

LEVEL 3



WJEC Level 3

EXTENDED PROJECT

ADMINISTRATION HANDBOOK FOR CENTRES 2018–2019

The procedures in this handbook apply to those candidates entering for the Level 3 Extended Project specification



Contents


		Page
1	Contacts	3
2	About this Handbook	3
3	Key Dates	4
4	Entry Procedures	4
5	Project Title Approval	5-6
6	Submission of Coursework	6-11
7	Standardising marking within centres	11
8	Annotation of work	12
9	Moderation and feedback	12
10	Return of work to centres	13
11	Authentication	13
12	Malpractice	14
13	Unsatisfactory practice by centres	14
14	Post-results review of moderation	14
15	Certificates	15

Appendices

1. FAQs – Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks
2. Reviews of centre assessed marks – suggested template for centres

1. CONTACTS

Glenda Kinsey


 029 2026 5348



Extended Project Qualification Manager

glenda.kinsey@wjec.co.uk

Julie Rees


 029 2026 5096



Qualification Subject Support Officer

epq@wjec.co.uk

Caroline Morgan

 029 2026 5319



Welsh Baccalaureate Framework Manager

caroline.morgan@wjec.co.uk

2. ABOUT THIS HANDBOOK

This *Handbook* provides WJEC centres with the essential information for operating the administration of the Extended Project Qualification.

This *Handbook* should be used with the following publications:

- Extended Project Specification
- WJEC Entry Procedures *and* Coding Information.
- Instructions for conducting coursework (JCQ)
- Internal Assessment – A guide for centres (WJEC)
- Guide to e-Submissions (WJEC)

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

3. KEY DATES

The Extended Project Qualification is available in the **June series only**.

3.1 Entry Deadlines

Final Date for receipt of entries	21 February 2019
-----------------------------------	-------------------------

3.2 Making late entries

Late entries will be charged from	5 April 2019
Very Late entries will be charged from	5 May 2019

3.3 Fees

Entry Fee	Late Fee	Very Late Fee
£36.66	£73.32	£91.65

3.4 Marks to be submitted via IAMIS – 8 May 2019

3.5 Submission of project samples direct to moderators (for hard copy and e-submissions) – 15 May 2019.

3.6 Results Dates

Results in centres on	15 August 2019
-----------------------	-----------------------

Please note that results are available via WJEC Online and EDI on a date prior to above unless confirmed otherwise.

4. ENTRY PROCEDURES

4.1 Methods of Entry

Centres can make entries for the Extended Project Qualification via EDI or online entries via WJEC Secure website.

4.2 Entry Codes

English Medium		Welsh Medium	
Subject	Option	Subject	Option
9500	03	9500	W3

5. PROJECT TITLE APPROVAL

We offer continuous support to centres who are offering the Extended Project Qualification for the first time or who have newly appointed Course Leaders/Coordinators/Supervisors for the Extended Project.

5.1 Are you a new centre to WJEC or delivering the EPQ for the first time?

If you are a new centre to WJEC for the EPQ and have not delivered the EPQ before you are encouraged to submit your learners' project titles to WJEC for general feedback or to seek guidance for any questions concerning them. This is not a compulsory condition in delivering WJEC's EPQ; we are here to offer guidance to ensure your learners start on the right track. It is the responsibility of your centre to approve your learners' project proposals and titles. As your centre delivers the qualification in subsequent years, your Course Leader/Project Co-ordinator/Supervisor will be able to offer the initial feedback, as well as approve your learners' project proposals.

There are many benefits on why your centre should approve your own learners' project proposals and draft titles, these include saving time, ability to give feedback to learners quickly and respond to learner needs more effectively.

5.2 Timescales

We recommend that project proposals and draft titles should be approved at least 6 months before the final submission date for the award the learners are entering.

This allows them sufficient time to undertake their projects. For example, learners completing their EPQ within one academic year, starting in September, the **project proposals should be approved by your centre by mid-November** 6 months before the standard 15 May submission date for the summer series, however final project titles can be refined at any time, even after the mid-project review, as learners engage with the final write up.

5.3 Overlaps with other qualifications

The Extended Project must be the **original work** of the Learner. Any assignment or coursework/s already submitted, or yet to be submitted, for assessment, in another accredited qualification, e.g. GCE, is not eligible. **Dual accreditation is not allowed and it is the responsibility of the centre to ensure this is avoided.** WJEC accepts that there may be some overlap in skills and/or subject content with GCE courses, however, the skills developed and content for the EPQ are different to GCE A/AS level courses.

Learners will be extending and developing their skills for the EPQ beyond another programme of study. Learners may wish to use one of their other programmes of study as a

springboard to undertake a more in-depth research project into an area of particular interest, or in preparation for their future Higher Education courses. If you have any concerns regarding dual accreditation, please contact us to check before your learners embark on their EPQ.

5.4 Learners undertaking the EPQ that are already undertaking the Advanced Individual Project (Wales centres only)

Having consulted with Qualifications Wales, we can confirm that it is possible for your learners to enter for both the EPQ and Advanced Skills Challenge Certificate. This is permitted on the basis that the skills developed and content for the EPQ are different: learners will be extending and developing their skills for the EPQ beyond the requirements of the Individual Project. However, in cases where learners may be using their Individual Project as a springboard to undertake a more in-depth EPQ research project, it is essential that learners can demonstrate that their Extended Project has properly extended the work completed for the Advanced WBQ Individual Project, or any other qualification. Dual submission of the same (or overly similar) work for two different awards is not allowed and it is the responsibility of the centre to ensure that this is avoided. The EPQ supervisor will need to confirm that no work to be submitted for the EPQ is also to be submitted, or has been submitted, for any other accredited qualification(s), including the Skills Challenge Certificate. Centres may be required to provide a rationale for entering both qualifications. Advice can be sought from WJEC where necessary, and this is usually best obtained before your learners embark on their EPQ work. In situations where the EPQ work is a further development of work undertaken for a different qualification, it is good practice to ensure that a copy of the earlier work is available to the supervisor at the time of final assessment and is retained until the moderation process is completed, in case WJEC should request it.

6. SUBMISSION OF COURSEWORK

6.1 Project Mark Submission

Project marks to be submitted to WJEC (online - IAMIS)	by 8 May, 2019
---	-----------------------

Once entries have been submitted and processed by WJEC, centres **must** log on to WJEC's secure website and click the 'internal assessment mark input' (IAMIS) button. A web page will be available for each component for which the centre has entries; this will be pre-populated with candidate names and numbers. Centres will need to insert the **marks and assessor initials** for all candidates in the spaces provided. Further information and support will be available on the various mark-input screens. Further information and support will be available on the mark input screen.

Submission of outcomes – by submitting outcomes to WJEC you are declaring that:

- All internal moderation has taken place
- All marks submitted are genuine and correct
- All candidate work is complete and available for external moderation

Amending marks after submission – once marks have been submitted via IAMIS the centre cannot amend them. If teachers notice that an incorrect mark has been submitted, the Ex-

ams Officer or the EPQ Coordinator **must** email epq@wjec.co.uk and include the following information:

- centre number
- candidate name
- challenge name and level
- old mark
- new mark
- reason for change

Amending marks after issuing of results – if a teacher notices that an incorrect mark has been submitted after the issuing of results, the Head of Centre **must** send a written request to the address below for the mark to be amended, clearly outlining the circumstances. The actual work (or copy) together with a completed signed and dated internal mark sheet **must** accompany this written request. This information will be referred to the subject officer. After consideration of the evidence, the mark may be altered or the request may be refused. All requests to alter centre submitted marks **must** be received by **20th September** (June series).

EPQ Manager,
WJEC,
245 Western Avenue,
Cardiff, CF5 2YX

WJEC monitors amendments to centre submitted marks and may undertake additional checks.

6.2 Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks

Centres have for many years been required to have a written internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions. As part of this procedure, candidates **must** be told the mark given by their centre for a centre-assessed component/unit. This applies to legacy and new GCE and GCSE qualifications, and Project qualifications.

This requirement is to enable candidates to request a review of the centre's marking prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body, should they wish to do so, and will facilitate the operation of a fair review process. It is reflected in the regulators' *Qualification Level Conditions and Requirements*.

Centres should use the internal standardisation process to ensure that all teachers are confident in correctly and accurately applying the marking standard. Exemplar material and any guidance provided by the awarding body should be used. This should help to prevent marking errors and avoid candidates requesting a review of the mark awarded by the centre.

Although many consortia, multi-academy trusts etc. are likely to follow common procedures, it is for each centre to determine how a request for a review of marking is managed. The internal deadlines set for marking; internal standardisation arrangements, staffing arrangements and resources will all be influencing factors. Each Subject Department may be given discretion to apply the requirements in the most practical way.

Centres may wish to publish a policy for candidates and their parents/carers. See **Appendix 2** for a suggested template. Further details may be found in the JCQ publication ***Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments***.

The JCQ member awarding bodies have produced some frequently asked questions that are set out in **Appendix 1**. These will help centres in their understanding of this new requirement and help in the implementation of this policy for the June 2019 examination series, and all subsequent series.

6.3 Moderation Sample

Centres have an option of submitting samples for moderation either by posting hard copy samples to the moderator or by e-submission.

For e-submissions, centres should assess candidate work in the normal way and enter marks through IAMIS on the WJEC secure website. A sample will be generated electronically and the work for those candidates in the sample can then be uploaded onto SecureAssess (Surpass) together with the individual Learner Declaration Form, mark sheet, etc. using the individual candidate key codes provided. Exams officers will receive a password-protected pdf of all key codes for individual candidates to upload their work. Exams Officers will be able to share the key codes with EPQ Coordinators if they are responsible for uploading the work. Please use the following link for full guidance on e-submissions:

https://www.wjec.co.uk/WJEC-guide-to-e-Submissions-R12_2.pdf?language_id=1

For graded qualifications with mark-based assessment, the sample will be based on the overall rank order for the total entry. Samples will automatically be selected and viewed via IAMIS. A step-by-step guide is available on IAMIS.

The size of the sample will be based on the number of candidates entered, which will give a minimum sample size, and then on the number of assessors; **with at least three candidates selected from each assessor (new for Summer 2019 series)**. Samples will automatically be selected and viewed via IAMIS, and must then be despatched to arrive with the moderator or be uploaded to SecureAssess by the specified date.

However, WJEC may require additional samples to ensure the range of project outcomes are covered by the moderation process.

Total Number of Candidates	Minimum Sample Required
1 – 10	All
11 - 100	Total sample of 10
100 - 199	Total sample of 15
200 – 299	Total sample of 25
Over 300	Total sample of 25

Individual Candidates - work selected in the sample **must** be available for moderation. If a candidate's work is not available then the mark will be recorded as zero.

Entries made after submission of marks – centres should not make entries after the sample has been made available. If entries are made WJEC reserves the right to request the work to be sent to the moderator in addition to the original sample. Work that is not forwarded to the moderator when requested will be recorded as a zero.

Learner Declaration Form – both the candidate and teacher/assessor confirming that the work is that of the candidate on the assessment sheet must sign the Learner Declaration Form. **All** candidates in the cohort (not only those included in the moderation sample) must have completed, signed assessment sheets that can be found throughout the EPQ File Forms. Electronic, typed signatures are acceptable.

The final sample (hard copy and e-submissions) must be with your allocated moderator or uploaded by the **15th May**.

Moderator details will be shown on the Internal Assessment Mark Input System (IAMIS), once marks have been input and samples generated.

6.4 Instructions for submission of Extended Projects for Moderation

The final project must be submitted, for external moderation, in the form of 'WJEC Extended Project File'. As a minimum requirement, this **MUST** include:

PART A	LEARNER RECORDS	Form
	Project File Cover Sheet	✓
	Learner Declaration Form (<i>signed by both learner and supervisor</i>)	✓
	1. Extended Project Proposal and Title	EPF 1
	2. Extended Project Record	
	(a) Project Plan and Change to Plan	EPF 2a & 2b
	(b) Record & Review of Teaching and Learning Programme	EPF 2c
	(c) Record & Review of Individual Progress	EPF 2d
	(d) Record of Meetings with Supervisors	EPF 2e
	(e) Records of Any Additional Meetings with Supervisors	
	3. Extended Project Outcome*	EPF 3
	4. Extended Project Presentation	EPF 4
PART B	SUPERVISOR/ASSESSOR RECORDS	
	5. Extended Project Presentation Witness Statement	EPF 5
	6. Extended Project Supervisor Final Assessment & Mark Sheet	EPF 6
	Internal Standardisation Form	✓

**If, for practical reasons, the actual Project Outcome cannot be posted, the centre must ensure that clear photographic or video evidence is submitted and made accessible to the external moderator. WJEC reserves the right to visit a centre.*

To find downloadable versions of these forms please visit:

<https://www.wjec.co.uk/qualifications/qualification-resources.html?subject=extendedProject&level=level3>

6.5 Presentation of Extended Project Files

The following procedures must be followed:

- The coversheet must be completed with the final project title, project format/type, learner name, learner number, centre name, centre number and final marks.
- The Learner Declaration Form, Presentation Witness Statement, Final Assessment Mark Sheet and the Centre Internal Standardisation Form must be completed for each learner.
- Any sources, copied material, quotations, etc. must be acknowledged and references provided, where appropriate (this may be in the form of an appendix).
- Work submitted for postal moderation must be assessable, e.g. contained in an envelope folder or held together by treasury tags, and not placed in a series of plastic pockets or a bulky ring binder or stapled.
- If placed in an envelope folder, this must clearly be marked with centre name and number, learner name and number.
- Work may be submitted through ICT (e-submission, USB).

7. STANDARDISING MARKING WITHIN CENTRES

It is essential that a process of Internal Moderation take place prior to the final submission of the Project to WJEC. Centres should use reference materials (such as exemplar material provided by WJEC) to help set the standard of assessment within the centre.

Prior to assessment, it is useful to undertake a trial marking exercise. Teachers 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; it alleviates a heavy marking load at the end of the course.

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 that has been marked by each teacher is re-marked by the teacher, who is in charge of internal standardisation.

Alternatively, 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 discrepant teacher(s) should adjust their marks or re-consider the marks of all candidates for whom they were responsible. The teacher in charge of internal standardisation should check the new marks.

If centres encounter any difficulties either in the application of mark schemes or in the process of internal standardisation, advice should be sought from WJEC.

8. ANNOTATION OF WORK

The following general principles for the annotation of work should be related to any subject-specific requirements.

- (a) One of the following three approaches could be adopted:
 - (i) summative comments either on the work, usually at the end, or on a 'cover sheet';
 - (ii) key pieces of evidence flagged throughout the work with annotation either in the margin or in the text;
 - (iii) a combination of (i) and (ii).
- (b) Indications as to how marks have been awarded should:
 - (i) be clear and unambiguous;
 - (ii) be appropriate to the nature and form of the work;
 - (iii) facilitate the standardisation of marking within a centre;
 - (iv) enable the moderator to check the application of the assessment criteria to the marking.
- (c) Annotation, where deemed appropriate, should:
 - (i) indicate where the assessment criteria have been met, e.g. by writing key phrases from the criteria (such as 'selects information', 'uses a variety of techniques') at the appropriate point in the work;
 - (ii) indicate any planning and processing not undertaken individually and provide details of any assistance or prompting given to the candidate.

9. EXTERNAL MODERATION AND FEEDBACK

9.1 External Moderation

The WJEC moderator will consider the sample that has been submitted. Should a query arise WJEC may request a further sample to be provided.

In most circumstances where WJEC requests to see more work the following protocols will be implemented:

- WJEC administration staff will contact the Examinations Officer at the centre to verbally confirm that the moderator has requested more work.
- WJEC will request that work be with the moderator or uploaded within five working days from the initial request, and will specify a date.
- WJEC will follow up with an email to the Examinations Officer to confirm the request.

Please note, WJEC staff will not enter into discussion with anyone other than the Examinations Officer, and cannot discuss the reason that further work has been requested. In certain circumstances, WJEC will visit the centre to view any further requested work. WJEC reserves the right to request more work or make a visit to a centre at short notice or without prior notification.

9.2 Feedback

Feedback regarding moderation is provided on publication of results, through a moderator's report, available on IAMIS. The moderator's report will provide feedback on:

- (i) the efficiency of the centre's administration;
- (ii) the accuracy of the centre's assessments against the criteria and in relation to the agreed standard for each learning outcome of the component;
- (iii) whether the centre's marks have been adjusted and detail of the reasons.

10. RETURN OF WORK TO CENTRES

WJEC will return Projects direct to centres after the Enquiry about Results deadline (20 September). WJEC will handle with care material submitted for moderation, but cannot accept responsibility for loss or damage. Samples may be retained by WJEC for use as exemplar or archive material.

Centres are required to retain candidates' Projects under secure conditions, so far as is practicable, until all possibility of queries on results has been exhausted. Where retention is a problem, because of the nature of the work, some form of evidence (e.g. photographic, audiotaped or videotaped) must be available.

N.B. Candidates should be advised not to include any items of real or sentimental value e.g. photographs, certificates etc.

11. AUTHENTICATION

The Code of Practice states that:

"The awarding organisation must require centres to obtain from each candidate a signed declaration that authenticates the work they produce for internal assessment as their own. A mark of zero or absent must be recorded if a candidate cannot provide confirmation of the authenticity of the work they have produced for internal assessment."

Candidates must be aware that they are responsible for ensuring that the work submitted for assessment is their own. The JCQ documents *Information for candidates - Controlled Assessments 2018/2019* and *Information for Candidates - Coursework 2018/2019* are available on the JCQ website and provide instructions and guidance for centres.

For all WJEC subjects with a written internal assessment component, an authentication statement is included as part of the mark (assessment) /cover sheet for individual candidates' folders. **All candidates (not merely those included in the moderation sample) are required to sign the authentication statement** that all work (with any exceptions stated) is their own work, countersigned by teachers that to the best of their knowledge this is the case.

Where both the candidate and the teacher do not sign authentication forms in the moderation sample, this must be reported to the Subject Officer who will follow it up with the centre. However, you should record a mark for the work as normal.

Any concerns regarding the content or integrity of a folder should be brought to the attention of the Subject Officer.

If specific instructions have been given at the Moderators' conferences, these should be followed.

12. MALPRACTICE

Centres are informed that where any malpractice is discovered prior to the signing of the authentication statement, this need not be reported to WJEC, but should be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures. Centres are required to have a policy in place to deal with appeals by candidates against internal assessment decisions. The JCQ website contains guidance on recommended procedures for this (Arrangements for Internal Appeals about Internal Assessment decisions and Enquiries about Results).

Where malpractice (e.g. plagiarism) is suspected during the moderation process, there are formal procedures for following this up with centres. This must be done via the Subject Officer, who will need full details of the material in question and, in the case of plagiarism, of the sources identified. Given the need to resolve matters well before the publication of results, it is essential that suspected malpractice be discussed with the Principal Moderator and/or Subject Officer as soon as the problem arises. All communication on such matters must be via the WJEC.

Details of procedures (and the penalties for offences) are included in the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments 2018-2019*, available on the JCQ website. Centres have been advised that further guidance on the detection of plagiarism may be found in the document *Plagiarism in Examinations*, also available on the JCQ website.

13. UNSATISFACTORY PRACTICE BY CENTRES

Further guidance will be provided to the Head of Centre where individual teachers or centres fail to meet WJEC requirements for internally assessed work. Where significant problems are identified, WJEC may require monitoring of the centre's arrangements for marking and standardisation.

The following guidelines will be used as a means of determining whether there are matters, which need to be taken up with centres.

- (a) Have the assessment criteria been applied appropriately?
- (b) Have WJEC's administrative and procedural instructions been followed?
- (c) Has the internally assessed work been properly annotated?
- (d) Has the internally assessed work been properly authenticated, especially in those cases where some activities may have taken place outside school?
- (e) Is standardisation within the centre effective and within WJEC requirements?

14. POST-RESULTS REVIEW OF MODERATION

This is a review of the original moderation to ensure that the assessment criteria have been fairly, reliably and consistently applied. Please note that if your centre's marks have been accepted without change by WJEC this service is not available.

When applying for a post-results review of moderation, the following should be taken into account:

- The application should be submitted to WJEC through the normal method.
- Candidate consent is not required.
- Request **must** be received by the awarding organisation by 20th September.
- The deadline for completion is within 35 calendar days of the moderator receiving the original sample of work from the centre.

- Review of moderation will be undertaken on the original sample of candidates' work.
- Review of moderation may include feedback similar to that provided following the original moderation.
- If centre marks are reinstated, feedback will not be provided.
- Review of moderation cannot be undertaken upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample.

Review of moderation can only be undertaken for the series in which the request is received.

15. CERTIFICATES

Certificates are issued to centres in the autumn term after the publication of results. Certificates will not be issued before the end of the post-results services deadline of 20th September. The last date that certificates will be issued is 7th November.

Appendix 1

Frequently asked questions (FAQs)

WHERE THE REQUIREMENT APPLIES

THE REVIEW REQUEST

1. What should a centre do if it is challenged about a candidate's mark before moderation?

In the first instance, the centre should follow its published internal appeals procedure, which must set out its arrangements for conducting a review of internally assessed marks. The outcome of the review should determine the mark to be submitted to the awarding body.

The principle should be that the centre submits marks that it has standardised internally before submission to the awarding body. This will then enable the awarding body's moderation process to be undertaken successfully.

2. What should a centre do if it is challenged about a candidate's mark after moderation?

The internal review process must be completed prior to an awarding body's date for submitting marks. Any candidates submitting later requests for a review must therefore be informed that they are out of time. Centres must publish and communicate clear deadlines for candidates to submit a request for a review against the mark before the date for submitting marks.

3. What materials should the centre make available to candidates so they can decide whether to proceed with a request for a review of an internal assessment?

Generally, copies of the marked assessment materials and the mark scheme or assessment criteria should be made available, as a minimum. Additional materials may vary from subject to subject. For some marked assessment materials, such as artwork and recordings, it may be more appropriate for them to be shared under supervised conditions.

4. What constitutes 'sufficient time' for a candidate to study copies of materials and decide whether he/she wishes to review the mark awarded by the centre?

Five working days would be considered reasonable, although this may vary, depending on, for example, the subject, the size of the cohort and the number of teachers of that subject at the centre. Centres should provide a clear deadline to candidates, which takes into account the time it will take to review any marks and submit the final marks to the awarding body by the published deadline. Candidates must, on no account, be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised.

5. Will an awarding body allow centre-assessed marks to be submitted after the published deadline to specifically accommodate candidates' requests for reviews of an internal assessment?

No. An awarding body will not allow centre-assessed marks to be submitted after the published deadline to specifically accommodate candidates' requests for a review of an internal assessment. A review needs to be completed by the deadline for the submission of marks to the awarding body.

6. Can a candidate only request a review of an internal assessment mark if he/she identifies an issue or issues?

Centres should inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark. Centres may wish to rule out complaints regarding the quality of teaching since the review will focus on the quality of work submitted. Having reviewed the copies of materials made available to him/her, the candidate will need to explain what he/she believes the issue to be.

In most cases, it is likely candidates who request reviews will believe that the marks they have been awarded does not give them sufficient credit for meeting the criteria in the assessment materials. Generally, candidates are unlikely to request a review on the grounds that their mark is not in line with the standards set by the centre. The purpose of giving candidates the assessment criteria is to enable them to evaluate whether the criteria have been correctly applied.

It is important that candidates understand that 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 to the awarding body is subject to change and therefore should be considered provisional.

7. Can the centre charge candidates for an internal review?

This is entirely at the discretion of the centre and may potentially align with any other centre policies on charging for services, such as clerical checks and reviews of awarding body marking.

THE REVIEW

8. Should the review be of the mark awarded or of the process leading to the mark being awarded?

The review should be of the mark that has been awarded, confirming whether or not the candidate's mark is in line with the standard set for the other candidates at the centre. The following will be reviewed:

- the candidate's work (where the evidence of this is ephemeral, for example in Drama or Music, then the recording of the work should be given to the reviewer);
- the mark sheet completed by the teacher which usually shows the breakdown of marks per Assessment Objective (AO) or section of the mark scheme;
- information regarding any internal standardisation to ascertain whether consistent standards were applied by the original marker to this candidate's work; and
- any comments/annotation made by the teacher during the marking process.

See also question 11.

9. Who should conduct the review of an internally assessed mark where a candidate requests one?

The review **must** be conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of the candidate, and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review.

This could be either another teacher within the centre or a teacher from another centre.

However, the centre would need to ensure that the reviewer has declared any conflict of interest prior to undertaking the review.

It is acceptable for a teacher, who has been internally standardised, to review the work of a candidate marked by another teacher within the same centre. However, if the candidate's work was part of the centre's internal standardisation process, it would not be possible for the teacher who participated in the internal standardisation process to then review the candidate's work.

For large centres, internal standardisation arrangements could enable different sub groups of teachers to mark, standardise and conduct any reviews in a matrix arrangement.

For small centres, where there are only a few staff, the centre may need to consider whether the candidate in question was 'in the sample' for internal standardisation and therefore already seen by all Departmental staff. The centre may wish to consider standardising another member of staff in another department, in a related subject, in order to undertake reviews of marking. Alternatively, the centre could outsource reviews of marking, for example to a teacher in another school.

10. Will outsourcing the review of an internally assessed mark breach the confidentiality of assessment materials and candidate data?

No. Confidential assessment materials should not be discussed with, or sent to, any person not directly connected to the conduct of the task(s) or their assessment. However, because the reviewer is linked to the assessment process, confidentiality is not breached. Concerning candidate data, any external parties must comply with the centre's data protection policy.

11. How should the review be conducted?

Different approaches may be equally valid, depending on the particular subject, however, the task of the reviewer does not vary. It is important that the reviewer be provided with some materials from the centre's internal standardisation process that took place prior to releasing marks to candidates, as well as the work that is under review. Centres will need to ensure they retain internal standardisation materials for this purpose. The reviewer would need to see the candidate's work, the internal assessor's mark sheet and any annotation or comments that demonstrate how/why a certain mark was awarded.

These **must** be considered within the context of the internal standardisation materials provided in order to ensure a consistent approach to other candidates in the centre. Where there was no internal standardisation carried out (because there was only one teacher involved in marking the component), work of other candidates in the cohort must be considered to ensure that judgements can be made on the consistency of standards.

It is recommended that the review take place at the centre in order to maintain the integrity of the work and to ensure secure storage. If the review must take place remotely, then the original materials should be held at the centre, with the reviewer being provided with copies of the candidate's work.

It **must** be made clear to the reviewer, the teacher and the candidate that it is not possible for anyone to alter the work after the internal assessor has provided a mark to the candidate.

The reviewer **must** provide a reason for upholding or changing the mark awarded by the centre. This can be a brief annotation on the record form, showing the reviewer's breakdown of marks per Assessment Objective (AO) or section.

The candidate must be informed in writing of the outcome of the review and it should be logged and brought to the attention of the head of centre. The written record must be made available to the awarding body on request.

Should the review raise wider concerns, for example about the centre's general application of the assessment criteria, the reviewer should discuss these with the head of department/head of centre as required. Further advice should be sought from the awarding body if necessary.

12. If an external reviewer disagrees with the marking, is the centre obliged to accept the new mark?

The reviewer should be instructed to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the centre's marking standard. He/she is required to correct any marking error.

The three types of marking error are:

- an administrative error;
- a failure to apply the marking criteria to the evidence generated by the candidate where that failure did not involve the exercise of academic judgement; or
- an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement.

If the reviewer decides that there has been a marking error, he/she must indicate where the marking error has occurred and how the mark is not in line with the standard of other candidates at the centre. It is for the centre to determine whether any difference in marking is within any tolerances such as the centre would allow during its internal standardisation process. The head of centre will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body.

AFTER THE REVIEW

13. Will the awarding body request that the work that was reviewed be submitted for moderation?

Not specifically. The awarding body will use its standard sampling system to identify candidates' work to be submitted for moderation. This may include candidates whose marks were reviewed.

14. Can candidates follow up the outcome of a review by producing additional work in order to improve the mark that they have been given by the centre?

No. This is not an opportunity for candidates to try to improve their mark after the centre's deadline for the submission of final work. The service is to specifically provide an opportunity to challenge the mark, as awarded by the centre, on work already submitted for assessment.

15. Where does the legal responsibility lie for the fairness and lawfulness of the marks and grades awarded?

The centre is responsible for following the regulations and processes set by an awarding body, including internal assessment. Any legal challenge made against a centre regarding a mark it has awarded as part of a qualification should be referred to the relevant awarding body.

However, if the challenge is made before moderation has taken place, the complainant would need to wait until the moderation process has been completed. As part of any such challenge, the awarding body would need to satisfy itself that the centre followed the correct processes. Awarding bodies are responsible for the grades and awards that they make.

Appendix 2

Reviews of marking - centre assessed marks (GCSE controlled assessments, GCE coursework, GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments and Project qualifica- tions)

Suggested template for centres

[Centre Name] is committed to ensuring that whenever its 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. [Centre Name] 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.

1. [Centre Name] will 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. [Centre Name] will inform candidates that they may request copies of materials to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment.
3. [Centre Name] will, having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate.
4. [Centre Name] will provide candidates with sufficient time in order to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision.
5. [Centre Name] will 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.
6. [Centre Name] will allow sufficient time 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. [Centre Name] will 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. [Centre Name] will instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.
9. [Centre Name] will inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking.

10. 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 line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.