Joint Council for Qualifications CIC

Instructions for conducting coursework

ELC qualifications and Project qualifications
CCEA GCE unitised AS and A level qualifications

Effective from 1 September 2026

For the attention of heads of centre, senior leaders and subject leaders

Produced on behalf of:

AQA Questions matter · CAMBRIDGE OCR · City & Guilds · CCEA Rewarding Learning · Pearson · WJEC CBAC

©JCQ CIC 2026

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 ELC qualifications, Project qualifications and CCEA GCE unitised AS and A level qualifications.

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

These instructions are applicable from 1 September 2026.

Changes made to the contents of this document since the previous version (1 September 2025 to 31 August 2026) are highlighted in yellow for easy identification.

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

Centres should note that any reference to 'JCQ' or 'Joint Council for Qualifications' within this document should be read as JCQ[CIC] or the Joint Council for Qualifications[CIC].

Contents

Introduction iv

1 Task setting 1

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

3 Presentation and submission of coursework 3

4 Involvement of parents/carers 5

5 Acknowledgement of sources 6

6 Malpractice in coursework 7

7 Authentication procedures 9

8 Marking of internally-assessed coursework 10

9 Annotation 11

10 Jointly-produced work 12

11 Quality of language/written communication 13

12 Standardisation of marking within centres 14

13 Submission of marks for internally-assessed components 15

14 Incomplete coursework 16

15 Applications for special consideration in respect of incomplete coursework 17

16 Lost coursework 18

17 Re-use of coursework marks by candidates 19

18 External moderation 20

19 Feedback to centres 21

20 Externally-assessed coursework 22

21 Retention of candidates' work 23

22 Centre consortium arrangements 24

23 Reviews of moderation 25

24 Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments 26

Appendix 1 Candidate declaration form 27

Appendix 2 JCQ Information for candidates – coursework assessments 30

Appendix 3 Private candidates 33

Introduction

Throughout these instructions, a centre is an institution approved by an awarding body. 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 contact 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. It includes the work required in Project qualifications and internally-assessed work in other qualifications covered by these instructions. Centres should be aware that sections 1-7, 10, 11, 15-17 and 24 also apply to externally-assessed coursework.

The term 'teacher' covers anyone (regardless of employment status) who is responsible for supervising and/or assessing candidates' work.

Centres **must** send all correspondence relating to coursework directly to the awarding body concerned and not to the moderator (unless the awarding body indicates otherwise).

Centres 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 document *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*. This document is available on the JCQ website:

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice

For information relating to the conduct of non-examination assessments, GCE AS, A level and GCSE specifications, centres **must** refer to the JCQ document *Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments:*

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/non-examination-assessments

1 Task setting

1.1 Coursework components assess candidates' knowledge, understanding and skills 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, but is not limited to: 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 **must** ensure that candidates are clear about the assessment criteria which they are expected to meet in their coursework. Specifications explain the criteria in detail. However, 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.

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.

1.4 The centre **must** ensure that all candidates have read the *Information for candidates – coursework assessments* (see Appendix 2, page 30) **and** the candidate declaration **prior to** beginning their work (see Appendix 1, page 27). Candidates **must not** sign the declaration until they have completed their work and handed it in for final assessment.

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

2.1 When marking the coursework, teachers **must 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.

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.

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, proportional to the marks available.

2.3 Where drafting is inherent in the knowledge, understanding and 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 enough to enable candidates to understand the demands of the assessment criteria. Advice may be given in either oral or written form.

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. 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 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.

2.7 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.

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

3 Presentation and submission of coursework

3.1 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.

3.2 Candidates' work for assessment must be in English, Irish or Welsh as specified by the awarding body. AI translation tools **must not** be used to generate work for assessment.

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. 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.

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 only be given credit 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. 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 until 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 creation, submission and moderation of coursework in an electronic format.

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

3.6 Where candidates produce coursework electronically, their work **must** be backed up regularly and stored securely on the centre's IT system. Centres should consider the contingency of candidates' work being backed up on two separate devices, including one off-site backup. The centre **must** implement appropriate information security arrangements (which will include protection against corruption and cyber-attack such as firewall protection and virus scanning software).

3.7 Centres should take precautions to ensure that the package in which the work is despatched is robust and securely fastened. Centres should also consider encrypting any sensitive digital media to ensure the security of the data stored within it. Centres **must** refer to awarding body guidance to ensure that the method of encryption is suitable.

3.8 For postal 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 centre number, 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 component/unit code appears on each page as a header or footer.

3.9 Where candidates' work is to be submitted electronically, either directly to an awarding body's digital platform or to an examiner/moderator, centres must follow the awarding body's instructions.

3.10 For Project qualifications, the written report and all evidence specified by the awarding body **must** 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. However, 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 their teacher.

5 Acknowledgement of sources

5.1 In many subjects, candidates will use source material, including the internet and AI tools, when completing out their coursework. However, candidates **must not** copy such material and claim it as their own work. Source material must be appropriately credited and referenced.

5.2 If candidates use material from a source or generated from a source which is not their own work, they **must** indicate the particular 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 taken and used and **must** show the precise web page, not simply 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 downloaded 5 February 2027.

Where AI has been used, the reference **must** show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2027. Candidates should also acknowledge the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content.

Where AI is used, candidates must retain a copy of the question(s)/prompts used to generate the AI content as well as the AI-generated content itself 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.

Centres must also refer to the following JCQ documents which can be found on the JCQ website: **http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice**

JCQ *AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications*

JCQ *Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments*
A summary for teachers

JCQ *AI and Assessments: A quick guide poster for students*

JCQ *Plagiarism in Assessments*

5.3 Candidates may be required to produce 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: Curran, J. *Mass Media and Society* (Hodder Arnold, 2005).

6 Malpractice in coursework

6.1 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 (as defined in the JCQ document *AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications*);
- 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 allowed to lend books or other resources to one another, provided these are not used as part of their own independently sourced material.

6.2 If irregularities in coursework are discovered **prior** to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication (see paragraph 7.1), this should be dealt with under the centre's internal procedures and does not need to be reported to the awarding body. 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 in another 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 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

6.4 Centres **must** have a published internal appeals procedure in place, relating to internal assessment decisions, which is made widely available and accessible to all candidates. The procedure **must** cover appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice or not being able to confidently authenticate the candidate's work.

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.

6.5 Where the awarding body receives a report of suspected malpractice in coursework, they may ask the head of centre to gather information and report their findings. Guidance is provided in the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* referred to in paragraph 6.3 above.

6.6 Awarding bodies reserve the right to submit candidates' work to third party IT service providers to detect potential and suspected malpractice. Any submissions will protect the identity of the candidate.

6.7 Heads of centre and appropriate senior leaders **must** ensure that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing coursework are aware of the potential for malpractice.

Teaching staff must be reminded that failure 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.

7 Authentication procedures

7.1 **It is the responsibility of the centre** to ensure each candidate signs a declaration (see Appendix 1) when submitting their coursework to their teacher for final assessment. Electronic signatures are acceptable. This is to confirm that the work is their own and that any assistance given and/or sources used have been acknowledged.

Teachers **must not** assess work which has not been properly authenticated. All work must be properly authenticated prior to submission to the awarding body.

Centres **must** record a mark of **'0'** (zero) if the candidate cannot confirm the authenticity of work submitted for assessment.

7.2 Teachers **must** confirm 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 **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.

If, during the external moderation process, it is found that the work has not been properly authenticated, the awarding body will take steps to determine the appropriate action, including potentially setting the mark(s) at **'0'** (zero).

7.3 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 ability.

7.4 In most centres, teachers are familiar with candidates' work through class and homework assignments. Where this is not the case, teachers should take steps to ensure they can confidently authenticate candidates' work. Examples of this could include candidates completing some work under direct supervision and/or regular discussions with teachers regarding their work.

7.5 In all cases, some direct supervision is necessary to ensure that the coursework submitted can be confidently authenticated as the candidate's own.

7.6 If teachers have reservations about signing the authentication statements due to concerns regarding copying/plagiarism (including the use of AI tools) or collusion, 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 (see paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3).

8 Marking of internally-assessed coursework

8.1 When marking coursework, teachers **must** 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 associated subject-specific 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.

Teachers **must not** use AI tools as the sole or primary means of marking candidates' work. Teachers must review all the work in its entirety and determine the mark it warrants using their own professional judgement regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. The teacher remains responsible for the mark/grade awarded. This is subject to any further guidance published by the regulators.

8.2 Centres **must** make every effort to avoid situations where a candidate is assessed by a person who has a close personal relationship with the candidate; for example, members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g. son/daughter).

Where this cannot be avoided, the centre **must** declare the possible conflict of interest to the relevant awarding body and submit the marked work for moderation, whether or not it is part of the moderation sample. Further details are given in section 5 of the JCQ document *General Regulations for Approved Centres*. The document can be found on the JCQ website:

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations

8.3 Candidates' work **must** be dated by teachers to reflect when it was marked.

9 Annotation

9.1 When coursework is marked, it **must** be annotated to show clearly how credit has been awarded.

9.2 Subject to any further guidance contained in awarding bodies' 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.

9.3 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.

9.4 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;
- any planning and processing not undertaken individually and provide details of any assistance or prompting given to the candidate.

9.5 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.

10 Jointly-produced work

10.1 The awarding body's specification will say whether candidates can work together when undertaking an assignment. However, candidates **must** provide an individual response as part of any task outcome.

Where an assignment may be undertaken as part of a group, each candidate **must** write up their own account of the assignment. Even if the information the candidates have is the same, the description of how the information 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.

It **must** be possible to determine the contribution made by individual candidates.

11 Quality of language/written communication

11.1 Candidates should use both clear communication and presentation in their coursework. Specifications will state whether quality of language will be assessed.

12 Standardisation of marking within centres

12.1 Reference and archive materials should be used to help set the standard of marking within centres. This could include exemplar material provided by the awarding body or, where available, work in the centre from the previous year taking into account moderator feedback.

12.2 It is useful to complete a trial marking exercise before marking candidates' work. Teachers should mark the same relatively small sample of completed 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 may alleviate a heavy marking load at the end of the course.

12.3 Where the work for a component/unit has been marked by more than one teacher in a centre, 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 reconsider the marks of all candidates for whom they were responsible. The new marks should be checked by the teacher in charge of internal standardisation.

12.4 Following completion of the marking and internal standardisation, the coursework must be securely retained by the centre 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.

12.5 Centres **must** retain evidence that internal standardisation has been carried out.

13 Submission of marks for internally assessed components

13.1 Awarding bodies will publish deadlines for the submission of marks.

13.2 Any documentation supplied by the awarding bodies **must** be completed in accordance with the instructions given and returned by the date specified. Unless instructed otherwise, centres should submit their coursework marks electronically.

Centres must carefully check the marks they are submitting to an awarding body to minimise errors.

Marks for all candidates, not just the sample submitted, **must** be checked by the centre for both addition and transcription errors before submission.

13.3 Where a centre has been affected by circumstances beyond its control, it may be possible to grant a short extension in **exceptional cases**. This is at the discretion of the awarding body. 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.

Awarding bodies **will not** accept late coursework marks where there are concerns as to the integrity of the marks.

13.4 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.

13.5 The centre **must** inform candidates of their centre-assessed marks, as a candidate can request a review of the centre's marking **before marks are submitted to the awarding body.**

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

- Sufficient time **must** be given to candidates to allow them to review copies of material, as necessary, and reach a decision.
- The centre **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.

Centres **must** also make it clear to candidates that any centre-assessed marks are subject to change through the moderation process.

Centres **must** inform the awarding body if they do not accept the outcome of a review.

The awarding bodies have produced a set of Frequently Asked Questions which may be found within the *Notice to Centres – Informing candidates of their centre-assessed marks*:

https://www.jcq.org.uk/knowledge-hub/notice-to-centres-informing-candidates-of-their-centre-assessed-marks/

Although the Frequently Asked Questions apply to non-examination assessments, they equally apply to the qualifications covered by this document.

14 Incomplete coursework

14.1 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 should 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.

14.2 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 subject grade of 'partially absent' in a multi-component qualification and a grade of 'absent' in a single component qualification, e.g. a Project qualification.

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

15 Applications for special consideration in respect of incomplete course

15.1 If a candidate has temporarily experienced an illness, injury or some other event outside of their control which has had, or is reasonably likely to have had, a material effect on their ability to take an assessment or demonstrate their level of attainment in an assessment, 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; for example, if work has not been submitted or the assessment objectives have not been satisfied.

15.2 Centres **must not** adjust candidates' marks. 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 work in advance.

15.3 Candidates **will not** be eligible for special consideration if their preparation for or performance in coursework components is affected by failure to cover the course because 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.

15.4 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

16 Lost coursework

16.1 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 **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

16.2 The awarding body will consider whether it is appropriate to accept a mark for an internally-assessed component/unit where there is no available evidence of attainment. This might occur in the following circumstances:

- The centre can verify that the work was completed or partially completed and had been monitored whilst it was in progress.
- The loss **is not** a consequence of negligence on the part of the candidate.
- If only part of the work is lost, further guidance must 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.**

[‡] AQA and Cambridge OCR centres **must not** submit Form 15 – JCQ/LCW. Applications **must** be submitted online using AQA Centre Services or OCR Interchange as appropriate.

17 Re-use of coursework marks by candidates

17.1 In unitised specifications, the result of a coursework unit is available for re-use after certification, as with the result of any other unit, **subject to the availability of the specification in a future examination series.**

17.2 Candidates who re-sit a unit may submit new, amended or enhanced coursework. Centres **must** check awarding body specifications for subject-specific guidance.

Centres **must** be aware of the need to authenticate candidates' work, as detailed in section 7. They **must** ensure that any additional assistance is recorded and taken into account when marking the work (or submitting the work to the external examiner) in the normal way, as detailed in section 2.

In the case of amended or enhanced coursework, this **must** include additional assistance received before the previous submission or following feedback from that submission. However, candidate knowledge of the previous breakdown of marks **does not** need to be regarded as additional assistance.

18 External moderation

18.1 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.

18.2 In most cases, 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.

18.3 Different procedures may apply where work is ephemeral (i.e. there is no permanent end-product).

18.4 By the date specified, each centre **must** 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.

18.5 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.

It is the responsibility of centres to ensure that moderators receive the correct samples of work to review.

18.6 For visiting moderation, a visit is arranged for a date and time convenient to both the centre and moderator.

18.7 During the moderation process, the moderator assesses the sample work using the published marking criteria in the specification.

18.8 The moderator marks are compared with the centre's marks for the sample of work. If the differences between the moderator marks and the centre's marks exceed the specified tolerance, adjustments may be applied to the centre's marks.

18.9 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.

18.10 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 reconsider 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 Feedback to centres

19.1 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 – e.g. did the tasks allow candidates to access the full range of marks available?
- the accuracy of the centre's marking against the criteria and in relation to the agreed standard for the component/unit – were there inaccuracies within the marking range? Was the marking of the assessments unduly harsh or generous?
- the efficiency of the centre's administration – were the assessments conducted and submitted within the requirements of the specification? Were the assessments submitted on time?

19.2 The advice given on the feedback forms will be constructive, objective and supported by fact or judgement. It will be sufficiently detailed to explain any differences between the centre's assessments and the agreed standard for the component/unit. It should enable centres to take remedial action where necessary before the next series.

20 Externally-assessed coursework

20.1 In some specifications, coursework is externally assessed. The coursework of all candidates, and where required the authentication statements, **must** be sent by a specified date to an awarding body/examiner for marking.

20.2 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 document *Post Results Services, Information and guidance to centres*. This document 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.

21 Retention of candidates' work

21.1 Moderators will return work directly to centres where instructed to do so by the awarding body. Coursework assessments submitted electronically **will not** normally be returned to centres.

21.2 **Centres are required to 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.

Centres are requested to 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 within the centre, protection against corruption and cyber attacks must also be considered.

21.3 An awarding body will retain exemplar work for archive and standardisation purposes. For information on copyright, please see paragraphs 6.12 to 6.14 of the JCQ document *General Regulations for Approved Centres*. The document is also available in PDF format on the JCQ website: **http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations**

22 Centre consortium arrangements

22.1 Where candidates from different centres have been taught and are assessed together, centres **must** inform the awarding body of the relevant internally-assessed components/units and the centres involved. Centres in such an arrangement are referred to as a consortium.

22.2 The centres in the consortium **must** nominate a consortium co-ordinator who will liaise with the awarding body on behalf of all the centres.

22.3 Consortium co-ordinators **must** complete Form JCQ/CCA *Centre consortium arrangements for centre assessed work*, which is accessible via the Centre Admin Portal (CAP), for each examination series and for each specification with one or more internally-assessed components/units that has been taught jointly.

Co-ordinators **must** submit the form by the published deadline.

22.4 The centres **must** carry out internal standardisation of the marking of coursework across the consortium.

22.5 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.

22.6 If a consortium requests a review of moderation, the work **must** be available from **all** the centres in the consortium, as it is the original sample that is reviewed.

23 Reviews of moderation

23.1 Centres can request a 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.**

23.2 The review of moderation:

- is a process in which a second standardised moderator reviews the work of the first standardised 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 a process to ensure that the first moderator has made an accurate judgement on the centre's ability to mark the work to the agreed national standard;
- 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).

The moderator undertaking a review of moderation must consider the marks given by the previous moderator and can only make a change to the outcome of moderation if an error occurred in the initial moderation process.

23.3 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).

23.4 The coursework submitted for a review of moderation:

- **must** be despatched to the moderator within three working days following the receipt of instructions from the awarding body. Failure to meet this undertaking may delay the outcome of the review of moderation, or result in the review of moderation being cancelled;
- **must** be the original work submitted for moderation;
- **must** have been kept securely;
- **must not** have been returned to the candidates.

23.5 An equivalent sample may be requested by the awarding body where the original sample of candidates' work has been lost.

23.6 Externally-assessed coursework will be treated as examination scripts. Centres should request a review of marking (Service 2) or a priority review of marking (Priority Service 2) as appropriate to the level of the qualification.

23.7 For further information on reviews of marking and reviews of moderation, please refer to the JCQ document *Post Results Services, Information and guidance for centres*. This document is available on the JCQ website:

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services

24 Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

24.1 When choosing specifications, candidates **must** be made aware of the knowledge, skills and understanding which they will be required to demonstrate. If they choose a specification where they **will not** be able to demonstrate attainment in all parts of the assessment, they will be unable to gain all of the available credit.

24.2 It is possible for awarding bodies to agree arrangements so that candidates with disabilities, special educational needs, a temporary illness, a temporary injury and candidates with English as an additional language can access the assessment(s). **These arrangements must be made in advance of examinations and assessments**. Centres should 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**

24.3 Centres **must** ensure that, where coursework is marked by teachers, credit is only given for knowledge, skills and understanding demonstrated by the candidate working independently. Access arrangements **must not** undermine the integrity of the qualification.

Appendix 1 – Candidate declaration form

Notice to candidates

1. The work you submit for assessment must be your own.

You must not plagiarise. This means you must not take someone else's words, thoughts, ideas or outputs and try to pass them off as your own.

2. You must clearly reference all your sources.

If you have used any material to create ideas for your work (like a book, journal or internet search) you must reference this, even if you haven't used the same words or phrases in your own work. You must make clear which part, element or phrase you have used and say where it came from. If you receive help and guidance from someone other than your teacher, you must tell your teacher. They will then record the assistance given to you.

3. You must clearly acknowledge and reference any use of AI.

Sometimes you are allowed to use an AI tool to create your work. You must keep a copy of the original question(s) and any AI-generated content you used, for example, a screenshot with a short explanation of how you used it. You must acknowledge the name of the AI tool used; the date the content was generated and the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content.

You need to hand this in with your final work so your teacher can check the AI content and how you used it.

4. You must keep your work confidential.

You can only share the work you submit for assessment with your teacher(s). You must not share it with anyone else, and you must not post it online.

5. The work you submit for assessment must be produced under the conditions set out in the awarding body's specification/ scheme of assessment/NEA handbook.

Each qualification has a specific set of conditions. Your teacher will have explained the level of supervision and control necessary for this assessment.

If you break the rules, you could get zero marks, be disqualified from the unit or subject, or even from all exams. The awarding body will investigate and decide what happens.

If there is anything you don't understand, please speak to your teacher before you sign the form below.

Candidate declaration

I have read and understood the *Notice to Candidates* above. I declare that the work submitted for this assessment:

1. is my own work
2. has clearly referenced all sources
3. has clearly acknowledged any use of AI
4. has been kept confidential
5. has been produced under the conditions set out in the specification/scheme of assessment/ NEA handbook.

I understand that if I make a false declaration this is a form of malpractice.

If there is anything you don't understand, please speak to your teacher before you sign the form.

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

Notice to teachers

You must keep a copy of the Candidate declaration on file until the deadline for requesting a review of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later. This may be subject to inspection by the awarding body and/or a JCQ Centre Inspector.

Before signing this declaration, please ensure you have read and understood the guidance produced by JCQ on authenticating candidates' work, marking candidates' work and internal standardisation. Please also ensure that you are familiar with the candidate's general standard of work.

Teacher declaration

I confirm that:

- all reasonable steps were taken, including steps to mitigate the risk of AI misuse, to make sure the work submitted is solely that of the candidate concerned
- to the best of my knowledge, where sources have been used they are referenced
- to the best of my knowledge, where the candidate has used AI, it has been used and acknowledged appropriately
- any help given to the candidate has been recorded
- to the best of my knowledge, the work has been kept confidential (when with the candidate) and has been securely stored by the centre (when appropriate to the assessment)
- the candidate's work was conducted under the required conditions detailed in the specification/scheme of assessment/NEA handbook

- the marking was carried out according to the mark scheme and AI was not used as the sole form of marking; I have reviewed the work in its entirety and determined the final mark
- internal standardisation was carried out to ensure all candidates have been assessed against the same standard.

I understand that a false declaration is a form of malpractice.

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

Information for candidates – coursework assessments
Effective from 1 September 2026

This notice has been produced on behalf of: AQA, Cambridge OCR, City & Guilds, CCEA, Pearson and WJEC

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

When you submit your work 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.

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

You can demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of a subject by using information from sources, or generated from sources, which may include the internet and AI tools. Remember, though, information from these sources may be incorrect or biased. 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, p 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://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid_2621000/2621915.stm, downloaded 5 February 2027.

Where AI has been used has been used, your reference **must** show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2027. You should also acknowledge the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content.

You **must** retain a copy of the question(s)/prompts used to generate the AI content as well as the AI-generated content itself for reference and authentication purposes in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how you used it. This **must** be submitted with your work for final assessment so that your teacher can review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.

You may be required to produce a bibliography at the end of your work. This **must** list the full details of publications you have used in your research, even where these are not directly referred to. For example: Curran, J. *Mass Media and Society* (Hodder Arnold, 2005).

If you copy the words, ideas or outputs from other sources and do not 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. They will record the nature of the assistance given to you.

Your parent/carer may provide you with access to resource materials and discuss your coursework with you. However, they **must not** give you direct advice on what should or should not be included.

If you worked as part of a group on an assignment, you **must each** write up your **own account of the assignment**. Even if the information you have is the same, the description of how that information 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. **Don't** share it with anyone, including posting it on social media. You **must always** keep your work secure and confidential. If it is stored on the computer network, keep your password secure. Collect all copies from the printer and destroy those you do not need.

Don't be tempted to use any prepared or generated online solutions and try to pass them off as your own work – this is cheating. Electronic tools used by awarding bodies can detect this sort of copying.

You **must not** write inappropriate, offensive or obscene material.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism involves taking someone else's words, thoughts, ideas or outputs and not crediting the source. This includes outputs from AI tools. **Plagiarism 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 work you have copied from.
- Internet search engines for detecting plagiarism and specialised computer software can be used to match phrases or pieces of text with original sources. They can detect changes in the grammar and style of writing or punctuation.

Sanctions for breaking the regulations

If it is discovered that you have broken the rules, one of the following sanctions will be applied:

- you will be awarded zero marks for your work;
- 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.

The awarding body will decide which sanction is appropriate.

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

Private candidates

Prior to embarking on any work for a coursework component, private candidates **must** register or enrol with a centre which has been **approved by the relevant awarding body. This includes Distance Learning Providers which are approved examination centres**. The centre, including a Distance Learning Provider approved by the relevant awarding body, will administer all aspects of the coursework process, as per the awarding body's specification. This will be defined as the candidate's entering centre.

Information for private candidates may be found at:

www.aqa.org.uk/student-support/private-candidates

Entries Information | CCEA

https://www.ocr.org.uk/students/private-candidates/

https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/registrations-and-entries/academic-registrations-and-entries/private-candidates.html

https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/student-support/private-candidates/

The entering centre will be responsible for administering the course, including all aspects of setting, authenticating and marking the candidate's work.

Where a specification has timetabled written examinations, the entering centre may, or may not, be able to conduct them. If not, the private candidate will be responsible for finding a centre which is prepared to host the timetabled written examinations.

Where required, once a 'host centre' has been found, the entering centre will initiate the transferred candidate arrangement process. **The process must be completed by the published deadline**. A fee will be payable to the awarding body by the entering centre for the transferred candidate arrangement.

A centre which **does not** provide 'face-to-face' teaching **must** comply with the awarding body's requirements. To achieve this there **must** be a pattern of regular contact between the candidate and any assigned tutor(s) or assessor(s) prior to the commencement of the work through to its submission.

During such contact, the tutor(s) or assessor(s) **must** ensure that all published rules are, or will be, successfully adhered to.

The tutor(s) or assessor(s) **must** authenticate the candidate's work and, where relevant, record any factors which may have a bearing on their judgement of the assessment, including the amount of assistance that has been requested by the candidate.

The tutor(s) or assessor(s) **must** be sufficiently familiar with the candidate's general standard to judge whether the piece of work submitted is within their capabilities.

The entering centre **must** mark the candidate's work, which must be in accordance with the awarding body's published mark scheme.

The awarding body will issue results and certificates to the entering centre.

The entering centre **must** make private candidates aware that there are several costs associated with the examination entry process.