

Addendum to Non-Examined Assessment Policy including malpractice and maladministration

This addendum supplements but does not replace the current Archbishop Temple School Non-Examination Assessment Policy.

On 4 January 2021, the Government announced that it was no longer fair for the summer 2021 examination series for the GCSE and vocational qualifications to go ahead due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. On 25th February it was announced that teachers must assess their students' performance to determine the grade each student should receive.

The JCQ and Ofqual subsequently published significant guidance:

[Guidance: Information for centres about making objective judgements in relation to awarding qualifications in 2021, Ofqual February 2021](#)

[Guidance: Information for heads of centre, heads of department and teachers on the submission of teacher assessed grades: summer 2021, Ofqual, 24 March 2021](#)

[JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for summer 2021, JCQ, 26 March 2021](#)

This year, for the purposes of awarding grades for qualifications, all evidence on which a candidate's grade is based is to be deemed non-examination assessment, and delivery, completion, marking and moderating of such work must follow the current Non-Examination Assessment Policy and this addendum to that policy.

Archbishop Temple School manages malpractice, in accordance with the JCQ [General Regulations for Approved Centres](#) (section 5.11); thus, when non-examination assessment is to be undertaken, staff and pupils must adhere to the regulations stipulated in [JCQ Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments](#).

The decision to award grades based on teacher assessment inherently introduces increased risk of malpractice, either by omission or commission, because of the increase in volume of NEA tasks and because some evidence will have been completed remotely during periods of national lockdown. We will take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice, including maladministration, before, during and after the determination of grades process and report and investigate as detailed in the Non-Examination Assessment Policy according to the requirements.

Supervision

Formal

Work may be completed remotely and under formal supervision if the task has been done with 'cameras on'. This gives the teacher confidence that no assistance beyond that normally permitted by awarding bodies has been given and that the work is the candidate's own.

To facilitate remote formal supervision, candidates will need to use a mobile phone, iPad or any other electronic communication device during the session, which is subject to formal supervision to enable the teacher to confirm the integrity of the work. Additionally, evidence used may involve tasks set, completed and submitted digitally as a consequence of learning from home.

The Archbishop Temple School Centre Policy for Determining Teacher Assessed Grades in Summer 2021 page 17 states the measures taken by teachers at the subject level to ensure a very high level of confidence that work completed remotely and which is used as evidence in awarding a grade is the candidate's own work.

Informal and limited supervision

The completion, marking and moderating of evidence that is done under informal or limited supervision must adhere to the existing Non-Examination Assessment Policy. Teachers are to have an increased awareness of the opportunity for plagiarism including poor or lack of referencing within their work. Where the format permits, candidates' work is to be checked for plagiarism using <https://www.quetext.com/> or similar.

Malpractice

The [JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures 2020-2021](#) continues to apply.

In addition to the examples of malpractice cited in the current Non-Examination Assessment Policy, there is potential for the following instances of malpractice in summer 2021.

Centre Staff

Archbishop Temple School will report any instances of potential malpractice, including maladministration, where any centre staff fail to follow the published requirements for determining grades.

Immediately a suspicion is raised or an allegation received of suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration by school staff, the Head Teacher will complete and submit the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form JCQ M2 Notification of suspected malpractice / maladministration involving centre staff.

The Head Teacher will delegate a subsequent investigation to the assistant headteacher i/c of examinations and assessments, who will conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. The assistant headteacher i/c of examinations will work with the Exams Officer to undertake the investigation in line with the published *Procedures in the Event of an Allegation of Malpractice* as detailed in the Non-Examination Assessment Policy. Such an investigation will be supported by the Headteacher and all personnel linked to the allegation.

Examples of staff malpractice and steps to mitigate against these are detailed below.

Malpractice	Mitigation
Exam entries are created for students who had not studied the course of entry or had not intended to enter for June 2021.	No late entries made after February 2021.
Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that grade.	Face-to-face teaching took place for all pupils during 3 rd September '19 – 23 rd March '20, 2 nd September '20 – 4 th January 2021 and 8 th March '21 – present.

	<p>For the period 23rd March '20 – 17th July '20, pupils engaged in remote learning, the majority of which was asynchronous activities using resources provided by school.</p> <p>For the period 4th January – 7th March '21, all pupils were offered blended remote learning with a majority of teacher-lead instruction via MS Teams.</p> <p>As such, all candidates have been offered sufficient teaching to provide a basis for a grade. Where candidates, for valid reasons, have been unable to engage in these opportunities, teachers have been alerted to the reasons and dates and instructed, where appropriate, to apply special consideration (see below).</p>
<p>A teacher deliberately and inappropriately disregarding the centre's published policy when determining grades.</p>	<p>Draft school policy discussed at department meetings on Tuesday 20th April '20 and subject leaders' responses contributed to the final version published on 28th April.</p> <p>The assessment of evidence is moderated within school for subjects with two or more teachers and externally with another centre for subjects with only one teacher.</p> <p>Increased, weekly department time to facilitate assessment and moderation as a subject team to support consistent application of the school policy.</p> <p>All grades and the supporting basket of evidence will be checked and counter-signed by the subject leader or a second in department. For single-teacher subjects, the SLT line manager will countersign the final grades.</p>
<p>A teacher fabricating evidence of candidate performance to support an inflated grade.</p>	<p>Benchmarking of grades using FFT 50 and FFT 20 estimates to identify unexpected grades.</p> <p>Moderation of all candidates' grades by subject leaders and SLT line managers during the quality assurance process.</p> <p>AHT i/c exams to scrutinize all grades for all candidates to identify anomalous outcomes for a specific subject or an individual candidate within a subject.</p>
<p>A teacher deliberately providing inappropriate levels of support before or during an assessment, including deliberate disclosure of mark schemes and assessment materials, to support an inflated grade.</p>	<p>Departmental moderation and internal quality assurance processes will check - at least samples of – work.</p>
<p>A teacher intentionally submitting inflated grades.</p>	<p>All grades and the supporting basket of evidence will be checked and counter-signed by the subject leader or a second in department. For single-teacher subjects, the SLT line manager will countersign the final grades.</p>
<p>A failure to retain evidence used in the determination of grades in</p>	<p>Subject leaders to be responsible for the retention of physical and/or digital portfolios. These are checked by the SLT line manager during the internal quality assurance process.</p>

accordance with the JCQ Grading guidance.	
A systemic failure to follow the centre's policy in relation to the application of Access Arrangements or Special Consideration arrangements for students in relation to assessments used to determine grades.	<p>Guidance on and details of access arrangements and special consideration was distributed to all teachers on 8th March '21 with subsequent updates as necessary.</p> <p>The Archbishop Temple School Summer 2021 Assessment Record documentation will provide a record of when access arrangements and/or special consideration have not been applied and how this is taken into account when determining the final grade. These are checked by the SLT line manager during the internal quality assurance process.</p>
A failure to take reasonable steps to authenticate student work.	Where work has not been completed in school under teachers' supervision, subject teachers take the steps cited in the centre's policy on page 17
A failure to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest (COIs) within a centre.	<p>Routine declarations of conflicts of interest submitted to AOs in Autumn '20.</p> <p>Food and Nutrition – candidate's work marked by Head of Technology and moderated externally by Balshaw's C of E.</p> <p>Physics – candidates' work marked by AHT and moderated by Second in Department.</p>
A Head of Centre's failure to submit the required declaration when submitting their grades.	Process checked by Exams Officer and AHT i/c exams
Grades being released to students (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results.	Final grades determined after pupils are no longer required to attend lessons.
Failure to cooperate with an awarding body's quality assurance, appeal or investigation processes.	Subject leaders and SLT line managers will be directed by the Head Teacher regarding matters related to quality assurance and appeals.
Failure to conduct a centre review or submit an appeal when requested to do so by a student.	Addendum to Internal Appeals Policy provides details of appeals for 2021.

Students

In accordance with JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for Summer 2021 the evidence to be used for the determination of grades and its priority is distributed to parents/carers and pupils via Firefly and on the school's website. This range of evidence used to determine a grade is not negotiable.

Where a candidate might attempt to gain an unfair advantage during the centre's process on the determination of grades, (E.g. submitting fabricated evidence or plagiarised work, or any other act deemed as malpractice in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2020-2021) the assistant headteacher i/c of examinations and assessments will submit a report of suspected candidate malpractice to the relevant awarding body.

Where a candidate, or an individual acting on their behalf such as a parent/carer, might try to influence grade decisions by applying pressure to the centre or any of its staff, Archbishop Temple School will keep and retain clear and reliable records of the circumstances and the steps taken, and make the candidate aware of the outcome. This will include a record that confirms the candidate had been made aware of the evidence that was going to be used and understand that the range of evidence used to determine a grade was not negotiable.

However, if a candidate or an individual acting on their behalf continues to inappropriately attempt to pressure centre staff, a report of suspected candidate malpractice will be submitted immediately to the relevant awarding body using the appropriate documentation as guided by the awarding body/bodies concerned, including the form JCQ M1 Report of suspected candidate malpractice.

Additionally, the assistant headteacher i/c of examinations will subsequently provide the awarding body/bodies a report on investigations into instances of suspected malpractice.

Examples of candidate malpractice and steps to mitigate against these are detailed below.

Malpractice	Mitigation
Students may attempt to influence their teachers' judgements about their grades.	The assessment of evidence is moderated and determination of grades is done collaboratively within a department. Subject leaders and SLT line managers will quality assure the process. Any incident of a student attempting to influence grades must be reported in writing (email) to AHT i/c exams. The student will be severely reprimanded and parents/carers informed.
Students might attempt to gain an unfair advantage during the centre's process by, for example, submitting fabricated evidence or plagiarised work.	Where possible, all digitally completed work will be run through a plagiarism checker. Subject specific checks for the authenticity of a candidates work are cited in the centre's policy on page 17. Work recognised as not being that of the candidate will not be used as evidence. The candidate and their parents/carers will be notified.
Students, or individuals acting on behalf of a student, such as parents/carers, might also try to influence grade decisions by	JCQ guidance, awarding organisations' guidance and the school's policies have been distributed to pupils and their parents/carers on Firefly.

<p>applying pressure to centres or their staff.</p>	<p>In the first instance of such plagiarism, the teacher will document the incident and alert the AHT i/c exams in writing, who will redirect the individual to the documents.</p> <p>In the event of further instances, full documentation of incidents will be made and awarding organisations notified.</p>
---	--

Appendix

Collaborative moderation will take place as follows:

Art – Brownedge St Mary’s (Preston)

Business – Nelson Thomlinson (Carlisle) and Slough HS

Computer Science – Corpus Christi and Kirkham Grammar School (Preston)

Creative iMedia - St Aiden’s (Preesall) and Millfield (Thornton Cleveleys)

Food and Nutrition – Balshaw’s C of E (Leyland)

Music – The Piggott C of E (Reading)

PE – Our Lady’s HS, St Cecilia’s HS, Broughton HS, Corpus Christi (Preston)

Sports Studies – Moor Park HS, Ashton Community HS (Preston)