



## **Policy on Coursework**

### **Task Setting**

Coursework components assess candidates' knowledge, understanding and skills that may not readily be assessed by timed written papers. Teachers will ensure that candidates are clear about the assessment criteria which they are expected to meet in their coursework. Candidates may require some further explanation or interpretation before they fully understand the nature of the knowledge, understanding and 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.

### **Marking, Revision, re-drafting and interim review of work**

When marking the coursework, teachers should not give credit to any additional assistance given to candidates beyond that which is described in the awarding body's specification. Teachers must give details of any additional assistance on the appropriate record form(s). Examples would include:

- having reviewed the candidate's coursework, giving detailed advice and suggestions (either to individual candidates or to groups) 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 assessment 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.

Candidates are free to revise and re-draft a piece of coursework without teacher involvement before submitting the final piece. 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. Once work is submitted for final assessment it must not be revised. Adding or removing any material to or from coursework after it has been presented by a candidate for final assessment will constitute malpractice.

Where coursework is submitted in digital format there may be instances where the collation of the electronic work does not attract any marks. In this case, the collation and submission may be done by the teacher instead of the candidate.

If a candidate requires additional assistance 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 record form.

Teachers must always keep 'live' coursework secure and confidential whilst in their possession. The sharing of 'live' coursework with other candidates or posting candidates' work on social media by teaching staff will constitute malpractice.

### **Presentation and submission of coursework**

All coursework submitted for assessment must be the candidate's own work. Written material should, wherever possible, be word-processed or handwritten using black ink. If videos or photographs/images of candidates are included as evidence of individual participation or contribution, heads of centre must obtain, at the beginning of the course, the written consent of each candidate (and, where necessary, the candidate's parent/carer) who appears. Candidate consent must allow for the sharing of images with centre staff, awarding body staff and examiners/moderators as per the awarding body's privacy notice.

Coursework must include a title and, where relevant, a table of contents and a bibliography. Where candidates produce coursework electronically, their work must be backed-up regularly and stored securely on the centre's IT system.

Valuable illustrative materials should not normally be included with the work sent for moderation or external marking. RBAI accepts 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 creation, submission and moderation of coursework in an electronic format.

### **Involvement of parent/carers**

Parents/carers should encourage their children to spend time on their coursework and may provide their children with access to resource materials and discuss the coursework with their children. However, they must not give direct advice on what should or should not be included.

### **Acknowledgement of sources**

Candidates must not copy material and claim it as their own work. If candidates use material from a source or generated from a source which is not their own work, they must indicate the part/element/phrase 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://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid\\_2621000/2621915.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid_2621000/2621915.stm), downloaded 5 February 2026.**

Candidates should also reference the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content. Candidates must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used. This must be submitted with the candidate's work for final assessment so that the teacher can review the work, the AI generated content and how it has been used. If this is not submitted and the teacher suspects the candidate has used AI tools, they will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for the next steps and assure themselves that the work is the candidate's own. Further guidance on how this can be done is set out in the JCQ document *Plagiarism in Assessments*. The document can be found on the JCQ website: <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>. Teachers may also reference the *AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications*, JCQ-AI-information-sheet-for-teachers-1.pdf, JCQ-AI-poster-for-students-2.pdf

## Malpractice in coursework

Candidates must not:

- submit work which is not their own
- make their work available to other candidates through any medium
- allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material
- assist other candidates to produce work
- use AI tools, books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution
- misuse AI
- submit work that has been word-processed by a third person without acknowledgement
- include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material.

These prohibitions mean that candidates must not publicise their work by posting it on social media or by any other electronic means. They must be made aware of the JCQ document *Information for candidates – Social Media*: <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents>

Candidates are not prohibited from lending books or other resources to one another, provided these are not used as part of their own independently sourced material.

Teachers conducting coursework will regularly check to ensure that there are no irregularities in coursework. Teachers should intervene at the earliest possible opportunity, regularly reminding candidates of the need for them to authenticate work with their signature.

If irregularities in coursework are discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication, teachers should inform their HoD and in turn the Curriculum VP. If appropriate teachers may allow work to be re-done providing there is enough time to allow for marking, moderation, return of mark for appeal and submission to the awarding body. Teachers may also take necessary steps to ensure that this work may be authenticated. The only exceptions to this are where the offence relates to a breach of the conditions of the assessment, e.g. possession of notes, communication with other candidates or where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has been breached. In such a case, the breach must 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 another appropriate place.

If irregularities in coursework are identified after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication the teacher must inform the HoD and in turn the Curriculum VP. The Principal will submit full details of the case to the relevant awarding body immediately. Guidance is provided in the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*. The document and Form JCQ/M1 can be found on the JCQ website: <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>

RBAI will ensure that members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing coursework are aware of the potential for malpractice.

Failure of teaching staff to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself.

Teaching staff must:

- be vigilant in relation to candidate malpractice and be fully aware of the published regulations
- escalate and report any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice to the head of centre or directly to the awarding body, following the centre's whistleblowing procedures where relevant.

### **Authentication procedures**

Each candidate must sign the declaration of authentication when submitting their coursework to their teacher for final assessment (Appendix 1 [file:///N:/Downloads/Coursework\\_ICC\\_25-26\\_FINAL%20\(4\).pdf](file:///N:/Downloads/Coursework_ICC_25-26_FINAL%20(4).pdf)). Teachers must not assess work which has not been properly authenticated, and all work must be properly authenticated prior to submission to the awarding body. A mark of '0' (zero) will be given if the candidate cannot confirm the authenticity of work submitted for assessment.

Teachers must confirm that all 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 must not be accepted for assessment.

All teachers must sign the declaration of authentication after the work has been completed. Electronic signatures are acceptable. Failure to sign the authentication statement may delay the processing of the candidate's results. The teacher should be sufficiently aware of the candidate's standard and level of work to be able to identify if the coursework submitted appears to be beyond that candidate's talents. If this is not the case, the teacher with responsibility for that piece of coursework should take steps to ensure they can confidently authenticate candidates' work. This could include candidates completing some work under direct supervision and/or regular discussions with teachers regarding their work. Some direct supervision is necessary to ensure that the coursework submitted can be confidently authenticated as the candidate's own. Reservations about signing the authentication statements, due to concerns regarding copying/plagiarism (including the use of AI tools) or collusion should be escalated immediately to the Head of Department who should in turn escalate immediately to the Curriculum Vice-Principal. 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 should award a mark which represents the candidate's unaided achievement. The authentication statement must be signed and information given on the relevant form;
  - if the teacher is unable to sign the authentication statement of a particular candidate, then the candidate's work cannot be accepted for assessment. A mark of '0' (zero) must be submitted;
  - if malpractice is suspected in any of the above scenarios, a member of the senior leadership team must be consulted about the procedure to be followed.
- (Coursework\_ICC\_25-26\_Final)

### **Marking of internally assessed coursework**

Teachers must pay close attention to the requirements of the specification and 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 marks must reflect the relative attainment of all the candidates. The work should also be dated to indicate when it was marked.

Teachers must not use AI tools as the sole or primary means of marking candidates' work.

RBAI will attempt to avoid any conflicts of interest, but where this is not possible the RBAI Conflicts of Interest policy.

### **Annotation**

Teachers when annotating work, should, in accordance with subject guidance and specification, show clearly how credit has been awarded to meet the assessment criteria. Where appropriate key phrases should be used to indicate this.

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.

### **Standardisation of marking within centres and return of work**

When standardising teachers should use reference and archive materials, including 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.

#### **12 Standardisation of marking within centres**

Where the work for a component/unit has been marked by more than one teacher, internal standardisation of marking must be carried out. One of the following procedures should normally be used:

- 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/unit 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 adjust 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.

Following completion of the marking and internal standardisation, the coursework must be securely retained and not returned to the candidates until after the closing date for reviews of moderation for the series concerned or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later.

Heads of Department must retain evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out.

### **Submission of marks for internally assessed components**

Teachers will complete relevant documentation and submit marks by the deadlines of the awarding bodies. They must carefully check the marks, for all candidates, they are submitting to an awarding body to minimise errors, including checking for both addition and transcription errors before submission.

If RBAI or a pupil has been affected by circumstances beyond their control, then RBAI will liaise with the awarding body.

Staff must inform candidates of their centre-assessed marks allowing five working days for a candidate to request a review of marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body.

Any review must be undertaken before marks are submitted to the awarding body.

- Any review of marking should follow 7h. RBAI Management of Internal Appeals Procedure

- Sufficient time must be given to candidates to allow them to review copies of material, as necessary, and reach a decision.
- Staff must also 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.
- The review must be 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.
- The reviewer must ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.

RBAI will make it clear to candidates that any centre-assessed marks are subject to change through the moderation process.

RBAI will inform the awarding body if they do not accept the outcome of a review.

### **Incomplete coursework**

Where candidates are required to produce several distinct pieces of work which are assessed separately, a candidate who fails to complete all parts of the work will be credited with the marks for the task(s) carried out unless the specification says otherwise. In some subjects, the tasks may be interdependent, and teachers should follow the instructions in the specification when assessing incomplete work.

A candidate who fails to submit any coursework must be recorded as absent and not awarded a mark of '0' (zero), when marks are submitted.

A candidate who fails to submit coursework will receive a partially absent subject grade in a multi-component qualification and an absent grade in a single component qualification, e.g. a Project qualification.

If none of the work is worthy of credit or where the authenticity of the work cannot be confirmed, a mark of '0' (zero) must be awarded.

### **Applications for special consideration in respect of incomplete course**

If a candidate has temporarily experienced an event outside of their control, it may, in some subjects, be possible to accept a reduced quantity of coursework without penalty. However, all of the assessment objectives must have been covered at least once. This will not be possible if the specification only requires one piece of work. Where several pieces of work are required, the reduction will only be accepted if those pieces are testing the same criteria. It will not be possible to give this consideration in every case.

RBAI will not adjust candidates' marks. An application for special consideration will 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.

It should be noted that awarding bodies will not normally agree a reduced amount of work in advance.

For further information on special consideration, please refer to the JCQ document *A guide to the special consideration process*. The document can be found on the JCQ website:

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance>



### **Lost coursework**

If a candidate's work has been lost within RBAI and, despite every effort, it cannot be found or it has been accidentally destroyed, the circumstances must 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>

To mitigate against the penalty relating to lost coursework staff should

- Monitor work whilst in progress.
- Advise candidates on keeping their work safe.

RBAI are aware of the following

- If only part of the work is lost, further guidance will be sought from the relevant awarding body.
- If the work was marked before it was lost or damaged, marks must be submitted in the usual way. Form 15 – JCQ/LCW‡ must be submitted to the moderator and the awarding body by the deadline for the submission of marks. 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 for consideration by the awarding body 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‡. Estimated marks will not normally be accepted after the issue of results.

### **Re-use of coursework marks by candidates**

RBAI may re-use the result of a coursework unit after certification, subject to the availability of the specification in a future examination series. If the coursework required for that specification changes, then re-use may not be possible.

RBAI will check awarding body specifications for subject-specific guidance and ensure authentication. Any additional assistance will also be recorded. However, candidate knowledge of the previous breakdown of marks does not need to be regarded as additional assistance.

### **External moderation**

RBAI will submit evidence, by the submission date, relating to coursework required by the awarding body.

RBAI will submit to the awarding body

- details of marks awarded
- confirmation that internal standardisation has been carried out as required
- any other documentation that the specification or the awarding body requires
- the correct samples of work for review
- further evidence of marking if required

If the moderator adjusts marks, the HoD should inform the Curriculum VP immediately, who will in turn inform the Principal.

### **Retention of candidates' work**

HoDs will retain candidates' marked coursework securely, whether or not it was part of the moderation sample, until all possibility of a review of moderation has been exhausted or until any appeal, malpractice investigation or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later. Where retention is a problem, because of the nature of the coursework, some form of evidence (e.g. photographic, audio or media recording) must be available, in consultation with the Head of Examinations.

HoDs will keep a record of those candidates (candidate name and number) whose work is included in the sample sent to or seen by moderators. This information may be required if there is a review of moderation at a later date. In the case of coursework stored electronically, protection against corruption and cyber-attacks is provided by the C2k for school accounts. If pupils are working from their own account they should be encouraged to use their OneDrive or Google Drive to back up work.

### **Reviews of moderation**

Following an adjustment in marks, the HoD will consult with Curriculum VP and Head of Centre. The Head of Centre will then decide whether to pursue a review of moderation.

If the decision is taken to request a review of moderation then RBAI will follow awarding body and JCQ guidelines. For further information see <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services>

### **Further access arrangements and reasonable adjustments**

Arrangements for candidates with disabilities will be made in advance of examinations and assessments. RBAI will refer to the JCQ document *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments*. The document can be found on the JCQ website: <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration>

RBAI will ensure that, where coursework is marked by teachers, credit is only given for skills demonstrated by the candidate working independently.