Elmley Dray School

Examinations Policy
Comprised of:
Examination Policy
Malpractice and Maladministration Policy
Complaints and Appeals Policy
Controlled Assessment Policy

Contents

This policy complies with the JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres 2018-2019 (section 5.8) requiring that the centre will draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their written complaints and appeals procedure which will cover general complaints regarding the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification.

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the centre's exam processes to read, understand and implement these policies.

Examinations Policy

Ensuring Equality (Equality Act 2010): Disability Discrimination

All staff must ensure that they meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA), extended in 2005, and the Disability Equality Duty (DED), introduced in 2006 - now part of the equality act 2010. Elmley Dray will meet the disability provisions under the DDA (or the Equality Act 2010 once in force), by ensuring that the exams centre is accessible and improving candidate experience.

Access Arrangements ***(special considerations and reasonable adjustments)***

The SENDCo will inform all staff of candidates with special educational needs who are embarking on a course leading to an exam as well as any special arrangements that individual candidates can be granted during the course and in the exam. All learners have a “normal ways of working” document which informs examining bodies of each candidate’s individual usual way of working in the classroom, to support their application for access arrangements in assessments.

Exam Series and Timetables

Exam Seasons

The end of year assessments take place from May through to July, based on the GCSE dates set by the examining bodies. Maths and English GCSE resits are held in November, with the possibility of non-GCSE assessment resits to be sat in January.

Mock Exams will be held under external exam conditions in Shurland Cottage, or as in class assessments.

External assignments and controlled assessments are held within classroom conditions but are managed under exam conditions, e.g. silence, timed conditions, but with access to their reasonable adjustments.

The Examinations Officer ensures that the Examinations Calendar is made available to all staff. Any changes that are made are also emailed to all staff in a timely manner.

Controlled assessments and external examinations are added to the shared Elmley Dray School Calendar to ensure all staff have access.

Timetable

Once confirmed, the Examinations Officer, overseen by the Examinations Manager, will circulate the exam timetable for internal exams and external exams. This information will be made available to all staff, learners and parents as appropriate and exam letters will be generated. Any changes to this information will also be communicated by the examinations manager.

Entries, entry details and late entries

Entries, entry details and late entries

Candidates are selected for their exam entries by the subject teachers. Candidates or their parents/carers can request a subject entry, change of level or withdrawal.

Entry deadlines are circulated to subject teachers via email under responsibility of the Examinations Manager.

Late entries are authorised by the Head of Centre and Examinations Manager.

Retakes are authorised by the Head of Centre after a consultation with educational staff and the Examinations Manager and Officer.

Managing Invigilators

Invigilators are used from the Elmley Dray School staff team, but are selected as they are not connected to the teaching and learning of the examination. External invigilators may be recruited should internal staff numbers not allow us to cover the role.

Recruitment of invigilators is the responsibility of the Head of Centre and the Examinations Manager. Invigilators are timetabled and briefed by the Examinations Officer. Invigilation training is provided on a yearly basis in accordance with JCQ guidelines to ensure all invigilators are fully aware of their roles and responsibilities.

Exam Days

The Examinations Officer will book all exam rooms after liaison with other teaching staff and ensure that the question papers, a copy of the ICE booklet, other exam stationery and materials are available for the invigilator/s.

A subject staff member may be present at the start of the exam to assist with identification of candidates and wish them luck, but must **not** communicate with candidates regarding the paper, or advise on which questions or sections to be attempted.

Exam papers must not be read by subject teachers, tutors and instructors or removed from the exam room before the end of a session. Papers will be distributed to teachers, instructors and tutors at the end of the examination season.

In the unexpected absence of the Examinations Officer due to grief, illness or any other circumstances in which the Examinations Manager is unable to fulfil duties;

The **examination contingency plan** will come into action and should be followed. All duties, roles and responsibilities usually fulfilled by the Examination Officer will be fulfilled by the Examinations Manager unless stated otherwise. All Examination paperwork and confidential/secure material will be stored in the same way unless stated otherwise.

Candidates

The candidates may not have access to any electronics inclusive of mobile phones, ipods, iPads and any electronic device that contains data or connected to the internet during the examinations. This now includes **all** watches, not just smart watches.

Candidates are able to use ear plugs to support their concentration if it is acceptable to the Head of Centre, or if it is the normal study process for the individual candidate.

Candidates are expected to stay until one hour after the official publish time has passed, unless the assessment is an online assessment.

Note: candidates may only leave the exam room for a genuine purpose and are required to return immediately to the exam room. They must be accompanied by a member of staff at all times. Supervised rest breaks are given and the candidates time is noted when they leave and re-enter the room if this is in line with their Normal Way of Working.

Reception is responsible for informing the Examinations Officer of late or absent candidates on exam day or subsequently.

Should a candidate be ill before an exam, suffer bereavement or other trauma, be taken ill during the exam itself or otherwise disadvantaged or disturbed during an exam, then it is the candidate's responsibility to alert the Headteacher or Examinations Officer.

The candidate must support any special consideration claim with appropriate evidence within three working days of the exam, for example by providing a letter from the candidate's doctor. The Examinations Manager will then forward a completed special consideration form to the relevant awarding body within seven working days of the exam.

Candidate identification

Elmley Dray's process to ensure that we know the identity of every candidate in the examination room is:

- All learners should wear their learner lanyards, showing a photo of themselves along with their name and candidate number.
- A member of staff who knows the learners and is able to identify that the learners, as they appear on the candidate exam register, are the learners who sat in the examination room, in the correct place according to the seating plan.

Version control - Approval and review

Version No.	Approved By	Approval Date	Main Change	Review Period
1	Hayley Furnell	September 2024	Initial policy approved	Annually
2	Hayley Furnell	August 2025	Annual review Change to staff roles Change to location of exams	Annually

Hayley Furnell, Director, Examinations Manager
Reviewed: August 2025
Next review: August 2026

Malpractice & Maladministration Policy

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are related concepts, the common theme of which is that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy and procedure uses the word 'malpractice' to cover both 'malpractice' and 'maladministration' and it means any act, default or practice which is:

- a breach of the Regulations; and/or
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered; and/or
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification; which: • gives rise to prejudice to candidates; and/or
- compromises public confidence in qualifications; and/or
- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre.

The individuals involved in malpractice vary. They may be:

- candidates;
- teachers, lecturers, tutors, trainers, assessors or others responsible for the conduct, administration or quality assurance of examinations and assessments including examination officers, invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements (e.g. readers, scribes and practical assistants);
- assessment personnel such as examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers;
- other third parties (e.g. parents/carers, siblings or friends of the candidate).

Malpractice may or may not relate directly to sitting an examination. Awarding bodies are aware of the possibility of novel or unexpected forms of malpractice emerging as technologies and the nature and organisation of examination centres change.

Use of AI (artificial intelligence)

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres, *"all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the learners' own"*
- Learners 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.
- Learners and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice.
- Learners 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 learner 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
- Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the learners' own (in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres)
- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of learner 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.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the learner'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 learner'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/)
Further information for centres can be found at:
https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/JCQ-AI-Use-in-Assessments-Protecting-the-Integrity-of-Qualifications.pdf

Failure by a centre to notify, investigate and report to an awarding body all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself. Failure to take action as required by an awarding body, as detailed in this document, or to co-operate with an awarding body's investigation, constitutes malpractice.

Preventing malpractice
The centre must take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice. These can include but are not limited to:

Centre staff malpractice and maladministration.

- Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the JCQ documents above and any further awarding body guidance.
- Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the key dates and deadlines and that there are robust procedures in place to ensure these are met.
- Ensure that examination officers are appropriately trained, resourced and supported.
- Ensure that exams at alternative sites are conducted in accordance with JCQ ICE requirements.
- Ensure that all staff who manage and implement special consideration and access arrangements are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced.
- Ensure that members of staff do not communicate any confidential information about examinations and assessment materials, including via social media.
- Ensure that examination clash arrangements are planned and managed effectively.
- Ensure that staff delivering/assessing coursework or non-examination assessments have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism or other potential candidate malpractice.
- Ensure that the centre has a culture of honesty and openness so that any concerns of potential malpractice can be escalated appropriately without fear of repercussion.

Candidate malpractice

- Ensure that all JCQ notices, e.g. Information for candidates, non examination assessments, coursework, on-screen tests, written examinations, social media, plagiarism are distributed to candidates prior to assessments/examinations taking place.
- Ensure candidates are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the introduction of prohibited materials and devices into the assessments, and access to restricted resources.

- Ensure that candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving (even if the information was not requested) confidential assessment materials. If a candidate receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.
- Ensure that candidates involved in examination clash arrangements are aware of appropriate behaviour during supervision, i.e. ensuring that candidates cannot pass on or receive information about the content of assessments, thereby committing candidate malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own.

Reporting maladmininistration & malpractice

The Head of Centre must:

- notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate. If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s);
- report malpractice using the appropriate forms as detailed in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.6; on the JCQ site
- be accountable for ensuring that the centre and centre staff comply at all times with the awarding body's instructions regarding an investigation;
- ensure that where a candidate who is a child/vulnerable adult is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer/ appropriate adult is kept informed of the progress of the investigation;
- ensure that if it is necessary to delegate the gathering of information to a senior member of centre staff, the awarding body's agreement is obtained and the senior member of centre staff chosen is independent and not connected to the department or candidate involved in the suspected malpractice. The Head of Centre should ensure there is no conflict of interest (see below) which might compromise the investigation;

- respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into an allegation of malpractice. This will be in the best interests of centre staff, candidates and any others involved;
- make information requested by an awarding body available speedily and openly;
- co-operate with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice and ensure that their staff do so also, whether the centre is directly involved in the case or not;
- ensure staff members and candidates are informed of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in this document;
- forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so;
- at all times comply with data protection law;
- pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of sanctions and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.

Heads of centre are reminded that a failure to comply with the requirements set out in the above points, may itself constitute malpractice.

Suspected malpractice can be identified and reported by any of the following:

- centres (including by learners, parents or centre staff);
- awarding bodies (including by examiners, moderators and awarding body staff);
- other individuals (such as funding agency staff, anonymous sources, or members of the public).

Investigations

- Any allegation that the awarding body decides requires investigation will need an individual appointed to gather information. This is to determine whether or not there is any evidence to support the allegation made.
- An allegation of malpractice is unproven until the relevant information has been gathered and considered.
- An investigation will allow the awarding body to make a decision on a case – this may be that there is no case to answer as, following investigation, there is no evidence to support the allegation. Alternatively, it may lead to a finding of malpractice which could then incur a sanction for an individual/s, or a centre.

Further information on sanctions and JCQ appendices can be found at https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Malpractice_Mar24_Revision_One_

FINAL.pdf

Version control - Approval and review

Version No.	Approved By	Approval Date	Main Change	Review Period
1	Hayley Furnell	September 2024	Initial policy approved	Annually
1.1	Hayley Furnell	August 2025	Annual review	Annually

Hayley Furnell, Director, Examinations Manager
Reviewed: August 2025
Next review: August 2026

Grounds for complaint

A candidate or their parent/carer, may make a complaint on the following grounds:

1. **Teaching and learning**

   The quality of teaching and learning, for example

- Non-subject specialist teacher without adequate training/subject matter expertise utilised on a long-term basis.
- Teacher lacking knowledge of new specification/incorrect core content studied/taught
- Core content not adequately covered
- Inadequate feedback for a candidate following assessment(s)

2. **Pre-release/advance material/set task issued by the awarding body not provided on time to an exam candidate**

3. **The taking of an assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not conducted according to the JCQ/awarding body instructions.**

4. **Centre assessed marking**

- The marking of an internal assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not undertaken according to the requirements of the awarding body.
- Candidate not informed of their centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body.
- Candidate not informed of his/her centre assessed marks in sufficient time to request/appeal a review of marking prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body.
- Candidate not given sufficient time to review materials to make a decision whether to request a review of centre assessed marks.

5. **Access arrangements**

- Candidate not assessed by the appointed assessor.
- Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding their access arrangements.
- Candidate did not consent to personal data being shared electronically (by the non-acquisition of a signed Data Protection Notice).
- Candidate not informed/adequately informed of the arrangements in place and the subjects or components of subjects where the arrangements would not apply.

- Exam information not appropriately adapted for a disabled candidate to access it.
- Adapted equipment put in place failed during exam/assessment.
- Approved access arrangement(s) not put in place at the time of an exam/assessment.
- Appropriate arrangements not put in place at the time of an exam/assessment as a consequence of a temporary injury or impairment.

6. Entries

- Candidate not entered for a required exam/assessment.
- Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment.
- Candidate entered for a wrong tier of entry.

7. Conducting examinations

- Failure to adequately brief candidate on exam timetable/exam regulations prior to exam/assessment taking place.
- Room in which the exam was held did not provide the candidate with appropriate conditions for taking the exam.
- Inadequate invigilation in the exam room.
- Failure to conduct the exam according to the regulations.
- Online or IT systems failed during online/word processed exam/assessment.
- Disruption during exam/assessment.
- Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated or reported
- Eligible application for special consideration for a candidate not submitted/not submitted to timescale.
- Failure to inform/update candidate on the outcome of a special consideration application.

8. Results and Post-results

- Before exams, candidate was not made aware of the arrangements for post-results services and the accessibility of senior members of centre staff after the publication of results.
- Candidate not having access to a member of senior staff after the publication of results to discuss or make a decision on the submission of an enquiry.
- Candidate request for return of work after moderation and work not available/disposed of earlier than allowed in the regulations.
- Candidate (or parent/carer) unhappy with a result.
- Candidate (or parent/carer) unhappy with a centre decision not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal.
- Centre applied for the wrong post-results service/for the wrong exam paper for a candidate.
- Centre missed awarding body deadline to apply for a post-results service.

- Centre applied for a post-results service for candidate without gaining required candidate consent/permission.

Complaints and appeals procedure

If a candidate, or their parent/carer, has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification they are following, Elmley Dray School encourages them to try to resolve this informally in the first instance by contacting a member of staff.

A concern or complaint should be made in person, by telephone or in writing to the head of centre.

If a complaint fails to be resolved informally, the candidate (or their parent/carer) is then at liberty to make a formal complaint.

How to make a formal complaint and how it will be investigated

- A complaint should be submitted in writing.
- The complaint will be acknowledged within 2 working days.
- The head of centre will further investigate or appoint a member of the senior leadership team, who is not involved in the grounds for complaint and has no personal interest in the outcome, to investigate the complaint and report on the findings and conclusion
- The result of the investigation will be communicated within 2 working weeks.

How to appeal against the outcome of a formal complaint

Following the outcome, if the complainant remains dissatisfied and believes there are clear grounds, an appeal can be submitted.

- Any appeal must be submitted in writing.
- The appeal will be acknowledged within 2 working days.
- The appeal will be referred to a special Committee for consideration.
- The appellant will be told when they can expect to be informed of the conclusion.
- The committee will inform the appellant of the final conclusion

Version control - Approval and review

Version No.	Approved By	Approval Date	Main Change	Review Period
1	Hayley Furnell	September 2024	Initial policy approved	Annually
1.1	Hayley Furnell	August 2025	Annual review	Annually

Hayley Furnell, Director, Examinations Manager
Reviewed: August 2025
Next review: August 2026

Controlled Assessment Policy

Controlled assessment applies to GCSE and non GCSE subjects that have an internal assessment component. It is defined as work assigned to and completed by a pupil during a course of study and is evaluated as part of the pupil's final grade in the qualification.

Controlled assessment is internal assessment in a supervised environment. There are three stages: task setting, task taking, and task marking. Levels of control (low, medium or high) for each stage are set by the examination boards to ensure reliability and authenticity of each pupils' work. In most cases, tasks are usually internally marked and externally moderated. Ensuring the validity of the marks produced from the controlled assessment is vital in maintaining the integrity and reputation of Elmley Dray in the assessment of its pupils. Each subject teacher is responsible for setting, scheduling, marking, moderating, standardising, and administering controlled assessment as regulated by the examination boards.

Controlled assessments are stored securely within a safe in the locked examinations storage room. The Head of Centre, Examinations Manager and Examinations Officer are the only members of staff who have access to this room and materials.

It is the responsibility of all teachers at Elmley Dray, to ensure that all internal assessment is ready for dispatch at the correct time. The Examinations Officer will assist by keeping a record of each dispatch, including the recipient details and the date sent.

Task setting
The subject teacher will select tasks from a choice provided by the awarding body, or will design tasks where this is permitted by criteria set out within the subject specification. The teacher will make the candidates aware of the criteria used to assess their work. The teacher will refer to each examining body's specifications to ensure guidelines are being followed.

Issuing of tasks
The subject teacher determines when set tasks are issued by the awarding body and identifies the date/s when tasks should be taken by candidates. The subject teacher is also responsible for accessing the set tasks in sufficient time to allow planning, resourcing and teaching and ensures that materials are stored securely at all times, liaising with the examinations manager.

Marks and Appeals

Marks for all internally assessed work and estimated grades must be provided to the Examinations Manager, Examinations Officer and Headteacher by the teachers.

The members of the Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) Team who are qualified to Level 4 will act as the Verifier for the internally assessed work, sampling 25% of an assessor's marking before it is submitted for external moderation.

Candidates are able to appeal about any of the outcomes received for the qualifications that they have undertaken. This appeal can be made in writing to the Head of Centre via letter or email. (see complaints and appeals policy).

Results
Candidates will receive individual result slips on results days, either in person at Elmley Dray, or via post, or email to their school email address. Learners must sign to give permission for another individual to collect their results should they not be able to attend on the day.

Arrangements for the centre to be open on results days are made by the Examinations Manager, who will be supported by the Head of Centre amongst other staff.

EAR: Enquiries about Results
EARs may be requested by either staff or candidates at Elmley Dray, if there are reasonable grounds for believing there has been an error in marking. The candidates' consent is required before any EAR is requested.

If a result is queried, the Examinations Manager, Subject Teacher and the Head of Centre will investigate the feasibility of asking for a re-mark at the expense of the School.

When the centre does not support a candidate's or parent's request for an EAR, a candidate may apply to have an enquiry carried out, however if a candidate requires this against the advice of the staff team at Elmley Dray, they will be charged.

ATS: Access To Scripts

After the release of results, a candidate may ask subject staff to request the return of papers within three working days for scrutiny of the results. Staff at Elmley Dray may also request scripts for investigation or for teaching purposes. For the latter, the consent of candidates must be obtained.

Please note: GCSE re-marks cannot be applied for once a script has been returned.

Returned Entry Level and Vocational Portfolios

These are retained by the school for one year in order to support the evidence of achievement and then are destroyed if not requested by candidates at the end of the archived period.

Certificates

Certificates are presented in person in the form of a photocopy and officially filed in each candidates' Achievement file until the candidate leaves Elmley Dray. Certificates can be

collected on behalf of a candidate, by third parties, provided they have been authorised to do so and sign a document kept by the centre confirming this.

Version control - Approval and review

Version No.	Approved By	Approval Date	Main Change	Review Period
1	Hayley Furnell	September 2024	Initial policy approved	Annually
2	Hayley Furnell	August 2025	Annual review Change to staff roles	Annually

Hayley Furnell, Director, Examinations Manager
Reviewed: August 2025
Next review: August 2026