



Joint Council
for Qualifications

GCE, ELC and Project qualifications

Instructions for conducting coursework

1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014

(These instructions must be forwarded electronically to each subject leader within the centre)

Produced on behalf of:



The Joint Council for Qualifications has written these instructions for the setting, supervision, authentication, marking, internal standardisation and external moderation of coursework in examination centres.

These instructions are for use in GCE and ELC specifications. They also apply to Project qualifications including the Extended Project.

These instructions are additional to any guidelines or regulations an individual awarding body may issue. If there is a conflict between the awarding body's guidelines or regulations and these instructions, the awarding body and subject-specific instructions shall prevail.

These instructions are applicable from 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014.

It is the responsibility of each subject leader within the centre to familiarise themselves with the content of this booklet.

Contents

Introduction	ii
1 Task setting	1
2 Marking, revision, re-drafting and interim review of work	1
3 Presentation and submission of coursework	3
4 Involvement of parents/carers	4
5 Acknowledgement of sources	4
6 Malpractice in coursework	5
7 Detection of plagiarism	6
8 Authentication procedures	6
9 Marking of internally-assessed coursework	7
10 Annotation	7
11 Jointly-produced work	7
12 Quality of Language/Written Communication	8
13 Standardisation of marking within centres	8
14 Submission of marks for internally-assessed components	8
15 Incomplete coursework	9
16 Applications for special consideration in respect of incomplete coursework	9
17 Lost coursework	10
18 Re-use of coursework marks by candidates	10
19 External moderation	11
20 Feedback to centres	12
21 Guidance for centres where coursework requirements have not been met	12
22 Externally-assessed coursework	12
23 Return of work to centres	13
24 Centre consortium arrangements	13
25 Enquiries about Results	14
26 Access issues	14
Appendix 1 JCQ Declaration of Authentication – coursework assessments	15
Appendix 2 JCQ Information for candidates, GCE, ELC and Project Qualifications, Coursework Assessments	16

Introduction

In these instructions, a centre is an institution approved by an awarding body as a centre for its examinations. The head of a school, the principal of a college or the chief officer of an institution approved as a centre is known as the head of centre.

The head of centre is responsible to the awarding bodies for ensuring that coursework is conducted and marked in accordance with these instructions.

If a situation arises which is not covered by these instructions, please ask the awarding body for advice. Where there are subject-specific instructions printed in a specification, they take precedence over the instructions in this document.

These instructions apply to the setting, supervision, authentication, marking, internal standardisation and external moderation of coursework in all subjects.

The term coursework is a generic one, which includes the work required in Project qualifications. Centres should be aware that **sections 1-6, 8, 11, 12, 16-18 and 26** also apply to externally assessed coursework.

You must send all correspondence relating to coursework directly to the awarding body concerned and not to the moderator (unless the awarding body informs you otherwise).

You are reminded that any breach of the regulations for the setting, supervision, authentication and marking of coursework may constitute malpractice (which includes maladministration) as defined in the JCQ publication *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014*. This publication is available on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice> to which you are referred for further information.

For information relating to the conduct of GCSE controlled assessments, you must refer to the JCQ publication *Instructions for conducting controlled assessments*, which is available on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/controlled-assessments>.

The JCQ documents referred to are additionally available on the JCQ Autumn 2013 memory stick which forms part of the JCQ despatch to centres in September, at the start of the new academic year.

1 Task setting

- 1.1 Coursework components assess candidates' skills, knowledge and understanding that may not readily be assessed by timed written papers. Coursework will take many different forms. Evidence of participation that may be appended to the candidate's final work may include printouts, copies of presentations, charts, photographs, letters, artefacts, videos, recordings or transcripts of interviews, CDs or DVDs. This diversity will be reflected in any subject-specific requirements for coursework that have been issued by the awarding body.
- 1.2 The centre should ensure that candidates are clear about the assessment criteria which they are expected to meet in their coursework. Specifications usually explain the criteria in detail, but candidates may require some further explanation or interpretation before they fully understand the nature of the skills which they are expected to demonstrate. Any explanation or interpretation given by teaching staff **must** be general and not specific to a candidate's work.
- 1.3 For candidates embarking on Project qualifications, it must be made clear what is involved: a free choice of topic, flexible choice of output and the opportunity to show evidence of a wide range of capabilities. However, projects must be chosen by candidates in discussion with their supervisor and verified as appropriate, by the centre following procedures specified by the awarding body.

2 Marking, revision, re-drafting and interim review of work

- 2.1 When marking the coursework, teachers/assessors **must not** give credit in regard to any additional assistance given to candidates beyond that which is described in the specification. Teachers/assessors **must** give details of any additional assistance on the appropriate record form(s). Examples would include:
 - having reviewed the candidate's coursework giving (either to individual candidates or to groups) detailed advice and suggestions as to how the work may be improved in order to meet the assessment criteria;
 - giving detailed indications of errors or omissions which leave the candidate no opportunity for individual initiative;
 - giving advice on specific improvements needed to meet the criteria;
 - providing writing frames specific to the coursework task (e.g. outlines, paragraph headings or section headings);
 - intervening personally to improve the presentation or content of the coursework.

Before giving additional assistance beyond that which is described in the specification, teachers should ensure that there is provision to record this assistance and take account of it in the marking, **as there are a few coursework components in which no additional assistance is allowed.**

- 2.2 **Candidates are free to revise and re-draft a piece of coursework without teacher involvement before submitting the final piece.** Candidates should be advised to spend an appropriate amount of time on the work, commensurate with the marks available.

- 2.3 Where drafting is inherent in the skills being tested, subject-specific guidance and exemplification will indicate its role in relation to the type of writing being undertaken and any interim assessment allowed in these circumstances. This guidance may extend to the way in which evidence of re-drafting is provided for subsequent internal standardisation or external moderation purposes.
- 2.4 In the absence of subject-specific guidance, teachers may review coursework before it is handed in for final assessment. Provided that advice remains at the general level, enabling the candidate to take the initiative in making amendments, there is no need to record this advice as assistance or to deduct marks. Generally one review should be sufficient to enable candidates to understand the demands of the assessment criteria. Advice may be given in either oral or written form. Some subjects, such as Art, may require more than one review.
- 2.5 A clear distinction must be drawn between any interim review of coursework and final assessment for the intended examination series. Once work is submitted for final assessment it **must not** be revised. Under no circumstances are 'fair copies' of marked work allowed. **Adding or removing any material to or from coursework after it has been presented by a candidate for final assessment will constitute malpractice.**
- 2.6 Where coursework is submitted in digital format there may be instances where the construction of the e-coursework does not attract any marks, in which case this construction may be done by the teacher instead of the candidate.
- 2.7 If a candidate requires additional assistance in order to demonstrate aspects of the assessment, the teacher **must** award a mark which represents the candidate's unaided achievement. The authentication statement **must** be signed and information given on the *Candidate Record Sheet*.
- 2.8 Where candidates are following Project qualifications, the supervisor will need to discuss with the candidate the range of acceptable evidence that should be used. The supervisor may give feedback on the progress of the Project, which should be acknowledged on the appropriate record form.
- 2.9 Teachers must keep live coursework secure and confidential at all times whilst in their possession. It is not acceptable for teaching staff to share 'live' coursework with other candidates.

3 Presentation and submission of coursework

- 3.1 All coursework submitted for assessment **must** be the candidate's own work. Written material may be handwritten using black ink or where possible, word-processed. (Computers may be used unless stated otherwise in the awarding body's specification.)
- 3.2 A photocopy is acceptable when the coursework is submitted for more than one subject, unless stated otherwise in the specification. In this case it will be necessary to enclose a note to the moderator explaining why a photocopy has been submitted.
- 3.3 Where appropriate, work submitted may also include printouts/copies of presentations, charts, artefacts, photographs, letters, videos, recordings or transcripts of interviews, as well as witness statements from supervising teachers to record what a candidate has demonstrated. **In the event that videos or photographs/images of candidates are included as evidence of individual participation or contribution, heads of centre must obtain the informed consent of each candidate, and (where necessary) the candidate's parent/carer, appearing in a photograph or video.**
- 3.4 Coursework must include a title and, where relevant, a table of contents and a bibliography. Material included as appendices (such as tables of statistics, diagrams, graphs, illustrations, photographs, maps etc) will be given credit only if it is pertinent to the work and is referred to in the text.
- 3.5 Valuable illustrative materials should not normally be included with the work sent for moderation or external marking, but a note should be attached to the coursework confirming that the material was part of the original submission. Photographs of the material may be included if appropriate.

If valuable or fragile illustrative materials have been sent for moderation or external marking, awarding bodies recommend that centres insure such material against damage or loss from the time of its despatch up to its return to the centre.

The awarding bodies accept no liability for the loss of, or damage to coursework that occurs during the moderation process or during despatch, transit or storage, or for problems that occur during the construction, submission and moderation of coursework in an electronic format. N.B. Candidates should be advised not to include any items of real or sentimental value e.g. photographs, certificates.

- 3.6 Where candidates produce coursework electronically their work must be backed-up regularly and stored securely on the centre's IT system. The centre must also take into account protection of the candidates' work from corruption.
- 3.7 For moderation or external marking purposes, typed or written work should be submitted on appropriately sized paper in a plain cover or folder, **together** with the cover sheets provided by the awarding body. The cover must be marked clearly with the candidate's name and number, the number of the centre, the specification title or code and the component/unit title or code. Bulky covers or folders must not be included. **If the coursework is word-processed, the candidate must ensure that their centre number, candidate number and the unit/component code appears on each page as a header or footer.**
- 3.8 For Project qualifications, the written report and all evidence specified by the awarding body should be securely attached to the candidate's record form so that the moderator can easily read the work and associated marks.

4 Involvement of parents/carers

- 4.1 Parents/carers should encourage their children to spend time on their coursework and to think about it as early as possible. They should discuss with their children the planning and timing of the work.
- 4.2 Parents/carers may provide their children with access to resource materials and discuss the coursework with their children, but they must not give direct advice on what should or should not be included.
- 4.3 A child who needs more specific help should be encouraged to speak to his/her teacher.

5 Acknowledgement of sources

- 5.1 In many subjects candidates will need to use information from published sources (including the internet) when carrying out their coursework. However, candidates must not copy published material and claim it as their own work.
- 5.2 If candidates use the same wording as a published source, they must place quotation marks around the passage and state where it came from. Candidates **must** give detailed references even where they paraphrase the original material.

A reference from a printed book or journal should show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number. For example: (Morrison, 2000 p 29).

For material taken from the internet, the reference should show the date when the material was downloaded and **must** show the precise web page, not the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example:
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/16/sosteacher/history/40766.shtml>.

Candidates should be encouraged as a means of good practice to state the actual date when the material was downloaded.

- 5.3 Candidates must also include a bibliography which lists the full details of publications used to research and support their coursework, even where these are not directly referred to, for example: Morrison, A (2000) 'Mary Queen of Scots', London: Weston Press.

6 Malpractice in coursework

6.1 Candidates must not:

- submit work which is not their own;
- lend work to other candidates or allow their work to be copied;
- allow other candidates access to, or the use of, their own independently sourced material or assist others in the production of coursework; (this does not mean that candidates may not lend their books to one another, but candidates must not plagiarise others' research);
- use any books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution;
- submit work word-processed by a third person without acknowledgement.

These actions constitute malpractice, for which a penalty (e.g. disqualification from the assessment) will be applied.

6.2 **If irregularities in coursework are discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication** this should be dealt with under the centre's internal procedures and need not be reported to the awarding body. Details of any work which is not the candidate's own **must** be recorded on the authentication form supplied by the awarding body or other appropriate place.

6.3 **If irregularities in coursework are identified by a centre after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication**, the head of centre **must** submit full details of the case to the relevant awarding body at the earliest opportunity. Guidance is provided in the JCQ publication *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures*. The publication and **Form JCQ/M1** can be found on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>.

6.4 The *Code of Practice* places a responsibility upon the awarding bodies to require centres to have a published internal appeals procedure in place, relating to internal assessment decisions, which is made widely available and accessible to candidates. The procedure must cover appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice.

A centre may place its internal appeals procedure on the school/college website or alternatively the document may be made available to candidates upon request.

Further advice is given in the JCQ document *Arrangements for internal appeals about internal assessment decisions and enquiries about results*. This document can be found on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/other-documents>.

6.5 In the case of reports of suspected malpractice in coursework received from examiners or moderators, the awarding body, where necessary, will ask the head of centre to conduct a full investigation into the alleged malpractice and report his/her findings to the awarding body. Guidance is provided in the JCQ publication referred to in **paragraph 6.3**.

6.6 Awarding bodies reserve the right to submit candidates' work to third party IT service providers in order to detect potential and suspected malpractice. Any such submissions will be done in a way which protects the identity of the candidate.

7 Detection of plagiarism

- 7.1 There are a number of clues that point to the possibility of plagiarism, and teachers should remain alert to these. Further guidance on the detection of plagiarism may be found in the JCQ document *Plagiarism in Examinations: Guidance for Teachers/Assessors*. This document can be found on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>.
- 7.2 The following guides, published by Ofqual, should also be consulted: <http://www.ofqual.gov.uk/for-students-and-parents/123-for-students-and-parents-main-box-2-no-image/268-plagiarism-guides-for-students-parents-and-teachers>.

8 Authentication procedures

- 8.1 The *Code of Practice* requires **all candidates** to confirm that work they submit for assessment is their own. All candidates are required to sign a declaration of authentication (**see Appendix 1, page 15**) before submitting their coursework to their teacher/assessor for final assessment. This is to confirm that the work is their own and that any assistance given and/or sources used have been acknowledged. **Ensuring that they do so is the responsibility of the centre.** Centres should record marks of zero if candidates cannot confirm the authenticity of work submitted for assessment.
- 8.2 It is also a requirement of the *Code of Practice* that teachers/assessors confirm to the awarding body that all of the work submitted for assessment was completed under the required conditions and that they are satisfied the work is solely that of the individual candidate concerned. If they are unable to do so, the work should not be accepted for assessment. All teachers/assessors who have assessed the work of any candidate entered for each component must sign the declaration of authentication. Failure to sign the authentication statement may delay the processing of the candidate's results. **If, during the external moderation process, there is no evidence that the work has been properly authenticated, the awarding body will set the mark(s) awarded by the centre to zero.**
- 8.3 The teacher should be sufficiently aware of the candidate's standard and level of work to appreciate if the coursework submitted is beyond that candidate's talents.
- 8.4 In most centres teachers are familiar with candidates' work through class and homework assignments. Where this is not the case, teachers should require coursework to be completed under direct supervision.
- 8.5 In all cases, some direct supervision is necessary to ensure that the coursework submitted can be confidently authenticated as the candidate's own.
- 8.6 If teachers/assessors have reservations about signing the authentication statements, the following points of guidance should be followed:
- if it is believed that a candidate has received additional assistance and this is acceptable within the guidelines for the relevant specification, the teacher/assessor should award a mark which represents the candidate's unaided achievement. The authentication statement should be signed and information given on the relevant form;
 - if the teacher/assessor is unable to sign the authentication statement of a particular candidate, then the candidate's work cannot be accepted for assessment. A mark of zero should be recorded on the mark sheet or encoded on the EDI file;
 - if malpractice is suspected, the examinations officer should be consulted about the procedure to be followed (**see paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3, page 5**).

9 Marking of internally-assessed coursework

- 9.1 In marking coursework, teachers should pay close attention to the requirements of the specification. Teachers should note that it is their responsibility to award marks for coursework in accordance with the marking criteria detailed in the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents. Teachers must show clearly how the marks have been awarded in relation to these marking criteria. The centre's marks must reflect the relative attainment of all the candidates.
- 9.2 **Where a teacher teaches his/her own child, the centre must declare the conflict of interest and send the marked work to the moderator whether it is part of the sample or not.**

10 Annotation

- 10.1 Any guidance given in the awarding body's specification on providing evidence to support the marks awarded must be followed.
- 10.2 Subject to any further guidance contained in specifications, one of the following approaches should be adopted:
- summary comments either on the work (usually at the end) or on a cover sheet;
 - key pieces of evidence flagged throughout the work by annotation either in the margin or in the text;
 - a combination of the above.
- 10.3 Indications as to how marks have been awarded should:
- be clear and unambiguous;
 - be appropriate to the nature and form of the coursework;
 - facilitate the standardisation of marking within the centre;
 - enable the moderator to check the application of the assessment criteria to the marking.
- 10.4 Where appropriate to the type of work, the evidence to support the marks awarded should:
- indicate where the assessment criteria have been met, e.g. by writing key phrases from the criteria (such as 'awareness of values', 'selects information', 'uses a variety of techniques') at the appropriate point in the work;
 - indicate any planning and processing not undertaken individually, and provide details of any assistance or prompting given to the candidate.
- 10.5 Where a moderator cannot find evidence to justify the mark awarded to a candidate, the work may be returned to the centre for further explanation or the mark may be subject to adjustment.

11 Jointly-produced work

- 11.1 Where permitted by the specification, the work of individual candidates may be informed by working with others, for example in undertaking research, but candidates **must** provide an individual response as part of any task outcome.

Where an assignment may be undertaken as part of a group, for example undertaking field research, each candidate **must** write up his/her own account of the assignment. Even if the data the candidates have is the same, the description of how the data was obtained and the conclusions drawn from it must be in each candidate's own words. Alternatively, where candidates are required to construct a product, they may collaborate in the construction of the product but their responses **must** be their own and their individual contribution clearly identified.

12 Quality of Language/Written Communication

- 12.1 Candidates should be aware of the need to use both clear communication and presentation in their coursework; specifications state whether quality of language will be assessed.

13 Standardisation of marking within centres

- 13.1 Centres should use reference and archive materials (such as exemplar material provided by the awarding body or, where available, work in the centre from the previous year) to help set the standard of marking within the centre.
- 13.2 Prior to marking, it is useful to undertake a trial marking exercise. Teachers should mark the same relatively small sample of work to allow for the comparison of marking standards. The exercise can take place at appropriate stages during the course and has three beneficial effects: it helps to bring about greater comparability in the marking standards; it may identify at an early stage any teachers whose standards are out of line with that of their colleagues; and it alleviates a heavy marking load at the end of the course.
- 13.3 Where the work for a component has been marked by more than one teacher in a centre, standardisation of marking should normally be carried out according to one of the following procedures:
- Either** a sample of work which has been marked by each teacher is re-marked by the teacher who is in charge of internal standardisation;
- Or** all the teachers responsible for marking a component exchange some marked work, (preferably at a meeting led by the teacher in charge of internal standardisation) and compare their marking standards.

Where standards are found to be inconsistent, the relevant teacher(s) should make adjustments to their marks or re-consider the marks of all candidates for whom they were responsible. The new marks should be checked by the teacher in charge of internal standardisation.

- 13.4 **Following completion of the marking and internal standardisation, the coursework must be retained by the centre and not returned to the candidates until after the closing date for enquiries about results for the series concerned.**
- 13.5 Centres should retain evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out.

14 Submission of marks for internally-assessed components

- 14.1 Awarding bodies will publish deadlines for the submission of marks.
- 14.2 Forms for recording final coursework marks are supplied by the awarding bodies. The forms and any other documentation provided must be completed in accordance with the instructions given and returned to the awarding bodies by the date specified. As an alternative, centres may submit their coursework marks electronically, as specified by the awarding body.
- 14.3 Where a centre has been affected by circumstances beyond its control it may, **in exceptional cases**, be possible to grant a short extension. This is at the discretion of the awarding body and the centre **must** contact the awarding body as soon as possible to request such an arrangement. It is important that centres are aware that the timely release of examination results will be put at risk if the deadlines for the submission of marks and samples are not adhered to.

- 14.4 Where centres submit their coursework marks electronically, the awarding body may also require a copy of the marks to be submitted to the moderator, along with any other documentation needed.
- 14.5 **The centre may inform candidates of the marks which have been submitted to the awarding body, but in doing so must make it clear that those marks are subject to change through the moderation process.**
- 14.6 Awarding bodies will not accept coursework from centres that arrives too late to be moderated.

15 Incomplete coursework

- 15.1 In cases where the coursework element of the specification requires candidates to produce several distinct pieces of work (e.g. three assignments or ten essays), which are assessed separately, a candidate who fails to complete all parts of the work should be credited with the marks for the task carried out unless the specification says otherwise. In some subjects, the tasks may be inter-dependent and teachers should follow the instructions in the specification when assessing incomplete work.
- 15.2 Candidates who fail to submit any coursework must be recorded as absent when mark sheets are completed or marks processed electronically. Failure to submit coursework will not render a candidate ineligible for the award of a subject grade.
- 15.3 A mark of '0' (zero) should only be given in cases where a candidate has submitted work which is considered to be worthless or where the authenticity of the work cannot be confirmed. It should not be awarded to a candidate who does not submit any work at all. The candidate should be recorded as absent.

16 Applications for special consideration in respect of incomplete coursework

- 16.1 If a candidate has been subject to an unforeseen prolonged illness or other misfortune during the period when the coursework was produced, it may, in some subjects, be possible to accept a reduced quantity of coursework without penalty, **as long as all of the assessment objectives have been covered at least once**. This will not be possible if the specification requires only one piece. Where several pieces are required, the reduction will be accepted only if those pieces are testing the same criteria. It will not be possible to give this consideration in every case, for example, if work has not been submitted or the assessment objectives have not been satisfied.
- 16.2 No adjustment to the marks should be made by the centre. An application for special consideration should be submitted to the awarding body, attached to a breakdown of marks across the assessment objectives. **Candidates must have been fully prepared for the course but unable to finish the work**. Awarding bodies will not normally agree a reduced amount of coursework in advance. This arrangement does not apply when candidates join the course late.
- 16.3 Candidates will not be eligible for special consideration if preparation for, or performance in coursework components is affected by failure to cover the course as a consequence of joining the class part way through. Candidates who change examination centres part way through a course will either have to make up the work which has been missed or accept that there will be a gap in their coursework which may have consequences upon the grade issued.
- 16.4 For further information on special consideration please refer to the JCQ publication *A guide to the special consideration process*. This publication is available on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration>.

17 Lost Coursework

- 17.1 If a candidate's work has been **lost within the examination centre** and, despite every effort it cannot be found, or it has been accidentally destroyed, the circumstances should be reported immediately to the awarding body using **JCQ Form 15 - JCQ/LCW‡**. This form is available from the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework>.

Guidance is provided in the JCQ publication referred to in **paragraph 16.4, page 9**.

- 17.2 The awarding body will consider whether it is appropriate to accept a mark for which there is no available evidence of attainment. This might occur in the following circumstances:

- The centre **must** be able to verify that the work was done and that it was monitored whilst it was in progress.
- The loss **is not** the consequence of negligence on the part of the candidate.
- **If only part of the work is lost and part of the work is available**, further guidance must be sought from the relevant awarding body.
- **If the work was marked before it was lost or damaged**, marks should be submitted in the usual way. **Form 15 – JCQ/LCW‡ must** be submitted both to the moderator and the awarding body by the deadline for the submission of internally assessed marks or by the date by which the work should be despatched for moderation. **No marks will be accepted after the issue of results.**
- **If the work was not marked before it was lost or damaged**, an estimated mark may be submitted on **Form 15 – JCQ/LCW‡**, based on the teacher's knowledge of the work up to the point where it was lost. Estimates **must not** include any supposition as to what the candidate might have achieved if the work had been finished. Estimates **must not** be submitted on mark sheets, only on **Form 15 – JCQ/LCW‡**. **No estimated marks will be accepted after the issue of results.**

‡AQA and OCR centres must not submit Form 15 – JCQ/LCW.

Applications must be submitted on-line using eAQA or OCR Interchange as appropriate.

18 Re-use of coursework marks by candidates

- 18.1 In unitised specifications the result of a coursework unit is available, like the result of any other unit, for re-use after certification.
- 18.2 Candidates who re-sit a unit may submit new, amended or enhanced coursework.

19 External moderation

- 19.1 The purpose of moderation is to bring the marking of internally-assessed components in all participating centres to an agreed standard. All centres are required by awarding bodies to submit to moderation as described below (except where centres are accredited for a specification or a unit, e.g. within Applied GCE specifications).
- 19.2 The normal procedure is postal moderation, where the centre submits a sample of work to the moderator. For certain components however, the moderator may visit the centre to moderate the sample of work.
- 19.3 Different procedures may apply where work is ephemeral (i.e. there is no permanent end-product).
- 19.4 By the date specified, each centre must submit to the awarding body:
- details of marks awarded;
 - authentication of the work submitted for assessment;
 - confirmation that internal standardisation has been carried out as required;
 - any other information as the specification may require.
- 19.5 The awarding body (or the moderator on behalf of the awarding body) normally specifies the candidates whose work is required for moderation by name/number. The sample should include work from across the range of attainment at the centre.
- 19.6 For visiting moderation, a visit is arranged for a date and time convenient to both the centre and moderator.
- 19.7 For both postal and visiting moderation, the moderator assesses the sample work using the published marking criteria in the specification.
- 19.8 The moderator marks are compared with the centre marks for the sample of work. If a significant number of the differences between the moderator marks and the centre's marks exceed the specified tolerance, adjustments may be applied to the centre's marks.
- 19.9 If further evidence of the centre's marking is required, the moderator may request some or all of the remaining work which **must** have been kept securely and be available.
- 19.10 If the moderator significantly disagrees with the centre's rank order (perhaps because internal standardisation has not been carried out effectively) the awarding body may ask the centre to re-consider its marks. Alternatively, the moderator's marks may be applied to all candidates in the centre and, in some circumstances, a charge may be made.
- 19.11 In certain circumstances (for example, if internal standardisation has not been carried out) the awarding body may ask the centre to re-consider its marks.

20 Feedback to centres

- 20.1 Following moderation the final marks are provided to centres electronically with the results. Feedback forms from the moderator are made available to centres, either in hard copy format or electronically, and provide advice on the following:
- how appropriate the tasks were (where set by the centre) and the coverage of the assessment objectives;
 - the accuracy of the centre's assessments against the criteria and in relation to the agreed standard for the component;
 - the efficiency of the centre's administration.
- 20.2 The advice given on the feedback forms will be constructive, objective, supported by fact or judgement and sufficiently detailed to explain any differences between the centre's assessments and the agreed standard for the component. It should enable centres to take remedial action where necessary before the next submission of internally-assessed work.
- 20.3 Comments on the accuracy of a centre's assessments may be made even if no adjustment is applied. For example, if the difference between the moderator marks and the centre marks is only just within the specified tolerance, the moderator will normally provide advice on the standard of marking.

21 Guidance for centres where coursework requirements have not been met

- 21.1 Further guidance will be provided to the head of centre on a case-by-case basis where an individual teacher or the centre fails to meet the awarding body's requirements for coursework.
- 21.2 As required by the *Code of Practice*, the following actions will be taken by awarding bodies where a significant problem has not been rectified:
- providing further guidance for the centre;
 - approving and monitoring the centre's arrangements for assessment and standardisation;
 - informing the regulators;
 - informing other awarding bodies.

22 Externally-assessed coursework

- 22.1 In some specifications, coursework is externally assessed. In such cases, the coursework of all candidates, together with the authentication statements, must be sent by a specified date to an awarding body/examiner for marking.
- 22.2 Externally-assessed coursework will not necessarily be returned to centres automatically. Where the work is not returned to centres, it is treated in the same way as examination scripts and centres will be required to request such work under access to scripts arrangements. For further information on access to scripts arrangements, centres should refer to the JCQ publication *Post Result Services, Information and guidance for centres*. This publication is available on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services>.

Feedback forms will not accompany any externally assessed coursework returned to centres.

23 Return of work to centres

- 23.1 Moderators will return work directly to centres where instructed to do so by the awarding body. Coursework assessments submitted electronically will not be returned to centres.
- 23.2 **Centres are required to retain candidates' marked coursework, under secure conditions, whether or not it was part of the moderation sample, until all possibility of an enquiry about results has been exhausted.** Where retention is a problem, because of the nature of the coursework, some form of evidence (e.g. photographic, audio-taped or videotaped) must be available. Centres are requested to keep a record of the examination numbers and names of those candidates whose work is included in the sample sent to or seen by moderators. This information may be required if there are enquiries about results at a later date. In the case of coursework stored electronically within the centre, protection from corruption should also be taken into account.
- 23.3 The awarding bodies may use extracts from coursework material on an anonymous basis for the purposes of training and to exemplify standards. Awarding bodies reserve the right to use extracts from centre assessed material on an anonymous basis for assessment, educational and/or training purposes in accordance with copyright law and to retain examples of centre assessed work for archive purposes, (e.g. standardising and guidance to teachers).

24 Centre consortium arrangements

These rules apply to centres which are following free standing Project qualifications.

These rules *may* also apply to Project qualifications undertaken as part of a Diploma qualification. Centres should contact their awarding body for further guidance.

- 24.1 In cases where all candidates from different centres have been taught and are assessed together, centres **must** inform the awarding body of the relevant internally-assessed units/components and the centres involved. Centres in such an arrangement are referred to as a consortium.
- 24.2 The centres in the consortium **must** nominate a consortium co-ordinator who undertakes to liaise with the awarding body on behalf of all the centres.
- 24.3 Consortium co-ordinators **must** complete Form JCQ/CCA *Centre consortium arrangements for centre assessed work* for each examination series and for each specification with one or more internally-assessed components that has been taught jointly. The form is available on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/forms>. Co-ordinators **must** return the form to the relevant awarding body by 31 October 2013 for the January 2014 examination series† or by 31 January 2014 for the June 2014 examination series. (†Where GCE specifications are available)

For other examination series during the course of the academic year 2013/14 the relevant awarding body should be contacted.

- 24.4 The centres **must** carry out internal standardisation of the marking of coursework across the consortium.
- 24.5 The awarding body will allocate the same moderator to each centre in the consortium and the candidates will be treated as a single group for the purpose of moderation.
- 24.6 If a consortium submits an enquiry about results, the work must be available from all the centres in the consortium, as it is the original sample that is reviewed.

25 Enquiries about Results

- 25.1 As part of the JCQ awarding bodies' enquiries about results services, centres can request a post-results review of moderation (Service 3) to ensure that the assessment criteria have been fairly, reliably and consistently applied. **This service is not available if the centre's coursework marks have been accepted without change by an awarding body.**
- 25.2 The review of moderation:
- is a process in which a second moderator reviews the work of the first moderator. The second moderator sees the original marks and any annotations made by the first moderator to gain a full and clear understanding of whether the assessment criteria have been applied as intended;
 - is undertaken on the original sample of candidates' work;
 - includes feedback similar to that provided following the original moderation. (If centre marks are reinstated, feedback may not be provided.)
- 25.3 A review of moderation will not be undertaken upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample (unless there was a fault in the selection of the original sample, e.g. insufficient candidates included).
- 25.4 The coursework submitted for review of moderation:
- must be despatched to the moderator within three working days – failure to meet this undertaking may delay the outcome of the enquiry or result in the enquiry being cancelled;
 - must be the original work submitted for moderation;
 - must have been kept under secure conditions;
 - must not have been returned to the candidates.
- 25.5 If the original sample of candidates' work has been lost, an equivalent sample may be requested by the awarding body.
- 25.6 **Externally assessed coursework** will be treated as examination scripts for the purposes of enquiries about results. Centres should request a post-results review of marking (Service 2) or a priority post-results review of marking (Priority Service 2) as appropriate to the level of the qualification.
- 25.7 For further information on the enquiries about results process please refer to the JCQ publication *Post Result Services, Information and guidance for centres*. This publication is also available on the JCQ website - <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services>.

26 Access Issues

- 26.1 When choosing specifications, candidates must be made aware of the skills which they will be required to demonstrate in coursework components. If they choose a specification where they will not be able to demonstrate attainment in all parts of the coursework assessment, they will be unable to gain all of the available credit.
- 26.2 It is possible for awarding bodies to agree arrangements so that candidates with particular requirements can access the assessment(s). These arrangements **must** be made in advance of examinations and assessments. Centres should refer to the guidance published in the JCQ publication *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments, 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014*. This is published on the JCQ website – <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration>
- 26.3 Centres **must** ensure that, where coursework is marked by teachers, credit is given only for skills demonstrated by the candidate working independently. Access arrangements must not undermine the integrity of the qualification.

Declaration of Authentication – coursework assessments

Each candidate is required to sign a declaration, before submitting their coursework to their subject teachers/assessors, stating that the work is their own and that any assistance given and/or sources used have been acknowledged. **Ensuring that they do so is the responsibility of centres.**

Awarding bodies may issue Declaration of Authentication forms to centres, which will replicate some or all of the wording detailed below. Alternatively, the following text may be used as guidance by those centres who wish to create their own documentation.

The work you submit for assessment must be your own.

If you copy from someone else, allow another candidate to copy from you, or if you cheat in any other way, you may be disqualified from at least the subject concerned.

Declaration by candidate

I have read and understood the **Information for candidates (GCE, ELC and Project qualifications: coursework assessments)**. I have produced the attached work without assistance other than that which is acceptable under the scheme of assessment.

Candidate's name:.....

Candidate's signature:.....Date:.....

Declaration by teacher

I confirm that:

1. the candidate's work was conducted under the conditions laid out by the specification;
2. I have authenticated the candidate's work and am satisfied that to the best of my knowledge the work produced is solely that of the candidate.

Teacher's name:.....

Teacher's signature.....Date:.....



This notice has been produced on behalf of:

AQA, City & Guilds, CCEA, Edexcel, OCR and WJEC

Information for candidates

GCE, ELC and Project qualifications, coursework assessments

This leaflet tells you about some things that you must and must not do when you are completing coursework.

Before you submit any coursework for marking, you will be asked to sign an authentication statement confirming that you have read and followed these regulations.

If there is anything that you do not understand, you **must** ask your teacher or lecturer.

Coursework provides you with an opportunity to do some independent research into a topic. The research you do will involve looking for information in published sources such as textbooks, encyclopedias, journals, TV, radio, and on the internet.

Using information from published sources (including the internet) as the basis for your coursework is a good way to demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of a subject, but you must take care how you use this material - you cannot copy it and claim it as your own work.

The regulations state that:

“the work which you submit for assessment must be your own”,

“you must not copy from someone else or allow another candidate to copy from you”.

If you use the same wording as a published source, you must place quotation marks around the passage and state where it came from. This is called “referencing”. You must make sure that you give detailed references for everything in your work which is not in your own words. A reference from a printed book or journal should show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number, for example: (Morrison, 2000, pg.29).

For material taken from the internet, your reference should show the date when the material was downloaded and must show the precise web page, not the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example:
(<http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/16/sosteacher/history/49766.shtml>), downloaded 12 February 2014.

You must also include a bibliography at the end of your work, which lists the full details of publications you have used in your research, even where these are not directly referred to, for example:
Morrison, A. (2000) “Mary, Queen of Scots”, London: Weston Press.

If you copy the words or ideas of others and don’t show your sources in references and a bibliography, this will be considered as cheating.

Preparing your coursework — good practice

If you receive help and guidance from someone other than your teacher, you **must** tell your teacher who will then record the nature of the assistance given to you.

If you worked as part of a group on an assignment, for example, undertaking field research, you must each write up your own account of the assignment. Even if the data you have is the same, the description of how that data was obtained and the conclusions you draw from it should be in your own words.

You must meet the deadlines that your teacher gives you. Remember - your teachers are there to guide you. Although they cannot give you direct assistance, they can help you to sort out any problems before it is too late.

Take care of your work and keep it safe. Don't leave it lying around where your classmates can find it. You must always keep your coursework secure and confidential whilst you are preparing it; do not share it with your classmates. If it is stored on the computer network, keep your password secure. Collect all copies from the printer and destroy those you don't need.

Don't be tempted to use essays from on-line essay banks — this is cheating. Electronic tools used by awarding bodies can detect this sort of copying.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism involves taking someone else's words, thoughts or ideas and trying to pass them off as your own. **It is a form of cheating which is taken very seriously.**

Don't think you won't be caught; there are many ways to detect plagiarism.

- Markers can spot changes in the style of writing and use of language.
- Markers are highly experienced subject specialists who are very familiar with work on the topic concerned — they may have read the source you are using (or even marked the essay you have copied from!).
- Internet search engines and specialised computer software can be used to match phrases or pieces of text with original sources and to detect changes in the grammar and style of writing or punctuation.

Penalties for breaking the regulations

If your work is submitted and it is discovered that you have broken the regulations, one of the following penalties will be applied:

- the piece of work will be awarded zero marks;
- you will be disqualified from that unit for that examination series;
- you will be disqualified from the whole subject for that examination series;
- you will be disqualified from all subjects and barred from entering again for a period of time.

Your awarding body will decide which penalty is appropriate.

REMEMBER – IT'S YOUR QUALIFICATION SO IT NEEDS TO BE YOUR OWN WORK