



Maesteg School

Non-Examination Assessment (NEA) Policy

Updated September 2020

(amended for awarding of CDG's March 2021)



Foreword

Any GCSE and A Level assessment that is not 'externally set and taken by candidates at the same time under controlled conditions' is classified by the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) as non-examination assessment (NEA). NEA therefore includes all work that is internally-assessed, as well as any that is internally-supervised but externally-assessed. It encompasses a number of forms of assessment, including written coursework, practical project work, investigations, performances, and spoken assessment; it also includes the practical skills endorsement element of the A Level Sciences.

The purpose of this document is to help staff identify their responsibilities in planning, supervising and assessing NEA work, showing how responsibilities are distributed among a range of colleagues, including Directors of Learning, subject teachers and the Senior Leadership Team. It also describes the process by which candidates may request a review of the marking of internally-assessed work.

1. Key Documents

All teachers involved with the delivery and/or assessment of NEA components must be familiar with this policy and with the detailed requirements and processes described in the relevant, current subject specification document, and should refer to the JCQ document 'Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments' for further more general guidance and advice

[Instructions_NEA_20-21_v2_Stage2.indd \(jcq.org.uk\)](#)

Directors of Learning should ensure that candidates are made fully aware of the requirements of the NEA components for which they are studying, and may find it helpful to refer them to the JCQ notice 'Information for candidates: non-examination assessments'

https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/IFC-Coursework_Assessments_FINAL.pdf

Awarding of Centre Determined Grades 2021

The School has taken notice of the additional guidance for the awarding of Centre Determined Grades that has been produced by JCQ. Staff have been made aware of this guidance and it can be viewed at

[Notice-to-Centres-NEA-June-2021-v2-1.pdf \(jcq.org.uk\)](#)



2. Staff Responsibilities

Maesteg School is committed to quality assuring the procedures used when its staff assess candidates' work for NEA components of external qualifications. Assessments are conducted by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skills, and who have been trained in this activity.

Principal responsibility for NEA, as a curriculum matter, lies with the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Assessment)

Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Assessment)

- oversees Directors of Learning' safe and secure conduct of NEAs, ensuring that JCQ guidelines and awarding bodies' subject-specific instructions are complied with;
- coordinates with Directors of Learning as regards the scheduling of task-setting and completion, and the release of raw, internally-assessed, marks to candidates for JCQ-regulated, internally-assessed NEA components;
- liaises with Directors of Learning to ensure that key dates are agreed well in advance and are made available to colleagues, candidates and parents through the School calendar;
- oversees any reviews of assessment requested under sections 5 and 6 of this policy, below.

Directors of Learning:

- ensure that individual teachers understand their responsibilities with regard to NEA and are aware of the relevant deadlines, internal and external;
- ensure that individual teachers understand the requirements of the relevant subject specification and are familiar with all notes or guidance provided by the awarding body, as well as key details from moderators' reports on previous years' NEAs;
 - ensure that any internally-set tasks are in line with relevant assessment objectives and are, where required, approved in advance by the awarding body;
 - ensure that the details of tasks set by the awarding body are communicated to candidates in an accurate and timely manner;
- ensure that candidates and supervising teachers sign authentication forms, as appropriate;
- standardise internally the marking of all teachers involved in assessing internally-assessed NEAs, prior to external moderation by the awarding body;
 - ensure that internally-assessed work is stored securely, once assessed;
- ensure that the Exams Officer/awarding body receive entry details, raw marks and candidates' work in the required form and to appropriate deadlines;
- retain candidates' work securely, post-completion, for the period required by the awarding body.



Teachers:

- understand and comply with the general guidance contained in the JCQ document 'Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments', and with the specific instructions regarding NEA contained in the relevant awarding body specifications;
- ask the ALNCO for any assistance required for the administration and management of access arrangements;
- take possession, where appropriate, of confidential materials sent by awarding bodies in sufficient time to prepare for assessment, and ensure that such materials are stored securely at all times;
- supervise assessments, providing support and guidance to the candidates only to the extent permitted by the specification;
- communicate and enforce deadlines – internal and external – clearly and consistently with candidates;
- store candidates' work appropriately during the course of study, prior to assessment and moderation;
- mark internally-assessed NEAs using the mark schemes provided by the awarding body, ensuring that work is available for internal moderation as scheduled by the Director of Learning

The Examinations Officer:

- enters candidates for NEA components in liaison with candidates and Directors of Learning
- is responsible for receipt, storage and onward transmission, in whatever format, of the confidential materials received by the Exams Office;
- provides information to Directors of Learning regarding submission of raw marks and ensures that raw marks are submitted to awarding bodies before deadlines

ALNCO:

- ensures access arrangements have been applied for;
- supports teaching staff in ensuring that any relevant access arrangements are in place for NEAs

3. Assessment and Review Overview

All examination centres are required to have a published appeals procedure relating to the internal assessment of NEA work. The following sections of this policy outline the processes in place at Maesteg School to ensure that internal assessment is completed fairly, consistently and in accordance with the specification for the qualification concerned, and



describes the procedure which can be followed in cases where a review of marking is requested.

The procedure is set out in this policy, which is available to parents and candidates on the school website, and is referred in briefings for public examination year groups. The focus of sections 4 and 5, below, are on specifications set by awarding bodies which form JCQ.

After work has been assessed internally it is moderated by the examinations board before the award of grades to ensure consistency between centres. Such moderation can alter the marks awarded by the School; that is outside the control of Maesteg School and is not covered by this procedure.

4. Departmental Processes

When setting NEA timelines, Directors of Learning work back from the deadline for the submission of internally moderated marks to the awarding body, and share the following key information with the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Assessment) and the Examinations Officer.

- dates of any NEA 'events', such as spoken examinations, performance work or assessment days;
- submission date given to candidates for any coursework or other NEA assignments;
- provisional dates of relevant moderation meetings;
- release date of marks to candidates;
- departmental deadline for requests for review of NEA marking (five working days after the release of marks, and at least five working days before the deadline for submission of marks to the awarding body);
- date by which internally moderated marks must have been received by the relevant awarding body;
- name of the individual identified as 'reviewer' for the purposes of any review (see below).

Once the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Assessment) has this core information, Directors of Learning are responsible for updating him about any changes which arise in relation to the planned process.

Candidates must be informed of their marks for JCQ qualifications; prior to release, marks will already have been considered within the internal moderation process, so the marking has already, in effect, been reviewed; the likelihood of further change is limited, and candidates and parents should be aware of this. The mark awarded is the culmination of a robust and fair assessment process and should therefore prove to be consistent with, and within tolerance of, the standard applied to the school's candidates in that NEA component.



5. Review Procedure for JCQ Specifications

Reviewer

- All relevant departments should, when setting NEA timelines, nominate an appropriately experienced individual to conduct any potential review of marking. This individual is likely to be a colleague, but must not have been directly responsible for teaching the candidate and should have no personal vested interest in the outcome (e.g. by being a member of the candidate's family), nor should they have been the initial assessor of the work for which the review has been requested.
- The nominated reviewer should be in a position to quality-assure the processes undertaken by the department in arriving at the candidate's mark, ensuring that the mark awarded is consistent with, and within tolerance of, the standard applied to the school's candidates in that NEA component.
- In any circumstance where it is not reasonably possible to nominate an appropriately experienced reviewer from among the staff of Maesteg School, an external reviewer may then need to be agreed through discussion between the Director of Learning and the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Learning). If it is necessary to appoint an external reviewer, this is likely to have an impact on the fee charged for the review (see below).
- The school will avoid the appointment of an external reviewer if at all possible, both in view of the practical difficulty of ensuring that a suitable reviewer can be appraised of the necessary information within the timeframe, and because an internal colleague is likely to be best placed to undertake the task.

6. Initiating a Review

- Candidates have the right to access their submitted work for the purpose of determining whether to request a marking review. The process of access will depend on the nature of the work and is to be decided by each department.
- There must be clear grounds for the review, arising from misapplication of the formal mark scheme: a review cannot be submitted simply on the basis that a candidate is unhappy with the current mark awarded.
- Candidates are strongly encouraged to have a preliminary discussion about their concerns with the relevant Director of Learning before making a formal request for a review, and to bear in mind when doing so that the time-frame for review is limited. Heads of Department should inform the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Assessment) and the Examinations Officer of any such preliminary approaches.
- The request for the review of the mark awarded for an NEA component should be made to the Directors of Learning using the form at the end of this policy and **must include BOTH**



the parent/guardian's consent to be billed for the cost of conducting the review AND the candidate's consent to the review being undertaken.

- The deadline for the receipt of request forms is five working days after the release of marks to candidates; no requests will be accepted after the deadline.
- The Directors of Learning must inform the Head of Learning & Achievement immediately on receipt of the review request form; the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Assessment) will share this information with the Headteacher and Deputy Head.
- Director of Learning will reply formally and promptly to acknowledge the review request, confirm receipt of consent for the review fee to be added to the school bill, and outline the process and timeframe as per this policy. In their response, the Directors of Learning should reiterate that there is no "mark protection" and that whilst a review may result in the mark being raised, it is possible that the mark will be reduced. The most likely outcome is that the mark will remain the same unless it is clear that the original mark awarded is not consistent with, or within tolerance of, the standard applied to the school's candidates in that NEA unit.

Fee

- The fee levied will be kept broadly in line with the priority re-mark fee charged by awarding bodies; as these charges vary between boards and levels of examination, the review fee has been fixed at £45 and will be reviewed from time to time. The fee payable is for the completion of the process and will only be refunded if the mark is positively adjusted.
- Where it is necessary to appoint an external reviewer, the Directors of Learning will include information about any higher fee in their initial email response to the parent/guardian.

Review Process

Although conducted by the reviewer nominated by the department, the review process must be overseen by the Director of Learning in close conjunction with the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Assessment).

- The reviewer must, firstly, check that all appropriate NEA procedures have been followed, including those set out by Maesteg School and those prescribed by the relevant awarding body, and that the marking and moderation processes were carried out appropriately and correctly.
- The reviewer should then consider the marking of the relevant piece(s) of work with sight of the original mark, ensuring that the mark is consistent with, and within tolerance of, the standard applied to the school's candidates in that NEA unit; 'reasonable tolerance' with regard to the original mark means plus or minus 10%.
- The reviewer should communicate a final decision to the Directors of Learning the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and assessment and the Examinations Officer, along with succinct written feedback.
- The review process must under normal circumstances be concluded within five working days of the receipt of the formal written request that a mark should be reviewed.



- Should unforeseen circumstances arise, such as the need to appoint an external reviewer, the working timeframe may need to be increased beyond the stated five working days; in that case the Director of Learning will keep the parent informed of any revised timescale in a timely manner.

The outcome of the review will be communicated to the parent and candidate in writing (usually by email) by the Directors of Learning, with a copy to the Assistant Headteacher (Examinations and Assessment). There is no expectation that extended feedback or justification of the decision will be offered, nor that the decision will be subject to any further ongoing dialogue with the candidate/parent concerned, but any pertinent observations from the reviewer may be shared if it is deemed constructive to do so.

The outcome will also be shared with the Headteacher and Deputy Head; a written record of the review process will be kept and made available to the awarding body at their request. The awarding will be informed, if appropriate, of any significant irregularity brought to light by the review.



Risk Assessment

| Example risks and issues | Possible remedial action | | Staff |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| | Forward planning | Action | |
| Timetabling | | | |
| Assessment schedule clashes with other activities | Plan/establish priorities well ahead (e.g. start of academic year) for all subjects or lines of learning | Plan dates in consultation with school calendar – negotiate with other parties | Deputy Head Exams Officer |
| Too many assessments close together across subjects or lines of learning | Plan assessments so they are spaced over the duration of the course | Space assessments to at least allow candidates some time between assessments | DOL / Subject Teacher |
| Accommodation | | | |
| Insufficient space in classrooms for candidates | Once group sizes are known at the start of the year, flag instances where regular classroom space may not be suitable to conduct controlled assessment | Use more than one classroom or multiple sittings where necessary | Subject Teacher / Exams Officer |
| Insufficient facilities for all candidates | Careful planning ahead and booking of rooms/centre facilities | | DOL / Subject Teacher / Exams Officer |



| Example risks and issues | Possible remedial action | | Staff |
|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| | Forward planning | Action | |
| Downloading awarding body set tasks | | | |
| IT system unavailable on day of assessment | Download tasks well ahead of scheduled assessment date in all cases | Book IT equipment well ahead and download tasks before scheduled date of assessment | Subject Teacher / DOL / CC |
| Teaching staff/assessors unable to access task details | Test secure access rights ahead of schedule every year and every session | Ensure teaching staff/assessors have access rights for correct area of awarding body secure extranet sites ahead of time | |
| Loss of task details in transmission | Download tasks well ahead of scheduled assessment date | Report loss to awarding body for replacement; download again | |
| Absent candidates | | | |
| Candidates absent for all or part of assessment (various reasons) | Plan alternative session(s) for candidates | | Subject Teacher / DOL |
| Candidates have a scheduling clash for exams or assessment (possibly off-site on consortium teaching) | Always consider candidate timetables well ahead and decide on priorities in advance to scheduling clashes | Check before booking the date; provide an alternative date, where necessary and consult awarding body procedures for dealing with timetabling clashes Please note: retakes of controlled assessment are limited | DOL / Examinations Officer |



| Example risks and issues | Possible remedial action | | Staff |
|---|--|--|---------------------------|
| | Forward planning | Action | |
| Control levels for task taking | | | |
| Assessment is undertaken under incorrect level of control (time, resources, supervision and collaboration) | Ensure teaching staff/assessors know what level is applicable and understand what is involved. Provide training if required | Seek guidance from the awarding body | Exams Officer / NJS / DOL |
| Supervision | | | |
| Student study diary/plan not provided or completed* | Ensure teaching staff/assessors are aware of the need for study diary/plans to be completed early in course | Ensure candidates start, continue and complete study diary/plans that are signed after every session | Teacher / DOL |
| Teaching staff/assessors do not understand supervision of controlled assessment is their responsibility | Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand nature of controlled assessments and their role in supervision | | Exams Officer/ NJS / DOL |
| Suitable supervisor has not been arranged for an assessment where teaching staff/assessors are not supervising | A suitable supervisor must be arranged for any controlled assessment where a teacher/assessor is not supervising, in line with the awarding body specification | | Exams Officer / DOL |

* Not all controlled assessment, whether for Principal Learning (Wales) or GCSEs, will require the completion of a study diary or study plans.



| Example risks and issues | Possible remedial action | | Staff (use 'RACI' to determine who should be listed) |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Forward planning | Action | |
| Task setting | | | |
| Teaching staff/assessors fail to correctly set tasks | Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body specification* | Seek guidance from the awarding body | Exams Officer / NJS / DOL |
| Assessments have not been moderated as required in the awarding body specification | Check specification and plan required moderation appropriately | Seek guidance from the awarding body | Exams Officer / NJS / DOL |
| Security of materials | | | |
| Assessment tasks not kept secure before assessment | Ensure teaching staff understand importance of task security | Request/obtain different assessment tasks | Exams Officer / DOL |
| Candidates’ work not kept secure during or after assessment | Define appropriate level of security, in line with awarding body requirements, for each department as necessary | Take materials to secure storage | Teacher / DOL / Exams Officer |
| Insufficient or insecure storage space | Look at provision for suitable storage early in the course | Find alternative spaces | Teacher / DOL / Exams Officer |

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



| Example risks and issues | Possible remedial action | | Staff (use 'RACI' to determine who should be listed) |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Forward planning | Action | |
| Deadlines | | | |
| Deadlines not met by candidates | Ensure all candidates are briefed on deadlines/penalties for not meeting them | Mark what candidates have produced by deadline and seek guidance from awarding body on further action | Teacher / DOL / Exams Officer |
| Deadlines for marking and/or paperwork not met by teaching staff/ assessors | Ensure teaching staff/assessors are given clear deadlines (prior to awarding body ones) to complete marking/paperwork so the exams office can process and send off marks ahead of awarding body deadlines | Seek guidance from awarding body | Teacher / DOL / Exams Officer |
| Authentication | | | |
| Candidate fails to sign authentication form | Ensure all candidates have authentication forms to sign and attach to work when it is completed before handing in | Find candidate and ensure form is signed | Teacher / Exams Officer |
| Teaching staff/assessors fail to complete authentication forms or leave before completing authentication | Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand importance of authentication forms and the requirement of a signature | Return form to staff for signature. Ensure forms are signed as work is marked, not at end of season | DOL / Exams Officer |



| Example risks and issues | Possible remedial action | | Staff (use 'RACI' to determine who should be listed) |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Forward planning | Action | |
| Marking | | | |
| Teaching staff/assessors interpret marking descriptions incorrectly | Ensure appropriate training and practicing of marking. Plan for sampling of marking during the practice phase | Arrange for remarking. Consult awarding body specification for appropriate procedure | Exams Officer / DOL |
| Centre does not run standardisation activity as required by the awarding body | Plan against the requirements for standardisation for the awarding body when and how this activity will be conducted | Check with the awarding body whether a later standardisation event can be arranged | DOL / Exams Officer |