

Non Examination Assessment Policy (including complaints and appeals)

March 2022

Policy no: 5

Coordinator	Charlotte Paine, Deputy Headteacher
Review Frequency	Annually
Last reviewed	April 2021
Agreed by SLT on	March 2022
Agreed by Governors on	TBC (Previous: March 2019)
Committee	Progress and Achievement Committee
The policy is communicated by the following means	
Governors	Consultation at meetings when reviewed
Staff	Policy folder on the staff google drive
Parents	School Website
Students	Informed via Exams Officer Student portal Form Time

1.1 Non-examined Assessment (NEA) also known as ‘coursework’.

1.1.1 Meeting the requirements of NEA is the responsibility of the Senior Leadership Team Link, Curriculum Leaders, Teaching Staff, Exams Officer and the SENCo.

1.1.2 Candidates who have to prepare for NEA should do so by the internally set deadline. Curriculum Leaders must ensure all work is ready for dispatch, standardisation and moderation at the correct time.

1.1.3 The Exams Officer will keep a record of what has been sent when and to whom. NEA marks are provided to the Exams Officer by the Curriculum Leaders.

1.1.4 It is the responsibility of the Exams Officer to notify awarding bodies of other centres with joint teaching arrangements, so that the candidates for each specification can be treated as a single group for the moderation of NEA.

1.2 Controlled Assessments

1.2.1 Meeting the requirements of controlled assessment is the responsibility of the Senior Leadership Team Link, Curriculum Leaders, Teaching Staff, Exams Officer and the SENCo in the conducting of controlled assessment tasks. It is the responsibility of each staff member to be aware of their responsibilities and to carry out all controlled assessments in accordance with JCQ, examination board and syllabus requirements.

1.2.2 Any awarding body documentation concerning controlled assessments received by the Examinations Office will be passed to the relevant Curriculum Leader for secure storage. The Exams Officer can support the secure storage of these materials if required. All controlled assessments will be conducted by teaching staff within the classroom setting.

1.2.3 Attendance at all Controlled Assessments is compulsory. Students who are unable to attend a Controlled Assessment through illness should contact Student Services before 8.30 am on the day the Controlled Assessment is due to take place. Students will be required to produce medical documentation confirming their illness on their return to school. Provided the correct medical documentation is received, and that the Controlled Assessment window for that subject is still open, the relevant Curriculum Leader will give the candidate a second opportunity to complete the Controlled Assessment. Candidates who miss Controlled Assessment through reasons other than documented illness may not be able to subsequently complete the Controlled Assessment. The teacher should notify the Exams Officer who will telephone home for any candidate who is absent at the beginning of a Controlled Assessment session.

1.3 Internal appeals procedures

1.3.1 Appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

This procedure confirms Sarah Bonnell School’s compliance with JCQ’s *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2019-2020, section 5.7* that the centre has in place “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” and that the centre “must inform candidates of their centre assessed marks. A candidate is allowed to request a review of the centre’s marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body.”

Certain components for qualifications that contribute to the final grade are internally assessed (marked) by the centre. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderation.

Please see the [Internal Appeals Procedures 2021/22](#) for further information around appealing NEA.

Deadlines for the submission of marks (Summer2022 Grades)

Date	Qualification	Details
15/05/2022	GCSE	Final date for submission of comments on provisional examination timetables to JCQ (GCSE, GCE, June 2020)

Sarah Bonnell School is committed to ensuring that whenever staff mark candidates' work, this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. Sarah Bonnell School is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where a number of subject teachers are 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 mark scheme to her marking, then they may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

Sarah Bonnell School 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 may request copies of materials (for example, a copy of their marked work, the relevant specification, the mark scheme and any other associated subject-specific documents) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment.
3. having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate within 3 working days.
4. provide candidates with sufficient time in order to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision.
5. 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 2 working days of receiving copies of the requested by completing the internal appeals form (Appendix A).
6. allow 3 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.
7. ensure that the review of marking is carried out by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate and has no personal interest in the review.
8. instruct the assessor to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.

9. 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. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

The moderation process carried out by the awarding bodies 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 by Sarah Bonnell School to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.

1.3.2 Appeals against the centre's decision not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal.

This procedure confirms Sarah Bonnell School compliance with JCQ's *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2021-22, section 5.13* that the centre has in place "a written internal appeals procedure to manage disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical 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 office.

Candidates are also informed of the arrangements for post-results services **before** they sit any exams and the accessibility of senior members of centre staff immediately after the publication of results by assemblies and letters home before the exams season. Students are then re-sent another letter before results day and guidance is available on the website.

If the centre or a candidate (or their parent/carer) has a concern and believes a result may not be accurate, a review of the result may be requested.

Reviews of Results (RoRs) offers three services.

- „ Service 1 – clerical re-check
- „ Service 2 – review of marking
- „ Service 3 – review of moderation (this service is not available to an individual candidate)

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 is submitted to the awarding body as with these services candidates' marks and subject grades may be lowered. Candidate consent can only be collected after the publication of results.

If a concern is raised about a particular examination result the Exams Officer, DHT and Head of Centre will investigate the feasibility of requesting a review supported by the centre.

Where the centre does not uphold a request from a candidate the candidate may pay the appropriate RoR fee to the centre, and a request will be made to the awarding body on the candidate's behalf.

If the candidate (or her parent/carer) believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support a review, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre by completing the SB internal appeals form at least 2 days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of their 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 SB internal appeals form (Appendix A) should be completed and submitted to the centre within 2 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 receiving 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.

1.4. Complaints and appeals procedure (exams)

1.4.1 Complaint and appeals can be made on the following bases:

Teaching and learning

- Quality of teaching and learning, for example
 - A non-subject specialist teacher without adequate training/subject matter expertise was utilised on a long-term basis
 - The teacher was lacking knowledge of new specification/incorrect core content studied/taught
 - Core content was not adequately covered
 - Inadequate feedback was provided for a candidate following assessment(s)
- Pre-release/advance material/set task issued by the awarding body was not provided on time to an exam candidate
- The taking of an assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, was not conducted according to the JCQ/awarding body instructions
- The marking of an internal assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, was not undertaken according to the requirements of the awarding body (complainant should refer to the centre's internal appeals procedure)
- The Centre failed to adhere to its internal appeals procedure
- The candidate was not informed of her centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body
- The candidate was not informed of her centre assessed marks in sufficient time to request/appeal a review of marking prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body
- The candidate was not given sufficient time to review materials to make a decision whether to request a review of centre assessed marks

Access arrangements

- Candidate not assessed by the centre's appointed assessor
- Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding her 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

Entries

- Failure to clearly explain a decision of early entry for a qualification to candidate (or parent/carer)
- Candidate not entered/entered late (incurring a late entry fee) for a required exam/assessment
- Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment
- Candidate entered for a wrong tier of entry

Conducting examinations

- Failure to adequately brief candidate on exam timetable/exam regulations prior to exam/assessment taking place
- Room in which exam held did not provide candidate with appropriate conditions for taking the exam
- Inadequate invigilation in exam room
- Failure to conduct exam according to the regulations
- Online system failed during (online) exam/assessment
- Disruption during exam/assessment
- Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated/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

Results and Post-results

- Before exams, candidate 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/make 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 (complainant to refer via Exams Officer to awarding body post-results services)
- 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 (complainant to refer via Exams Officer to the centre's internal appeals procedure)
- 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 her parent/carer) has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification she is following, Sarah Bonnell School encourages them to try to resolve this informally in the first instance. A concern or complaint should be made in person, by telephone or in writing to the head of the centre.

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

1.4.2 How to make a formal complaint

- A complaint should be submitted in writing by completing a SB complaints and appeals form (Appendix A)
- Forms are available from the Exams Officer
- Completed forms should be returned to the Head of Centre
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 4 working days

N.B. This process differs for appeals against Centre Assessed Grades in summer 2021. Details of the appeals process can be found in the Sarah Bonnell Centre Policy for GCSE Grades 2021.

1.4.3 How a formal complaint is investigated

- 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 findings and conclusion will be provided to the complainant within 2 working weeks

1.4.4 Appeals

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 by again completing a SB complaints and appeals form (appendix A).
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 5 working days (Appendix B).
- The appeal will be referred to the Chair of Governors.
- The Chair of Governors will inform the appellant of the final conclusion in due course.

1.5. Process to check the qualifications of the centre's assessor and that the correct procedures are followed (GR 5.4; AA 7.3)

The Head of Centre is responsible for:

- the quality of the access arrangements process within his or her centre; and
- the appointment of assessors, checking the qualifications of those assessing candidates

Heads of centre ensures assessors are suitably qualified as well as attend regular training across each subject is up to date via CPD, online training and working across the MAT. The professional must present evidence of successful completion of a post-graduate course in individual specialist assessment.

A Head of Centre ensures:

- an access arrangements assessor who has successfully completed a postgraduate course at or equivalent to Level 7, including at least 100 hours relating to individual specialist assessment*. An access arrangements assessor may conduct assessments to be recorded within Section C of Form 8; and/or
- a specialist assessor with a current SpLD Assessment Practising Certificate, as awarded by BDA, the Dyslexia Guild or Patoss and listed on the SASC website, who may conduct assessments to be recorded within Section C of Form 8 and where necessary undertake full diagnostic assessments; and/or
- an appropriately qualified psychologist registered with the Health & Care Professions Council who may conduct assessments to be recorded within Section C of Form 8 and where necessary undertake full diagnostic assessments.

All assessors are:

- fully trained to understand the current edition of the JCQ publication Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments and the principles, procedures and accountabilities involved;
- be familiar with the Equality Act 2010 (although it is not their role to determine what is a 'reasonable adjustment', but rather to help identify access arrangements that might assist the candidate);
- either hold an appropriate qualification to teach and make recommendations for secondary aged or adult learners who have learning difficulties or be a HCPC registered psychologist..

Alternatively, the assessor is:

- employed at another centre, e.g. within an Academy chain; or
- employed by the Local Authority; or
- an external assessor who has an established working relationship with the centre or, before an assessment, establishes a relationship with the centre.

The SENCo will provide the assessor with at least a 'skeleton' Section A of Form 8 prior to the candidate being assessed (Section C of Form 8).

Appendix A

Sarah Bonnell School Internal Appeals form (NEA)

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

FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Reference No.	

- Appeal against an internal assessment decision and/or request for a review of marking
- Appeal against the centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

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

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

