable candidates to take their examinations (referencing the JCQ document *Preparing for disruption to examinations*)
- take advice offered by the awarding body on the options for candidates who have not been able to take scheduled examinations
- discuss alternative arrangements with the awarding body if a candidate misses an exam or loses their assessment due to an emergency, or other event, outside of the candidate's control
- identify whether the exam or timetabled assessment can be sat at an alternative venue, in agreement with the relevant awarding body, ensuring the secure transportation of questions papers or assessment materials to the alternative venue
- communicate with candidates (and where appropriate, parents/carers) any changes to the exam or assessment timetable or to the venue
- **Communication** details: Candidates and parents/carer will be kept informed via email.
- consider whether any candidates' ability to take the assessment or demonstrate their level of attainment has been materially affected and, if so, apply for special consideration

11. Centre may not be able to open for examinations

(including in the event of the centre being unavailable for examinations owing to an unforeseen emergency)

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Centre may not be able to open as normal for scheduled examinations

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- focus on enabling candidates to take their examinations
- take advice, or follow instructions, from relevant local or national agencies in deciding whether the centre is able to open
- contact the relevant awarding body as soon as possible and follow its instructions (This could include implementing alternative arrangements for the conducting of examinations and notifying the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of an alternative site arrangement by submitting the JCQ Alternative Site form online, using the Centre Admin Portal)
- contact the relevant awarding body as soon as possible and follow its instructions
- discuss alternative arrangements with the awarding body if the exam or assessment cannot take place
- follow guidance provided by the awarding body on the conduct of examinations in such circumstances

- where accommodation is limited, prioritise candidates whose progression will be severely delayed if they do not take their exam or timetabled assessment when planned
- communicate with candidates (and where appropriate, parents/carers) any changes to the exam or assessment timetable or to the venue
- **Alternative site(s)** details:

Venue	Location	Contact Number
Northstowe Secondary College	Northstowe	01223 343800

- **Communication** details: Candidates and parents/carer will be kept informed via email.
- consider whether any candidates' ability to take the assessment or demonstrate their level of attainment has been materially affected and, if so, apply for special consideration

12. 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 to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- liaise with awarding bodies regarding the provision of electronic access to examination papers via a secure external network and will ensure when copies are received/made these are stored under secure conditions
- follow guidance provided by the awarding body on the conduct of examinations in such circumstances
- understand that as a last resort, and in close collaboration with centres and regulators, awarding organisations will consider scheduling of the examination on an alternative date
- communicate with candidates (and where appropriate, parents/carers) any changes to the exam or assessment timetable or to the venue

13. Delay in collection arrangements for completed examination scripts

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Delay in normal collection arrangements for completed examination scripts/assessment evidence

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- where examinations are part of the national 'yellow label' service or where awarding organisations arrange collections, seek advice from the relevant awarding organisations and will not make its own arrangements for transportation unless told to do so by the awarding organisation
- for any examinations where the centre makes its own arrangements for transportation, investigate alternative dispatch options that comply with the requirements detailed in the JCQ document *Instructions for conducting examinations*
- ensure the secure storage of completed examination scripts until as close to the collection time as possible

14. 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
- Completed examination scripts/assessment evidence does not reach awarding organisations

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- liaise with the awarding body to determine if candidate marks for affected assessments may be able to be generated based on other appropriate evidence of candidate achievement as defined by the awarding body
- where marks cannot be generated by awarding body, inform candidates they may need to retake the affected assessment in a subsequent assessment series
- students, parents and carers informed of situation

15. Centre unable to distribute results as normal (including in the event of the centre being unavailable on results day owing to an unforeseen emergency) or facilitate post-results services

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

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

The centre will:

- make arrangements to access its results at an alternative venue/share facilities with another centre if this is possible, in agreement with the relevant awarding body
- make arrangements to coordinate access to post-results services from an alternative venue
- **Alternative site(s) details:**

Venue	Location	Contact Number
Northstowe Secondary College	Northstowe	01223 343800

- make arrangements to make post-results requests at an alternative location
- contact the relevant awarding body if electronic post-results requests are not possible
- inform candidates of any alternative arrangements in place for the distribution of results and the facilitation of post-results services
- **Communication** details: Candidates and parents/carer will be kept informed via email.

16. Any other cause of disruption to the exam process

Cause of disruption

No further causes identified.

Centre actions to mitigate the impact of the disruption listed above

Not applicable.

Changes 2025/2026

(Changed) Under heading **Contingency arrangements** slight change of wording to reflect GR 3.17-19.

(Changed) Under heading **National Centre Number Register and other information requirements** slight change of wording to reflect GR 5.3.

(Changed) Heading **Head of centre/senior leader(s) with oversight of examination and assessment administration absence at a critical stage of the exam cycle.**

(Changed) Heading **3. Teaching staff** (or other key staff essential to the examination process) **extended absence at a critical stage of the exam cycle**

(Changed) Heading **6. Cyber security** and amended criteria for implementation of the plan.

(Changed) Heading **11. Centre may not be able to open for examinations**

(Updated) Under heading below **Further guidance to inform procedures and implement contingency planning**, relevant links and information has been updated and outdated links/information removed.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.

Further guidance to inform procedures and implement contingency planning

DfE

Meeting digital and technology standards in schools and colleges - [Cyber security standards for schools and colleges](#)

Ofqual

Ofqual guidance extract taken directly from the Exam system contingency plan: England, Wales and Northern Ireland - What schools and colleges and other centres should do if exams or other assessments are seriously disrupted www.gov.uk/government/publications/exam-system-contingency-plan-england-wales-and-northern-ireland/what-schools-and-colleges-should-do-if-exams-or-other-assessments-are-seriously-disrupted

"This document was updated in October 2023 to include Ofqual's final decisions on long-term resilience arrangements, and the Department for Education (DfE)'s guidance for education settings with confirmed reinforced autoclaved aerated concrete (RAAC).

In addition to this guidance, you will need to be aware of your specific responsibilities for local and national school preparations and contingencies. You should also follow advice from relevant public health bodies.

Contingency planning

Awarding organisations are required to establish, maintain and comply with an up-to-date detailed written contingency plan, to mitigate any incident they have identified may occur. This includes having communication plans for external parties ([Ofqual General Condition of Recognition A6](#)). Schools and colleges should also be prepared for possible disruption to exams and assessments and make sure staff are aware of these plans.

Disruption to assessments or exams

In the absence of any instruction from the relevant awarding organisation, you should make sure that any exam or timetabled assessment takes place if it is possible to hold it. This may mean relocating to alternative premises. You should discuss alternative arrangements with your awarding organisation if:

the exam or assessment cannot take place

a student misses an exam or loses their assessment due to an emergency, or other event, outside of the student's control

You may also wish to see the [JCQ's notice to centres on exam contingency plans](#) and [JCQ's notice on preparing for disruption to examinations](#) in England, Wales and Northern Ireland for qualifications within its scope.

Steps you should take

Exam planning

Review your contingency plans well in advance of each exam or assessment series. Consider how, if the contingency plan is invoked, you will comply with the awarding organisation's requirements.

Schools, colleges and other exam centres must speak to the relevant awarding organisations as soon as possible if they are expecting any disruption that might affect the sitting of exams and assessments.

In the event of disruption

Contact the relevant awarding organisation and follow its instructions.

Take advice, or follow instructions, from relevant local or national agencies in deciding whether your centre is able to open.

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.

Where accommodation is limited, prioritise students whose progression will be severely delayed if they do not take their exam or timetabled assessment when planned.

In the event of an evacuation during an examination please refer to JCQ's [Centre emergency evacuation procedure](#)

Communicate with students, parents and carers any changes to the exam or assessment timetable or to the venue.

Communicate with any external assessors, invigilators or relevant third parties regarding any changes to the exam or assessment timetable.

After the exam

Consider whether any students' ability to take the assessment or demonstrate their level of attainment has been materially affected and, if so, apply to the relevant awarding organisation for special consideration.

Advise students, where appropriate, of the opportunities to take their exam or assessment at a later date.

Ensure that scripts are stored under secure conditions.

Return scripts to awarding organisations in line with their instructions. Never make alternative arrangements for the transportation of completed exam scripts, unless told to do so by the awarding organisation.

Steps the awarding organisation should take

Exam planning

Establish and maintain, and at all times comply with, an up-to-date, written contingency plan.

Ensure that the arrangements in place with centres and other third parties enable them to deliver and award qualifications in accordance with their conditions of recognition.

In the event of disruption

Take all reasonable steps to mitigate any adverse effect, in relation to their qualifications, arising from any disruption.

Provide effective guidance to any of their centres delivering qualifications.

Ensure that where an assessment must be completed under specified conditions, students are able to complete the assessment under those conditions (other than where any reasonable adjustments or special considerations require alternative conditions).

Promptly notify the relevant regulators about any event which could have an adverse effect on students, standards or public confidence.

Coordinate its communications with the relevant regulators where the disruption has an impact on multiple centres or a wide range of learners.

After the exam

Consider any requests for special consideration for affected students; for example, those who may have lost their internally assessed work or whose performance in assessments or exams could have been affected by the disruption.

If any students miss an exam or are disadvantaged by the disruption

If some of the students have been adversely affected by the disruption, you should ask the awarding organisation about applying for special consideration.

Decisions about special consideration, when it is or is not appropriate, is for each awarding organisation to make. Their decisions might be different for different qualifications and for different subjects, depending on their specific policies.

See also [JCQ's guidance on special consideration](#)

Wider communications

The regulators, [Ofqual](#) in England, [Qualifications Wales](#) in Wales and [CCEA Regulation](#) in Northern Ireland, will share timely and accurate information, as required, with awarding organisations, government departments and other stakeholders.

The [DfE in England](#), the [DfE in Northern Ireland](#), and the [Welsh Government](#) will inform the relevant government ministers as soon as it becomes apparent that there will be significant local or national disruption, and ensure that they are kept updated until the matter is resolved.

Awarding organisations will alert the [Universities and Colleges Admissions Service](#) (UCAS) and the [Central Applications Office](#) (CAO) about any impact of the disruption on their deadlines and liaise regarding student progression to further and higher education.

Awarding organisations will alert relevant professional bodies or employer groups if the impact of disruption particularly affects them.

Widespread national disruption to the taking of examinations or assessments

As education is devolved, in the event of any widespread sustained national disruption to examinations or assessments, national government departments will communicate with regulators, awarding organisations and centres prior to a public announcement. Regulators will provide advice to government departments on implications for examinations and assessments, including exam timetables.

In September 2023, Ofqual and the DfE published [joint consultation decisions on long-term resilience arrangements](#). As in 2023, Ofqual has provided [guidance on collecting evidence of student performance to ensure resilience in the qualifications system](#) for students entering GCSEs, AS and A levels, the Advanced Extension Award and Project qualifications. For VTQs and other qualifications used alongside or instead of GCSEs, AS and A levels, awarding organisations will provide guidance where needed and will contact schools and colleges with more information.

In December 2022, Qualifications Wales published [guidance for contingency assessment arrangements](#) for GCSEs, AS and A levels and Skills Challenge Certificates in the event that a national decision is made to cancel exams. This guidance is still relevant for the current academic year.

The DfE has updated its guidance on [handling strike action in schools](#) in England in light of the industrial action in 2023. The guidance recommends schools should prioritise the running of examinations and assessments on any strike days, and should review their contingency plans to make this happen. Schools, colleges and other exam centres must speak to the relevant awarding organisations if they are expecting any disruption that might affect the sitting of exams and assessments.

The DfE has also issued [guidance for education settings with confirmed reinforced autoclaved aerated concrete \(RAAC\)](#) in their buildings. It includes the need for contingencies for possible disruption to examinations and links to the existing emergency planning guidance.

We will update this page as necessary, with any further relevant links, should national disruption occur.

General contingency guidance

[emergency planning and response for education, childcare and children's social care settings](#) from the DfE in England

[handling strike action in schools](#) from the DfE in England

[school organisation: local-authority-maintained schools](#) from the DfE in England

[reinforced autoclaved aerated concrete: guidance for education settings with confirmed RAAC](#) from the DfE in England

[exceptional closure days: Northern Ireland](#) from the Department of Education in Northern Ireland

[checklist - exceptional closure of schools](#) from the Department of Education in Northern Ireland

[school terms and school closures](#) from NI Direct

[opening schools, childcare and play settings in extreme bad weather and extreme hot weather](#) - guidance for schools from the Welsh Government

[emergency planning and response guidance for education and childcare settings](#)- guidance for schools and education settings from the Welsh Government

[protective security and preparedness for education settings](#) from the DfE

[police guidance](#) from National Counter Terrorism Security Office and partners on preparing for threats

[cyber security guidance for schools and colleges](#) from the National Cyber Security Centre"

JCQ

JCQ guidance taken directly from [Instructions for conducting examinations 2025-2026](#) section 15, Contingency planning

"15.1 The qualification regulators, awarding bodies and government departments responsible for education have prepared and agreed information for schools and colleges in the event of examinations being seriously disrupted. This jointly agreed information will ensure consistency of response in the event of major disruption to the examinations system affecting significant numbers of candidates.

Further information may be found at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/exam-system-contingency-plan-england-wales-and-northern-ireland

15.2 In addition, awarding bodies have their own well-established contingency plans in place to respond to disruptions. It is important that exams officers who are facing disruption liaise directly with the relevant awarding body or bodies.

15.3 All centres must have a written examination contingency plan which covers all aspects of examination administration. This will allow members of the senior leadership team to act immediately in the event of an emergency or where the head of centre, examinations officer or SENCo is absent at a critical stage of the examination cycle. The examination contingency plan should reinforce procedures in the event of the centre being unavailable for examinations owing to an unforeseen emergency.

All relevant centre staff must be familiar with the examination contingency plan. Consideration should be given as to how these arrangements will be communicated to candidates, parents and staff should disruption to examinations occur.

15.4 If the head of centre decides the centre cannot be opened for scheduled examinations, the centre's contingency plan must be invoked, utilising the centre's alternative site(s) and the relevant awarding bodies must be informed as soon as possible. Awarding bodies will be able to offer advice regarding the alternative arrangements for conducting examinations that may be available and the options for candidates who have not been able to take scheduled examinations.

15.5 The awarding bodies will designate 'contingency sessions' for examinations, summer 2026. This is consistent with the qualification regulators' document *Exam system contingency plan: England, Wales and Northern Ireland* - www.gov.uk/government/publications/exam-system-contingency-plan-england-wales-and-northern-ireland

15.6 The designation of 'contingency sessions' within the common examination timetable is for use in the event of national or significant local disruption to examinations. It is part of the awarding bodies' standard contingency planning for examinations.

15.7 In the event that there is national disruption to a day of examinations in summer 2026, the awarding bodies will liaise with the qualification regulators and government departments to agree the most appropriate option for managing the impact. As a last resort, the affected examinations will be rescheduled. Although every effort would be taken to keep the impact to a minimum, it is possible that there could be more than one timetable date affected following the disruption, up to and including the last contingency day. Centres will be alerted if it was agreed to reschedule the examinations and the affected candidates will be expected to make themselves available in such circumstances. The decision regarding the re-scheduling of examinations will always rest with the awarding body. The centre must conduct the examination on the scheduled date unless instructed to do otherwise by the awarding body.

15.8 Where candidates choose not to be available for the rescheduled examination(s) for reasons other than those traditionally covered by special consideration, they will not be eligible for enhanced grading. Centres must, therefore, ensure candidates and parents are aware of the contingency arrangements so that they may take them into account when making their plans for the summer. However, the awarding bodies will not insist upon candidates being available throughout the entire timetable period as a matter of course."

Links to other JCQ documentation

[JCQ Joint Contingency Plan](#)

[Preparing for disruption to examinations](#)

[General Regulations for Approved Centres](#)

[Guidance notes on alternative site arrangements](#)

[Guidance notes for transferred candidates](#)

[Instructions for conducting examinations](#)

[A guide to the special consideration process](#)

[Guidance for centres on cyber security](#)

GOV.UK

[Emergency planning and response](#): Exam and assessment disruption

[Dispatch of exam scripts guide](#): Contingency planning

Wales

[School closures: examinations](#)

[Opening schools in extremely bad weather and extreme hot weather](#)

Northern Ireland

[Exceptional closure days - Northern Ireland](#)

[Checklist - exceptional closure of schools](#)

National Cyber Security Centre

[Cyber Security for Schools](#)

[Cyber security training for school staff](#)



Meridian Trust

Emergency Evacuation Policy (Exams)

Emergency Evacuation Policy (Exams)

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	22/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	07/01/26
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
SENCo (or equivalent role)	Parveen Jhali (Deputy SENCo)
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that emergency evacuation from examination rooms at the Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to ICE refer to the JCQ document **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Introduction

An emergency evacuation is required where it is unsafe for candidates to remain in the examination room. This might include a fire, the fire alarm sounding to warn of fire, bomb alert or other serious threat.

In exceptional situations, where candidates might be severely disadvantaged or distressed by remaining in the room, the emergency evacuation procedure may also need to be followed. This might include situations where there is severe disruption in the examination room, serious illness of a candidate or invigilator or similarly serious incidents.

- As each incident may be different, advice will be sought (if applicable) from the relevant awarding body as soon as it is safe to do so (ICE 25.6)
- Where candidates are unable to return to the building to complete the examination, the relevant awarding body will be contacted immediately for advice (ICE 25.6)

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm the arrangements at the Academy for dealing with an emergency evacuation of an examination room by defining staff roles and responsibilities and confirming the emergency evacuation procedure.

This policy ensures compliance with JCQ regulations (ICE 25) which state that centres must have a written policy for dealing with emergency evacuation of the examination room which will be subject to inspection by the JCQ Centre Inspection Service.

1. Emergency evacuation procedure

Actions taken in the event of an emergency evacuation of the examination room

At the Academy, the following actions (in accordance with ICE 25) are taken if an examination room has to be evacuated:

- Candidates are instructed to stop writing
- The attendance register is collected (in order to ensure all candidates are present)
- The examination room is evacuated in line with the instructions given by the appropriate authority
- Candidates are advised to leave all question papers and scripts in the examination room. Candidates are advised to close their answer booklet(s)
- Candidates are instructed to leave the room in silence
- Candidates are supervised as closely as possible while they are out of the examination room so that there is no discussion about the examination
- The time of the interruption is noted and how long it lasted
- Candidates are allowed the remainder of the working time set for the examination once it resumes
- If there are only a few candidates, the possibility is considered of taking the candidates (with question papers and scripts collected by the invigilator) to another place to finish the examination
- A full report is made of the incident and of the actions taken (and retained on file if required by an awarding body)

For on-screen assessments:

- candidates must be closely supervised if an emergency evacuation of the assessment room occurs
- invigilators should refer to any software specific instructions to safeguard the security of the assessment content and candidates' responses (For example, pausing the assessment for all candidates and locking the evacuated assessment room without closing down the software)

- invigilators should understand the procedures for re-starting an on-screen assessment after an emergency evacuation of the assessment room, controlling the re-starting of the assessment, re-setting the timing and ensuring, where appropriate, candidates can access their previous responses

Additional actions taken:

- In the event of a fire alarm, invigilators are trained to Evacuate the examination room immediately by the nearest fire exit and escort candidates to the assembly point(s) in the MUGA, keeping all of their candidates together and silent and await further instructions. Members of SLT and the Exams Team will assist in keeping candidates together and silent.
- When/if allowed to return to the examination room, invigilators allow candidates time to settle down, reminding them they are still under formal examination conditions and that they must not open their answer booklets until instructed to do so
- Invigilators announce clearly to candidates when they may begin and how much time they have (the examination will formally restart at this point)
- Invigilators record the time the examination(s) restarted and amend the displayed finishing time(s) for all candidates to see
- Invigilators are trained to record as much detail on the exam room incident log when able to do so (ensuring candidates are continually supervised and giving complete attention to this duty at all times) and to ensure the exams officer is fully briefed at the end of the examination(s) to enable a full report to be submitted to the awarding body/bodies
- Where not allowed to return to the examination room, or the decision is made by the appropriate authority that the examination(s) cannot be resumed, the centre's examination contingency plan will be invoked and invigilators/candidates briefed accordingly at the time
- When/if allowed to return to the examination room, invigilators allow candidates time to settle, reminding them that they are still under formal examination conditions and that they must not open their answer booklets until instructed to do so
- Invigilators announce clearly to candidates when they may begin and how much time they have (the examination will formally restart at this point)
- Invigilators record the time the examination(s) restarted and amend the displayed finishing time(s) for all candidates to see
- Where not allowed to return to the examination room, or the decision is made by the appropriate authority that the examination(s) cannot be resumed, the centre's examination contingency plan will be invoked and invigilators/candidates briefed accordingly

2. Roles and responsibilities

The role of the head of centre

- Ensure that the emergency evacuation policy for examinations is fit for purpose and complies with relevant health and safety regulation
- Ensure that any instructions from relevant local or national agencies are referenced and followed where applicable (ICE 25.1)
- Ensures any breach of question paper security or malpractice is reported to the awarding body **immediately** (ICE 25.5)

Other responsibilities: Not applicable

The role of the senior leader

- Where responsible for the centre-wide emergency evacuation procedure, ensure that all staff and appointed fire marshals are aware of the policy and procedures to be followed when an emergency evacuation of an examination room is required

Other responsibilities:

To assist the Invigilators in keeping Examination Candidates together and silent.

The role of the special educational needs coordinator (SENCo) or equivalent role

- Ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place for the emergency evacuation of a disabled candidate from an examination room where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for the candidate
- Ensure that the candidate is informed prior to taking their examinations of what will happen in the event of an emergency evacuation

Other responsibilities: Not applicable

The role of the exams office/officer

- Ensure that invigilators are trained in emergency evacuation procedures and how an incident and actions taken must be recorded
- Ensure that candidates are briefed prior to examinations taking place, on what will happen in the event of an emergency in the examination room
- Provide invigilators with a copy of the emergency evacuation procedure in every exam room
- Provide a standard invigilator announcement for each exam room which includes appropriate instructions for candidates about emergency procedures and what will happen if the fire alarm sounds
- Provide an exam room incident log in every examination room
- Liaise with relevant staff prior to each examination session where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for a disabled candidate
- Brief invigilators prior to each examination session where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for a disabled candidate
- Ensure that appropriate follow-up is undertaken after an emergency evacuation, reporting the incident to the awarding body and the actions taken
- Ensure a full report of the incident is produced and retained on file if required by an awarding body (ICE 25.4)
- Ensure an online application for special consideration is submitted to the relevant awarding body where candidates have been disadvantaged (ICE 25.7)

Other responsibilities: Not applicable

The role of invigilators

- By attending training and/or update sessions, ensure they understand what to do in the event of an emergency in the examination room
- Follow the actions required in the emergency evacuation procedure issued to them for every examination room
- Confirm with the exams officer, where different procedures or assistance may need to be provided for a disabled candidate they are invigilating
- Record details on the exam room incident log to support follow-up reporting to the awarding body by the exams officer (see below)

Other responsibilities:

Not applicable

The role of other centre staff

Support the senior leader, ALS lead/SENCo, exams officer and invigilators in ensuring the safe emergency evacuation of exam rooms.

Recording details

As soon as practically possible and safe to do so, the following details will be recorded (see **Roles and Responsibilities** for the members of staff who will record these details):

- The actual time of the start of the interruption
- The actions taken
- The actual time the exam(s) resumed
- The actual finishing time(s) of the resumed exam(s) Further details which may also be recorded include:
- A report on candidate behaviour throughout the interruption/evacuation
- A judgement on the impact on candidates after the interruption/evacuation

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) New bullet point under **Actions taken in the event of an emergency evacuation of the examination room** to reflect the arrangements for on-screen assessments

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Escalation Process

Escalation Process

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date process first created	31/10/2024
Current process approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current process reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	08/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the process

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	Chris Suckling (Deputy Head Academic)

This process is reviewed and updated annually to ensure compliance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in the process to **GR** relates to relevant sections of the current JCQ document **General Regulations for Approved Centres**.

Introduction

In terms of internal governance arrangements, it is the responsibility of the head of centre to ensure that the Academy has in place a written escalation process should the head of centre, or a member of the senior leadership team with oversight of examination administration, be absent (GR 5.3).

This process also supports the Academy being able to confirm to an awarding body the external governance arrangements so that the awarding body has confidence in the integrity of centre activities such as the delivery of qualifications and the conducting of examinations and assessments. (GR 5.3)

Purpose of the process

The purpose of the process is to confirm where responsibility will be escalated to ensure continued compliance with JCQ regulations.

Before examinations/assessments

Planning

Responsibility for ensuring compliance will be escalated to:

Deputy Head Academic

Main areas of compliance relate to:

The agreement between the centre and awarding bodies (GR 3)

- Third party agreements
- Centre status
- Confidentiality
- Resilience and contingency arrangements
- Cyber security
- Retention of candidates' work
- Communication

The responsibility of the centre (GR 5): Centre management

- Recruitment, selection, training and support
- External and internal governance arrangements
- Delivery of qualifications
- Public liability
- Conflicts of interest
- Controlled assessments, coursework and non-examination assessments
- Security of assessment materials
- National Centre Number Register and other information requirements
- Centre inspections
- Policies available for inspection

Personal data, freedom of information and copyright (GR 6)

Reference information:

To support understanding of the regulations and requirements, the following JCQ documents will be referenced:

- A guide to the special consideration process
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments
- AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications
- Guidance for centres on cyber security
- Instructions for conducting coursework
- Instructions for conducting examinations
- Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (GCE and GCSE specifications)
- Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (Vocational and Technical Qualifications)
- Notice to Centres – Informing candidates of their centre-assessed marks
- Plagiarism in Assessments – Guidance for Teachers/Assessors
- Suspected Malpractice – Policies and Procedures

Additional JCQ document for reference:

- JCQ Centre Inspection Service Changes

Centre-specific reference information:

- the Academy has in place a member of the senior leadership team who has a good working knowledge of the examination system, who will provide effective line management support and supervision to the examinations officer to ensure that the integrity and security of examinations and assessments is maintained throughout an examination series.
- Ensures centre staff undertake key tasks within the exams process to meet internal deadlines set by the EO
- Can confirm to an awarding body the external governance arrangements so that the awarding body has confidence in the integrity of centre activities such as the delivery of qualifications and the conducting of examinations and assessments.

Entries and Pre-exams

Responsibility for ensuring compliance will be escalated to Deputy Head Academic

Main areas of compliance relate to:

The responsibility of the centre (GR 5)

- Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments
- Entries (including ensuring appropriate controls are in place which allow accurate entries to be submitted to the awarding bodies)

- Centre assessed work (including that candidates' work is backed-up and considering the contingency of candidates' work being back-up in the event of IT system corruption and cyber-attacks; ensuring appropriate controls are in place which allow accurate internally assessed marks to be submitted to the awarding bodies)
- Candidate information

Reference information:

To support understanding of the regulations and requirements, sections of relevant JCQ publications will be specifically referenced including:

- General Regulations for Approved Centres (5)
- Instructions for conducting examinations (1-15)
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments (6-8)

Additional JCQ publications for reference:

- Key dates
- Guidance Notes for Transferred Candidates
- Alternative Site guidance notes
- Guidance notes for overnight supervision of candidates with a timetable variation
- Guidance Notes – Centre Consortium Arrangements
- Information for candidates documents
- Exam Room Posters

Centre-specific reference information:

Not applicable.

During examinations/assessments

Exam time

Responsibility for ensuring compliance will be escalated to Deputy Head Academic

The centre also has in place a member of the senior leadership team who will provide support and guidance to the examinations officer and ensure that the integrity and security of examinations and assessments is maintained throughout an examination series.

Main areas of compliance relate to:

The agreement between the centre and the awarding bodies (GR 3)

- Retention of candidates' work

The responsibility of the centre (GR 5)

- Conducting examinations and assessments
- Malpractice

Reference information:

To support understanding of the regulations and requirements, sections of relevant JCQ publications will be specifically referenced including:

- General Regulations for Approved Centres (3, 5)
- Instructions for conducting examinations (16-31)
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments (8)
- A guide to the special consideration process (2-7) Additional JCQ publications for reference:
- Guidance Notes – Very Late Arrival

Centre-specific reference information:

Not applicable.

After examinations/assessments

Results and Post-Results

As a contingency, the centre has at least one senior member of staff (senior designated contact) who is available to manage emergency requests from awarding bodies that are results related during the summer holidays. The National Centre Number Register is provided with the senior designated contact details (this might include a personal mobile number and/or email address). These are the contact details of someone who can be reached in an emergency if the centre is closed over the summer and who can mobilise resources to respond to the issue. (GR 3.18, 5.3)

Responsibility for ensuring compliance will be escalated to Deputy Head Academic

Main areas of compliance relate to:

The responsibility of the centre (GR 5)

- Results
- Post-results services and appeals
- Certificates

Reference information:

To support understanding of the regulations and requirements, sections of relevant JCQ publications will be specifically referenced including:

- General Regulations for Approved Centres (5) Additional JCQ publications for reference:
- JCQ Release of results notice
- JCQ Post-Results Services (Information and guidance to centres)
- JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes)

Centre-specific reference information:

Not applicable.

Changes 2025/2026

(Updated) Under heading **Planning** updated list of JCQ reference documents

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in October 2025, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document

Link to Meridian Trust Data Retention Policy

<https://www.meridiantrust.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Meridian-Trust-Retention-Policy-Jan-2025-FINAL.pdf>



Meridian Trust

Food and Drink Policy (Exams)

Food and Drink Policy (Exams)

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	22/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	08/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that food and drink in the examination room at The Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to ICE refer to the JCQ publication **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Purpose of the policy

This policy confirms that The Academy reserves the right to exercise discretion whether to allow food and drink in the examination room, and confirms:

- the correct procedures are followed regarding food and drink in the examination room

- appropriate arrangements are in place for the management of food and drink in the examination room

1. Food and drink in the examination room

- Food and drink is allowed in the examination room at the discretion of the head of centre (ICE 18.4)

To enable invigilators to check these items quickly and efficiently:

- food brought into the examination room by the candidate must be free of packaging and in a transparent container
- drink bottles must be transparent with all labels removed which would include transparent, reusable plastic bottles (ICE 18.4)

The following arrangements are applied at The Academy:

Only clear, still drinks are allowed in the examination room.

Food or sugary drinks are not allowed unless there is a pre-approved medical reason.

Additional centre-specific arrangements: None

2. Roles and responsibilities

The role of the exams office/officer

- Through briefings, ensure candidates are aware of the regulations, and centre-specific arrangements, relating to food and drink in the examination room
- Ensure invigilators are trained and aware of the regulations/centre-specific arrangements relating to food and drink in the examination room
- Escalate any issue or breach of centre-specific arrangements to the relevant senior leader for the application of internal sanction(s)
- Escalate any breach of JCQ regulations immediately to the head of centre (a breach of the regulations constitutes suspected or actual malpractice)

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

The role of the invigilator

- Be vigilant in the examination room and remain aware of incidents or emerging situations, looking out for malpractice (ICE 20.2)
- Record what has happened and actions taken on the exam room incident log in relation to any breach of regulations/centre-specific arrangements regarding food and drink in the examination room (ICE 20.2)

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

The role of the head of centre

- Report to the awarding body immediately all cases of suspected or actual malpractice in connection with the examination (ICE 24.3)

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

Changes 2025/2026

(Updated) Reference to ICE 18.2 updated to 18.4

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



**Meridian
Trust**

INTERNAL APPEALS PROCEDURE

2025/26

This procedure is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Jim Stavrou / Peter Hoornaert	
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
SENCo (or equivalent role)	Parveen Jhali (Deputy SENCo)

Contents

Key staff involved in the procedure	2
Purpose of the procedure	4
Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)	5
Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice	6
Appeals relating to centre decisions not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal	8
Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration	11
Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues	13
Further guidance to inform and implement appeals.....	16

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms the academy's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (5.3z, 5.8) that the centre will:

- have in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre, an internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, access to post-result services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their internal appeals procedure

This procedure covers appeals relating to:

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

Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

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

The qualifications currently delivered at the academy containing internally assessed components or units are:

GCSE Art & Design

GCSE Photography

GCSE Geography

GCSE Drama

GCSE Dance

GCSE Music

GCSE PE

WJEC Cert Hospitality & Catering

Cambridge National Sports Science

Cambridge National Child Development

Cambridge National Engineering

Cambridge National Creative iMedia

BTEC Construction

BTEC Health & Social Care

VTCT Hair and Beauty

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

- have in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions and to ensure that details of this procedure are communicated, made widely available and accessible to all candidates
- before submitting marks to the awarding body inform candidates of their centre assessed marks and allow a candidate to request a review of the centre's marking

Deadlines for the submission of marks

The academy 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.

The academy ensures that all centre staff follow a robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework. This policy details the procedures relating to all subjects where internally assessed components are included. This includes the marking and quality assurance/internal standardisation processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, who have been trained in this activity and do not have any potential conflicts of interest. If AI tools have been used to assist in the marking of candidates' work, they will not be the sole marker.

The academy is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where more than one subject teacher/tutor is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

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

The academy will:

1. ensure that candidates are informed of their centre-assessed marks so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body
2. inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of work submitted
3. inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (as a minimum, a copy of the marked assessment material (work) and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment
4. having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate normally within five working days (This will either be the originals viewed under supervised conditions, or copies)
5. inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised
6. provide candidates with sufficient time, normally at least five calendar days, to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision
7. provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking. Requests will not be accepted after this deadline. Requests must be made in writing within five calendar days of receiving copies of the requested materials and candidates must explain on what grounds they wish to request a review
8. normally allow five working days for the review to be carried out, to make any necessary changes to marks and to inform the candidate of the outcome, all before the awarding body's deadline for the submission of marks
9. ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review
10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
11. inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking

The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre who will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review.

The moderation process carried out by the awarding body 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's marking is in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should, therefore, be considered provisional.

Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice

The JCQ [Information for candidates documents](#) (Coursework, Non-examination assessments, Social media) which are distributed to all candidates prior to relevant assessments taking place, inform candidates of the things they must and must not do when they are completing their work.

The JCQ [Information for candidates - AI \(Artificial Intelligence and assessments\)](#) or similar centre document is issued to candidates prior to assessments taking place (and prior to a candidate signing the declaration of authentication which relates to their work).

The academy ensures that staff delivering/assessing coursework, internal assessments and/or non-examination assessments are aware of centre procedures relating to the authentication of learner work and have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism (including AI misuse) and other potential candidate malpractice.

Candidate malpractice offences relating to the content of work (i.e. inappropriate/offensive content, copying/collusion, plagiarism (including AI misuse) and/or false declaration of authentication) which are discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication do not need to be reported to the awarding body but will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment where the offence does not relate to the content of candidates' work (e.g. possession of unauthorised materials, breach of assessment conditions) or where a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, must be reported to the awarding body.

If there are doubts about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or irregularities are identified in a candidate's work before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication/authentication statement (where required) and malpractice is suspected, the academy will:

- Follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document (*Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments/Instructions for conducting coursework*) and any supplementary guidance that may be provided by the awarding body. Where this may lead to the decision to **not** accept the candidate's work for assessment or to reject a candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice, the affected candidate will be informed of the decision.

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:

- A written request, setting out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal, should be submitted
- an **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted within five calendar days of the decision being made known to the appellant

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal normally within five working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre

This procedure is informed by the JCQ documents [Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments](#) (4.6, 6.1, 9), [Instructions for conducting coursework](#) (6, 7, 13.5), [Review of marking \(centre assessed marks\) suggested template for centres](#), [Notice to Centres - Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks](#) and [Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures](#) (3.3, 4.5 including reference to Form JCQ/M1)

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

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

- have available for inspection purposes and draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers, a written internal appeals procedure to manage disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. Full details of these services, internal deadlines for requesting a service and fees charged are provided by the exams officer.

Candidates are also made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results. Candidates are also informed of the periods during which senior members of centre staff will be available immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking. Candidates are made aware/informed by email.

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

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

Reviews of Results (RoRs):

- Service 1 (Clerical re-check)
This is the only service that can be requested for objective tests (multiple choice tests)
- Service 2 (Review of marking)
- Priority Service 2 (Review of marking)
This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE A-level specifications. It is also available for Level 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications. For NCFE this service only applies to T-levels.
- Service 3 (Review of moderation)
This service is not available to an individual candidate

Access to Scripts (ATS):

- Copies of scripts to support reviews of marking
- Copies of scripts to support teaching and learning

Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, the centre will look at the marks awarded for each component part of the qualification alongside any mark schemes, relevant result reports, grade boundary information, etc. when made available by the awarding body to determine if the centre supports any concerns.

For written components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

1. Where a place a university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking (where the qualification concerned is eligible for this service)
2. In all other instances, consider accessing the script by:
 - a) requesting a priority copy of the candidate's script to support a review of marking by the awarding body deadline, or
 - b) (where the option is made available by the awarding body) viewing the candidate's marked script online to consider if requesting a review of marking is appropriate
3. Collect informed written consent/permission from the candidate to access their script
4. On access to the script, consider if it is felt that the agreed mark scheme has been applied correctly in the original marking and if the centre considers there are any errors in the marking
5. Support a request for the appropriate RoR service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified
6. Collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the RoR service before the request is submitted

7. Where relevant, advise an affected candidate to inform any third party (such as a university or college) that a review of marking has been submitted to an awarding body

Written candidate consent (informed consent via candidate email is acceptable) is required in all cases before a request for a RoR service 1 or 2 (including priority service 2) is submitted to the awarding body. Consent is required to confirm the candidate understands that the final subject grade and/or mark awarded following a clerical re-check or a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, may be lower than, higher than, or the same as the result which was originally awarded. Candidate consent must only be collected after the publication of results.

For any moderated components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

- Confirm that a review of moderation cannot be undertaken on the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample submitted for moderation
- Consult any moderator report/feedback to identify any issues raised
- Determine if the centre's internally assessed marks have been accepted without change by the awarding body – if this is the case, a RoR service 3 (Review of moderation) will not be available
- Determine if there are any grounds to submit a request for a review of moderation for the work of all candidates in the original sample

Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (dispute)

Where a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking or a review of moderation, the centre will:

- For a review of marking (RoR priority service 2), advise the candidate they may request the review by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for this service to the centre by the deadline set by the centre
- For a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2), first advise the candidate to access a copy of their script to support a review of marking by providing written permission for the centre to access the script (and any required administration fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2) is required, this must be submitted by the deadline set by the centre by providing informed written consent (and the required fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (RoR service 3) cannot be requested for the work of an individual candidate or the work of a candidate not in the original sample

If the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support a review of results, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre by completing the **internal appeals form** at least five calendar days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal before the internal deadline for submitting a RoR.

Following the RoR outcome, an external appeals process is available if the head of centre remains dissatisfied with the outcome and believes there are grounds for appeal. The JCQ publications **Post-Results Services** and **JCQ Appeals Booklet** (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes) will be consulted to determine the acceptable grounds for a preliminary appeal.

Where the head of centre is satisfied after receiving the RoR outcome, but the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds for a preliminary appeal to the awarding body, a further internal appeal may be made to the head of centre. Following this, the head of centre's decision as to whether to proceed with a preliminary appeal will be based upon the acceptable grounds as detailed in the **JCQ Appeals Booklet**. Candidates or parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body.

The **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted to the centre within five calendar days of the notification of the outcome of the RoR. Subject to the head of centre's decision, this will allow the centre to process the preliminary appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required **30 calendar days** of the awarding body issuing the outcome of the review of results process. Awarding body fees which may be charged for the preliminary

appeal must be paid to the centre by the appellant before the preliminary appeal is submitted to the awarding body (fees are available from the exams officer). If the appeal is upheld by the awarding body, this fee will be refunded by the awarding body and repaid to the appellant by the centre.

This procedure is informed by the JCQ documents [Post-Results Services](#) and [A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes](#)

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

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

- have in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre, an internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding... centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

The academy will:

- comply with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and special consideration as set out in the JCQ documents **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** and **A guide to the special consideration process**
- ensure that all staff who manage and implement access arrangements and special consideration are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced

Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

In accordance with the regulations, the academy:

- recognises its duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, to submit applications for reasonable adjustments through the access arrangements process and make reasonable adjustments to the services the centre provides to disabled candidates
- complies with its responsibilities in identifying, determining and implementing appropriate access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

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

Examples of failure to comply include:

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

Special consideration

Where the academy has appropriate evidence authorised by a member of the senior leadership team to support an application, it will apply for special consideration at the time of the assessment for a candidate who is affected by adverse circumstances beyond their control when the issue or event has had, or is reasonably likely to have had, a material effect on the candidate's ability to take an assessment or demonstrate their normal level of attainment in an assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

The appellant will normally be informed of the outcome of the appeal within five working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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

This procedure is informed by the JCQ documents [A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes](#) (3), [Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures](#) (3.3), [General Regulations for Approved Centres](#) (5.4), [Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments](#) (Importance of these regulations) and [A guide to the special consideration process](#) (1, 2, 6)

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

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

Where the academy may make a decision that affects a candidate or candidates:

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

The appellant will normally be informed of the outcome of the appeal within five working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

This procedure is informed by the JCQ document [A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes](#) (7)

INTERNAL APPEALS FORM

FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Reference No.	

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

- Appeal against an internal assessment decision and/or request for a review of marking
- Appeal against a decision to reject candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice
- Appeal against the centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal
- Appeal against the centre's decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration
- Appeal against the centre's decision relating to an administrative issue

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

Name of appellant		Candidate name (if different to appellant)	
Awarding body		Exam paper code	
Qualification type Subject		Exam paper title	

Please state the grounds for your appeal below:

(If applicable, tick below)

- Where my appeal is against an internal assessment decision, I wish to request a review of the centre's marking

If necessary, continue on an additional page if this form is being completed electronically or overleaf if hard copy being completed

Appellant signature:

Date of signature:

This form must be signed, dated and returned to the exams officer on behalf of the head of centre to the timescale indicated in the relevant appeals procedure

Further guidance to inform and implement appeals

JCQ publications

- General Regulations for Approved Centres <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations>
- Post-Results Services <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services>
- JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes) <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals>
- Notice to Centres – Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/non-examination-assessments>
- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance/>
- A guide to the special consideration process <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance/>

Ofqual publications

- GCSE (9 to 1) qualification-level conditions and requirements <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gcse-9-to-1-qualification-level-conditions>
- GCE qualification-level conditions and requirements <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gce-qualification-level-conditions-and-requirements>



Meridian Trust

Internal Appeals Procedure (Internal assessment decisions)

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date procedure first created	29/12/2023
Current procedure approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current procedure reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	08/01/2025
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks) at The Academy are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations in the following JCQ documents: **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (5.3, 5.7), **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** (4.6, 6.1, 9) and **Instructions for conducting coursework** (6, 7, 13.5). This procedure is also informed by the JCQ documents **Reviews of marking (centre assessed marks) suggested template for centres**, **Notice to Centres - Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (4.5).

Introduction

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

The moderation process carried out by the awarding body may result in a mark change, either upwards or downwards, even after an internal review. The internal review process is in place to ensure consistency of marking within the centre, whereas moderation by the awarding body ensures that centre marking is in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.

The qualifications currently delivered at The Academy containing internally assessed components/units are:

GCSE Art & Design

GCSE Photography

GCSE Geography

GCSE Drama

GCSE Dance

GCSE Music

GCSE PE

WJEC Cert Hospitality & Catering

Cambridge National Sports Science

Cambridge National Child Development

Cambridge National Engineering

Cambridge National Creative iMedia

BTEC Construction

BTEC Health & Social Care

VTCT Hair and Beauty

Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm the arrangements at The Academy for dealing with appeals relating to internal assessment decisions.

This procedure ensures compliance with JCQ regulations which state that centres must:

- have in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions and to ensure that details of this procedure are communicated, made widely available and accessible to all candidates
- before submitting marks to the awarding body inform candidates of their centre assessed marks and allow a candidate to request a review of the centre's marking

Principles relating to centre assessed marks

The head of centre/senior leader(s) at The Academy will ensure that the following principles are in place in relation to marking the work of candidates:

- A commitment to ensuring that whenever teaching staff mark candidates' work, that this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents
- All centre staff follow a robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework which details the procedures relating to relevant qualifications delivered in the centre, including the marking and quality assurance/internal standardisation processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow
- Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity and do not have any potential conflicts of interest (If AI tools have been used to assist in the marking of candidates' work, they will not be the sole marker)
- A commitment to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body (Where more than one subject teacher/tutor is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking)
- On being informed of their centre assessed marks, if candidates believe that the above procedures were not followed in relation to the marking of their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the marking standards to the marking, then they may make use of the internal appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking

Additional centre-specific principles:

Not applicable

Procedure for appealing internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

The head of centre/senior leader(s) at The Academy 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
- Inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of work submitted
- Inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (generally as a minimum, a copy of the marked assessment material (work) and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment
- Having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate (this will either be the originals viewed under supervised conditions or copies) within the period of time as specified (see **Deadlines** below)
- Provide candidates with sufficient time to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision, informing candidates that if their decision is to request a review they will need to explain what they believe the issue to be
- Provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking and confirm understanding that requests must be made in writing and will not be accepted after this deadline (see **Deadlines** below)
- Require candidates to make requests for a review of centre marking by a formal written request to the teacher or to the Exams Manager. This can be via email or a hand delivered letter. There is an Internal Appeals form if the candidate wishes to use it.
- 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 (see **Deadlines** below)
- 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
- Instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre

- Inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking
- Ensure the outcome of the review of the centre's marking is made known to the head of centre who will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body
- Ensure a written record of the review is kept and made available to the awarding body upon request • Ensure the awarding body is informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review

Additional centre-specific procedure:

Not Applicable

Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice

The JCQ **Information for candidates' documents (Coursework, Non-examination assessments, Social media)** which are distributed to all candidates prior to assessments taking place, inform candidates of the things they must and must not do when they are completing their work.

The JCQ **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre document is issued to candidates prior to assessments taking place (and prior to a candidate signing the declaration of authentication which relates to their work).

The centre ensures that staff delivering/assessing coursework, internal assessments and/or non-examination assessments are aware of centre procedures relating to the authentication of learner work and have robust processes in place for

Candidate malpractice offences relating to the content of work (i.e. inappropriate/offensive content, copying/collusion, plagiarism (including AI misuse) and/or false declaration of authentication) which are discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication do

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment where the offence does not relate to the content of candidates' work (e.g. possession of unauthorised materials, breach of assessment conditions) or where a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, must be reported to the awarding body.

If there are doubts about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or irregularities are identified in a candidate's work before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication/authentication statement (where required) and malpractice is suspected, The Academy will:

Follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document "Instructions for conduction on-examination assessments/Instructions for conduction coursework and any supplementary guidance that may be provided by the awarding body. Where this may lead to a decision to not accept the candidates work for assessment or to reject a candidates work on the grounds of malpractice, the affected candidate will be informed of the decision.

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:

is asked to submit a written request, setting out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal within 2 days of the decision being made known to the appellant.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal:

Within 5 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

Deadlines and timescales

Upon request, copies of materials will be made available to the candidate, normally within 2 working days.

The deadline to request a review of marking must be made within 2 working days of the candidate receiving copies of the requested materials.

The process for completing the review, making any changes to marks, and informing the candidate of the outcome will normally be completed within 2 working days, all before the awarding body's deadline for the submission of marks.

Changes 2025/2026

(Changed/Added) Under heading Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice wording changed in bullet points and new bullet points added.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in October 2025, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Internal Appeals Procedure (Reviews of Results and Appeals)

Internal Appeals Procedure (Reviews of Results and Appeals)

Centre name (the academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date procedure first created	31/10/2024
Current procedure approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current procedure reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	28/10/2025
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that appeals against any decision at The Academy not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation, or an appeal are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in this procedure to GR refers to the JCQ document **General Regulations for Approved Centres**.

Introduction

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available.

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

Access to Scripts (ATS):

Centres may request copies of scripts to support:

- reviews of marking; and/or
- teaching and learning

Requests must be submitted online via the awarding bodies' extranet sites.

Information on deadlines for Access to Scripts is found on awarding bodies' websites.

Reviews of Results (RoRs):

- Service 1 (Clerical re-check): This is the only service that can be requested for objective tests (multiple choice tests)
- Service 2 (Review of marking): This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE AS, A-level and GCSE specifications. It is also available for Level 1, 2 and 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications.
- Priority Service 2 (Review of marking): This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE A-level specifications. It is also available for Level 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications. For NCFE this service only applies to T-levels.
- Service 3 (Review of moderation): A review of moderation cannot be undertaken upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample

Requests must be submitted online via the awarding bodies extranet sites

Appeals

- The appeals process is available after receiving the outcome of a review of results

Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of these procedures is to confirm how the Academy deals with candidates' requests for access to scripts, clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, reviews of moderation and appeals to the awarding bodies in compliance with JCQ regulations (GR 5.13).

Details of these procedures are made widely available and accessible to all candidates by:

the issue of a Candidate Exam Handbook in the autumn/spring term and by email immediately after the results are released

The arrangements for post-results services

- Candidates must be made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results (GR 5.13)
- A review of moderation cannot be undertaken upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample (PRS 4.3)
- The appeals process is available after receiving the outcome of a review of results (PRS 5.1)

At The Academy:

- Candidates are made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results
- Candidates are also informed of the periods during which senior members of centre staff will be available immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking

Candidates are made aware/informed by

There is an assembly for the Y11 students prior to exam leave to inform them of the arrangements for exam results day e.g. date and times that school is open and SLT will be available for support and questions. They are advised what they need to do to give consent for someone else to collect results on their behalf. It is also explained that results will be emailed to all students later in the day on results day. If they will be abroad on results day, they are advised to send an email to the Exams inbox so that a request can be put in to the IT dept, to make their inbox available abroad on results day.

During the assembly, the post-results services are also explained.

This same information about results day arrangements and post-results services is communicated to parents and the students via email so that they have it for reference during the summer holidays.

Full details of the post-results services, internal deadline(s) for requesting a service and the fees charged (where applicable) are provided by in the form sent out from the Exams Department by the Assistant Head (Exams) following the release of results. Details of the process to consent for each service and how to pay the fee are also included.

Dealing with requests

All post-results service requests from internal candidates must be made through the centre (GR 5.13)

At the academy, the process to request a service is:

By completing the online Post-results request, consent and payment form.

Candidate consent

Candidates must provide their **written consent** for clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, and any subsequent appeal, and access to scripts services offered by the awarding bodies **after** the publication of examination results (GR 5.13)

(As applicable, it will be ensured that any private candidates are made aware that all post-results service requests can be made directly through the relevant awarding body)

The Academy will:

- Acquire candidate informed consent via candidate email in all cases before a request for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, or an access to scripts service request is submitted to the awarding body
- Acquire informed candidate consent to confirm the candidate understands that the final subject grade and/or mark awarded following a clerical re-check or a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, may be lower than, higher than, or the same as the result which was originally awarded
- Only collect candidate consent **after** the publication of results
- Retain consent e-mails from candidates for at least six months following the outcome of a clerical re-check or review of marking or any subsequent appeal (PRS 4.2)
- Retain consent/permission e-mails from candidates to request and use their scripts for at least six months (PRS Appendix B)

Additional actions: None

Submitting requests

The Academy will:

- Submit requests electronically for clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, reviews of moderation and access to scripts by the published deadline(s) in accordance with the JCQ document **Post-results services** (GR 5.13)
- Submit requests for appeals in accordance with the JCQ document **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes** (GR 5.13)
- Confirm the awarding body's acknowledgement of receipt of a review of results request prior to the deadline for submission of post-results services and regularly check the progress of the request online (PRS 4.5)

Additional actions: None

Dealing with outcomes

The Academy will:

- Ensure outcomes of clerical re-checks, reviews of marking, reviews of moderation and appeals are made known to candidates as soon as possible (GR 5.13)

Candidates will be notified by being emailed a copy of the outcome notification from the awarding body.

Additional actions: None

Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (dispute)

Where a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking or a review of moderation, The Academy will:

- For a review of marking (Review of Results priority service 2), advise the candidate a review may be requested by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for this service to the centre by the deadline set by the centre
- For a review of marking (Review of Results service 1 or 2), first advise the candidate to access a copy of their script to support a review of marking by providing written permission (and any required administration fee) for the centre to access the script from the awarding body
- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (Review of Results service 1 or 2) is required, this must be submitted by the deadline set by the centre by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for the centre to request the service from the awarding body
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (Review of Results service 3) cannot be requested for the work of an individual candidate or the work of a candidate not in the original sample

Additional centre-specific actions: None

If the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support a review of results, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre by completing an internal appeals form at least 5 school days prior to the internal deadline for submitting for a request for a review of results. The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal before the internal deadline for requesting review of results.

Appeals

Following a Review of Results outcome, an external appeals process is available if the head of centre remains dissatisfied with the outcome and believes there are grounds for appeal.

The JCQ publications **Post-Results Services** and **JCQ Appeals Booklet** (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes) will be consulted to determine the acceptable grounds for a preliminary appeal.

Where the head of centre is satisfied after receiving the Review of Results outcome, but the candidate (or parent/carer) believes there are grounds for a preliminary appeal to the awarding body, an internal appeal may be made directly to the centre. Candidates or parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body. Following this, the head of centre's decision as to whether to proceed with a preliminary appeal will be based upon the acceptable grounds as detailed in the **JCQ Appeals Booklet**. To submit an internal appeal:

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

Additional centre-specific information:

Not Applicable.

Changes 2025/2026

(Updated) Under heading **Introduction** wording updated in relation to the JCQ post-results services currently available.

(Reformatted) Under heading **The arrangements for post-results services** insert fields reformatted and require updating on reviewing and updating this procedure.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Leaving the Examination Room Policy

Leaving the Examination Room Policy

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	22/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	08/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that candidates leaving the examination room at The Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to ICE refer to the JCQ document **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm that candidates leaving the examination room at The Academy is managed in line with JCQ regulations.

This policy confirms:

- the correct procedures are followed in relation to candidates leaving the examination room

- The Academy reserves the right to exercise discretion whether to allow extra time to compensate candidates for their temporary absence from the examination room

Arrangements for leaving the examination room

- For examinations that last one hour or more, candidates must stay under centre supervision until 10.00am for a morning examination or 2.30pm for an afternoon examination, i.e. one hour after the awarding body's published starting time for that examination (ICE 23.1)
- For examinations that last less than one hour, candidates must be supervised and question papers must be kept in secure storage until the published finishing time of the examination (ICE 23.2)
- Candidates who are allowed to leave the examination room temporarily must be accompanied by a member of centre staff. This must not be the candidate's subject teacher or a subject expert for the examination in question. (ICE 23.3)
Candidates may be allowed extra time at the discretion of the centre to compensate for their temporary absence. (ICE 23.5)
- Candidates can only leave the examination room where necessary or where supervised rest breaks have been granted by the SENCo. The centre must ensure that candidates who leave the room do not have access to any unauthorised materials. (ICE 23.4)
- Candidates who have finished the examination and have been allowed to leave the examination room early must hand in their script, question paper and any other material before they leave the examination room. Those candidates must not be allowed back into the room (ICE 23.6)
- At the end of the examination, candidates must hand in their script, question paper and any other material before they leave the examination room (ICE 23.7)

The following arrangements are applied at The Academy:

- Toilet breaks are not normally allowed in the first 30 minutes or last 20 minutes of an exam unless the candidate has a known medical condition or toilet pass.
- Candidates (without a known medical condition/those not approved supervised rest breaks) may be allowed to leave the room temporarily, disturbance to other candidates will be minimised. The risk of opportunity to look at the work of other candidates (over their shoulders) as the candidate is leaving the room will be minimised
- Candidates who are allowed to leave the examination room temporarily may be allowed extra time to compensate for their temporary absence (ICE 23.5) if there is a medical need, e.g. requirement to monitor or regulate diabetes, nosebleed, etc.
- Extra time will not be given for toilet breaks, unless there is a pre-approved medical reason for frequent toilet breaks.

Additional arrangements: None

Roles and responsibilities

The role of the exams office/officer

- Through training, ensure invigilators are aware how candidates who may be allowed to leave the examination room temporarily should be managed and recorded

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable.

The role of the invigilator

- Ensure a candidate who may be allowed to leave the examination room temporarily is accompanied by a member of centre staff who is not the candidate's subject teacher or a subject expert for the examination in question (ICE 23.3)

- Record instances on the exam room incident log of candidates who may be allowed to leave the examination room temporarily because they may be feeling unwell or require a toilet break (ICE 20.2)
- Ensure candidates who have finished the examination and have been allowed to leave the examination room early hand in their script, question paper and any other material before they leave the examination room. Ensure those candidates are not allowed back into the room (ICE 23.6)
- At the end of the examination, ensure candidates hand in their script, question paper and any other material before they leave the examination room (ICE 23.7)

Invigilators will record every event on the incident log whatever the circumstances. This will include details of how the timings for any candidate who will be compensated for their temporary absence from the exam room will be managed and the candidate's amended finishing time calculated/made known to the candidate

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) Under heading **Arrangements for leaving the examination room**, optional insert field added to allow for expansion on the arrangements applied at the centre.

(Added) Under heading **The role of the invigilator** optional insert field added to allow for expansion on recording incidents and timings, etc.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Lockdown Policy (Exams)

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	31/10/2024
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	08/01/2025
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	Chris Suckling (Deputy Head Academic)

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that a lockdown during the conducting of examinations at the Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

In addition to this policy, a summary is provided to all centre staff of the information relating to a lockdown during the examination period using the framework of the Department for Education's Lockdown Template.

Staff engaged directly with the conducting of examinations (e.g. exams officer, exams officer assistant, invigilators, facilitators of access arrangements, etc.) are instructed to refer to the full policy.

Definitions

For the purpose of this policy, the following definitions should be noted:

Lockdown

This is a protective measure implemented when there is a credible threat to the safety of candidates/students and staff. During a lockdown, individuals are instructed to remain inside the building and seek shelter in a secure location, away from the source of danger.

The purpose of a lockdown is to minimise exposure to potential harm and ensure the safety and wellbeing of everyone on site until the threat has been resolved or emergency services arrive.

Lockdown procedures may be activated in situations including:

- The presence of an unauthorised or suspicious individual on the grounds or within the building
- A violent, aggressive, or abusive parent/carer causing disruption
- A specific threat made against the centre or its occupants

All staff must be familiar with the centre's lockdown protocol and ensure candidates/students are guided calmly and efficiently to designated safe areas.

Communication with emergency services and internal coordination will be managed by the head of centre or designated safeguarding lead.

Invacuation

This is a safety measure used when there is a potential external threat in the surrounding area. While lockdowns are activated in response to immediate risks within or directly threatening the premises, invacuations are employed when it is safer for candidates/students, staff, and visitors to remain inside the building due to hazards outside.

Invacuation procedures are designed to ensure that all individuals are brought indoors promptly and remain inside until the external threat has passed or further guidance is provided by emergency services.

An invacuation may be applicable to exam candidates if they have left the exam room in the event of an emergency evacuation (for example, due to a fire alarm).

Examples of situations requiring invacuation include:

- The presence of loose or potentially dangerous animals on the grounds
- Environmental hazards such as gas leaks, smoke, or chemical pollution in the vicinity
- Nearby incidents (e.g. police activity or civil disturbance) that may pose a risk if individuals exit the building

Staff are expected to follow the invacuation protocol calmly and efficiently, ensuring that all candidates/students are accounted for and safely indoors. The head of centre or designated safeguarding lead will oversee communication and coordination during such events.

Purpose of the policy

This policy details the measures taken at the Academy in the event of a centre lockdown during the conducting of examinations.

Lockdown procedures have been determined by consulting [ProtectUK](#), the Department for Education's guidance relating to [School and college security](#) and [Martyn's Law](#)

Depending on the nature of the incident, a decision will be made to evacuate, invacuate (an inward evacuation) or use a protected space(s). However, this policy focuses specifically upon the actions, roles and responsibilities during an exams-related lockdown.

The Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025

Although the Academy is not classified as a high-risk venue under current legislation, we are committed to embedding the principles of Martyn's Law into our safeguarding and emergency preparedness framework. These include:

- **Risk awareness:** Staff being equipped to identify potential threats and recognise suspicious behaviour or activity that may pose a risk to students, staff and visitors
- **Emergency planning:** Maintaining clear, comprehensive, and regularly reviewed procedures to respond effectively to a range of emergency scenarios
- **Rapid response capability:** Training staff to act swiftly and appropriately in the event of an emergency to ensure the safety and protection of students, colleagues, and visitors

These principles underpin our broader approach to security and safeguarding, and will be reflected in staff training, policy reviews, and incident management protocols.

Compliance

To ensure that all staff at the Academy are meeting the requirements of the Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025, the following procedures are in place:

Evacuation (Getting people out of the building)

An evacuation of the exam room will be initiated when it is deemed safer for candidates and staff to leave the room and the building due to an internal threat such as fire, gas leak, structural damage, or other emergencies. This procedure ensures a swift, orderly, and safe exit to designated assembly points.

Step-by-step procedure:

1. Activation of alarm

- The fire alarm or emergency alert system will be triggered manually or automatically.
- Invigilators will immediately begin evacuation procedures without waiting for further instruction unless advised otherwise

2. Immediate response

- Candidates will be instructed to stop their examination and prepare to leave the exam room in line with the invigilator's instructions
- Invigilators will lead candidates out of the building via the nearest safe exit, avoiding lifts and blocked routes

3. Use of evacuation routes

- Pre-assigned evacuation routes and exits will be followed
- Invigilators will check the exam room (and any candidates who may have temporarily left the exam room) to ensure that no one is left behind

4. Assembly at designated point

- Invigilators will take candidates to the designated assembly point(s) outside the building
- Registers will be taken promptly to account for all candidates and invigilators
- Any missing candidates will be reported immediately to the senior leadership team or emergency services

5. Communication and co-ordination

- The head of centre or designated safeguarding lead will liaise with emergency services and provides updates
- Invigilators will supervise candidates and maintain calm until further instructions are given

6. Re-entry or dismissal

- No one will be permitted to re-enter the building until it has been declared safe by emergency personnel

Invacuation (Moving people to a safe place)

If candidates have been outside of the exam room, for example, for an emergency evacuation, or on a supervised rest break, they will be brought back into the exam room promptly and remain inside until the situation is resolved. The procedure will include:

1. Initial Alert

- The head of centre or designated safeguarding lead will assess the situation and initiate the invacuation protocol
- A clear announcement will be made via the centre's communication system (e.g. tannoy, radios, or internal messaging)

2. Movement Indoors

- All outdoor activities (for example, an emergency evacuation or supervised rest break) being undertaken by candidates sitting an examination will be halted immediately
- Candidates will be escorted indoors quickly and calmly, using the nearest safe entry point

3. Securing the Building

- External doors and windows will be closed and secured
- Access points will be monitored to prevent entry or exit until the all-clear is given

4. Internal Safety Measures

- Candidates and staff (invigilators) will remain in the exam room or designated safe area(s)
- Movement within the building will be restricted unless necessary
- Invigilators will take registers to account for all candidates and report any discrepancies to the exams office/officer (unless instructed otherwise)

5. Communication

- The head of centre or designated safeguarding lead will maintain contact with emergency services and monitor updates
- Parents/carers will be informed if appropriate, depending on the nature and duration of the incident

6. All-Clear and Debrief

- Once the threat has passed, an all-clear message will be issued

- Candidates will resume their examination
- The incident will be reported to the relevant awarding body/bodies, and a short debrief may be conducted to review the response and identify any improvements

Lockdown procedures

Where a lockdown is required, the following procedures will be employed at the Academy:

Before an examination

As candidates are entering/waiting to enter the examination room:

Invigilators will:

- instruct candidates to enter the examination room immediately
- instruct candidates to remain silent, hide under desks or sit against a wall/around a corner but not near the door and to ensure mobile phones are on silent and non-vibrate mode
- lock all windows and close any/all curtains/blinds
- switch off all lights
- lock all doors and/or use tables, or any other furniture, to barricade the entrance to the room
- take an attendance register/head count if possible
- (if the threat is a chemical or toxic release) instruct candidates to cover their nose and mouth (their own clothing can be used) and attempt to use anything to hand to seal up cracks around doors and any vents into the room
- where safe/possible, not leave the examination question papers unattended/out of sight

A senior leader/authorised person will be present around the examination room(s) area(s) and where safe/possible, communicate the situation to the exams office/officer (via mobile phone/walkie talkie on silent and non-vibrate mode)

The exams office/officer will collate the information from all examination rooms and forward this to the head of centre immediately

The head of centre will make informed decisions on alerting parents/carers, awarding bodies and emergency services

Additional centre-specific procedures: Not applicable

During an examination

When candidates are in the examination room:

Invigilators will:

- tell candidates to stop writing immediately and close their answer booklets
- collect the attendance register
- make a note of the time when the examination was suspended
- instruct candidates to remain silent, leave all examination materials on their desks and hide under desks
- where safe/possible, communicate (via mobile phone/walkie talkie) the situation to the exams officer (ensuring that all mobile phones/walkie talkies are on silent and non-vibrate mode)
- lock all windows and close any/all curtains/blinds
- switch off all lights

- lock all doors and/or use tables, or any other furniture, to barricade the entrance to the room
- (if the threat is a chemical or toxic release) instruct candidates to cover their nose and mouth (their own clothing can be used) and attempt to use anything to hand to seal up cracks around doors and any vents into the room
- where safe/possible, not leave the examination question papers unattended/out of sight

Where safe/possible, the exams office/officer will collate the information from all examination rooms and forward this to the head of centre immediately

The head of centre will make informed decisions on alerting parents/carers, awarding bodies and emergency services

If appropriate, where safe/possible, and following instruction from the appropriate authority, the exams office/officer and/or invigilators will initiate the emergency evacuation procedure

Where safe/possible, the exams office/officer will collect all examination question papers and materials for safe/secure storage following advice from the appropriate awarding body/bodies

Additional centre-specific procedures: Not applicable

After an examination

As candidates are leaving the examination room:

Invigilators will:

- stop dismissing candidates from the examination room
- instruct candidates who have left to re-enter the examination room
- instruct candidates to remain silent and hide under desks/tables
- where safe/possible, communicate (via mobile phone/walkie talkie) the situation to the exams officer (ensuring that all mobile phones/walkie talkies are on silent and non-vibrate mode)
- lock all windows and close any/all curtains/blinds
- switch off all lights
- lock all doors and/or use tables, or any other furniture, to barricade the entrance to the room
- (if the threat is a chemical or toxic release) instruct candidates to cover their nose and mouth (their own clothing can be used) and attempt to use anything to hand to seal up cracks around doors and any vents into the room
- where safe/possible, not leave the examination question papers unattended/out of sight

Where safe/possible, the exams officer will collate the information from all examination rooms and forward this to the head of centre immediately

The head of centre will make informed decisions on alerting parents/carers, awarding bodies and emergency services

Additional centre-specific procedures: Not applicable

Ending a lockdown

The lockdown will be ended by either:

- the sound of a defined alarm, or
- the identification/authorisation of emergency service officer/senior leader/head of centre entering the examination room

Invigilators will undertake a head count/register and confirm attendance with the exams office/officer/senior leader

Where applicable and if advised to do so by a senior leader/head of centre, if there is sufficient time (and following JCQ regulations), candidates may be allowed to restart their examination Invigilators will:

- ask candidates to return to their desks, remind them they are under formal examination conditions and allow a settling down period
- allow candidates the full working time remaining for their examination
- recalculate the revised finish time(s)
- tell the candidates to open their answer booklets and re-start their examination
- amend the revised finish time(s) on display to candidates
- note how long the lockdown lasted on the exam room incident log (to later inform a report to the awarding body/bodies)

The exams office/officer will:

- safely/securely store all collected exam papers and materials pending awarding body advice/guidance
and where this may be applicable:
- ensure appropriate follow-up is undertaken after the incident, reporting the incident to the awarding body and the actions taken, where this may be applicable
- where this may be applicable, ensure a full report of the incident is produced and retained on file if required by an awarding body
- where this may be applicable, ensure an online application for special consideration is submitted to the relevant awarding body where candidates have been disadvantaged
- At the earliest immediate opportunity the head of centre will ensure that any breach of question paper security or malpractice is reported to the awarding body

Where applicable/possible/available, the senior leader/exams office/officer will:

- discuss any alternative examination sittings with the awarding body/bodies
- offer, arrange and provide support services to staff and candidates

At the earliest opportunity, the senior leader/head of centre will prepare a communication to parents/carers advising them of events (including relevant actions and outcomes)

Where possible, exams staff and candidates will be invited to attend an assembly lead by the head of centre to discuss the lockdown and offer ongoing support.

- If this is not possible, communications will be provided via a centre text/email/newsletter and information uploaded to the centre website

Additional centre-specific procedures:

Staff will be alerted to a partial or full lockdown via NOTIFY message 'Lockdown AMBER' or 'Full Lockdown RED'.

Exam rooms will be alerted by text message or radio message.

2. Roles and responsibilities

The role of the head of centre

To ensure that vulnerability and space assessments are conducted to:

- Identify specific risks (for example, intruders, violent or aggressive individuals or incidents happening in the local area)
- Consider different times of the day/during an examination when candidates may be more dispersed across the site or away from the exam room (for example, during a supervised rest break, a toilet break)
- Highlight areas centre where an attacker might carry out an attack, and where the easiest places to gain access are
- Assess how many candidates can be accommodated in a particular (safe) area (for example, the exam room)
- Ensure that a dedicated lockdown alarm tone is in place and recognised by all staff and candidates
- Arrange appropriate training for all exams staff in lockdown procedures
- Ensure candidates are aware of the procedures relating to a lockdown, particularly those arriving late for an examination who cannot access the examination room due to it being locked down
- Ensure all candidates and staff are aware of a possible exit point in case an intruder manages to gain access, or the room becomes unsafe
- Provide written lockdown procedures for examination room/invigilator use
- Inform the relevant emergency service(s) immediately in the case of any potential threat to the safety of exams staff and candidates

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

The role of the senior leader

- Assume responsibility for exams staff and candidates taking examinations during a lockdown
- Arrange training/drills for examination candidates on lockdown procedures
- Inform parents/carers about the centre's Lockdown Policy in relation to the conducting of examinations
- Have a presence around examination room areas prior to the start of each examination session
- Liaise with the appropriate authorities and awarding bodies regarding candidates taking examinations during a lockdown
- Use the examination room attendance register(s) to compile a list of any candidates not accounted for

Additional responsibilities:

Invigilators will be trained on the Lockdown Procedure during Invigilator Training.

The role of the exams office/officer

- Train invigilators in the centre's lockdown procedures (this should also include identifying all access and egress points within exam rooms, an awareness of the design of the locking device within each room and if there is more than one invigilator, whose role it would be to secure the exam room)
- Where safe/possible, liaise with senior leaders/invigilators in all examination rooms during a lockdown
- Assist with lockdown training for staff and candidates where applicable to the conducting of examinations

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

The role of the invigilator

- Be aware of the centre's lockdown procedure
- Complete attendance registers as soon as possible so candidates can be identified in the event of a lockdown
- Where safe/possible, to communicate with the exams office/officer during a lockdown to confirm the situation in a particular examination room
- Where safe/possible, not leave the examination question papers and candidates' scripts unattended/out of sight

Additional responsibilities : Not applicable

Changes for 2025/2026

(Replaced/Added) Introduction replaced with Definitions and reference to invacuation added throughout.

(Added/Removed) Reference to legislation - Martyn's Law and the Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025 – added.
Reference to RUN HIDE TELL removed.

(Added) Compliance section added.

(Added) New bullet points/optional insert fields added in various places for accepting/declining.

(Updated) Various insert prompts updated with additional information.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document

Appendix 20a

Learner's Examination Malpractice Procedure 25–26

1. The Allegation

Suspected malpractice by students

- 1.1. Examiners, moderators and external verifiers who suspect malpractice in an examination or assessment must notify the Academy Examination Manager. A full account of the incident **must** be submitted together with supporting evidence and an indication of which regulation or specification requirement has been broken.
- 1.2. Where suspected malpractice is identified by a centre, the head of centre must submit full details of the case at the earliest opportunity to the relevant awarding body.
- 1.3. 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; the Trust has established measures to ensure students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice. (More information can be found in **Appendix A** of this document)

The Trust emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(k) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/general-regulations/>), teachers and assessors must only accept work for qualification assessments which is 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 and AI use and marking sections below and Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work at the end of this document); 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.

JCQ guidance refers to AI tools and AI detection tools:

<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>. Examples of candidate AI misuse cases and marking candidate work where AI tools have been used can be found in JCQ appendices A (page 16) and B (page 18) [AI-Use-in-Assessments_Apr25_FINAL.pdf](#) (This JCQ guidance was first published on 26 April 2023. Version 2 was amended on 30 April 2025).

Form JCQ/M1 (suspected candidate malpractice) or **Form JCQ/M2a** (suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff) **must** be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of malpractice. Each form is

available from the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>

Notifications in letter format will be accepted providing the information given covers the same points as Form JCQ/M1 or JCQ/M2a.

- 1.4. Malpractice by a candidate in a coursework or controlled assessment component of a specification discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body but must be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.

Centres should not normally give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate's own work. If any assistance has been given, a note **must** be made of this on the cover sheet of the candidate's work or other appropriate place.

(Note: Centres are advised that if coursework or portfolio work or controlled assessment which is submitted for internal assessment is rejected by the centre on grounds of malpractice, candidates have the right to appeal against this decision. The JCQ website contains advice on the recommended procedures for appeals against internal assessment decisions.)

- 1.5. Awarding bodies are aware that the reporting of malpractice by a member of staff or a candidate can create a difficult environment for that staff member or candidate.

Accordingly, an awarding body will try to protect the identity of an informant if this is asked for at the time the informant gives information.

An awarding body will use such information in its investigation but will not present to the Malpractice Committee information from an informant who wishes to withhold his/her identity.

- 1.6. If the information is provided over the telephone, the informant will usually be asked to make the allegation in writing.
- 1.7. When an awarding body receives an allegation from someone other than the head of a centre (including anonymous reports),

the awarding body will evaluate the allegation in the light of any other available information, to see if there is cause to investigate.

2. The awarding body's response to an allegation of malpractice

- 2.1. In the case of notifications of suspected malpractice received from examiners, moderators, external verifiers, the regulator or members of the public (including whistle-blowers) the awarding body will consider the information provided and decide to:
 - take no further action; **or**
 - ask the head of centre, or another suitably qualified individual, to conduct a full investigation into the alleged malpractice and to submit a written report; **or**
 - investigate the matter directly.
- 2.2. The awarding body will notify the regulators as soon as it receives an allegation of a serious breach of security. The other awarding bodies which have approved that centre, and the police, may also be informed.
- 2.3. On receipt of a notification of suspected malpractice, submitted by a head of centre, the awarding body will consider the information provided and decide either:
 - to take no further action; **or**
 - if the notification takes the form of a Report, to make a decision on the case in accordance with the procedures, (where the evidence permits) – **see sections 8 to 13; or**
 - to ask the head of centre to carry out a further investigation as described in **sections 6.1 to 6.6** and provide further evidence; **or**
 - to investigate the matter further itself.
- 2.4. Regardless of whether the allegation of malpractice is proven or not, in order to ensure the integrity of, and public confidence in, future examinations/assessments, the awarding body may

undertake additional inspections and/or monitoring, and/or require additional actions

3. The investigation

Investigations carried out by the head of centre/appointed investigator

- 3.1 It will normally be expected that investigations into allegations of malpractice will be carried out by the head of centre. The head of centre should be with the investigation in a timely manner
- 3.2 Those responsible for conducting an investigation should establish the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true.
- 3.3 The head of centre should consider that both staff and candidates can be responsible for malpractice.

If the investigation is delegated to another **senior member of centre staff**, the head of centre retains overall responsibility for the investigation. In selecting a suitable **senior member of centre staff** the head of centre **must** take all reasonable steps to avoid a conflict of interest.

Where a conflict of interest may be seen to arise, investigations into suspected malpractice should not be delegated to the manager of the section, team or department involved in the suspected malpractice. In the event of any concerns regarding conflicts of interest or the suitability of the potential investigator, the head of centre should contact the awarding body as soon as possible to discuss the matter.

- 3.4 If a centre is reporting the suspected malpractice, the awarding bodies recommend that, as a minimum, the centre provides the accused individuals with a completed copy of the form or letter used to notify the awarding body of the malpractice.
- 3.5 Where the person conducting the investigation deems it necessary to interview a candidate or member of staff in connection with an alleged malpractice, the interviews must be conducted in accordance with the centre's own policy for conducting disciplinary enquiries.

- 3.6 The involvement of legal advisors is not necessary, at least where there is no allegation of criminal behaviour.

However, if any party wishes to be accompanied by a solicitor or trade union official, the other parties must be informed beforehand to give them the opportunity to be similarly supported. An awarding body will not be liable for any professional fees incurred.

The head of centre is required to make available an appropriate venue for such interviews. Interviews may also be conducted over the telephone. Individuals involved may be requested to provide a written statement.

4. Investigations carried out by the awarding body

- 4.1 An awarding body will not normally withhold from the head of centre any evidence or material obtained or created during the course of an investigation into an allegation of malpractice.

However, it may do so where this would involve disclosing the identity of an informant who has asked for his/her identity to remain confidential. In such cases, the awarding body will provide the evidence and material and will withhold information that would reveal the person's identity and will explain why the withheld information cannot be provided.

Any material or evidence not provided to the head of centre will not be provided to a Malpractice Committee and will not be considered when deciding whether an allegation of malpractice is proven or not.

- 4.2 If investigations reveal that candidates had prior knowledge of the content of an examination or assessment, the awarding body must establish whether information could have been divulged to candidates at other centres or to other unauthorised persons.
- 4.3 Sometimes it is necessary for the awarding body to interview a candidate during an investigation. If the candidate is a minor or a vulnerable adult, and if the interview is to be conducted face to face, the awarding bodies undertake to do this only in the presence of the head of centre, or other senior member of staff, or

the candidate's parent/carer or with the permission of the head of centre or parent/carer.

- 4.4 Interviews may also be conducted over the telephone.
- 4.5 When it is necessary for a member of the awarding body staff to conduct an interview with a staff member, the member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or advisor (who may be a representative of a teacher association or other association).
- 4.6 If the individual being interviewed wishes to be accompanied by a legal advisor, the other parties must be informed beforehand to give them the opportunity to be similarly supported.

The head of centre will be required to make available an appropriate venue for such interviews.

- 4.7 The individual being interviewed may also be requested to provide a written statement
- 4.8 When in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual whether a candidate or a member of staff, accused of malpractice, **must**:
 - be informed (preferably in writing) of the allegation made against him or her;
 - be advised that a copy of the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures can be found on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>
 - know what evidence there is to support that allegation;
 - know the possible consequences should malpractice be proven;
 - have the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations (if required);
 - have an opportunity to submit a written statement;

- be informed that he/she will have the opportunity to read the submission and make an additional statement in response, should the case be put to the Malpractice Committee;
- have an opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required);
- be informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him or her;
- be informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators, the Police and/or professional bodies including the Teaching Agency as appropriate

4.9 Responsibility for informing the accused individual rests with the head of centre. In certain circumstances it may be necessary for the head of centre to exercise discretion, in the light of all the circumstances of the case, as to the timing and the means by which an allegation of malpractice and the supporting evidence is presented to the individual(s) involved.

Full details of the awarding body's appeals procedures will be sent to the head of centre involved in an appeal.

5. The Report

- 5.1 After investigating an allegation of malpractice the head of centre must submit a full written Report of the case to the relevant awarding body.
- 5.2 The Report should be accompanied by the following documentation, as appropriate:
- a statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice, and details of any investigations carried out by the centre;
 - written statement(s) from the invigilator(s), assessor, internal verifier(s) or other staff who are involved;

- written statement(s) from the candidate(s);
- any mitigating factors;
- information about the centre's procedures for advising candidates of the awarding bodies' regulations;
- seating plans showing the exact position of candidates in the examination room;
- unauthorised material found in the examination room;
- any work of the candidate and any associated material (e.g. source material for coursework) which is relevant to the investigation.

5.3 Form **JCQ/M1 or Form JCQ/M2b** should be used as the basis of the Report.

The forms are available from the JCQ website -

<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>

Reports in letter format will be accepted providing the information given covers the same points as the form.

5.4 The awarding body will decide on the basis of the Report, and any supporting documentation, whether there is evidence of malpractice and if any further investigation is required. The head of centre will be informed accordingly

6. The decision

The Malpractice Committee

6.1 In order to determine the outcomes in cases of alleged malpractice awarding bodies may appoint a Panel or Committee composed of internal and/or external members experienced in examination and assessment procedures. Alternatively, this function may be allocated to a named member or members of staff. In this document the Committee (or awarding body personnel responsible for making decisions in malpractice cases) is referred to as the "Malpractice Committee".

The Committee may be assisted by an awarding body member of staff.

6.2 The following applies to the activities of the Malpractice Committee (or to the personnel acting in this capacity):

- The work of the Malpractice Committee is confidential.
- Members of the Malpractice Committee are required to identify any case of which they have personal knowledge or might be said to have some interest which could lead to an inference that the committee had been biased. Any member with a close personal interest will take no part in the discussion of the case and will not be present when the Malpractice Committee discusses the matter.
- Accused individuals, heads of centre and their representatives are not entitled to be present at meetings of the Malpractice Committee.

6.3 The key principle underpinning the composition of the Malpractice Committee is that it is independent of those who have conducted the investigation.

6.4 Awarding body staff who have directly investigated the case will play no role in the decision-making process.

6.5 No one who declares an interest in the outcome of the case will be present in the room when the case is considered.

6.6 Information supplied to the Malpractice Committee will be only that which is directly relevant to the case under consideration and which has been made available to the person against whom the allegation has been made, subject to redaction.

The person against whom the allegation has been made will be given the opportunity to make a statement to the Malpractice Committee in light of the material provided.

Making the decision - overview

- 6.7 In making a decision on any Report, the Malpractice Committee will establish that correct procedures have been followed in the investigation of the case, and that all individuals involved have been given the opportunity to make a written statement.
- 6.8 If satisfied, the Malpractice Committee will then seek to determine:
- whether the examination and assessment regulations have been broken;
 - where the culpability lies for the breach of regulations.
- 6.9 If the Malpractice Committee is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that malpractice has occurred, the Committee will then determine:
- appropriate measures to be taken to protect the integrity of the examination or assessment and to prevent future breaches;
 - the nature of any sanction or penalty to be applied.

Making the decision

Each case of suspected malpractice will be considered and judged on an individual basis in the light of all information available. Where there is an established, clearly evidenced, repeated pattern of behaviour this may be taken into consideration when determining whether a sanction should be applied.

The Malpractice Committee will seek to make decisions unanimously, but, if necessary, may decide by a majority.

- 6.10 The Malpractice Committee will consider, as separate issues:
- whether or not there has been malpractice; and
 - if malpractice is established, whether a sanction should be applied.
- 6.11 When making a decision in a case the Malpractice Committee will:

- identify the regulation or specification requirement which it is alleged has been broken;
- establish the facts of the case. Where there are conflicting statements the decision as to whether or not there has been malpractice is made by reference to the facts as disclosed by the papers, independent of any decision on sanctions;
- decide whether the facts as so established actually breach the regulations or specification requirements.

If a breach of regulations has occurred, the Malpractice Committee will establish who is responsible for this and;

- consider any points in mitigation;
- determine an appropriate level of sanction or penalty, considering the least severe penalty first.

6.12 The Malpractice Committee must be satisfied from the evidence before it that on the balance of probabilities the alleged malpractice occurred (i.e. that it is more likely than not). It is possible that the evidence in some cases may be inconclusive, but the awarding body may decline to accept the work of the candidates in order to protect the integrity of the qualification for the majority

6.13 In situations where a case is deferred because the Committee requires further information in order to make a determination, the deferral and the nature of the request will be shared with the investigation team and the individual against whom the allegation has been made.

6.14 In straightforward cases where the evidence is not contested or in doubt, awarding bodies may invoke a summary procedure. A sanction or sanctions may be applied and notified to an individual or centre following consideration of the case by an awarding body member of staff.

6.15 Sanctions and penalties applied under this summary procedure are subject to appeal, as are all other sanctions and penalties resulting from cases of malpractice.

Please see the JCQ publication A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals>

Centres/centre staff

The awarding bodies may investigate credible allegations that raise concerns about the failure to follow due procedures in the teacher assessed grade process.

Examples (for General and Vocational qualifications) include:

- A Head of Centre fails to submit the required declaration when approving and submitting their teacher assessment grades.
- A failure by a centre to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest (COIs) within a centre.
- Teacher assessment grades being released to learners (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results.
- A failure to submit teacher assessment grades, this might include situations in which centre staff have been unreasonably pressured into making changes to their teacher assessment grades.
- A failure to accurately report grades of completed units for vocational qualifications.

Examples of malpractice/maladministration, taken from Centre Policy advice include:

- Breaches of internal security.
 - Deception.
 - Improper assistance to students.
 - Failure to appropriately authenticate a student's work.
 - Over direction of students in preparation for common assessments.
 - Allegations that centres submit grades not supported by evidence that they know to be inaccurate.
 - Failure to engage as requested with awarding organisations during the External Quality Assurance and appeal stages; and failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and teacher assessed grades.
- All such instances of Malpractice or maladministration will be investigated and dealt with inline with this procedure.

Learners

It is possible that some learners may attempt to influence their teachers' judgements on their teacher assessed grades. Learners might try to do this by submitting false evidence of performance or by applying pressure. The awarding bodies anticipate that the majority of such instances will be dealt with by the centre internally. However, if the learner's behaviour continues then please inform the relevant awarding body using the JCQ M1 form. The awarding bodies will contact your centre directly if we receive credible allegations that such pressure has been applied.

Possible Consequences

The consequences of malpractice or maladministration as published in the JCQ guidance: *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* and including the risk of a delay to students receiving their grades, up to, and including, removal of centre status have been outlined to all relevant staff.

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

Appendix A – AI in Assessments and exams

This appendix will cover various aspects of AI and its use in assessments

What is AI and how is it used?	
What are the risks of AI?	
How can students use AI in assessments? / Acknowledging AI use	
What is AI Misuse by students?	
Our responsibilities as a Centre in relation to AI	
AI Use in marking	
Teachers and Assessors – Preventing AI misuse and informing candidates	
Teachers and Assessors – Identifying AI misuse in assessments	
Reporting AI Malpractice	

What is AI and how is it used?

AI use in this context refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments, which contributes to the award of qualifications.

When properly referenced, this can be acceptable, although students cannot be credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own so the benefit to them of using AI is likely to be limited and they risk committing malpractice if AI is misused.

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 tools available include:

- ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com/auth/login>)
- Jenni AI (<https://jenni.ai>)
- Jasper AI (<https://www.jasper.ai/>)
- Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)
- Bloom AI (<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)
- Gemini (<https://gemini.google.com/>)
- Claude (<https://claude.ai/>)
- Gauth (<https://gauthmath.com/>)
- Question AI (<https://questionai.com/>)
- Brainly (<https://brainly.com/>)

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

- Midjourney (<https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/>)
- Stable Diffusion (<https://stablediffusionweb.com/>)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (<https://openai.com/dall-e-2/>)
- Soundraw (<https://soundraw.io/>)
- Musicfy (<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)
- Runway (<https://runwayml.com/>)
- LTX Studio (<https://ltx.studio/>)

In accordance with section 5.3 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 applies to both internal and private candidates.

Student work submitted for assessment must be in their own words and not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool and must reflect their own independent work. Students must 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.

The requirements for students are set out in the documents:

- JCQ Information for candidates – Non-examination assessments
- JCQ Information for candidates – Coursework assessments

Students are informed of these by subject teachers, at the Exams Evening to which parents are invited and via JCQ posters which are posted around the school.

All teachers and assessors that have an NEA or coursework component in their course must read the following JCQ guidance and school policies:

- This malpractice policy including the Appendix A (AI in Assessments and Exams)
- The JCQ AI Documentation – AI Use in Assessments
- The JCQ AI Documentation – Instructions for conducting coursework
- The JCQ AI Documentation – Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments

Students are informed of these by subject teachers, at the Exams Evening to which parents are invited and via JCQ posters which are posted around the school.

What are the risks of AI?

While AI is becoming a useful tool in the workplace, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it is important students develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying and do not rely on AI.

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

If work submitted by a candidate has not appropriately acknowledged the use of AI, this constitutes malpractice, and the candidate will be sanctioned in accordance with the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).

How can students use AI in assessments? / Acknowledging AI use

It is essential students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and 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 must ensure they independently verify the AI-generated content – and reference the sources they have used.

Students acknowledging the use of AI and showing clearly how they have used it allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether the 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, student acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example:

ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2025.

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 included 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.

The JCQ guidance for teachers on referencing may be found in the following:

Plagiarism in Assessments ([Plagiarism in Assessments – JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications](#))

Students are reminded, as with any source, poor referencing, paraphrasing and copying sections of text may constitute malpractice, and could 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.

Students are also reminded if they use AI they have not independently met the marking criteria therefore they will not be rewarded.

What is AI Misuse by students?

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 they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Our responsibilities as a Centre in relation to AI

In accordance with section 5.3 of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/>), the Head of Centre is responsible for having arrangements in place to ensure that students' centre-assessed work is produced, authenticated and marked, in accordance with the awarding bodies' instructions. This applies to all candidates, including private candidates.

To ensure compliance with the regulations, teachers, assessors and other staff will:

- regularly review the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree their approach to managing use of AI by students in their school, college or exam centre.
- 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.
- make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.
- consider how to best communicate with parents/carers to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the centre's approach.
- share with students via subject teachers, at the Exams Evening to which parents are invited and via JCQ posters which are posted around the school.

and the school must:

- a) Explain to students the importance of submitting work that is a result of their own independent efforts for assessments, and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;
- b) Regularly review 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, how it should be acknowledged and how teachers will authenticate work);

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

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

e) Ensure 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 AI and the What is AI misuse by students sections);

f) Ensure, 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;

g) Ensure each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates ([Information for candidates documents - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications](#)) document;

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

i) Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice

j) Ensure teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work (see AI use and marking section below);

k) Ensure teachers and Heads of Department are clear about their responsibility to only authenticate and submit work for assessment by the awarding organisation that they are confident is the student's own;

l) Have a process in place for teaching staff to follow where misuse of AI is suspected **before** the student has signed the declaration form as this does not need reporting to the awarding organisation and must be dealt with in the centre directly (See Reporting AI below)

AI Use in marking

When marking student work in which AI use has been acknowledged, and there are no concerns of AI misuse, the assessor must still ensure the student is not

rewarded if they have used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria. Depending upon the marking criteria or grade descriptors being applied, the assessor may need to take into account the student's failure to independently demonstrate their understanding of certain aspects when determining the appropriate mark/grade to be awarded. Where such AI use has been considered, and particularly where this has had an impact upon the final marks/grades awarded by the assessor, clear records should be kept – this provides feedback to the student and provides clarity in the event of an internal appeal or the work being selected for moderation/standards verification

The School may determine, after careful consideration of any data privacy concerns, whether it is appropriate for their teachers and assessors to use AI tools to help mark student work. Where the school does permit AI tools to be used to mark student work, an AI tool cannot be the sole marker. A human assessor must review all the work in its entirety and determine the mark it warrants, regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. The assessor remains responsible for the mark/grade awarded.

Teachers and Assessors - Preventing AI misuse and informing candidates

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 information on what plagiarism is, how to prevent it, and how to detect it ([Plagiarism in Assessments - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications](#)).

Teachers and assessors must ensure that they have read and understood the above guidance ahead of undertaking any NEA and / or coursework with their students.

To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and students is key. Here are some actions which the school will put in place:

- a) Restriction of access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- b) Ensure 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, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be completed in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate all of each student's work with confidence;
- e) Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure work is underway in a planned and timely manner and 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 the student understands the material;
- g) Consider whether it is helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain they understand it and 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

Teachers and Assessors – Identifying AI misuse in assessments

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques teachers are already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that may be used. These different methods are explored 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. Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions. Where the work is made up of writing, it is possible to 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)

Private candidates

Verifying the authenticity of work submitted by private candidates can be more challenging for centres, given they may not have a good understanding of the standard the student is currently working at. Before accepting entries from a private candidate for a subject that includes NEA or coursework, the centre must consider the steps they will take that will enable the teachers/assessors to ensure the work submitted for assessment is the student's own independent work.

This may involve requiring the student to undertake some of the work under supervision, a review of the student's portfolio of evidence across a range of qualifications and a short discussion with the student regarding their work. Further guidance on authenticating student work can be found in the JCQ Instructions for conducting coursework (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework/>).

Potential indicators of AI misuse

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication the student has misused AI:

- a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.
- b) A default use of language or vocabulary which may not accord with the qualification level (though be aware AI tools may be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content).
- c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected (though some AI tools will produce quotations and references).
- 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 may be notable for some subjects.
- f) Instances of incorrect and/or 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 it.

- 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 themselves, 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.
- 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 and 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.

Automated detection

AI tools, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means AI-generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who tend to 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, for example:

- Copyleaks (<https://copyleaks.com/ai-content-detector>)
- GPTZero (<https://gptzero.me/>)
- Sapling (<https://sapling.ai/ai-content-detector>)
- Turnitin AI writing detection
(<https://www.turnitin.com/solutions/topics/aiwriting/ai-detector/>)

These may 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 will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students, as they base their scores on the predictability of words.

Spending time getting to know how the detection tools work will help teachers and assessors understand what they are and are not capable of.

AI detection tools, including those listed above, employ a range of detection models which vary in accuracy depending on the AI tool and version used, the proportion of AI to human content, prompt types and other factors (such as an individual's English language competency). In instances where misuse of AI is suspected it may be helpful to use more than one detection tool to provide an additional source of evidence about the authenticity of student work.

The use of detection tools, where used, should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information must be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns. Teachers will know their students best and so are best placed to assess the authenticity of work submitted to them for assessment – AI detection tools can be a useful part of the evidence they can consider.

The list of certain suppliers of AI-related products is not exhaustive.

Reporting AI Malpractice

If a student has not signed the declaration of authentication, centres do not have to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents are detailed in the main body of this document as part of the malpractice policy.

If the student has signed the declaration of authentication and is found to have misused AI in their assessment, the teacher or assessor must report this as malpractice to the Exams Officer so they can raise a malpractice allegation in line with the JCQ regulations with the Awarding Body.

Learner's Examination Malpractice Procedure for undertaking ASDAN qualifications

1. The Allegation

Suspected malpractice by students

- 1.1. Examiners, moderators and external verifiers who suspect malpractice in an examination or assessment must notify the Academy Examination Manager. A full account of the incident **must** be submitted together with supporting evidence and an indication of which regulation or specification requirement has been broken.
- 1.2. Where suspected malpractice is identified by a Centre, the head of Centre must submit full details of the case at the earliest opportunity to the relevant awarding body.
- 1.3. 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; the Trust has established measures to ensure students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice.

The Trust emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with ASDAN Malpractice and maladministration Policy and Procedures <https://www.asdan.org.uk/media/vp4j35df/asdan-malpractice-and-maladministration-policy-and-procedure-2025.pdf>, teachers and assessors must only accept work for qualification assessments which is 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 ASDAN 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 as per page 6 and 7 (2.1 Artificial Intelligence)
- 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 ASDAN awarding organisations' staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for identifying, reporting and investigating student malpractice, including the misuse of AI. Centres must submit the full details of the case at the earliest opportunity to ASDAN, using the Notification of malpractice or maladministration form. Copies can be found on the ASDAN website: asdan.org.uk or obtained by contacting ASDAN's Compliance team by email: compliance@asdan.org.uk or phone 0117 954 8316. Any additional evidence to support the allegation should be included with the form. Note: Centres must not give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate's own work, but if any assistance has been given, for example use of a scribe, a note must be made of this on the cover sheet of the coursework or other appropriate place. Should AI generated evidence be presented by a candidate for external moderation for any reason, the assessor is to note this on the candidate's assessment checklist and provide the rationale behind the decision to include the evidence.

- 1.4. Malpractice by a candidate in a coursework or controlled assessment component of a specification discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body but must be dealt with in accordance with the center's internal procedures.

Centres should not normally give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate's own work. If any assistance has been given, a note **must** be made of this on the cover sheet of the candidate's work or other appropriate place.

Note: Centres are advised that if coursework or portfolio work or controlled assessment which is submitted for internal assessment is rejected by the Centre on grounds of malpractice, candidates have the right to appeal against this decision.

- 1.5. Awarding bodies are aware that the reporting of malpractice by a member of staff or a candidate can create a difficult environment for that staff member or candidate.

Accordingly, an awarding body will try to protect the identity of an informant if this is asked for at the time the informant gives information.

An awarding body will use such information in its investigation but will not present to the Malpractice Committee information from an informant who wishes to withhold his/her identity.

If the information is provided over the telephone, the informant will usually be asked to make the allegation in writing.

- 1.6. When an awarding body receives an allegation from someone other than the head of a Centre (including anonymous reports), the awarding body will evaluate the allegation in the light of any other available information, to see if there is cause to investigate.

2. The awarding body's response to an allegation of malpractice

- 2.1. In the case of notifications of suspected malpractice received from examiners, moderators, external verifiers, the regulator or members of the public (including whistle-blowers) the awarding body will consider the information provided and decide to:
 - take no further action; **or** ask the head of Centre, or another suitably qualified individual, to conduct a full investigation into the alleged malpractice and to submit a written report; **or** investigate

the matter directly.

- 2.2. The awarding body will notify the regulators as soon as it receives an allegation of a serious breach of security. The other awarding bodies which have approved that Centre, and the police, may also be informed.
- 2.3. On receipt of a notification of suspected malpractice, submitted by a head of Centre, the awarding body will consider the information provided and decide either:
 - to take no further action; **or** if the notification takes the form of a Report, to make a decision on the case in accordance with the procedures, (where the evidence permits) - **see sections 8 to 13**; **or**
 - to ask the head of Centre to carry out a further investigation as described in **sections 6.1 to 6.6** and provide further evidence; **or**
 - to investigate the matter further itself.
- 2.4. Regardless of whether the allegation of malpractice is proven or not, in order to ensure the integrity of, and public confidence in, future examinations/assessments, the awarding body may undertake additional inspections and/or monitoring, and/or require additional actions

3. The investigation

Investigations carried out by the head of Centre/appointed investigation

- 3.1. It will normally be expected that investigations into allegations of malpractice will be carried out by the head of Centre. The head of Centre should be with the investigation in a timely manner.
- 3.2. Those responsible for conducting an investigation should establish the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true.
- 3.3. The head of Centre should consider that both staff and candidates can be responsible for malpractice.

If the investigation is delegated to another **senior member of Centre staff**, the head of Centre retains overall responsibility for the investigation. In selecting a suitable **senior member of Centre staff**

the head of Centre **must** take all reasonable steps to avoid a conflict of interest.

Where a conflict of interest may be seen to arise, investigations into suspected malpractice should not be delegated to the manager of the section, team or department involved in the suspected malpractice. In the event of any concerns regarding conflicts of interest or the suitability of the potential investigator, the head of Centre should contact the awarding body as soon as possible to discuss the matter.

- 3.4. If a Centre is reporting the suspected malpractice, the awarding bodies recommend that, as a minimum, the Centre provides the accused individuals with a completed copy of the form or letter used to notify the awarding body of the malpractice.
- 3.5. Where the person conducting the investigation deems it necessary to interview a candidate or member of staff in connection with an alleged malpractice, the interviews must be conducted in accordance with the center's own policy for conducting disciplinary enquiries.
- 3.6. The involvement of legal advisors is not necessary, at least where there is no allegation of criminal behaviour.

However, if any party wishes to be accompanied by a solicitor or trade union official, the other parties must be informed beforehand to give them the opportunity to be similarly supported. An awarding body will not be liable for any professional fees incurred.

The head of Centre is required to make available an appropriate venue for such interviews. Interviews may also be conducted over the telephone. Individuals involved may be requested to provide a written statement.

4. Investigations carried out by the awarding body

- 4.1. An awarding body will not normally withhold from the head of Centre any evidence or material obtained or created during the course of an investigation into an allegation of malpractice.

However, it may do so where this would involve disclosing the identity of an informant who has asked for his/her identity to remain confidential. In such cases, the awarding body will provide the evidence and material and will withhold information that would reveal the person's identity and will explain why the withheld information cannot be provided.

Any material or evidence not provided to the head of Centre will not be provided to a Malpractice Committee and will not be considered when deciding whether an allegation of malpractice is proven or not.

- 4.2. If investigations reveal that candidates had prior knowledge of the content of an examination or assessment, the awarding body must establish whether information could have been divulged to candidates at other center's or to other unauthorized persons.
- 4.3. Sometimes it is necessary for the awarding body to interview a candidate during an investigation. If the candidate is a minor or a vulnerable adult, and if the interview is to be conducted face to face, the awarding bodies undertake to do this only in the presence of the head of Centre, or other senior member of staff, or the candidate's parent/carer or with the permission of the head of Centre or parent/carer.
- 4.4. Interviews may also be conducted over the telephone.
- 4.5. When it is necessary for a member of the awarding body staff to conduct an interview with a staff member, the member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or advisor (who may be a representative of a teacher association or other association).
- 4.6. If the individual being interviewed wishes to be accompanied by a legal advisor, the other parties must be informed beforehand to give them the opportunity to be similarly supported.

The head of Centre will be required to make available an appropriate venue for such interviews.

- 4.7. The individual being interviewed may also be requested to provide a written statement
- 4.8. When in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual whether a

candidate or a member of staff, accused of malpractice, **must**:

- be informed (preferably in writing) of the allegation made against them.
- know what evidence there is to support that allegation.
- know the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
- have the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations (if required);
- have an opportunity to submit a written statement;
- be informed that he/she will have the opportunity to read the submission and make an additional statement in response, should the case be put to the Malpractice Committee;
- have an opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required);
- be informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him or her;
- be informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators, the Police and/or professional bodies including the Teaching Agency as appropriate.

4.9. Responsibility for informing the accused individual rests with the head of Centre. In certain circumstances it may be necessary for the head of Centre to exercise discretion, in the light of all the circumstances of the case, as to the timing and the means by which an allegation of malpractice and the supporting evidence is presented to the individual(s) involved.

4.10. Full details of the awarding body's appeals procedures will be sent to the head of Centre involved in an appeal.

5. The Report

5.1. After investigating an allegation of malpractice the head of Centre must submit a full written Report of the case to the relevant awarding body.

5.2. The Report should be accompanied by the following documentation, as appropriate:

- a statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice, and details of any investigations carried out by the Centre;

- written statement(s) from the invigilator(s), assessor, internal verifier(s) or other staff who are involved;
- written statement(s) from the candidate(s);
- any mitigating factors;
- information about the Centre's procedures for advising candidates of the awarding bodies' regulations;
- seating plans showing the exact position of candidates in the examination room;
- unauthorized material found in the examination room;
- any work of the candidate and any associated material (e.g. source material for coursework) which is relevant to the investigation.

5.3. The Report should ideally be completed on the standard template. Reports in letter format will be accepted providing the information given covers the same points as the template.

5.4. The awarding body will decide on the basis of the Report, and any supporting documentation, whether there is evidence of malpractice and if any further investigation is required. The head of Centre will be informed accordingly

6. The Decision

The Malpractice Committee

In order to determine the outcomes in cases of alleged malpractice awarding bodies may appoint a Panel or Committee composed of internal and/or external members experienced in examination and assessment procedures. Alternatively, this function may be allocated to a named member or members of staff. In this document the Committee (or awarding body personnel responsible for making decisions in malpractice cases) is referred to as the "Malpractice Committee". The Committee may be assisted by an awarding body member of staff.

6.1. The following applies to the activities of the Malpractice Committee or personnel acting in this capacity:

- The work of the Malpractice Committee is confidential.
- Members of the Malpractice Committee are required to identify any case of which they have personal knowledge or might be said

to have some interest which could lead to an inference that the committee had been biased. Any member with a close personal interest will take no part in the discussion of the case and will not be present when the Malpractice Committee discusses the matter.

- Accused individuals, heads of Centre and their representatives are not entitled to be present at meetings of the Malpractice Committee.

6.2. The key principle underpinning the composition of the Malpractice Committee is that it is independent of those who have conducted the investigation.

6.3. Awarding body staff who have directly investigated the case will play no role in the decision-making process.

6.4. No one who declares an interest in the outcome of the case will be present in the room when the case is considered.

6.5. Information supplied to the Malpractice Committee will be only that which is directly relevant to the case under consideration and which has been made available to the person against whom the allegation has been made, subject to redaction.

The person against whom the allegation has been made will be given the opportunity to make a statement to the Malpractice Committee in light of the material provided.

Making the decision – overview

6.6. In making a decision on any Report, the Malpractice Committee will establish that correct procedures have been followed in the investigation of the case, and that all individuals involved have been given the opportunity to make a written statement.

6.7. If satisfied, the Malpractice Committee will then seek to determine:

- whether the examination and assessment regulations have been broken;
- where the culpability lies for the breach of regulations.

6.8. If the Malpractice Committee is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that malpractice has occurred, the Committee will then determine:

- appropriate measures to be taken to protect the integrity of the

- examination or assessment and to prevent future breaches;
- the nature of any sanction or penalty to be applied.

Making the decision

Each case of suspected malpractice will be considered and judged on an individual basis in the light of all information available. Where there is an established, clearly evidenced, repeated pattern of behaviour this may be taken into consideration when determining whether a sanction should be applied.

The Malpractice Committee will seek to make decisions unanimously, but, if necessary, may decide by a majority.

6.9. The Malpractice Committee will consider, as separate issues:

- whether or not there has been malpractice; and if malpractice is established, whether a sanction should be applied.

6.10. When making a decision in a case the Malpractice Committee will:

- identify the regulation or specification requirement which it is alleged has been broken;
- establish the facts of the case. Where there are conflicting statements the decision as to whether or not there has been malpractice is made by reference to the facts as disclosed by the papers, independent of any decision on sanctions;
- decide whether the facts as so established actually breach the regulations or specification requirements.

If a breach of regulations has occurred, the Malpractice Committee will establish who is responsible for this and;

- consider any points in mitigation;
- determine an appropriate level of sanction or penalty, considering the least severe penalty first.

6.11. The Malpractice Committee must be satisfied from the evidence before it that on the balance of probabilities the alleged malpractice occurred (i.e. that it is more likely than not). It is possible that the evidence in some cases may be inconclusive, but the awarding body may decline to accept the work of the candidates in order to protect the integrity of the qualification for the majority.

- 6.12. In situations where a case is deferred because the Committee requires further information in order to make a determination, the deferral and the nature of the request will be shared with the investigation team and the individual against whom the allegation has been made.
- 6.13. In straightforward cases where the evidence is not contested or in doubt, awarding bodies may invoke a summary procedure. A sanction or sanctions may be applied and notified to an individual or Centre following consideration of the case by an awarding body member of staff.
- 6.14. Sanctions and penalties applied under this summary procedure are subject to appeal, as are all other sanctions and penalties resulting from cases of malpractice.

The awarding bodies value your cooperation with the assessed grade process and appreciate that you will be working hard to make sure this is a success. We are all eager to ensure that we issue results which are a fair and accurate reflection of learners' abilities. The integrity of the results are particularly dependent on robust procedures within schools and colleges.

There may be some instances where a few individuals fail to act appropriately in the conduct of the teacher assessed grade process. To support schools and colleges in these challenging times, we wanted to provide some information regarding when we might need to investigate.

Centre's/Centre staff

The awarding bodies may investigate credible allegations that raise concerns about the failure to follow due procedures in the teacher assessed grade process.

Examples (for General and Vocational qualifications) include:

- A Head of Centre fails to submit the required declaration when approving and submitting their teacher assessment grades.
- A failure by a Centre to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest

(COIs) within a Centre.

- Teacher assessment grades being released to learners (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results.
- A failure to submit teacher assessment grades, this might include situations in which Centre staff have been unreasonably pressured into making changes to their teacher assessment grades.
- A failure to accurately report grades of completed units for vocational qualifications.
- Centre staff malpractice could be contravention of, or continued failure to meet centre approval, or any of ASDAN's administration or quality assurance requirements;
- allowing evidence which is known by the staff member not to be the candidate's own to be included; or making claims for certification prior to the candidate completing all the requirements of the assessment.

Examples of malpractice/maladministration, taken from Centre Policy advice include:

- Breaches of internal security.
- Deception.
- Improper assistance to students.
- Failure to appropriately authenticate a student's work.
- Over direction of students in preparation for common assessments.
- Allegations that center's submit grades not supported by evidence that they know to be inaccurate.
- Failure to engage as requested with awarding organization during the External Quality Assurance and appeal stages; and failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and teacher assessed grades.

All such instances of Malpractice or maladministration will be investigated and dealt with inline with this procedure.

Learners

It is possible that some learners may attempt to influence their teachers' judgement on their teacher assessed grades. Learners might try to do this by submitting false evidence of performance or by applying pressure. The awarding bodies anticipate that the majority of such instances will be dealt with by the Centre internally.

However, if the learner’s behaviour continues then please inform the relevant awarding body. The awarding bodies will contact your Centre directly if we receive credible allegations that such pressure has been applied.

Possible Consequences

The consequences of malpractice or maladministration including the risk of a delay to students receiving their grades, up to, and including, removal of Centre status have been outlined to all relevant staff.

Signatory section: signed/dated by all ASDAN staff each academic year. This is retained in the ASDAN Centre File.

Name	Role	Signature

Appendix 20c: Malpractice Policy BTEC Procedures

[btec-policies-and-procedures.pdf \(pearson.com\)](https://www.pearson.com/uk/education/learning-centres/btec-policies-and-procedures.pdf)

BTEC Registration, entry & certification process

Aims

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

To do this, Meridian Trust schools will:

Register each learner to meet with Pearson requirements • Register each learner on the appropriate programme code, at the start of teaching and prior to any assessment activity • 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 registration data on Edexcel Online is accurate and up to date, including learner 'estimated completion dates' • Ensure learner entries for internal and/or external assessment are accurate and timely, meeting published deadlines • Provide a mechanism for programme leads to check the accuracy of individual learner entries • Ensure that certificate claims are timely to meet Pearson published deadlines • Audit certificate claims made to Pearson • Audit the certificates received from Pearson, to ensure accuracy • Keep all records safely and securely for three years post certification, in line with Pearson Terms and Conditions.

- For Centre specific procedures see the 25 – 26 Examination Policy

Registration, Transfer, Withdrawal, Internal/ external assessment entries, Unit Certification, Certification, Staff roles and responsibilities for each process, as appropriate Key dates & actions, Policy review & update and version control details.

Links to key Pearson documents that may be helpful when reading or using this policy & procedure:

[btec-policies-and-procedures.pdf \(pearson.com\)](#)

Entries & Information manual: this is published by Pearson each year and provides detailed information for Exams Officers about registration and certification procedures for all Pearson programmes on our website.

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-for-you/exam-officers-administrators/entries-information-manual.html>

Please note – Learners should be registered on Edexcel Online on the appropriate programme code, at the start of teaching and prior to any assessment of a BTEC qualification. Failure to do so will be in breach of your Terms of Approval and may result in sanctions being applied to your centre.

BTEC Assessment

Aims

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

To do this, Meridian Trust schools 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 evidence using only the published assessment and grading criteria
- Ensure assessment practices meet current BTEC assessment requirements and guidance
- 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 plagiarism & assessment malpractice
- Maintain accurate and detailed records of assessment decisions
- Maintain a robust and rigorous internal verification procedure
- Provide samples for standards verification/external examination/ moderation as required by Pearson
- Monitor standards verification/external examination/ moderation 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 • Maintain and store securely all assessment and internal verification records in accordance with Pearson Terms of Approval

- For Centre specific procedures see the 25 – 26 Examination Policy

BTEC Internal Verification

Aims

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

To do this, Meridian trust schools will ensure: • Where required by the qualification, appoint a Lead Internal Verifier appropriately for each subject area, who is registered, annually, with Pearson and has completed standardisation with the programme team • Each Lead Internal Verifier oversees effective internal verification 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 • Secure records of all internal verification activity are maintained • The outcome of internal verification is used to enhance future assessment.

Each Meridian Trust school will share the process for:

- LIV registration • OSCA accreditation / standardisation activities • IV schedules • Staff briefing / annual updating • IV of assignments • IV of assessment decisions • Maintenance of IV records • Standards verification (Entry to L3) / External Examination (L4-7) monitoring and review.

Links to key Pearson and documents that may be helpful for staff.

BTEC Centre Guide to Internal Verification

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/btec-centre-guide-to-internal-verification.pdf>

Assessment & Internal Verification templates

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/delivering-our-qualifications/delivering-btec-qualifications/btec-forms-and-guides.html#>

Lead Internal Verification

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/Quick-Guide-to-BTEC-Lead-internal-verifier.pdf>

Quality Assurance

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/btec-centre-guide-to-quality-assurance.pdf>

BTEC Appeals

Aims

1. To enable the learner to enquire, question or appeal against an assessment decision
2. To attempt to reach agreement between the learner and the assessor at the earliest opportunity
3. To standardise and record any appeal to ensure openness and fairness
4. To facilitate a learner's ultimate right of appeal to the Pearson and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (BTEC Level 4-Level 7 only), where appropriate
5. To protect the interests of all learners and the integrity of the qualification

To do this, Meridian Trust schools will:

- Inform the learner at induction, of the Appeals Policy and procedure
- Accurately record, track, and validate any appeal submitted
- Forward the appeal to Pearson when a learner considers that an assessment decision continues to disadvantage them after the internal appeals process has been exhausted
- Keep appeals records for inspection by the Pearson for a minimum of 18 months
- Have a staged internal appeals procedure
- Take appropriate action to protect the interests of other learners and the integrity of the qualification, when the outcome of an appeal questions the validity of other results
- Monitor appeals to inform quality improvement.

Each Meridian trust school will share details for

- Learner induction, informing them about the appeals procedure
- Stages of learner appeals procedure (both

internal and external stages) • Recording each stage of the appeals procedure • Monitoring appeals • Roles / responsibilities of staff within the process.

Links to key Pearson and documents that may be helpful for staff.

- Policies for centres, learners, and employees: This is Pearson's policy on learner appeals. Please note, this does not apply until internal centre processes have been exhausted <https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/appeals>
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/policies-for-centres-learners-and-employees/enquiries-appeals-pearson-vocational-qualifications.pdf>

BTEC Assessment Malpractice

Aims • To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners

- To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively
- To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness
- To report all alleged, suspected, and actual incidents of malpractice to Pearson
- To protect the integrity of this centre and BTEC qualifications

To do this, Meridian Trust schools will:

- Foster a culture in which all learners and staff feel able to report any concerns of wrongdoing by anyone
- Seek to prevent malpractice by using the induction period and the learner handbook to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the sanctions for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice
- Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources
- Require 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
- Advise learners of the centre's rules regarding whether AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT) can be used and, if so,
- Require learners to acknowledge the use of artificial intelligence (AI) sources and provide copies of any interactions with AI tools made in the production of their work
- Report to Pearson all alleged, suspected and actual incidents of malpractice in accordance with JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures (add link)
- Where required, gather information for an investigation in accordance with Pearson instructions. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre / Principal / CEO and all personnel linked to the allegation. Where malpractice is proven, Pearson will determine the sanctions to be imposed.

Learner Malpractice This list of examples is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism of any nature, including the misuse of AI tools. 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 to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test.

Staff Malpractice This list of examples is not exhaustive: • Improper assistance to learners • Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the learners' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made • Failure to keep learner coursework/portfolios of evidence secure • 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 • Failing to provide reasonable adjustments where these have been approved, such as having a scribe or reader • Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or fabrication • Improper certificate claims, e.g., claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment.

Artificial Intelligence

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; the Trust has established measures to ensure students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice.

[Centre guidance for dealing with malpractice and maladministration](#)

The Trust emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with BTEC Malpractice and maladministration Policy and Procedures, teachers and assessors must only accept work for qualification assessments which is 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 ASDAN 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 as per page 6 and 7 (2.1 Artificial Intelligence)
- 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 awarding organisations' staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for identifying, reporting and investigating student malpractice, including the misuse of AI. Centres must submit the full details of the case at the earliest opportunity, using the Notification of malpractice or maladministration form. Should AI generated evidence be presented by a candidate for external moderation for any reason, the assessor is to note this on the candidate's assessment checklist and provide the rationale behind the decision to include the evidence.

Candidate malpractice

If you discover any irregularity in the internally assessed elements of qualifications before a learner has signed the declaration of authentication, you don't need to report this to us. Instead, you should follow your centre's academic misconduct/malpractice policy in resolving the matter.

If you discover an irregularity after a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, or you suspect any malpractice by a candidate during an external assessment, you must submit full details of the case to us at the earliest opportunity by emailing a JCQ Form M1 with supporting documentation to candidatemalpractice@pearson.com.

Staff malpractice

If you suspect that a member of staff has committed malpractice or that maladministration of the qualification may have occurred, you must let us know by emailing a completed JCQ M2 Form to pqsmalpractice@pearson.com.

Our Investigations team will review the documentation that you provide and advise you on the next steps.

Further information

- [JCQ M1](#)
- [JCQ M2](#)
- [JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures](#)
- [JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments](#)
- [JCQ Public Interest Disclosure Act](#)

Each Meridian Trust school to share the process: • How you minimise the risk of learner malpractice • How you minimise the risk of staff malpractice • How you deal with malpractice • Informing Pearson of any malpractice.

Links to key Pearson documents that may be helpful for staff.

Guide for dealing with malpractice and maladministration. This is Pearson's guidance on dealing with assessment malpractice and maladministration.

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/exams/examination-guidance/malpractice.html>

BTEC Quality Assurance guidance for BTEC Level 2 and 3, which includes guidance on understanding and managing plagiarism

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/btec-centre-guide-to-plagiarism.pdf>

BTEC Collaborative arrangements

Aims 1. To ensure that all collaborative (consortia) arrangements are approved and meet requirements

2. To ensure delivery and assessment of each qualification delivered through the arrangement will meet the learning outcomes and assessment requirements set out by Pearson

3. To manage quality assurance processes to provide robust internal verification that fully meets Pearson requirements

To do this, Meridian Trust schools will • have a process in place to ensure that approval to deliver qualifications in partnership with another provider has been authorised by Pearson, prior to recruitment & the start of teaching of the qualification(s) • make sure that all providers have qualification approval before applying for approval under a collaborative arrangement • identify a Lead Centre for the collaborative arrangement, to coordinate the quality assurance for each

qualification delivered • ensure a Lead Internal Verifier (LIV) is registered annually for each qualification delivered • ensure that the LIV completes standardisation activities annually and undertakes appropriate standardisation training with all staff completing assessment and internal verification • make accurate learner registrations and claims under the appropriate consortium programme code and / or subsite • have appropriate policies and procedures for registration and certification of learners in place • ensure we have access to all quality assurance documentation linked to registered learners • ensure we have access to all learner progress and achievement records • be included / participate fully in regular evaluation and review of all qualifications delivered in the collaborative arrangement • retain all assessment evidence and quality assurance documentation relating to registered learners in line with Pearson requirements • participate in Pearson quality assurance monitoring through the Holistic Review and Standards Verification (SV) • complete and submit an Annual Quality Declaration to confirm that all required Centre Quality processes and procedures are in place and operating effectively. apply the outcomes of Standards Verification and support any essential actions required • ensure we / or the Lead Centre communicate any changes or amendments to the collaborative arrangement to Pearson, including adding or withdrawing from a collaborative arrangement and adding or withdrawing qualifications.

Each Meridian Trust school will share centre specific details for • Staff roles and responsibilities (i.e., Lead IV, Lead centre, assessors, IV, Exams Officers) • Staff updating/ briefing (i.e., standardisation; meetings; review & evaluation) • Standards verification review & monitoring.

Links to key Pearson documents that may be helpful for staff

- BTEC Centre Guide to Collaborative arrangements for vocational qualifications
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/btec-guide-to-collaborative-arrangements.pdf>
- Collaborative and consortia arrangements for vocational qualifications policy
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/policies-for-centres-learners-and-employees/collaborative-and-consortium-arrangements-for-the-delivery-of-vocational-qualifications-policy.pdf>
- Collaborative and consortia arrangements application form
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/policies-for-centres-learners-and-employees/collaborative-consortia-arrangements-application-form.pdf>

BTEC Distance and blended learning

Aims 1. To ensure that distance and / or blended learning delivery meets the guidelines set by Pearson.

2. To ensure that assessment methodology is valid, reliable and does not disadvantage any group or individual learners.

To do this, Meridian Trust schools will

- Ensure that teaching/delivery/assessment staff are timetabled to support blended learning when learners are working remotely
- Ensure there is a process to manage feedback on assignments, questions are constructively answered, and feedback is provided in a timely manner
- Ensure the setting of assignments is undertaken in the face-to-face sessions and that deadlines are clear
- Ensure that when learners submit work measures are taken to ensure the work is authentic and has been completed by the learner
- Maintain and store securely all assessment and internal verification records in accordance with Pearson Terms of Approval.

Each Meridian Trust school to share procedures for

- managing feedback on assignments
- constructive feedback in a timely manner
- submissions / resubmissions & retakes as appropriate
- authenticating learner's work
- minimising assessment malpractice / plagiarism
- secure storage of all assessment and internal verification records

Staff roles and responsibilities regarding support when learners are working remotely; Staff updating & training for remote delivery & assessment
Key dates & actions for processes & procedures
Policy review & update and version control details.

Links to key Pearson documents that may be helpful for staff

- Pearson guidance for Distance Learning and Blended Learning

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/policies-for-centres-learners-and-employees/Pearson-distance-assessment-and-learning-policy.pdf>

- BTEC subject specifications.

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/understanding-our-qualifications/our-qualifications-explained/about-btecs.html>

BTEC Special consideration and reasonable adjustments - *new*

Aims

1. To make reasonable adjustments where a disabled person would be at a substantial disadvantage in undertaking an assessment.

2. To ensure any Special Consideration adjustment to a candidate's mark or grade to reflect temporary injury, illness, or other indisposition at the time of the examination/assessment is submitted appropriately and timely.

3. To ensure that learners are not unfairly disadvantaged/advantaged during the assessment process

To do this, Meridian Trust schools will

Reasonable adjustments • Ensure any reasonable adjustment during an assessment reflects the normal learning or working practice of a learner in the centre or working in an occupational area • Only use mechanical, electronic, and other aids to demonstrate competence that are generally commercially available or available from a specialist supplier • Ensure any adaptations do not impact on any assessment standards or competence standards being assessed • Only use adaptations that are recognised in current JCQ guidance and contact Pearson for further guidance, if appropriate • Consider any reasonable adjustment on a case-by-case basis • Provide evidence of need if requested by Pearson • Inform the learner where a reasonable adjustment application has been submitted to Pearson • Record all reasonable adjustments made in relation to internal assessments on Form VQ/IA and make available to Pearson on request • Apply for reasonable adjustments to external assessments in line with deadlines published by Pearson. Special Considerations • Apply for any special consideration at the time of the assessment and in line with deadlines published by Pearson • Only apply for a special consideration if the situation meets current JCQ guidance. Only apply for special consideration if the centre is satisfied that there has been a material detrimental effect on the learner performance in external or internal assessment • Make any applications on a case-by-case basis • Inform the learner where a special consideration application has been submitted to Pearson • Submit special consideration requests to Pearson in line with the published requirements along with evidence requested to support the request • Make all applications for special considerations on the appropriate form as required by Pearson • Ensure all applications are authorised by the head of centre/ Principal/CEO.

Each Meridian trust schools will share procedures for • managing & recording applications • secure storage of evidence to support applications • completion & authorisation of applications for reasonable adjustments and / or special considerations.

Links to key Pearson documents that may be helpful for staff.

- JCQ forms for Access Arrangements, Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/>

- Special considerations



Meridian
Trust

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/exams/special-requirements/special-consideration.html>

- Reasonable adjustments for BTEC qualifications

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/exams/special-requirements/reasonable-adjustment.html>

- Access arrangements for Pearson qualifications Author: CQM Page 26 of 28
Version: 1.0 Approver: Head of Centre Management Date: 6 September 2023 Public

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/exams/special-requirements/access-arrangements.html>

- Pearson Support portal

<https://support.pearson.com/uk/s/>

- Supplementary guidance for Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/policies-for-centres-learners-and-employees/supplementary-guide-ra-sc-for-internally-assessed-units.pdf>



Managing Behaviour Policy (Exams)

Managing Behaviour Policy (Exams)

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	29/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	08/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	Jenny Warburton (Asst Head), Joseph Barker-Sherry (Deputy Head)

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that candidate behaviour in the examination room at The Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to GR, ICE and SMPP refer to the JCQ documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres, Instructions for conducting examinations** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm that candidate behaviour in the examination room at The Academy is managed in line with JCQ regulations.

1. Briefing candidates

To ensure candidates are aware of the standard of behaviour that is required in the examination room, The Academy will:

- ensure the JCQ **Information for candidates documents** (coursework, non-examination assessments, onscreen tests, social media and written examinations) and awarding body privacy notices are distributed to all candidates whether electronically or in hard copy format **prior** to assessments and/or examinations taking place. (GR 5.8)
- ensure candidates are also made aware of the content of the JCQ **Unauthorised items** and **Warning to candidates** posters (GR 5.8)
- prior to assessments and/or examinations taking place, ensure candidates are briefed on what they must and must not do when sitting written examinations and/or on-screen tests, and when producing coursework and/or non-examination assessments (GR 5.8)

At The Academy candidates are made aware of JCQ information/briefed by:

- An Exams Assembly is held towards the end of the Spring Term, led by a senior member of staff and supported by the Exams Manager. The assembly reinforces what candidates must and must not do when sitting written examinations and/or on-screen tests, and when producing coursework and/or nonexamination assessments. This is followed up by issuing each candidate with an Exam Information Pack, which includes the JCQ documentation which candidates need to be aware of. Parents are also sent a link to the pack so that they are also aware of what has been communicated to the candidates and can reinforce it.

2. Candidate malpractice

- 'Malpractice', means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations (SMPP 1.2)
- Suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice (SMPP 2)
- 'Candidate malpractice' normally involves malpractice by a candidate in connection with any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the completion of any examination (SMPP 2)
- Inappropriate behaviour by a candidate in the examination room or assessment session is deemed 'candidate malpractice'
- Failure by a centre to notify, investigate and report to an awarding body all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself (SMPP 1.7)

Examples of inappropriate behaviour/actions that constitute 'candidate malpractice' are provided in the final section of this policy.

3. Instructions for conducting examinations - Malpractice in the examination room

The following requirements are applied at The Academy:

- Candidates are under formal examination conditions from the moment they enter the room in which they will be taking their examination(s) until the point at which they are permitted to leave

Candidates must not talk to, attempt to communicate with or disturb other candidates once they have entered the examination room. If they do, this must be reported to the relevant awarding body

Candidates must not open the question paper until the examination begins. If they do, this must be reported to the relevant awarding body (ICE 19.1)
- Where a candidate is being disruptive, the invigilator must warn the candidate that they may be removed from the examination room. The candidate must also be warned that the awarding body will be informed and may decide to penalise them, which could include disqualification (ICE 24.1)

- The head of centre, or authorised members of staff, have the authority to remove a candidate from the examination room but should only do so if the candidate would disrupt others by remaining in the room (ICE 24.1)
- The head of centre must report to the awarding body immediately all cases of suspected or actual malpractice in connection with the examination (ICE 24.3)
- Where candidates commit malpractice, the awarding body may decide to penalise them, which could include disqualification. Candidates should be warned of the possible penalties an awarding body may apply as detailed in the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (ICE 24.4)
- In cases of suspected malpractice, examination scripts must be packed as normal and Form JCQ/M1 must be submitted separately to the relevant awarding body (ICE 24.6)

Additional information: Not applicable.

4. Roles and responsibilities

The role of the invigilator

- Be vigilant and remain aware of incidents or emerging situations, looking out for malpractice (ICE 20.2)
- Warn a disruptive candidate that they may be removed from the examination room (ICE 24.1)
- Record what has happened and actions taken on the exam room incident log (ICE 24.1)

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable.

The role of the exams office/officer

- Ensure that the JCQ **Information for candidates documents** (coursework, non- examination assessments, on-screen tests, social media and written examinations) are distributed to all candidates whether electronically or in hard copy format prior to assessments and/or examinations taking place and that candidates are also made aware of the content of the JCQ **Unauthorised items** and **Warning to candidates** posters (GR 5.8)
- Ensure the JCQ **Unauthorised items** and **Warning to candidates** posters are displayed in a prominent place for all candidates to see prior to entering the examination room (GR 5.8)
- Where a candidate is being/has been disruptive in the examination room, warn the candidate that the awarding body will be informed and may decide to penalise them, which could include disqualification (ICE 24.1)

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

The role of the head of centre

- Where a candidate is seriously disrupting others, makes the decision (or authorised members of staff make the decision) to remove the candidate from the examination room (ICE 24.1)
- Report to the awarding body immediately all cases of suspected or actual malpractice in connection with the examination by completing form JCQ/M1 (ICE 24.3)

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

The role of the senior leader

- Ensure support is provided for the exams officer and invigilators when dealing with disruptive candidates in examination rooms
- Ensure that internal disciplinary procedures relating to candidate behaviour are instigated, when appropriate

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Examples of 'candidate malpractice'

These include (but are not limited to):

Introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room

Own blank paper - used for rough work; used for final answers

Calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited) - not used; used or attempted to use

Bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format or prohibited annotations - notes/annotations go beyond what is permitted but do not give an advantage / content irrelevant to subject; notes/annotations are relevant and give an unfair advantage; notes/annotations introduced in a deliberate attempt to gain an advantage

Unauthorised notes, study guides and personal organisers - content irrelevant to subject; content relevant to subject; relevant to subject and evidence of use

Mobile phone or similar electronic devices (including iPod, MP3/4 player, memory sticks, smartphone, smartwatch, smart glasses, smart devices, AirPods, earphones and headphones) - not in the candidate's possession but make a noise in the examination room; in the candidate's possession but no evidence of being used by the candidate; in the candidate's possession and evidence of being used by the candidate

Watches (not smartwatches) - in candidate's possession

Breaches of examination conditions

A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination rules and regulations - minor non-compliance: e.g. sitting in a non-designated seat / continuing to write for a short period after being told to stop; major non-compliance: e.g. refusing to move to a designated seat / significant amount of writing after being told to stop; related non-compliance

Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security and integrity of the examinations - leaving examination early (no loss of integrity) / removing script from the examination room, but evidence of the integrity was maintained; removing script from examination room but with no proof that the script is safe / taking home materials; deliberately breaking a timetable clash supervision arrangement / removing script from the examination room and with proof that the script has been tampered with / leaving examination room early so integrity is impaired

Disruptive behaviour in the examination room or assessment session (including use of offensive language) - minor disruption lasting a short time / calling out, causing noise, turning around; repeated or prolonged disruption / unacceptably rude remarks / being removed from the examination room / taking another's possessions; warnings ignored / provocative or aggravated behaviour / repeated or loud offensive comments / physical assault on staff or property

Exchange, obtaining, receiving, or passing on information which could be examination related (or the attempt to)

Verbal communication - isolated incidents of talking before the start of the examination or after papers have been collected; talking during the examination about matters not related to the exam / accepting examination related information; talking about examination related matters during the exam / whispering answers to questions

Communication - passing/receiving written communications which clearly have no bearing on the assessment; accepting assessment related information; passing assessment related information to other candidates / helping one another / swapping scripts

Offences relating to the content of candidates' work

The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or portfolios - isolated offensive words or drawings; frequent offensive words or drawings / isolated obscenity or offensive comments directed at an individual or group; frequent obscenities / discriminatory language, remarks or drawings directed at an individual or group

Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from or reproduction of third party sources (including the internet and AI tools); incomplete referencing - minor amount of plagiarism/poor referencing in places; plagiarism from work listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged / or minor amount of plagiarism from a source not listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged; plagiarism from work not listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged / or plagiarised text consists of the substance of the work submitted and the source is listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged

(Taken from SMPP, Appendix 6)

Changes 2025/2026

(Changed) Various section reference numbers changed to reflect changes in ICE 24.

Changed) Under heading **Instructions for conducting examinations - Malpractice in the examination room** changed:

The head of centre has the authority to remove a candidate from the examination room but should only do so if the candidate would disrupt others by remaining in the room (ICE 24.3)

To: The head of centre, or authorised members of staff, have the authority to remove a candidate from the examination room but should only do so if the candidate would disrupt others by remaining in the room (ICE 24.1).

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Non-examination Assessment (including controlled assessment and coursework) Policy

Non-examination Assessment (including controlled assessment and coursework) Policy

Centre name	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	16/12/2024
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	08/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
SENCo (or equivalent role)	Parveen Jhali (Deputy SENCo)
Quality assurance lead/Lead internal verifier (or equivalent role)	Jenna Grey
Other staff (if applicable)	Chris Suckling (Deputy Head Academic)

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that non-examination assessment at The Academy are planned for and managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to NEA and ICC refer to the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting nonexamination assessments** and **Instructions for conducting coursework**.

Introduction

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

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

- task setting
- task taking
- task marking (NEA 1)

The regulator's definition of an examination is very narrow. In effect, a non-examination assessment (NEA) is classified as any type of assessment that is not:

- set by an awarding body
- designed to be taken simultaneously by all relevant candidates at a time determined by the awarding body, and
- taken under conditions specified by the awarding body (including conditions relating to the supervision of candidates during the assessment and the duration of the assessment)

'NEA' therefore includes, but is not limited to, internal assessment. Externally marked and/or externally set practical examinations taken at different times across centres are classified as 'NEA'. (NEA, Foreword).

Instructions for conducting coursework for use in CCEA GCE unitised AS and A-level qualifications, ELC and Project qualifications are provided in the JCQ document *Instructions for conducting coursework*.

Instructions for the setting, supervision, authentication, marking, internal standardisation and external moderation of non-examination assessments for use in the vocational and technical qualifications listed are provided in the JCQ document *Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (Vocational and Technical Qualifications)*.

Purpose of the policy

This policy confirms the JCQ requirement that The Academy has in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework, which includes how candidates' work will be authenticated.

Awarding bodies require centres to have a non-examination assessment policy in place 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 (NEA 1)

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

Where reference is made in these procedures to non-examination assessment, this is intended to include all non-examination assessment components, controlled assessment (where applicable) and coursework.

The basic principles

Head of centre role and responsibilities:

Returns a declaration (managed as part of the National Centre Number Register annual update) to confirm awareness of, and that relevant centre staff are adhering to, the latest version of **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** and **Instructions for conducting coursework**, and confirms:

- 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 (GCSE English Language) Spoken Language endorsement
- (where relevant to the centre) 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 (A Level Sciences) prescribed practical activities
- Ensures the centre's policy is fit for purpose and covers all types of non-examination assessment

- Ensures the centre's **internal appeals procedure** clearly details the process to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks) and requesting a review of the centre's marking

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Senior leader role and responsibilities:

- Ensure the correct conduct of non-examination assessment (including endorsements) which comply with the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments**, **Instructions for conducting coursework** and awarding body subject-specific instructions
- Ensure the centre-wide calendar records assessment schedules by the start of the academic year

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

QA lead/Lead internal verifier (or equivalent) role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

- Ensure subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities within the non-examination assessment process
- Ensure the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments**, **Instructions for conducting coursework** and relevant awarding body subject specific instructions are followed in relation to the conduct of non-examination assessment (including endorsements)

Work with the QA lead/Lead internal verifier (or equivalent role) to ensure appropriate procedures are followed to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Understand and comply with the general instructions as detailed in the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** and **Instructions for conducting coursework**
- Where these may also be provided by the awarding body, understand and comply with the awarding body's specification for conducting non-examination assessments and coursework, including any subject specific instructions, teachers' notes or additional information on the awarding body's website
- Mark internally assessed work to the criteria provided by the awarding body
- Ensure the exams officer is provided with relevant entry codes for subjects (whether the entry for the internally assessed component forms part of the overall entry code for the qualification or is made as a separate unit entry code) to the internal deadline for entries for the relevant exam series

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Signpost the annually updated JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** and **Instructions for conducting coursework** to relevant centre staff
- Carry out tasks where these may be applicable to the role in supporting the administration/management of non-examination assessments and coursework

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

1. Task setting

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Select tasks to be undertaken where a number of comparable tasks are provided by the awarding body or designs tasks where this is permitted by criteria set out within the subject specification
- Make candidates aware of the criteria used to assess their work

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Issuing of tasks

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Determine when set tasks are issued by the awarding body
- Identify date(s) when tasks should be taken by candidates
- Access set tasks in sufficient time to allow planning, resourcing and teaching and ensures that materials are stored securely at all times

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

2. Task taking

Supervision

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Check the awarding body's subject-specific requirements ensuring candidates take tasks under the required conditions and supervision arrangements
- Ensure there is sufficient supervision to enable the work of a candidate to be authenticated
- Ensure there is sufficient supervision to ensure the work a candidate submits is their own
- To ensure that where work may be completed outside of the centre without direct supervision, that the work produced is the candidate's own
- Where candidates may work in groups, keep a record of each candidate's contribution and it must be possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates
- Ensure candidates are aware of the current JCQ documents **Information for candidates - nonexamination assessments** and **Information for candidates - Social media**

Ensure candidates understand and comply with the regulations in relevant JCQ **Information for candidates** documents

Ensure candidates:

- understand that information from all sources must be referenced
- receive guidance on setting out references
- are aware that they must not plagiarise other material

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Advice and feedback

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- As relevant to the subject/component, advise candidates on relevant aspects before candidates begin working on a task
- Will not provide candidates with model answers or writing frames specific to the task
- When reviewing candidates' work, unless prohibited by the specification, provide oral and written advice at a general level to candidates
- Allow candidates to revise and re-draft work after advice has been given at a general level
- Record any assistance given beyond general advice and takes it into account in the marking or submits it to the external examiner
- Ensure when work has been assessed, candidates are not allowed to revise it

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Resources

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Refer to the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation to determine if candidates have restricted/unrestricted access to resources when planning and researching their tasks

Refer to the JCQ document **AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of**

Qualifications (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice) as well as the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation published by the awarding bodies and the regulator

- By referencing this document and the centre's malpractice policy, makes candidates 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
- Ensure conditions for any formally supervised sessions are known and put in place
- Ensure appropriate arrangements are in place to keep the work to be assessed, and any preparatory work, secure between any formally supervised sessions, including work that is stored electronically
- Ensure conditions for any formally supervised sessions are understood and followed by candidates
- Ensure candidates understand that they are not allowed to introduce improved notes or new resources between formally supervised sessions

Ensures candidates understand how all sources included in work that is submitted for assessment must be acknowledged

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Word and time limits

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Refer to the awarding body's specification to determine where word and time limits apply/are mandatory

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Collaboration and group work

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Unless stated otherwise in the awarding body's specification, and where appropriate, allow candidates to collaborate when carrying out research and preparatory work

- Ensure that it is possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates
- Ensure that where an assignment requires written work to be produced, each candidate writes up their own account of the assignment
- Assess the work of each candidate individually

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Authentication procedures - how candidates' work is authenticated

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

Where required by the awarding body's specification:

- ensure candidates sign a declaration confirming the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work
- sign the teacher declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met
- Keep signed candidate declarations on file until the deadline for requesting reviews of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later
- Provide signed candidate declarations where these may be requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector (Electronic signatures are acceptable)
- Where there may be doubt about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or if malpractice is suspected, follow the authentication procedures and malpractice information in the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** and/or **Instructions for conducting coursework** and inform a member of the senior leadership team
- Understand that if, during the external moderation process, it is found that the work has not been properly authenticated, the awarding body will set the mark(s) awarded by the centre to zero

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Presentation of work

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Obtain informed consent at the beginning of the course from parents/carers if videos or photographs/images of candidates will be included as evidence of participation or contribution
- Instruct candidates to present work as detailed in the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting nonexamination assessments/coursework** unless the awarding body's specification gives different subject specific instructions
- Instruct candidates to add their candidate number, centre number and the component code of the assessment as a header/footer on each page of their work
- Ensures if candidates' work is to be submitted electronically, that it meets the awarding body's specified requirements

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Keeping materials secure

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- When work is being undertaken by candidates under formal supervision, ensure work is securely stored between sessions (if more than one session)
- When work is submitted by candidates for final assessment, ensure work is securely stored
- Follow secure storage instructions as defined in the JCQ documents **Instructions for conducting nonexamination assessments/coursework**
- Take sensible precautions when work is taken home for marking

- Store internally assessed work, including the sample returned after awarding body moderation, securely until all possible post-results services have been exhausted
- If post-results services have not been requested, return internally assessed work to candidates (if requested by a candidate) after the deadline for requesting a review of results for the relevant series
- If post-results services have been requested, return internally assessed work to candidates (if requested by a candidate) once the review of results and any subsequent appeal has been completed
- Remind 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 (Remind candidates of the contents of the JCQ document **Information for candidates - social media**)
- Where work is stored electronically, liaise with IT to ensure the protection and back-up of candidates' work and that appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access to it between sessions
- 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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

IT role and responsibilities:

- Ensure appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates' work where work is stored electronically
- Restrict access to this material and utilises appropriate security safeguards such as firewall protection and virus scanning software
- Employ an effective back-up strategy so that an up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained
- Consider the contingency of candidates' work being backed-up on two separate devices, including one offsite back-up and implementing appropriate security arrangements which protect candidates' work in the event of IT system corruption and cyber-attacks
- Consider encrypting any sensitive digital media to ensure the security of the data stored within it and refers to awarding body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

3. Task marking - externally assessed components

Conduct of externally assessed work

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Submission of work

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Pays close attention to the completion of the attendance register, if applicable

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Provide the attendance register to the subject teacher where applicable
- Ensure the awarding body's attendance register for any externally assessed component is completed correctly
- Where candidates' work must be despatched to an awarding body's examiner or uploaded electronically, ensures this is completed by the date specified by the awarding body
- Keep a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series
- Package the work as required by the awarding body and attaches the examiner address label
- Ensure that the package in which the work is despatched is robust and securely fastened • Despatch the work to the awarding body's instructions by the required deadline

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

4. Task marking - internally assessed components

Marking and annotation

Head of centre role and responsibilities:

- Makes every effort to avoid situations where a candidate is assessed by a person who has a close personal relationship with the candidate, for example, 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)
- Where this cannot be avoided, ensures the possible conflict of interest is declared to the relevant awarding body and the marked work is submitted for moderation whether or not it is part of the moderation sample

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Attend/access awarding body training/updates as required to ensure familiarity with the mark scheme/marketing process
- Mark candidates' work in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body
(Does not use artificial intelligence as the sole means of marking candidates' work)
- Annotate 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
- Inform candidates of their marks which could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process

- Ensure candidates are informed of the timescale set by the subject lead or as indicated in the centre's internal appeals procedure 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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Internal standardisation

QA lead/Lead internal verifier (or equivalent) role and responsibilities:

- Ensure that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence
- Support staff not familiar with the mark scheme (e.g. ECTs, supply staff etc.) Ensure accurate internal standardisation - for example 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 meeting to make final adjustments
 - making final adjustments to marks prior to submission retaining work and evidence of standardisation • Retain evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Indicate on work (or cover sheet) the date of marking
- Mark to common standards
- Keep 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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Consortium arrangements for centre assessed NEA components

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

- Ensure a consortium co-ordinator is nominated (where this may be required as the consortium lead)
- If the consortium lead, liaise with the exams officer to ensure the relevant awarding body is informed that the centre is part of a consortium by submitting Form JCQ/CCA Centre consortium arrangements for centre-assessed work for each exam series affected
- Ensure procedures for internal standardisation as a consortium are followed

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Provide marks to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Provide the moderation sample to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Retain all candidates' work in the consortium until after the deadline for reviews of results for the exam series concerned or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities (where the centre is the consortium lead):

- Submit an online notification of Centre consortium arrangements for centre-assessed work to the relevant awarding body through the Centre Admin Portal (CAP) by no later than the published deadline for each exam series affected
- Submit marks for home centre candidates to the awarding body deadline
- (where relevant) Liaise with the other exams officers in the consortium to arrange despatch of a single moderation sample to the awarding body deadline

Submission of marks and work for moderation Subject teacher

role and responsibilities:

- Input and submit marks online, via the awarding body secure extranet site, keeping a record of the marks awarded, to the external deadline/Provides marks to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Where responsible for marks input, ensure checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensures mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors
- Submit the requested samples of candidates' work to the awarding body moderator by the external deadline, keeping a record of the work submitted/Provides the moderation sample to the exams officer to the internal deadline
- Ensure 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
- Ensure 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
- Submit any supporting documentation required by the awarding body/Provide the exams officer with any supporting documentation required by the awarding body

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Input and submit marks online, via the awarding body secure extranet site, keeping a record of the marks submitted, to the external deadline/Confirm with subject teachers that marks have been submitted to the awarding body deadline
- Where responsible for marks input, ensure checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensure mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors
- Submits the requested samples of candidates' work to the moderator by the awarding body deadline, keeping a record of the work submitted/Confirms with subject teacher that the moderation sample has been submitted to the awarding body deadline Ensure 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 successful 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
- Through the subject teacher, submit any supporting documentation required by the awarding body

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Storage and retention of work after submission of marks Subject teacher

role and responsibilities:

- Keep a record of names and candidate numbers for candidates whose work was included in the moderation sample
- Retain all marked candidates' work (including any sample returned after moderation) under secure conditions for the required retention period
- In liaison with IT, take steps to protect any work stored electronically from corruption and has a back-up procedure in place
- If retention is a problem because of the nature of the work, retain some form of evidence such as photos, audio or media recordings

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

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

Additional role and responsibilities: Not applicable

External moderation - the process

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

External moderation - feedback

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Access or signpost any moderator reports to relevant staff
- Takes remedial action, if necessary, where feedback may relate to centre administration

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

5. Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Work with the SENCo (or equivalent role) to ensure any access arrangements for eligible candidates are applied to assessments

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

SENCo (or equivalent) role and responsibilities:

- Follow the regulations and guidance in the JCQ document **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** in relation to non-examination assessment
- Where arrangements do not undermine the integrity of the qualification and is the candidate's normal way of working, ensure access arrangements are in place and awarding body approval, where required, has been obtained prior to assessments taking place
- Make subject teachers aware of any access arrangements for eligible candidates which need to be applied to assessments
- Work with subject teachers to ensure requirements for access arrangement candidates requiring the support of a facilitator in assessments are met
- Ensure that staff acting as an access arrangement facilitator are fully trained in their role

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

6. Special consideration and loss of work

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

Refer to/directs relevant staff to the JCQ document **A guide to the special consideration process**:

- Where a candidate is eligible, submits an application for special consideration via the awarding body's secure extranet site to the prescribed timescale
- Where application for special consideration via the awarding body's secure extranet site is not applicable, submits the required form to the awarding body to the prescribed timescale
- Keeps required evidence on file to support the application
- Refer to/directs relevant staff where applicable to **Form 15 - JCQ/LCW** (lost work) and where applicable submits to the relevant awarding body

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

7. Malpractice

Head of centre role and responsibilities:

- Understand the responsibility to immediately report to the relevant awarding body any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates or centre staff
- Ensures any irregularity identified by the centre before the candidate has signed the authentication statement (where required) are dealt with under its own internal procedures, with no requirement to report the irregularity to the awarding body (The only exception being where the awarding body's confidential assessment materials has been breached, the breach must be report to the awarding body)
- Is familiar with the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**

- Ensure that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing non-examination assessments or coursework are aware of the potential for malpractice and ensure that teaching staff are reminded that failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Is aware of the JCQ **Notice to Centre - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work**
- Ensure candidates understand what constitutes malpractice in non-examination assessments/coursework
- Ensure candidates understand the JCQ documents **Information for candidates - non-examination assessments/coursework assessments**
- Ensure candidates understand the JCQ document **Information for candidates - social media**
- Escalate and report any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice involving candidates to the head of centre

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Signpost the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** to the head of centre
- Signpost to relevant staff the JCQ **Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work**
- Signpost candidates to the relevant JCQ **information for candidates** documents
- Where required, support the head of centre in investigating and reporting incidents of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice

Additional responsibilities: Not applicable

8. Post-results services

Head of centre role and responsibilities:

- Is familiar with the JCQ document **Post-Results Services**
- Ensure the centre's **internal appeals procedure** clearly details the process to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against a centre decision not to support an application for a review of results or an appeal

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Is aware of the individual post-results services available for externally assessed and internally assessed components as detailed in the JCQ document **Post-Results Services** (Information and guidance to centres...)
- Provide/signpost relevant centre staff and candidates to post-results services information
- Ensure any requests for post-results services that are available to centre-assessed work are submitted online via the awarding body secure extranet site to deadline

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

9. Endorsements

Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications (designed for use in England) Head of centre role and responsibilities:

- Ensures new lead teachers undertake the required training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement
- Ensures relevant centre staff liaise with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of the monitoring visit

QA lead/Lead internal verifier (or equivalent) role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable.

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable.

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

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

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable.

Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences (designed for use in England) Head of centre role

and responsibilities:

- Ensures new lead teachers undertake the required training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement
- Ensures relevant centre staff liaise with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of the monitoring visit

QA lead/Lead internal verifier (or equivalent) role and responsibilities:

- Ensures arrangements are in place for implementing the requirements of the practical endorsement appropriately and applying the standards appropriately

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

- Confirms understanding of the Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences and ensures any relevant JCQ/awarding body instructions are followed
- Ensures where the centre intends to enter candidates for the first time for one or more of the A level subjects, the relevant awarding body will be contacted at the beginning of the course
- Undertakes any training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement
- Disseminates information to subject teachers ensuring the standards can be applied appropriately
- Liaises with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of a monitoring visit

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

- Ensures all the JCQ/awarding body requirements/instructions in relation to the endorsement are known, understood and followed
- Ensures the required arrangements for practical activities are in place
- Provides all the required centre records
- Ensures candidates provide the required records
- Provides any required information to the subject lead regarding the monitoring visit
- Assesses candidates using Common Practical Assessment Criteria (CPAC)
- Applies for an exemption where a candidate cannot access the practical endorsement due to a substantial impairment
- Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates Pass or Not Classified assessment outcome/provides assessment outcomes to the exams officer to the internal deadline

Exams office/officer role and responsibilities:

- Accepts contact with the monitor and passes information to the subject lead for a visit to be arranged with at least two weeks notice
- Confirms with the subject teacher that assessment outcomes have been submitted to the awarding body to the external deadline/Follows the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates Pass or Not Classified assessment outcome

10. Private candidates

Subject lead role and responsibilities:

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

11. Qualification/Subject specific additional information

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

12. Qualification/Subject specific additional information

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

GCE/GCSE Art & Design

- JCQ's Instructions for conducting examinations are followed for the conduct of externally set components

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) Under heading **Introduction** added reference to the new JCQ document **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (VTQs)** (and added various signposts to this document throughout).

(Reworded) Under heading **Introduction** reworded information about coursework.

(Added) Under heading **Purpose of the policy** added reference that the policy includes how candidates' work will be authenticated.

(Added) Under heading **Resources** (Subject teacher) added a new bullet point to reference ensuring candidates understand how all sources included in work that is submitted for assessment must be acknowledged.

(Changed) Heading **Authentication procedures** title has been extended - and added subject teacher ensuring that candidates sign the declaration as soon as they have completed the assessment.

(Changed) Heading **Consortium arrangements** title has been extended.

(Changed) Under headings **Procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessment identifying staff roles and responsibilities** and **Management of issues and potential risks associated with non-examination assessment** added reference that these procedures relate to all non-examination assessments.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.

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

Reference to non-examination assessment is intended to include any specifications with one or more non-examination assessment component or unit, controlled assessment (where applicable) and coursework.

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Centre staff malpractice	Records confirm that relevant centre staff are familiar with and follow the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments and the JCQ document Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates' work .	Exams Officer
Candidate malpractice	<p>Records confirm that candidates are informed and understand they must not: submit work which is not their own / make available their work to other candidates through any medium / allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material / assist other candidates to produce work / use books, the internet, AI 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.</p> <p>Records confirm that candidates have been made aware of the JCQ documents Information for candidates - nonexamination assessments/coursework and Information for candidates – social media - and understand they must not post their work on social media</p>	Exams Officer / HOD
Task setting		
Awarding body set task: IT failure/corruption of task details where set task details accessed from the awarding body online	<p>Awarding body key date for accessing/downloading set task noted prior to start of course</p> <p>IT systems checked prior to key date</p> <p>Alternative IT system used to gain access</p>	Exams Officer / IT

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
	Awarding body contacted to request direct email of task details	
Centre set task: Subject teacher fails to meet the assessment criteria as detailed in the specification	<p>Ensures that subject teachers access awarding body training information, practice materials etc.</p> <p>Records confirmation that subject teachers understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body's specification</p> <p>Samples assessment criteria in the centre set task</p>	Exams Officer / HOD
Candidates do not understand the marking criteria and what they need to do to gain credit	<p>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</p> <p>Records confirm all candidates understand the marking criteria</p> <p>Candidates confirm/record they understand the marking criteria</p>	Subject Teacher / Curriculum Leader
Subject teacher long term absence during the task setting stage	See centre's contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence)	Not Applicable
Issuing of tasks		

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Awarding body set task not issued to candidates on time	<p>Awarding body key date for accessing set task as detailed in the specification noted prior to start of course</p> <p>Course information issued to candidates contains details when set task will be issued and needs to be completed by</p> <p>Set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching</p>	Curriculum Leader
The wrong task is given to candidates	<p>Ensures course planning and information taken from the awarding body's specification confirms the correct task will be issued to candidates</p> <p>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</p>	HOD
Subject teacher long term absence during the issuing of tasks stage	See centre's examination contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence)	Not Applicable
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>Ensures the candidate's presentation does not form part of the sample which will be recorded</p> <p>Contacts the awarding body at the earliest opportunity where unable to record the required number of candidates for the monitoring sample</p>	Exams Officer / Safeguarding
Task taking		

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Supervision		
Planned assessments clash with other centre or candidate activities	<p>Assessment plan identified for the start of the course</p> <p>Assessment dates/periods included in centre wide calendar</p>	Exams Officer / HOD
Rooms or facilities inadequate for candidates to take tasks under appropriate supervision	<p>Timetabling organised to allocate appropriate rooms and IT facilities for the start of the course</p> <p>Staggered sessions arranged where IT facilities insufficient for number of candidates</p> <p>Whole cohort to undertake written task in large exam venue at the same time (exam conditions do not apply)</p>	Exams Officer / HOC
Insufficient supervision of candidates to enable work to be authenticated	<p>Confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow the current JCQ document Instructions for conducting nonexamination assessments and any other specific instructions detailed in the awarding body's specification in relation to the supervision of candidates</p> <p>Confirm subject teachers understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy</p>	Exams Officer
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (9. Malpractice) / Instructions for conducting coursework (6. Malpractice in coursework) are followed	Exams Officer / HOC

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
	An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed	
Access arrangements were not put in place for an assessment where a candidate is approved for arrangements	Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process (section 2), to determine the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for the candidate	Exams Officer / SENCO
Advice and feedback		
Candidate claims appropriate advice and feedback not given by subject teacher prior to starting on their work	<p>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</p> <p>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity</p> <p>Full records kept detailing all information and advice given to candidates prior to starting on their work as appropriate to the subject and component</p> <p>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given prior to starting on their work</p>	HOD
Candidate claims no advice and feedback given by subject teacher during the task-taking stage	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 procedure	HOD / HOC

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
	<p>Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity</p> <p>Full records kept detailing all advice and feedback given to candidates during the task-taking stage as appropriate to the subject and component</p> <p>Candidate confirms/records advice and feedback given during the task-taking stage</p>	
<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>	<p>An investigation is conducted; candidates and subject teacher are interviewed and statements recorded where relevant</p> <p>Records as detailed above are provided to confirm all assistance given</p> <p>Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body</p>	<p>Exams Officer / HOC</p>
<p>Candidate does not reference information from published source</p>	<p>Candidate is advised at a general level to reference information before work is submitted for formal assessment</p> <p>Candidate is again referred to the JCQ documents Information for candidates: non-examination assessments/coursework assessments</p> <p>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</p>	<p>Subject Teacher</p>

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Candidate does not set out references as required	<p>Candidate is advised at a general level to review and redraft the set out of references before work is submitted for formal assessment</p> <p>Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments/coursework assessments</p> <p>Candidate's detailed record of his/her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</p>	Subject Teacher
Candidate joins the course late after formally supervised task taking has started	A separate supervised session(s) is arranged for the candidate to catch up	Subject Teacher
Candidate moves to another centre during the course	Awarding body guidance is sought to determine what can be done depending on the stage at which the move takes place	Exams Officer
An excluded pupil wants to complete his/her nonexamination assessment(s)	<p>The awarding body specification is checked to determine if the specification is available to a candidate outside mainstream education</p> <p>If so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate</p>	HOC / Exams Officer
Resources		

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
<p>A candidate augments notes and resources between formally supervised sessions</p>	<p>Preparatory notes and the work to be assessed are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions</p> <p>Where memory sticks are used by candidates, these are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions</p> <p>Where work is stored on the centre's network, access for candidates is restricted between formally supervised sessions</p>	<p>Subject Teacher</p>
<p>A candidate fails to acknowledge sources on work that is submitted for assessment</p>	<p>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</p> <p>Awarding body guidance is sought on whether the work of the candidate should be marked where candidate's detailed records acknowledges sources appropriately</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Subject Teacher / Exams Officer</p>
<p>Word and time limits</p>		
<p>A candidate is penalised by the awarding body for exceeding word or time limits</p>	<p>Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if word or time limits are mandatory</p>	<p>Subject Teacher</p>

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
	<p>Where limits are for guidance only, candidates are discouraged from exceeding them</p> <p>Candidates confirm/record any information provided to them on word or time limits is known and understood</p>	
<p>Collaboration and group work</p>		
<p>Candidates have worked in groups where the awarding body specification states this is not permitted</p>	<p>Records confirm the awarding body specification has been checked to determine if group work is permitted</p> <p>Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</p>	<p>Subject Teacher</p>
<p>Authentication procedures</p>		
<p>A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment</p> <p>Candidate plagiarises other material</p>	<p>Records confirm subject staff have been made aware of the JCQ document Notice to Centres - Sharing NEA material and candidates</p> <p>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: nonexamination assessments/coursework assessments</p> <p>Candidates confirm/record that they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for nonexamination assessments as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</p>	<p>Exams Officer / HOD</p>

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
	<p>The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment</p> <p>A mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body</p>	
<p>Candidate does not sign their authentication statement/declaration</p>	<p>Records confirm that candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: nonexamination assessments/coursework assessments</p> <p>Candidates confirm/record they understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations as outlined in the JCQ document Information for candidates: nonexamination assessments/coursework assessments</p> <p>Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</p>	<p>Subject Teacher / Exams Officer</p>
<p>Subject teacher not available to sign authentication forms</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>HOD</p>
<p>Presentation of work</p>		
<p>Candidate does not fully complete the awarding body's cover sheet that is attached to their worked submitted for formal assessment</p>	<p>Cover sheet is checked to ensure it is fully completed before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</p>	<p>Subject Teacher / Exams Officer</p>

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Keeping materials secure		
Candidates work between formal supervised sessions is not securely stored	<p>Records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow current JCQ document Instructions for conducting nonexamination assessments</p> <p>Regular monitoring/internal audit ensures subject teacher use of appropriate secure storage</p>	HOD
Adequate secure storage not available to subject teacher	<p>Records confirm adequate/sufficient secure storage is available to subject teacher prior to the start of the course</p> <p>Alternative secure storage sourced where required</p>	HOD / Exams Officer
Candidates work produced electronically is not securely stored	<p>Records confirm subject teachers are aware of and follow current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting nonexamination assessments</p> <p>Internal processes and regular monitoring/internal audit by IT Manager ensures access to this material is restricted; appropriate security safeguards are in place; an effective back-up strategy is employed so that an up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained; any sensitive digital media is encrypted (according to awarding body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable) to ensure the security of the data stored within it</p> <p>Additional details:</p>	HOD / IT

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
Task marking – externally assessed components		
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an acceptable reason	<p>Awarding body guidance is sought to determine if alternative assessment arrangements can be made for the candidate</p> <p>If not, eligibility for special consideration is explored and a request submitted to the awarding body where appropriate</p>	Exams Officer
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason	The candidate is marked absent on the attendance register	HOD / Exams Officer
Task marking – internally assessed components		
A candidate submits little or no work	<p>Where a candidate submits no work, the candidate is recorded as absent when marks are submitted to the awarding body</p> <p>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</p>	Subject Teacher / Exams Officer
A candidate is unable to finish their work for unforeseen reason	Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide to the special consideration process (5) , to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for shortfall in work	Subject Teacher / Exams Officer

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ documents Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (8) / Instructions for conducting coursework (16) , to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for lost or damaged work	Not Applicable
Candidate malpractice is discovered	<p>Instructions and processes in the current JCQ documents Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (9. Malpractice) / Instructions for conducting coursework (6. Malpractice in coursework) are followed</p> <p>Investigation and reporting procedures in the current JCQ document Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures are followed</p> <p>Appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed</p>	HOC
A teacher assesses the work of a candidate with whom they have a close personal 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)	<p>A possible conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body before the published deadline for entries for each examination series</p> <p>Marked work of said candidate is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not</p>	Exams Officer
An extension to the deadline for submission of marks is required for a legitimate reason	<p>Awarding body is contacted to determine if an extension can be granted</p> <p>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ document A guide</p>	Exams Officer

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
	<p>to the special consideration process (5), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for an extension</p>	
<p>After submission of marks, it is discovered that the wrong task was given to candidates</p>	<p>Awarding body is contacted for guidance</p> <p>Relevant staff are signposted to the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (section 2), to determine eligibility and the process to be followed to apply for special consideration for candidates</p>	<p>Subject Teacher / Exams Officer</p>
<p>A candidate wishes to appeal/request a review of the marks awarded for their work by their teacher</p>	<p>Candidates are informed of the marks they have been awarded for their work prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body</p> <p>Records confirm candidates have been informed of their marks</p> <p>Candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process</p> <p>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</p> <p>Through the candidate exam handbook, candidates are made aware of the centre's internal appeals procedure 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</p>	<p>Subject Teacher</p>
<p>Deadline for submitting work</p>	<p>Records confirm deadlines given and understood by</p>	<p>Subject</p>

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue/mitigate risk	Action by
for formal assessment not met by candidate	<p>candidates at the start of the course</p> <p>Candidates confirm/record deadlines known and understood</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p>	Teacher
Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by subject teacher	<p>Internal/external deadlines are published at the start of each academic year</p> <p>Reminders are issued through senior leaders/subject heads as deadlines approach</p> <p>Records confirm deadlines known and understood by subject teachers</p> <p>Where appropriate, internal disciplinary procedures are followed</p>	HOD
Subject teacher long term absence during the marking period	See centre's contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence)	Not Applicable



Meridian Trust

Overnight Supervision Arrangements Policy

Overnight Supervision Arrangements Policy

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	29/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	08/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that overnight supervision arrangements at the Academy are awarded and managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to ICE refer to the JCQ document **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Purpose of the policy

This purpose of this policy is to confirm that The Academy:

- follows the correct procedures when considering the arrangements for a candidate entered for multiple examinations timetabled for the same day
- reserves the right to exercise discretion when considering allowing a candidate to take an examination the following morning
- has appropriate arrangements in place to maintain the security and integrity of the examination(s)

1. Overnight supervision arrangements

When candidates are entered for multiple examinations (three or more examinations) timetabled for the same day and the total duration for those papers is:

- more than six hours for GCE examinations (AS, A2, A-level), including approved extra time allowances and/or supervised rest breaks, or
- more than five and a half hours for GCSE examinations, including approved extra time allowances and/or supervised rest breaks

candidates may, at the centre's discretion, be allowed to take an examination scheduled for the afternoon session the following morning, including Saturdays. (ICE 8.1)

- These arrangements do not apply where a GCSE candidate has five and a half hours or less of examinations in one day or where a GCE AS or A-level candidate has six hours or less of examinations in one day (ICE 8.3)
- Overnight supervision arrangements should only be applied as a last resort and once all other options have been exhausted (ICE 8)
- The head of centre must be satisfied with any arrangement for overnight supervision of a candidate where necessary and must accept full responsibility for the security of the examination throughout (ICE 8)
- Candidates are not allowed to take examinations on an earlier day than that scheduled on the timetable (ICE 8.1)
- The overnight supervision arrangements must ensure that the candidate does not have advance warning of the content of the examination that is deferred until the following morning. This means the candidate must not meet or communicate with anyone who may have knowledge of the content. This includes email, internet, online streaming services, printed media, radio, social media (including messaging apps), telephone or television (ICE 8.6)
- If the candidate opts to sit all examinations in one day, then the supervised break between each examination can be more than 20 minutes. The supervised break may be conducted in an alternative location within the centre.

Where the supervised break is conducted outside of the examination room, the candidate may revise using their own resources. However, the candidate must not:

- be in possession of an electronic communication or storage device or have access to the internet
- have contact with any candidate who has sat the examination
- be coached by a member of centre staff

A member of centre staff, or an invigilator, must always be in the same room as the candidate. The invigilator must not be the subject teacher for the rescheduled examination. (ICE 8.2)

2. Roles and responsibilities

The role of the head of centre

- Ensure where a candidate takes an examination the following morning, a member of centre staff or an invigilator is appointed to supervise the candidate at all times while the candidate is on the premises sitting examinations (ICE 8.4)
- Be satisfied that the arrangements maintain the integrity and security of the examination (ICE 8.8)
- Inform the relevant awarding body immediately of any known or suspected contravention of the arrangements for overnight supervision of a candidate (ICE 8.8)

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable.

2. Roles and responsibilities

The role of the exams office/officer

- Discuss with an affected candidate all possible options to resolve, within the same day, their timetable clash of multiple examinations, only applying overnight supervision arrangements as a last resort and once all other options have been exhausted (ICE 8)
- Rearrange any examination that cannot be taken in the scheduled afternoon session for the following morning, ensuring if an examination is deferred from Friday afternoon, it is taken the following morning i.e. Saturday morning (ICE 8.10)
- Ensure the JCQ **Overnight Supervision** and **Overnight Supervision Declaration** forms are completed before the overnight supervision is to commence (ICE 8.7)
- Confirm the supervision of a candidate on journeys to and from the centre and overnight may be undertaken by the candidate's parent/carer or centre staff, determining a method of supervision which ensures the candidate's wellbeing (ICE 8.5)
- Download the JCQ **Overnight Supervision Declaration** form for signing by the candidate, the supervisor and the head of centre (ICE 8.7)
- Inform the parties involved that any infringement of the conditions governing overnight supervision arrangements may lead to the awarding body being unable to accept the script and/or the application of sanctions as detailed in the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (ICE 8.8)
- Keep all completed forms available for inspection until the deadline for reviews of marking has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later, and not send to an awarding body, unless specifically requested (ICE 8.8)
- Ensure where a candidate takes an examination the following morning, the candidate is under centre supervision from 30 minutes after the awarding body's published starting time for the delayed examination and ensure there is no contact with other candidates (ICE 8.4)
- If a candidate is allowed to take an examination on a later day than other candidates at the centre, ensure all copies of the question paper used on the scheduled day of the examination are sealed in an envelope and returned to the centre's secure storage facility until all candidates have taken the examination (ICE 8.11)

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable.

Changes 2025/2026

(Updated) References to sections of ICE 8 where these have been changed in ICE 2025-2026.

(Added) Bullet point under heading **Overnight supervision arrangements** to reflect change to ICE 8.2.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in October 2025, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.



Meridian Trust

Special Consideration Policy

Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	16/12/2024
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	28/10/2025
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
SENCo (or equivalent role)	Parveen Jhali (Deputy SENCo)
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that the special consideration process at The Academy is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to GR, SC and ICE refer to the JCQ documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres**, **A guide to the special consideration process** and **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Introduction

Special consideration can only be awarded where a candidate has been fully prepared for assessments and covered the entire course but their ability to demonstrate their subject knowledge and understanding is materially affected by adverse circumstances beyond their control at the time of the assessment(s).

A centre must decide whether the candidate meets the published criteria for special consideration. An awarding body cannot determine the candidate's eligibility and make the decision for the centre.

Applications must only be processed where they are supported by the centre and the candidate meets the published criteria for special consideration with evidence in place.

If the centre does not support an online application for special consideration, then it must not be submitted to the relevant awarding body or bodies. Speculative applications for special consideration cannot be accepted.

Where a candidate does not meet the published criteria for special consideration, the awarding body will reject the application and provide clear reasons for doing so.

Centres must not submit applications for special consideration for trivial cases.

Special consideration can only go some way to assist a candidate affected by a potentially wide range of difficulties, emotional or physical, which may influence performance in their assessments. It cannot remove the difficulty faced by the candidate. This means that there will be some situations where candidates should not be entered for a qualification or a unitised examination. This is because only minor adjustments can be made to the mark awarded. To make larger adjustments would jeopardize the standard of the qualification. (SC 1)

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to identify roles and responsibilities within the special consideration process and confirms The Academy will submit an application for special consideration where a candidate meets the published criteria. (GR 5.9)

Eligibility for special consideration

- Candidates will be eligible for special consideration if they have been fully prepared and have covered the whole course but performance in the examination, or in the production of coursework or non-examination assessment, is materially affected by adverse circumstances beyond their control (SC 2.1)
- Special consideration must be applied for at the time of the assessment (SC 2)
- Candidates will not be eligible for special consideration if preparation for, or performance in the examination is affected by the reasons detailed in the JCQ document **A guide to the special consideration process** (SC 2.3)

Roles and responsibilities

The role of the head of centre

- Be familiar with, refers to and directs relevant centre staff to the annually updated JCQ publication **A guide to the special consideration process**
- Ensure where a candidate meets the published criteria, an application for special consideration will be submitted to the relevant awarding body by the exams office/officer

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

The role of the exams office/officer

- Refer to the criteria detailed in the JCQ document **A guide to the special consideration process** to determine where a candidate is/is not eligible for special consideration
- Where a candidate meets the published criteria, submit an application for special consideration to the relevant awarding body

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

The role of the senior leader

- Sign appropriate evidence to support all eligible applications (SC 6)
- Ensure that if the centre does not support an application for special consideration, it will not be submitted to the relevant awarding body

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

The role of other staff

- Provide any appropriate evidence or information that may be required to determine a candidate's eligibility for special consideration

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

The role of an affected candidate (or parent/carer)

- Provide any medical or other evidence that may be required to confirm eligibility for special consideration

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

Applying for special consideration

At The Academy, where a candidate is eligible, special consideration will be applied for at the time of the assessment in accordance with the regulations as detailed in the JCQ document **A guide to the special consideration process**.

For candidates who are present for the assessment but disadvantaged The Academy must be satisfied that there has been a material detrimental effect on candidate examination performance or in the production of coursework or non-examination assessment.

Examples where a candidate/candidates may be eligible for special consideration include:

A candidate arrives for the examination and is clearly unwell, extremely distressed and/or may have sustained an injury that requires emergency access arrangements to be put in place:

- the candidate is kept under centre supervision (from 30 minutes after the published starting time for that examination until they begin it) while appropriate arrangements are put in place for the candidate to take the examination (ICE 6.9)
- special consideration is applied if this indisposition has had, or is reasonably likely to have had, a material effect on the candidate's ability to demonstrate his or her normal level of attainment in the examination (SC 1)

- Application for an allowance on the last paper taken in a day when a candidate has been entered for three or more examinations timetabled for the same day and the total duration of those papers is more than 6 hours (GCE and Level 3 exams) or more than 5 hours 30 minutes (GCSE, Level 1 and Level 2 exams) including any approved extra time but not any time taken for supervised rest breaks, special consideration for an allowance on the last paper taken will be applied for (SC 3.3)
- Serious disturbance during the examination (SC 2.1)
- Candidates will not be eligible for special consideration if preparation for, or performance in the examination is affected by a minor disturbance in the examination room caused by another candidate, such as momentary bad behaviour, a mobile phone ringing, or a momentary fire alarm (SC 2.3)

(In accordance with SC 1: A centre **must not** submit applications for special consideration for trivial cases.

Examples of trivial cases which **would not** warrant special consideration include, but are not limited to:

A bird tweeting outside the examination room; a lorry reversing; a toilet being flushed; doors in a corridor adjacent to the examination room opening and closing; very short, momentary noise from, for example, aeroplanes, helicopters, lawn mowers)

Additional examples:

Not applicable

Candidates who are absent from a timetabled component/unit for acceptable reasons

If a candidate is absent for acceptable reasons, and The Academy is prepared to support an application for special consideration, special consideration will be applied for if the examination missed is in the terminal series and the minimum requirements for enhanced grading in cases of acceptable absence can be met. (SC 4)

For unitised examinations taken in an examination series prior to certification, candidates must be re-entered for any missed units at the next assessment opportunity. Unless there are difficulties arising, e.g. group performances which cannot be repeated, special consideration will not be awarded. (SC 4)

Other issues

Where other issues or problems affect a candidate or a group of candidates, special consideration will be explored in **A guide to the special consideration process** and applied for where eligible. This may include, for example:

- Other certification (SC 5)
- Shortfall in work (coursework/non-examination assessment) (SC 5)
- Lost or damaged work (non-examination assessment components) (SC 5)
- Candidates issued with an incorrect or incomplete question paper, set the wrong coursework or non-examination assessment task or taught the wrong set text (SC 5)

Additional issues:

Not applicable

Where a candidate may be eligible for special consideration (a post-assessment adjustment) in a vocational qualification, The Academy will follow **A guide to special consideration** (7) and awarding body guidance to determine if, when and how an adjustment can be applied for.

Processing applications for special consideration

The role of the head of centre

- Ensure, before any applications are processed, that the centre is satisfied that the candidates' circumstances warrant special consideration, as set out within the JCQ document **A guide to the special consideration process** (SC 6)

Additional responsibilities:

Not applicable

The role of the exams office/officer

- Ensure applications are processed as required by the awarding bodies
- Ensure a candidate/candidates (or a parent/carer) understands that all cases must be dealt with by the centre (SC 6)
- Ensure that special consideration is applied for at the time of the assessment
- Ensure special consideration is not applied for in a cumulative fashion and where a candidate may be affected by different indispositions, ensure special consideration is only applied for the most serious indisposition
- Keep evidence to support all applications on file until after the publication of results and provide the appropriate evidence signed by a member of the senior leadership team to support an application where this may be requested by an awarding body (SC 6)
- Meet the awarding body deadline(s) for submitting applications

Other responsibilities:

Not applicable

Submitting applications for special consideration

At the Academy, where a candidate or group of candidates is/are eligible for special consideration, applications will be submitted to the relevant awarding body following the published processes in **A guide to the special consideration process**.

In cases of online applications for special consideration, the candidate/candidates will be informed when an application for special consideration is submitted to the awarding body (to ensure compliance with the UK GDPR/Data Protection Act 2018).

Evidence to support all applications will be retained on file until after the publication of results.

Timetabled written examinations

- Applications for individual candidates will be submitted online by logging into the relevant awarding body secure extranet site and following the links to special consideration (where the awarding body's secure site accepts applications online)
- A single application to cover all examinations affected where a candidate is present but disadvantaged and a separate application for each day on which examinations are missed where a candidate is absent from an examination for an acceptable reason will be submitted
- Form 14 **Self certification form** (Self certification for candidates who have missed an examination) will only be completed by a candidate/parent/carer where circumstances warrant this and will not be used where the centre knows the candidate was ill

Internally assessed work

- Where appropriate, applications will be made online where the awarding body's secure system accepts them or Form 10 (**Application for special consideration**) will be completed and submitted to the awarding body

Where an application relates to a shortfall in work for an individual candidate, this will be submitted by completing Form 10, attached to a breakdown of marks across the assessment objectives

Applications post-publication of results

If, after the publication of results for a particular examination series, a claim is made that special consideration was not applied for at the time of an assessment where a candidate was eligible, the claimant will be informed that late applications

will only be accepted by an awarding body in the most exceptional circumstances and where a senior leader is able to produce compelling evidence to support a late application.

The application must be submitted before the deadline for reviews of results for the respective exam series.

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) Under Introduction: additional paragraphs added.

(Added) Under heading Roles and Responsibilities: added to the role of the senior leader.

(Amended) Wording amended under heading Other issues.

(Added) Under heading Processing applications for special consideration: added to the role of the head of centre.

(Changed) Reference to a member of the senior leadership team 'signing' appropriate evidence changed to 'authorising' appropriate evidence.

(Amended) Under heading Timetabled written exams: removed bullet points referencing Form 10.

(Amended) Under heading Internally assessed work: removed reference to extensions.

(Removed) Section removed - Post assessment adjustments – special consideration (Vocational qualifications).

(Amended) Wording amended under heading Applications post-publication of results.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in October 2025, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document



Meridian Trust

Word Processor Policy (Exams)

Word Processor Policy (Exams)

Centre name	Swavesey Village College
Centre number	22173
Date policy first created	04/12/2024
Current policy approved by	Jim Stavrou
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Hoornaert
Date of review	09/01/2026
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
SENCo (or equivalent role)	Parveen Jhali (Deputy SENCo)
IT manager	Alwyn Owen
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually on the publication of updated JCQ regulations.

References in this policy to **AA** and **ICE** relate to/are directly taken from the JCQ documents **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** and **Instructions for conducting examinations**.

Introduction

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

The purpose of an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment 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 following principles are applied to access arrangements at the Academy:

- The purpose of an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment is to ensure, where possible, that barriers to assessment are removed for a disabled candidate preventing them from being placed at a substantial disadvantage due to persistent and significant difficulties. The integrity of the assessment is maintained, whilst at the same time providing access to assessments for a disabled candidate.

A centre must make decisions on appropriate access arrangements for their candidates. Although professionals from other organisations may give advice, they cannot make the decision for the centre. They will not have a working knowledge of an individual candidate's needs and how their difficulties impact in the classroom and/or in timed assessments. It is the responsibility of the SENCo to make appropriate and informed decisions based on the JCQ regulations. (AA 4.2.1)

- Although access arrangements/adjustments are intended to allow access to assessments, they are not granted where they will compromise the assessment objectives of the specification in question. (AA 4.2.2)
- Candidates may not require the same access arrangements/reasonable adjustments in each specification. Subjects and their methods of assessments may vary, leading to different demands of the candidate. SENCos (or equivalent role) must consider the need for access arrangements/reasonable adjustments on a subject-by-subject basis. (AA 4.2.3)
- The SENCo (or equivalent role) must ensure that the proposed access arrangement/reasonable adjustment does not unfairly disadvantage or advantage a candidate. (AA 4.2.1)
- The candidate must have had appropriate opportunities to practice using the access arrangement(s)/reasonable adjustments before their first examination. (AA 4.2.7)

Purpose of the policy

This policy details how the Academy complies with AA, chapter 4 (Managing the needs of candidates and principles for centres), section 5.8 (Word processor) and ICE, sections 14.20-27 Word processors (computers, laptops and tablets) when awarding and allocating a candidate the use of word processor in examinations.

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

The criteria the Academy uses to award and allocate word processors for examinations and assessments

The 'normal way of working' for exam candidates, as directed by the head of centre, is that candidates handwrite their exams unless there are exceptions.

Exceptions

A candidate may be awarded the use of a word processor in examinations where:

- the candidate may have an approved access arrangement in place, for example the use of a scribe/speech recognition technology
- the candidate has a firmly established need, it reflects the candidate's normal way of working and by not being awarded a word processor would be at a substantial disadvantage to other candidates

The Academy will:

- allocate the use of a word processor to a candidate with the spelling and grammar check facility/predictive text switched off where it is their normal way of working within the centre (AA 5.8.1)
- award the use of a word processor to candidates where appropriate to their needs (AA 5.8.4). For example, a candidate with a learning difficulty which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his/her ability to write legibly; a medical condition; a physical disability; a sensory impairment; planning and organisational problems when writing by hand; poor handwriting (This list is not exhaustive)
- 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)
- process access arrangements/reasonable adjustments at the start of the course, or as soon as practicable having firmly established a picture of need and normal way of working, ensuring arrangements are always approved before an examination or assessment (AA 4.2.4)
- provide the use of word processors to candidates in non-examination assessment components as standard practice unless prohibited by the specification (AA 5.8.2)

The Academy will not:

- simply grant the use of a word processor to a candidate because they now want to type rather than write in examinations or can work faster on a keyboard, or because they use a laptop at home (AA 5.8.4)

Additionally the use of a word processor would be considered for a candidate:

- 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 the curriculum is delivered electronically and the centre provides word processors to all candidates (AA 5.8.4)

Other centre specific information relating to the use of a word processor: Not applicable

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

A candidate using a word processor is accommodated as follows:

- Either in the main venue with the main cohort, but at the side of the room or in a room for a smaller group of candidates with similar needs.
- If the student has other access arrangements that require an individual space e.g. Reader, then that will be accommodated.

In compliance with the regulations, The Academy:

- provides a word processor with the spelling and grammar check facility/predictive text disabled unless an awarding body's specification says otherwise (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 the 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 a software application that does not allow for the insertion of a header or footer, once the candidate has completed the examination and printed off their typed script, they are instructed to handwrite their details as a header or footer; the candidate is supervised throughout this process to ensure that they are solely performing this task and not re-reading their answers or amending their work in any way (ICE 14.22)
- 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 to ensure that if there is a complication or technical issue, the candidate's work is not lost) (ICE 14.24)
- instructs the candidate to use a minimum of 12pt font and double spacing to make marking easier for examiners (ICE 14.24)

The Academy will ensure the word processor:

(ICE 14.25)

- is only used in a way that ensures a candidate's script is produced under secure conditions
- is not used to perform skills which are being assessed
- is in good working order at the time of the exam
- is accommodated in such a way that other candidates are not disturbed and cannot read the screen
- is used as a typewriter, not as a database, although standard formatting software is acceptable
- 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), e-mail, the Internet, social media sites, spreadsheets
- 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 (a scribe cover sheet must be completed), or the awarding body's specification permits the use of automatic spell checking
- does not include computer reading (text to speech) software unless the candidate has permission to use a computer reader
- does not include speech recognition technology unless the candidate has permission to use a scribe (a scribe cover sheet must be completed)
- Does not include AI tools
- is not used on the candidate's behalf by a third party unless the candidate has permission to use a scribe (a scribe cover sheet must be completed)

Portable storage medium

The Academy will ensure that any portable storage medium (e.g. a memory stick) used: (ICE 14.25)

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

Printing the script after the exam has ended

The Academy will ensure:

(ICE 14.25)

- the word processor is either connected to a printer so that a script can be printed off, or have the facility to print from a portable storage medium
- the candidate is present to verify that the work printed is their own
- a word processed script is attached to any answer booklet which contains some of the answers
- where an awarding body may require a word processor cover sheet, this is included with the candidate's typed script (and according to the relevant awarding body's instructions) (ICE 14.26)
- if a candidate omits to insert the required header or footer, they are instructed to handwrite the details as a header or footer; the candidate is supervised throughout this process to ensure that they are solely performing this task and not re-reading their answers or amending their work in any way (ICE 14.22)

The Academy:

- may retain electronic copies of word processed scripts as the electronic copy of a word processed script may be accepted by an awarding body where the printed copy has been lost. However, the centre would need to demonstrate to the awarding body that the electronic file has been kept securely. The head of centre would be required to confirm this in writing to the awarding body (ICE 14.27)

Other centre specific information relating to arrangements at the time of the assessment: Not applicable

Allocating word processors at the time of the assessment

Appropriate exam-compliant word processors will be allocated by:

- the IT department in liaison with the SENCo (or equivalent role) and the exams officer

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

- the cohort will be split into two groups
- one group will sit the exam earlier than or later than the awarding body's published start time
- the security of the exam will be maintained at all times and candidates will be supervised in line with ICE 7

Other centre specific information relating to allocating the use of a word processor: Not applicable

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) To reflect the change in ICE (14.25), a new bullet point (66) has been added - ensuring the word processor does not include AI tools

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in January 2026, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.

Link to Meridian Trust Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy

<https://www.meridiantrust.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Meridian-Trust-Safeguarding-and-Child-Protection-Policy-September-2025.pdf>

Link to Meridian Trust Data Protection Policy

<https://www.meridiantrust.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Meridian-Trust-Data-Protection-Policy-Jan-2025-FINAL.pdf>



Meridian Trust

Equalities Policy

Version Number:	2
Applicable To:	Meridian Trust Academies
Approved By:	Jim Stavrou
Approval Date:	12/01/2026
Review Cycle:	Annual
Date of Next Review:	November 2026

Version History

2	References to Appendices for various policies updated	October 2025
1	No Changes	November 2024

Contents

Purpose of the policy	3
Implementing access arrangements and the conduct of exams.....	3
The Equality Act 2010 definition of disability	3
Identifying the need for access arrangements	3
Roles and responsibilities	3
Use of word processors.....	4
Requesting access arrangements	4
Roles and responsibilities	4
Implementing access arrangements and the conduct of exams.....	6
Roles and responsibilities	6
External assessments	6
Internal assessments.....	8
Internal exams/assessments	8
Facilitating access - examples	9

Purpose of the policy

This document is provided as an exams-specific supplement to the centre-wide equalities and/or disability/accessibility policy/plan which details how the centre will:

- recognise its duties towards disabled candidates, including private candidates, ensuring compliance with all aspects of the Equality Act 2010[†], particularly Section 20 (7). This must include a duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, to submit applications for reasonable adjustments through the access arrangements process and to make reasonable adjustments to the services the centre provides to disabled candidates. Where the centre is under a duty to make a reasonable adjustment, the centre must not charge a disabled candidate any additional fee in relation to the adjustment or aid for any legislation in a relevant jurisdiction other than England and Wales which has an equivalent purpose and effect

(JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres**, 5.4)

This publication is further referred to in this policy as [GR](#)

This policy details how the centre facilitates access to exams and assessments for disabled candidates, as defined under the terms of the Equality Act 2010, by outlining staff roles and responsibilities in relation to:

- identifying the need for appropriate arrangements, reasonable adjustments and/or adaptations (referred to in this policy as 'access arrangements')
- requesting access arrangements
- implementing access arrangements and the conduct of exams
- good practice in relation to the Equality Act 2010

The Equality Act 2010 definition of disability

A definition is provided in the JCQ document (Adjustments for candidates with disabilities and learning difficulties) **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2025-2026** (*Definitions* section).

This publication is further referred to in this policy as [AARA](#)

Identifying the need for access arrangements

Roles and responsibilities

Head of centre

- Is familiar with the entire contents, refers to and directs relevant centre staff to the annually updated JCQ publications including [GR](#) and [AARA](#)
- Ensures the quality of the access arrangements process within the centre
- Ensures staff roles, responsibilities and processes in identifying, requesting and implementing access arrangements for **all** candidates are clearly defined and documented
- Ensures an appropriately qualified assessor(s) is appointed, evidence of the assessor's qualification(s) is obtained before he/she assesses candidates and that evidence of the qualification(s) of the person(s) appointed is held on file
- Ensures a policy demonstrating the centre's compliance with relevant legislation is in place

Senior leader(s)

- Are familiar with the entire contents of the annually updated JCQ documents including [GR](#) and [AARA](#)
- Support the SENCo in determining the need for and implementing access arrangements
- Produces and annually reviews/updates a word processor policy, specific to the centre, which details the criteria the centre uses to award and allocate word processors for examinations and assessments

Special educational needs coordinator (SENCo) or equivalent role

- Has full knowledge and understanding of the contents, refers to and directs relevant centre staff to the annually updated JCQ document [AARA](#)
- Ensures the assessment process is administered in accordance with the regulations and that the correct procedures are followed as in Chapter 7 of [AARA](#)
- Leads on the access arrangements process to facilitate access for candidates

- Ensures that the access arrangements/reasonable adjustments approved allow the candidate to access the assessment, but do not result in the candidate gaining an unfair advantage
- Is responsible for the processes in identifying, requesting and implementing access arrangements
- If not the appropriately qualified assessor, works with the person/persons appointed, on all matters relating to assessing candidates and the administration of the assessment process
- Ensures the qualified assessor(s) has access to the assessment objectives for the relevant specification(s) a candidate is undertaking
- Ensures that all assessments carried out and arrangements put in place comply with JCQ and awarding body regulations and guidance
- Ensures arrangements put in place for exams/assessments reflect a candidate's *normal way of working* within the centre
- Works with teaching staff, relevant support staff and the exams officer to ensure centre-delegated and awarding body approved access arrangements are put in place for candidates taking internal and external exams/assessments
- Ensures the need for access arrangements for a candidate is considered on a subject by subject basis

Exams Manager

- Presents when requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector, evidence of the assessor's qualification

Teaching staff

- (where appropriate) Inform the SENCo (or equivalent role) of any observations about a candidate or any support that might be needed by a candidate
- Provide information to evidence the normal way of working of a candidate

Support staff (for example, Learning Support Assistants, Teaching Assistants and Communication Support Workers)

- (where appropriate) Provide comments/observations to support the SENCo (or equivalent role) to 'paint a holistic picture of need', confirming normal way of working for a candidate
- Provide information to evidence the normal way of working of a candidate

Assessor of candidates with learning difficulties

(An assessor of candidates with learning difficulties will be an appropriately qualified access arrangements assessor/psychologist/specialist teacher assessor)

- Has detailed understanding of the JCQ publication [AARA](#)
- Conducts appropriate assessments to identify the need(s) of a candidate
- Provides appropriate evidence to confirm the need(s) of a candidate
- Completes appropriate documentation as required by the regulations of JCQ and the awarding body

Use of word processors

See Appendix 25 Word Processor Policy

Requesting access arrangements

Roles and responsibilities

SENCo or equivalent role

- Determines if the arrangements identified for a candidate require prior approval from the awarding body before the arrangements are put in place or if approval is centre delegated
- To comply with the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018, ensures relevant candidates **are** informed that an application for access arrangements will be processed using *Access arrangements online*

- Follows guidance in [AARA](#) (chapter 8) to process approval applications for access arrangements for those qualifications included
- Ensures that where approval is required the application is processed on time and no later than the awarding body's published deadline
- Ensures that the full supporting evidence is in place before an online application is processed
- Reviews the evidence before an online application is processed, ensuring that the candidate does meet the published criteria for the respective arrangement
- Holds all supporting evidence and presents such evidence to a JCQ Centre Inspector upon request
- Ensures that the agreed adjustment has been put in place before the candidate's first examination, e.g. internal tests and mock examinations
- Ensures appropriate and required evidence is held on file to confirm validation responses in AAO including (where required) the completion of relevant JCQ forms, such as Form 8 (Application for access arrangements – Profile of learning difficulties), Form 9 (Profile of need), Form 8RF; etc. supplemented by written statements, where required, etc
- Ensures where JCQ forms are required to be completed, forms are signed (a handwritten, electronic or typed signature is acceptable) and dated as required **prior** to approval being sought and that the form is provided for processing and inspection purposes (This may be a hard copy paper version or an electronic version)
- Confirms by ticking the '*Confirmation*' box prior to submitting the application for approval that the '*malpractice consequence statement*' has been read and accepted
- Maintains a file/e-folder for each candidate (the required documentation for a candidate will be in hard copy within the candidate's file/each of the required documents held electronically within the candidate's e-folder) that will include:
 - completed JCQ/awarding body application forms and evidence forms
 - appropriate evidence to support the need for the arrangement where required
 - appropriate evidence to support normal way of working within the centre
 - in addition, for those qualifications covered by AAO (where approval is required), a printout/PDF of the AAO approval, a signed candidate personal data consent form (which provides candidate consent to their personal details being shared)
 - (where applicable) 'Data protection confirmation by the examinations officer or SENCo' completed before an application is processed online
- Presents the files/e-folders when requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector and addresses any queries/questions raised
- Liaises with teaching staff regarding any appropriate modified paper requirements for candidates

Exams officer (EO)

- Is familiar with the entire contents of the annually updated JCQ publication [GR](#) and is aware of information contained in [AARA](#) where this may be relevant to the EO role
- Applies for approval where this is required, through *Access arrangements online* (AAO), or through the awarding body where qualifications sit outside the scope of AAO
- Ensures that where approval is required the application is processed on time and no later than the awarding body's published deadline
- Ensures the names of all other assessors, who are assessing candidates studying qualifications covered by AAO are entered into AAO to confirm their status
- Makes an *awarding body referral* through AAO where the initial application for approval may not be approved by AAO, where it is deemed by the centre that the candidate does meet the criteria for the arrangement(s)
- If the SENCo is unavailable, presents the files/e-folders of access arrangements candidates when requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector and addresses any queries/questions raised
- Liaises with the SENCo to ensure arrangements are in place to either order a non-interactive electronic (PDF) question paper (or to download a PDF copy of the standard question paper or to open a question paper packet in the secure room within 90 minutes of the awarding body's published starting time for the exam where the centre is permitted to modify a timetabled written component exam paper (copy on coloured paper, enlarge to A3 or copy to single sided print)

- Following the appropriate process orders published modified papers, by the awarding body's deadline for the exam series, where these may be required for a candidate

Implementing access arrangements and the conduct of exams

Roles and responsibilities

External assessments

These are assessments which are normally set and marked/examined by an awarding body which must be conducted according to awarding body instructions and/or the JCQ publication [Instructions for conducting examinations](#) (ICE).

Head of centre

- Supports the SENCo, the exams officer and other relevant centre staff in ensuring appropriate arrangements, adjustments and adaptations are in place to facilitate access for disabled candidates to exams
- Is familiar with the instructions for 'Invigilation arrangements for candidates with access arrangements' and 'Access arrangements' in [ICE 2025-2026](#)

ALS lead/SENCo

- Ensures appropriate arrangements, adjustments and adaptations are in place to facilitate access for candidates where they are disabled within the meaning of the Equality Act (unless a temporary emergency arrangement is required at the time of an exam)
- Is familiar with the instructions for 'Invigilation arrangements for candidates with access arrangements' and 'Access arrangements' in [ICE 2025-2026](#)
- Ensures a candidate is involved in any decisions about arrangements, adjustments and/or adaptations that may be put in place for them and ensures the candidate understands what will happen at exam time
- Ensures exam information (JCQ information for candidates documents, individual exam timetable etc.) is adapted where this may be required for a disabled candidate to access it
- Ensures that prior to any arrangements being put in place checks are made that arrangements do not impact on any assessment criteria/competence standards being tested
- Ensures that any arrangements put in place do not unfairly disadvantage or advantage disabled candidates
- Monitors, in internal tests/mock exams, the use of arrangements granted to a candidate and where a candidate has never made use of the arrangement, may consider withdrawing the arrangement, provided the candidate will not be placed at a substantial disadvantage
- Liaises with the exams officer (EO) regarding facilitation and invigilation of access arrangement candidates in exams

Exams officer

- Understands and follows instructions for Invigilation arrangements for candidates with access arrangements and Access arrangements in [ICE 2025-2026](#)
- Liaises with other relevant centre staff regarding the provision of appropriate rooming and equipment that may be required to facilitate access for disabled candidates to exams
- Appoints appropriate centre staff as facilitators to support candidates (practical assistant, prompter, Language Modifier, reader, scribe or Communication Professional)
- Ensures facilitators supporting candidates are appropriately trained and understand the rules of the particular access arrangement(s)
- Ensures a record of the content of training given to those facilitating an access arrangement for a candidate under examination conditions is kept and retained on file until the deadline for reviews of marking has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later
- Ensures where a person is appointed to facilitate an access arrangement, the person appointed is not normally the candidate's own subject teacher, Learning Support Assistant or teaching assistant. Where

the candidate's own subject teacher, Learning Support Assistant or teaching assistant has to be used, a separate invigilator is always present

- Ensures where a person is appointed to facilitate an access arrangement, the person appointed is not a relative, friend, peer or private tutor of the candidate
- Ensures a facilitator acting as a prompter is aware of the appropriate way to prompt depending on the needs of the candidate
- Ensures invigilators supervising access arrangement candidates are trained in their role and understand the invigilation arrangements required for access arrangement candidates and the role of any facilitator
- Ensures cover sheets, where these are required by the arrangement are completed as required by facilitators
- Liaises with the SENCo to ensure exam information (JCQ information for candidates documents, individual exam timetable etc.) is adapted where this may be required for a disabled candidate to access it
- Liaises with the SENCo regarding the facilitation and invigilation of access arrangement candidates
- Liaises with the SENCo regarding rooming of access arrangement candidates
- Liaises with the SENCo to ensure that invigilators are made aware of the Equality Act 2010 and are trained in disability issues
- Ensures appropriate seating arrangements are in place where different arrangements may need to be made for a candidate to facilitate access to his/her exams
- Ensures candidates with access arrangements are identified on exam room seating plans and invigilators are informed of those candidates with access arrangements and made aware of the access arrangement(s) awarded
- Ensures invigilators are briefed prior to each exam session of the arrangements in place for a disabled candidate in their exam room
- Checks in advance of dated exams/assessments that modified paper orders have arrived (and if not will contact the awarding body to ensure that papers are available when required)
- Makes modifications that are permitted by the centre (a question paper copied onto coloured paper, an A4 to A3 enlarged paper or a paper printed on single sheets or where a question paper may need to be scanned into PDF format where a candidate is approved the use of a computer reader) that may be required and either accesses a non-interactive electronic (PDF) question paper or opens the exam question paper packet in the secure room no earlier than 90 minutes prior to the awarding body's published start time of the exam
- Understands that where permitted/approved, a secure question paper packet may need to be opened early in the secure room to facilitate the following:
 - a Language Modifier may have access to the question paper 60 minutes prior to the awarding body's published start time for the exam in order to prepare
 - the Communication Professional may have access to the question paper 60 minutes prior to the awarding body's published start time for the exam in order to prepare
 - a Live Speaker may have access to the transcript of the Listening examination 60 minutes prior to the awarding body's published start time for the exam in order to prepare
- Provides cover sheets prior to the start of an exam where required for particular access arrangements and ensures that these have been fully completed before candidates' scripts are dispatched to examiners/markers
 - prints pre-populated cover sheets from AAO where this is required for particular arrangements
- Has a process in place to deal with emergency (temporary) access arrangements as they arise at the time of exams in terms of rooming and invigilation
- Liaises with the SENCo where a facilitator may be required to support a candidate requiring an emergency (temporary) access arrangement at the time of exams
- Where required for emergency (temporary) access arrangements, applies for approval through AAO or through the awarding body where any qualifications sit outside the scope of AAO

Other relevant centre staff

- Support the SENCo and the exams officer to ensure appropriate arrangements, adjustments and adaptations are in place to facilitate access for disabled candidates to exams
- Liaises with the EO where a facilitator may be required to support a candidate requiring an emergency (temporary) access arrangement at the time of exams

- Liaises with the SENCo and other relevant centre staff to ensure appropriate arrangements, adjustments and adaptations are in place to facilitate access for disabled candidates to exams

Internal assessments

These are non-examination assessments (NEA) which are normally set by a centre/awarding body, marked and internally moderated/standardised by the centre and externally moderated by the awarding body.

However, 'NEA' is not limited to internal assessment as externally marked and/or externally set practical examinations taken at different times across centres are also classified as 'NEA'.

SENCo or equivalent role

- Liaises with teaching staff to implement appropriate access arrangements for candidates
- Ensures centre-delegated and awarding body approved arrangements are in place prior to a candidate taking their first formal supervised assessment
- Ensures candidates are aware of the access arrangements that are in place for their assessments
- Ensures a candidate has had appropriate opportunities to practise using the access arrangement(s) before their first examination

Exams officer

- Ensures facilitators supporting candidates are appropriately trained and understand the rules of the particular access arrangement(s)
- Ensures cover sheets are completed as required by facilitators
- Liaises with the teacher where a facilitator may be required to support a candidate requiring an emergency (temporary) access arrangement at the time of their formal supervised assessment
- Provide the SENCo with assessment schedules to ensure arrangements are put in place when required
- Liaise with the SENCo regarding assessment materials that may need to be modified for a candidate

Teaching staff

- Support the SENCo in implementing appropriate access arrangements for candidates

Internal exams/assessments

These are exams or tests which are set and marked within the centre; normally a pre-cursor to external assessments.

SENCo or equivalent role

- Liaises with teaching staff to implement appropriate access arrangements for candidates

Exams officer

- Provide the SENCo with internal exam timetable to ensure arrangements are put in place when required

Teaching staff

- Support the SENCo in implementing appropriate access arrangements for candidates
- Provide exam materials that may need to be modified for a candidate

Facilitating access - examples

The following information confirms the centre's good practice in relation to the Equality Act 2010 and the conduct of examinations.

On a candidate by candidate basis, consideration is given to:

- adapting assessment arrangements
- adapting assessment materials
- the provision of specialist equipment or adaptation of standard equipment
- adaptation of the physical environment for access purposes

The table provides example arrangements, adjustments and adaptations that are considered to meet the need(s) of a candidate and the actions considered/taken by the centre for the purposes of facilitating access.

Example of candidate need(s)	Arrangements explored	Centre actions
A medical condition which prevents the candidate from taking exams in the centre	Alternative site for the conduct of examinations Supervised rest breaks	<p><i>SENCo gathers evidence to support the need for the candidate to take exams at home and for SRB</i></p> <p><i>Pastoral head provides written statement for file to confirm the need</i></p> <p><i>Approval confirmed by SENCo; AAO approval for both arrangements not required</i></p> <p><i>Pastoral head discussion with candidate to confirm the arrangements which should be put in place</i></p> <p><i>EO submits 'Alternative site form' for timetabled written exams to awarding body/bodies online using CAP</i></p> <p><i>An on-line submission must only be made for timetabled written examinations in the following qualifications...</i></p> <p><i>EO provides candidate with exam timetable and JCQ information for candidates</i></p> <p><i>Pastoral head confirms with candidate the information is understood</i></p> <p><i>Pastoral head agrees with candidate that prior to each exam will call to confirm fitness to take exam</i></p> <p><i>EO allocates invigilator(s) to candidate's timetable; confirms time of collection of exam papers and materials</i></p> <p><i>Invigilator monitors candidate's condition for each exam and records any issues on incident log</i></p> <p><i>Invigilator records supervised rest breaks (time and duration) on incident log and confirms full time given for exam</i></p> <p><i>Invigilator briefs EO after each exam on how candidate's performance in exam may have been affected by his/her condition</i></p> <p><i>EO discusses with pastoral head if candidate is eligible for special consideration (candidate present but disadvantaged)</i></p> <p><i>EO processes request(s) for special consideration where applicable; incident log(s) provides supporting evidence, supported by appropriate evidence signed by a member of the senior leadership team (Evidence retained until after the publication of results)</i></p> <p><i>Pastoral head informs candidate that special consideration has been requested</i></p>
Persistent and significant difficulties in accessing written text	Reader/computer reader 25% Extra time	<p><i>Confirms candidate is disabled within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010</i></p> <p><i>Papers checked for those testing reading</i></p>

	Alternative rooming arrangements	<p><i>Computer reader/examination reading pen sourced for use in papers (or sections of papers) testing reading OR up to 50% extra time awarded</i></p> <p><i>Candidate informed that an application for access arrangements will be processed using Access arrangements online</i></p> <p><i>AAO application for approval processed</i></p> <p><i>Supporting evidence and AAO approval-kept on file</i></p>
Significant difficulty in concentrating	Prompter Alternative rooming arrangements	<p><i>Gathers evidence to support substantial and long term adverse impairment</i></p> <p><i>Candidate informed that an application for access arrangements will be processed using Access arrangements online</i></p> <p><i>AAO application for approval processed</i></p> <p><i>Supporting evidence and AAO approval kept on file</i></p> <p><i>Confirms with candidate how and when they will be prompted</i></p> <p><i>Briefs invigilator to monitor candidate and the method of prompting (call out his name to bring his attention back to the paper - confirms requirement for alternative room)</i></p>
A wheelchair user	Desk Rooms Facilities Seating arrangements Practical assistant	<p><i>Candidate informed that an application for access arrangements will be processed using Access arrangements online</i></p> <p><i>Applies for practical assistant to help candidate set up wheelchair and other equipment in a practical assessment; approval automatically fails so awarding body referral lists the tasks that will be performed</i></p> <p><i>Supporting evidence and AAO approval kept on file Provides height adjustable desk in exam room</i></p> <p><i>Allocates exam room on ground floor near adapted bathroom facilities</i></p> <p><i>Spaces desks to allow wheelchair access</i></p> <p><i>Seats candidate near exam room door</i></p> <p><i>Confirms arrangements in place to assist the candidate in case of emergency evacuation of the exam room</i></p> <p><i>Practical assistant cover sheet printed from AAO; to be completed by facilitator and inserted inside the candidate's work where this may be applicable to the assessment</i></p>

Link to Meridian Trust Whistleblowing Policy

<https://www.meridiantrust.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Whistleblowing-Policy-and-Procedure-V7-2024.pdf>



**Meridian
Trust**

Private Candidate Policy

2025/26

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Centre name (the Academy)	Swavesey Village College
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Exams Manager	Peter Hoornaert

Contents

Purpose of the policy.....	3
Identifying Candidates.....	3
Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments	3
Centre assessed components/ units	4
Information for candidates.....	4
External Candidate Fees:	4
Post Results Services.....	4

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of the policy is to detail:

- External candidate criteria
- The application process
- The process of identifying external candidates
- Detail costings
- Exam Day and post results processes

Accepting Private Candidates

The Academy is a JCQ registered centre for external candidates.

Centre discretion will be used on an individual basis as to whether the Academy will accept an external candidate application.

The usual circumstances for this would be:

- A candidate who has previously been educated at the Academy
- A candidate who would like to pursue a home language qualification

Any Private Candidates meeting the above criteria will be considered for entry provided their subjects are in line with subjects and specifications being taught at the Academy.

The Academy is under no obligation to accept external candidate applications.

Identifying Candidates

External candidates will be required to provide in writing the candidate's personal details and information of which qualifications they would like to be entered for.

It is strongly recommended that candidates review the subject specification from the relevant exam board.

Candidates should also bring their passport, or similar, into the centre for identification purposes. A copy of this will be made and retained by the centre.

An administration fee will be payable.

Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments

Details of any candidate's access arrangements must be clearly indicated at the time of application and supporting documentation provided.

The exams office will make the relevant applications and arrangements. The candidate will be required to complete any Data Consent to Access Arrangements Online.

The centre will be in contact regarding any assessment or candidate interview that are required prior to submitting the EAA to JCQ and/or the Examination Board.

There may be an additional cost in order to provide external candidates with specific access arrangements.

Centre assessed components/ units

Consideration will be given to qualifications that have component/unit elements. The Academy generally will not accept external candidates for these types of subjects other than English Language.

Information for candidates

Candidates will be provided with relevant information related to the exam(s).

Candidates will be provided with a statement of entry, opportunity to sit mock exams if appropriate and an exam timetable.

On the day of the exam, candidates should arrive at the centre no later than 15 minutes prior to the exam start time. They should bring with them all relevant stationery i.e. black pen, pencil, ruler, rubber, protractor, compass, calculator. They should sign in at reception and wait to be collected and taken to the exam room.

If candidates are running late or unwell on the day of the exam they should contact the centre as soon as possible. If an exam is missed, it cannot be sat at a later date and candidates will not be entitled to a refund.

If running late they should refrain from using any electronic devices or accessing any source of information such as listening to the radio, social media or attempted contact with other candidates.

External Candidate Fees:

Current fees will be sent to the candidate, and payment will be required before any entries are made.

Post Results Services

Candidate results will be sent via email on results day to their personal email address. Alternatively, they can visit the centre during an allocated window of time to collect a paper copy. Details of the post results services will be provided including cost and timeframes.

Candidates will be contacted when certificates are available for collection. This will need to be collected in person with a form of photographic ID.

Process for checking AA Assessor's qualifications

Date of next review: 31st December 2026

Candidates must be assessed by an assessor to ensure that the access arrangements/reasonable adjustments approved allow the candidate to access the assessment, but do not result in an unfair advantage.

The head of centre is responsible for:

- the quality of the access arrangements/reasonable adjustments process within the centre
- the appointment of assessors
- checking the qualifications of those assessing candidates (e.g. photocopy of certificate or printout of screenshot of HCPC or SASC registration)

The head of centre must satisfy themselves that a professional assessor has the required level of competence and training. The professional assessor must present evidence of successful completion of a post-graduate course by providing evidence from the list below:

- copy of current Assessment Practising Certificate (APC) issued by Patoss, Dyslexia Guild or British Dyslexia Association;
- copy of Level 7 assessment qualification certificate
- screenshot of HCPC registration showing the Unique Registration Number
- screenshot of SASC listing showing the APC code number and expiry date
- screenshot of listing for PAPAA Graduates showing the certificate number
- screenshot of listing for CPT3A Certificate Holders showing the certificate number
- screenshot of listing for ETAAC Certificate Holders showing the certificate number
- screenshot of listing for Patoss AAA Certificate Holders showing the certificate number

SENCOs must hold on file, for inspection purposes, the evidence provided confirming that the assessor(s) is/are suitably qualified.

The names of all assessor(s) must be entered into Access arrangements online to confirm their status.



**Meridian
Trust**

**CYBER SECURITY POLICY
(Centre-wide & Exams)**

2025/26

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Date of next review	31/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Governor(s)	
Head of centre	Jim Stavrou
Senior leader(s)	Chloe Thompson
Exams officer	Peter Hoornaert
Other staff	Alwyn Owen (IT)

Purpose of the policy

At the Academy, the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of our information assets, IT systems, and the personal data of students, staff, and stakeholders are of paramount importance.

This policy establishes our comprehensive cyber security framework, delineates the duties and accountabilities of all relevant parties, and ensures strict adherence to JCQ regulations, the Data Protection Act 2018, the UK General Data Protection Regulation, and the statutory guidance detailed in *Keeping Children Safe in Education*.

This Cyber Security Policy details the measures taken at the Academy to mitigate the risk of cyber threats under the following sections:

1. Roles and responsibilities
2. Complying with JCQ regulations
3. Cyber security best practice
4. Account management best practice
5. Training

The senior leadership team recognises the need for staff involved in the management, administration and conducting of examinations to play a critical role in maintaining and improving cyber security at the Academy. This includes ensuring that all members of centre staff who access awarding bodies' online systems undertake annual cyber security training.

In addition to adhering to industry best practices, the following areas are addressed in this policy to ensure that members of the exams team protect their individual digital assets:

- Cyber Security Awareness and Training
- Device Security and Asset Register
- Creating strong, unique passwords
- Keeping all account details secret
- Enabling additional security settings wherever possible
- Updating any passwords that may have been exposed
- Setting up secure account recovery options
- Reviewing and managing connected applications
- Staying alert for all types of social engineering/phishing attempts
- Monitoring accounts and reviewing account access regularly

Scope

This policy applies to all staff who have access to the Academy's IT systems and data, with particular focus placed upon those members of staff who are involved in the management, administration and conducting of examinations and assessments.

Review

A designated member of the Senior Leadership Team will carry out annual evaluation of this policy, incorporating updates as required to remain abreast of new technologies, threat developments, and industry best practices.

Upon completion of the review and any revisions, the policy will receive formal approval from the Head of School.

1. Roles and responsibilities

Governors

- To oversee and review cyber security arrangements and policy compliance

Head of centre/Senior leadership team

- To provide overall responsibility for policy implementation and cyber security strategy
- To ensure that an up-to-date device security and asset register is maintained which details all computers, devices, and user accounts used for examinations and assessment administration. This

ensures that all technology used is regularly reviewed, patched, and secured, thus reducing the risk of overlooked vulnerabilities being exploited

- To ensure that all devices are secured with up-to-date anti-malware and software updates
- To ensure that members of the exams team, supported/led by the IT team, adhere to best practice(s) in relation to:
 - the management of individual/personal data/accounts
 - centre wide cyber security including:
 - Establishing a robust password policy
 - Enabling multi-factor authentication (MFA)
 - Keeping software and systems up to date
 - Implementing network security measures
 - Conducting regular data backups
 - Educating employees on security awareness
 - Developing and testing an incident response plan
 - Regularly assessing and auditing security controls
 - Managing and reporting a cyber-attack which impacts any learner data, assessment records or learner work

IT Manager/Team

- To implement technical controls, monitor systems, respond to incidents, manage access and updates

Data Protection Officer

- To ensure compliance with data protection law, advise on data handling, and oversee data breaches

All staff

- To follow this policy, complete annual training, report incidents or concerns promptly within the centre

Exams officer/Exams assistant

- To ensure that they follow best practice in relation to the management of individual/personal data/accounts
- To provide evidence of an awareness of best practice in relation to cyber security as defined by JCQ regulations/guidance, including the completion of certificated, annual, up-to-date cyber security awareness training
- To undertake training on:
 - the importance of creating strong, unique passwords
 - keeping all account details secret
 - enabling additional security settings wherever possible
 - updating any passwords which may have been exposed
 - setting up/an awareness of secure account recovery options
 - reviewing and managing connected applications
 - awareness of all types of social engineering/phishing attempts
 - reviewing and monitoring account access on a regular basis

Invigilators

- To ensure that they follow best practice in relation to the management of individual/personal data/accounts
- To provide evidence of an awareness of best practice in relation to cyber security as defined by JCQ regulations/guidance, including the completion of certificated, annual, up-to-date cyber security awareness training
- To undertake training on:
 - the importance of creating strong, unique passwords
 - keeping all account details secret
 - enabling additional security settings wherever possible
 - updating any passwords which may have been exposed
 - setting up/an awareness of secure account recovery options
 - reviewing and managing connected applications
 - awareness of all types of social engineering/phishing attempts

- reviewing and monitoring account access on a regular basis

Students/users

- To follow this policy, complete annual training, report incidents or concerns promptly within the centre

2. Complying with JCQ regulations

The head of centre/senior leadership team at the Academy to ensure that there are procedures in place to maintain the security of user accounts in line with JCQ regulations (sections 3.20 and 3.21 of the *General Regulations for Approved Centres* document) by:

- Developing and maintaining this cyber security policy
- Ensuring that all members of centre staff who access awarding bodies' online systems undertake annual, certificated cyber security training which includes:
 - the importance of creating strong, unique passwords
 - keeping all account details strictly confidential
 - the critical role of Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) in protecting against unauthorised access
 - how to properly set up and use MFA for both centre and awarding bodies' systems
 - an awareness of all types of social engineering/phishing attempts
 - the importance of staff quickly reporting suspicious activity, events and incidents
- Downloading and retaining certificates of completed staff cyber training on file
- Implementing and enforcing robust security measures, including:
 - mandatory Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) for all accounts and systems containing exam-related information, including those that interface between awarding body and centre systems, to enhance security and protect sensitive data
 - regularly reviewing and updating security settings to align with current best practices
- Enabling additional security settings wherever possible
- Updating any passwords that may have been exposed
- Setting up secure account recovery options
- Reviewing and managing connected applications
- Monitoring accounts and regularly reviewing account access, including removing access when no longer required
- Ensuring authorised members of staff securely access awarding bodies' online systems in line with awarding body regulations regarding cyber security and the JCQ document *Guidance for centres on cyber security* (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations), and that where necessary, they have access to a device which complies with awarding bodies' multi-factor authentication (MFA) requirements
- Reporting any actual or suspected compromise of an awarding body's online systems immediately to the relevant awarding body

3. Cyber security best practice

The head of centre/senior leadership team at the Academy ensures that:

- Security measures are in place including:
 - Firewalls and network security controls
 - Anti-virus and anti-malware software on all devices
 - Regular software updates and patch management
 - Secure data backup and tested recovery procedures
 - Encryption for sensitive and personal data
 - Multi-factor authentication (MFA) for critical systems and remote access
 - Secure configuration and monitoring of cloud services (e.g., Office 365, Google Workspace).
 - Prompt removal of access for leavers
- They and all staff involved in the management, administration and conducting of examinations/assessments stay informed about the latest security threats and trends in account security.

- Staff within the exams team are educated on how to identify phishing attempts, use secure devices and how to protect systems and data by online training.

Best practice, advice and guidance from [National Cyber Security Centre - NCSC.GOV.UK](https://www.ncsc.gov.uk) is observed for all IT systems, particularly those where learner information, learner work or assessment records are held.

By adopting industry standard cyber security best practices, the head of centre/senior leadership team are significantly reducing the risk of cyber-attacks and protecting valuable data and assets within the centre.

If a cyber-attack which impacts any learner data, assessment records or learner work is experienced, the senior leadership team/exams officer will contact the relevant awarding body/bodies immediately for advice and support.

4. Account management best practice

Creating strong unique passwords

- *Password governance follows National Cyber Security Centre guidance*
- *Exams office staff are informed that password length is a more valuable defence than complexity and instructed to use a password creation approach such as three random words to generate suitably secure passwords*
- *Exams office staff will not use easily guessable information such as birthdays, singular names or common words for a password*
- *For every account, users are instructed to use a strong unique password and that the same password is not used across any other account(s)*

Keeping all account details secret

- *Exams office staff are instructed never to share login/password details or additional factor/authentication codes with anyone else*
- *Staff who require access to a system will request their own user account and never share an account assigned for their use with anyone else. Staff are reminded that anything done with an account assigned to someone will be attributed to that person in the first instance*

Enabling additional security settings wherever possible

- *All staff will follow awarding body two-step verification (2SV)/two-factor verification (2FA) or multi-factor authentication (MFA) wherever available/requested. Staff are made aware of the purpose of 2SV/2FA /MFA, which includes:*
 - *adding a layer of account security*
 - *helps to protect users if the extra steps/factors are protected*

Updating any passwords that may have been exposed

- *If it is believed that a password may have been exposed/become known to others, staff will inform their senior leader/line manager immediately*
- *Any exposed passwords will be changed as soon as possible, and the new passwords should not be shared with anyone except their senior leader/line manager*
- *Staff are instructed to use strong unique passwords (e.g. three random words) when changing passwords and that old passwords should not be reused nor should cycling through a small set of passwords across multiple accounts be used*

Setting up secure account recovery options

Examples

- *Staff are instructed to follow centre account recovery options*

Reviewing and managing connected applications

- *Staff within the exams team will regularly review and remove access for third-party applications or services that no longer require access to accounts*
- *Staff will be informed that access should only be provided to trusted services*
- *Staff will be asked to be particularly cautious when interacting with content and services (e.g. quizzes, prize draws, surveys etc.)*
- *Staff will only grant permissions to required applications or the necessary access to allow them to function*
- *Staff will only download and install applications with established reputations from trusted sources*
- *Staff will not save passwords to local web browsers unless a secure password manager extension is used in a browser that requires unlocking (e.g. with another password) before the saved account details can be retrieved, however care will be taken to ensure that this is locked/signed out of after use*
- *When using a shared browser, staff will clear browser history and caches after use*

Staying alert for all types of social engineering/phishing attempts

- *Staff must take care if unsolicited or unexpected emails, instant messages, or phone calls are received asking for account credentials or personal or confidential information. Passwords and 2FA/MFA authentication codes should not be given out to anyone*
- *Staff are instructed that they should have a wariness of anyone or anything that seems to want to gain their trust, rush them into doing something or that just seems off, they should hang up/not reply and not click on links or take any action and check with a trusted party via a secure channel (i.e. call awarding body customer services via a known support number)*
- *Staff will never approve or authenticate a login request that they did not initiate*
- *Staff will not share codes/approve logins. Requests to share codes/approve logins should be treated with a high degree of suspicion*
- *Staff will not click on suspicious links, download attachments or scan QR codes from unknown sources*
- *The centre will provide exams team staff with a secure QR code scanner with a good reputation to help gauge whether a QR code is suspicious or malicious*
- *Staff will verify the authenticity of any communication by contacting the organisation directly through official known channels*
- *Staff will report any phishing attempts which reference awarding bodies/their systems to the awarding body concerned immediately*

Monitoring accounts and reviewing account access

- *Centre staff accounts will be routinely reviewed for any suspicious, unusual or unauthorised activity*
- *If any suspicious, unusual or potentially unauthorised activity on awarding body systems is observed this will be immediately reported to the relevant awarding body, particularly if it is believed that user account security may have been compromised*
- *Access control and permissions are based on job roles and reviewed regularly*
- *Levels of access for all exams team staff are reviewed regularly to ensure accounts have the minimum level of access required for their current role*
- *Accounts are promptly disabled when users leave*
- *Account activity is monitored and audited*

5. Training

The head of centre/senior leadership team ensure that there are procedures in place to maintain the security of user accounts by ensuring that all staff who have responsibility for the administration or delivery of examinations complete annual cyber security training and annual refresher training with practical advice on protecting assessment systems and recognising attacks such as phishing or social engineering.

Records of cyber training are retained for all staff by HR and are available for inspection

- *Type/source of training (e.g. online, face-to-face as part of annual INSET)*
- *Evidence (e.g. certification via online training)*
- *Frequency (e.g. annual)*