SOUTH HUNSLEY

Examinations Policy
Examinations Contingency Plan
Cyber Incident Response Plan

Important: This document can only be considered valid when viewed on the school website. If this document has been printed or saved to another location, you must check that the version number on your copy matches that of the document online. **Name and Title of Author:**	Barry Gray, Deputy Headteacher
Name of Responsible Committee/Individual:	South Hunsley School and Sixth Form Local Governing Body
Implementation Date:	Autumn 2025
Review Date:	Autumn 2026
Target Audience:	All Staff, Parents, Students
Version Control:	Version 2.3

Examinations Policy

Contents

1. South Hunsley Examinations Policy

The purpose of this policy is:

- to ensure the planning and management of exams is conducted efficiently and in the best interests of candidates;
- to ensure the operation of an efficient exams system with clear guidelines for all relevant staff.

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the centre's exam processes to read, understand and implement this policy.

The policy will be reviewed annually, in line with any updates to JCQ's Instructions for Conducting Examinations.

The policy will be reviewed by the Deputy Headteacher with responsibility for curriculum and assessment.

Where references are made to JCQ regulations/guidelines and specific links are not provided, further details can be found at www.jcq.org.uk.

Exam responsibilities

The Head of Centre:

- has overall responsibility for the school/college as an exams centre and advises on appeals and re-marks.
- is responsible for reporting all suspected or actual incidents of malpractice - refer to the JCQ document Suspected malpractice in examinations and assessments https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Malpractice_Sep25_FINAL.pdf.

Exams officer (or Exams team in case of absence):

- manages the administration of internal and external exams.
- advises the senior leadership team, subject and class tutors, and other relevant support staff on annual exams timetables and procedures as set by the various awarding bodies.
- oversees the production and distribution to all centre staff and candidates, of an annual calendar for all exams in which candidates will be involved and communicates regularly with staff concerning imminent deadlines and events.
- ensures that candidates and their parents/carers are informed of and understand those aspects of the exams timetable that will affect them.
- checks with teaching staff that the necessary coursework and/or controlled assessments are completed on time and in accordance with JCQ guidelines.
- provides and confirms detailed data on estimated entries.
- maintains systems and processes to support the timely entry of candidates for their exams.
- receives, checks and stores securely all exam papers and completed scripts and ensures that scripts are dispatched as per the guidelines.
- administers access arrangements and makes applications for special consideration following the regulations in the JCQ publication *A guide to the special consideration process https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/JCQ-A-guide-to-the-special-consideration-process-FINAL_2025_26.pdf*.
- identifies and manages exam timetable clashes.
- accounts for income and expenditures relating to all exam costs/charges.
- line manages the senior exams invigilator, organises the recruitment, training, and supports the monitoring of a team of exams invigilators responsible for the conduct of exams.
- ensures candidates' coursework / controlled assessment marks are submitted, and any other material required by the appropriate awarding bodies correctly and on schedule.

- tracks, dispatches, and stores returned coursework / controlled assessments.
- manages all actions taken on each day of exams, including handling late or absent candidates.
- arranges for dissemination of exam results and certificates to candidates and forwards, in consultation with the SLT, any post results service requests.

Subject Leaders are responsible for*:*

- guidance and pastoral oversight of candidates who are unsure about exam entries or amendments to entries.
- accurate completion of entry and all other mark sheets and adherence to deadlines as set by the exams officer and awarding organisations.
- accurate completion of NEA / coursework / controlled assessment policies, procedures, mark sheets and declaration sheets.
- decisions on post-results procedures.

Teachers are responsible for:

- supplying information on entries, NEA, coursework and controlled assessments as required by the head of department and/or exams officer.
- Implementing NEA /coursework/ controlled assessment polices and procedures as laid out by JCQ and awarding organisations

The special educational needs coordinator (SENCo) is responsible for:

- identification and testing of candidates' requirements for access arrangements and notifying the exams officer in good time so that they are able to put in place exam day arrangements
- processing any necessary applications in order to gain approval (if required), including collecting and keeping evidence.
- working with the exams officer and data team to provide the access arrangements required by candidates in exams rooms.

Lead invigilator/invigilators are responsible for:

- assisting the exams officer in the efficient running of exams according to JCQ regulations.
- collection of exam papers and other material from the exams officer before the start of the exam.
- collection of all exam papers in the correct order at the end of the exam and ensuring their return to the exams office.
- ensuring all procedures followed during each exam, as well as immediately before and immediately afterwards, are in line with JCQ or other relevant requirements. Specific attention must be given to ensuring there are no unauthorised materials in the exam room, and the requirement that all wrist watches are removed and set on desks by students.

Candidates are responsible for:

- confirmation and signing of entries.
- understanding NEA / coursework / controlled assessment regulations and signing a declaration that authenticates the NEA / coursework / controlled assessment as their own.
- Bringing any concerns that they have to the attention of a staff member in a timely manner before and during examinations.
- ensuring they conduct themselves in all exams in line with JCQ and school regulations.

2. Qualifications

The qualifications offered at this centre are decided by the Senior Leadership Team, working with subject

leaders.

The types of qualifications offered are Functional Skills, Entry Level Qualifications, GCSE Qualifications, A and AS Level Qualifications and Vocational/Technical Qualifications.

The subjects offered for these qualifications in any academic year may be found in the centre's published prospectus or similar documents for that year. If there is to be a change of specification for the next year, the exams office must be informed by January each academic year.

Informing the exams office of changes to a specification is the responsibility of subject leaders or the senior leadership team.

Decisions on whether a candidate should be entered for a particular subject will be taken by the Senior Leadership Team in consultation with teachers and subject leaders.

3. Exam series and timetables

Internal exams (mock or trial exams) and assessments are scheduled in the summer term of the preceding academic year, in line with the whole-school calendar.

External exams and assessments are scheduled in the preceding academic year, and in the case of some qualifications, including vocational qualifications, must be mapped out before any student is enrolled on the course.

Internal exams are held under external exam conditions, although they may sometimes be held in subject classrooms.

The senior leadership team decides which exam series are used in the centre.

The centre does offer some assessments on an on-demand basis. If offered, on-demand assessments can be scheduled only in windows agreed between the subject or pastoral leader and the exams officer, and senior leadership team.

Exam timetables

Once confirmed, the exams officer will circulate the exam timetables for internal and external exams at a specified date before each series begins.

4. Entries, entry details and late entries

Candidates or parents/carers can request a subject entry, change of level or withdrawal. Such requests must be made to the exams officer for consideration. South Hunsley School retains the final decision on any such requests.

The centre accepts entries from private candidates only in specific circumstances. Applications for private entries must be made to the exams officer, via the main school reception.

The centre does not act as an exams centre for other organisations. Where the centre has helped prepare candidates for a qualification as part of a partnership agreement, so those candidates may sit their exams with the centre.

Entry deadlines are circulated to subject leaders via email and internal post.

Subject Leaders will provide estimated entry information to the exams officer to meet JCQ and awarding body deadlines.

Entries and amendments made after an awarding organisation's deadline (i.e. late) require the authorisation, in writing, of the exams officer and/or the deputy headteacher with responsibility for assessment.

GCSE re-sits/retakes are permitted, where they are available under the specification rubric.

AS re-sits/retakes are permitted, where they are available under the specification rubric, although students will not routinely be entered for these.

A level re-sits/retakes are permitted, where they are available under the specification rubric.

Principal Learning re-sits/retakes are permitted, where they are available under the specification rubric.

Functional skills re-sits/retakes are permitted, where they are available under the specification rubric.

Re-sit decisions will be made by subject leaders in consultation with students, parents and the senior leadership team where appropriate, and a charge may be made for any resits.

Private candidates

Managing private candidates is the responsibility of the exams officer. Private candidates are accepted at the discretion of the school, and must have been previous students or employees. An administrative charge may be made to private candidates to cover additional costs incurred in providing additional administration, rooming and invigilation.

5. Exam fees

Candidates or departments will not be charged for changes of tier, withdrawals made by the proper procedures or alterations arising from administrative processes provided these are made within the time allowed by the awarding bodies.

The exams officer will publish the deadline for actions well in advance for each exams series.

GCSE first entry exam fees are paid by the centre, except in the case of external candidates, who are responsible for all exam fees.

AS Level first entry exam fees are paid by the candidate unless otherwise agreed by the Exams Officer, except in the case of external candidates who are responsible for all exam fees.

A Level first entry exam fees are paid by the centre, except in the case of external candidates, who are responsible for all exam fees.

Principal Learning first entry exam fees are paid by the centre, except in the case of external candidates, who are responsible for all exam fees.

Functional skills first entry exam fees are paid by the centre, except in the case of external candidates, who are responsible for all exam fees.

Late entry or amendment fees are paid by the centre, department, or candidates, depending on the reasons and responsibilities for late entries. Only where the choice or a clerical error has been made by the centre

itself, will the centre be responsible for payment of these fees.

Fee reimbursements are sought from candidates:
- if they fail to sit an exam;
- if they do not meet the necessary NEA or coursework requirements without medical evidence or evidence of other mitigating circumstances.

Re-sit fees are paid by candidates, unless the decision to take the resit has been made by the school.

See also Post Results Services and Access to Scripts.

6. Equality Legislation

All exam centre staff must ensure that they meet the requirements of any equality legislation.

The centre will comply with the legislation, including making reasonable adjustments to the service that that they provide to candidates in accordance with requirements defined by the legislation, awarding bodies, and JCQ. This is the responsibility of the deputy headteacher with responsibility for assessment, working with the exams officer, SENCO and safeguarding officer where appropriate.

Access arrangements

The SENCo will inform subject teachers of candidates with special educational needs and any special arrangements that individual candidates will need during the course and in any assessments/exams.

A candidate's access arrangements requirement is determined by the SENCO.

Ensuring there is appropriate evidence for a candidate's access arrangement is the responsibility of the exams officer, and the SENCO where the student has been assessed by the SEN team.

Submitting completed access arrangement applications to the awarding bodies is the responsibility of the exams officer.

Rooming for access arrangement candidates will be arranged by the exams team.

Invigilation and support for access arrangement candidates, as defined in the JCQ access arrangements regulations, will be organised by the exams team, with input from the SEN team.

Word Processing Policy

Centres are allowed to provide a word processor, with spelling and grammar checks facility/predictive text disabled, to a candidate where it is their normal way of working within the centre, unless the awarding body specifications state otherwise.

A word processor cannot be simply be granted to a candidate because he/she wants to type rather than write in an examination or can work faster on a keyboard. The use of a word processor must reflect the candidate's normal way of working. A word processor will have the facilities to print off the candidates work once the exam is over.

The candidate must be present to verify that the work printed is theirs before it can be sent to the exam board and a cover sheet will be completed to confirm the candidate work.

Our SEND team will set out the types of candidates which it considers would benefit from the use of a word

processor through our exam concessions testing. If a candidate accrues an injury during the examination season and is unable to write a laptop will be provided by the exams team and all rules will still apply.

Contingency planning

Contingency planning for exams administration is the responsibility of the Deputy Headteacher with responsibility for curriculum and assessment.

Contingency plans are available to senior leaders, the exams team, and for inspection, and are in line with the guidance provided by Ofqual, JCQ and awarding organisations.

See also Examinations Contingency Planning

7. Estimated grades

Subject Leaders are responsible for submitting estimated grades to the exams officer when requested by the exams officer.

8. Managing invigilators

External staff will be used to invigilate examinations. These invigilators will be used for some internal exams and all external exams.

Recruitment of invigilators is the responsibility of the Data and Timetabling team working with the Exams Officer and Human Resources Department.

Securing the necessary Disclosure Barring Service (DBS) clearance for new invigilators is the responsibility of the Director of Human Resources.

DBS fees for securing such clearance are paid by the centre.

Invigilators' rates of pay are set by the Executive Principal/Head of School. Invigilators are recruited by the HR team, working with the Exams Officer and are timetabled, trained, and briefed by the Exams Officer.

9 Malpractice (see Malpractice Appendix)

The Head of Centre in consultation with the Deputy Headteacher with responsibility for curriculum and assessment is responsible for investigating suspected malpractice.

See Malpractice Appendix

10 Exam days

The Exams Officer will book all exam rooms after liaison with other users and make the question papers, other exam stationery and materials available for the invigilation team.

The Premises Manager is responsible for setting up the allocated rooms, and will be advised of requirements at least 7 days in advance.

The exam invigilators will start and finish all exams in accordance with JCQ guidelines.

Subject staff may be present at the start of the exam to assist with identification of candidates, but should not be present in the exam rooms. Any staff present must be in accordance with the rules defined by JCQ concerning who is allowed in the exam room and what they can do.

In practical exams, subject teachers' availability will be in accordance with JCQ guidelines.

Exam papers must not be read by subject teachers or removed from the exam room before the end of a session. Unused papers will be distributed to heads of department in accordance with JCQ's recommendations and no later than 48 working hours after candidates have completed them.

After an exam, the Exams Officer will arrange for the safe dispatch of completed examination scripts to awarding bodies, working in conjunction with the Estates team.

11. Candidates

The exams officer will provide written information to candidates in advance of each exam series. A formal briefing session for candidates may be given by the senior leadership team or heads of house.

The centre's published rules on acceptable dress and behaviour apply at all times. Candidates' personal belongings remain their own responsibility and the centre accepts no liability for their loss or damage. Students are asked not to bring valuables to the centre on exam days. An invigilator will be available to monitor unattended belongings, but accepts to responsibility for their loss or damage.

In an exam room candidates must not have access to items other than those clearly allowed in the instructions on the question paper, the stationery list, or the specification for that subject. This is particularly true of mobile phones, electronic communication or storage devices with text or digital facilities or any other equipment which provides access to the internet. Any precluded items must not be taken into an exam room.

Disruptive candidates are dealt with in accordance with JCQ guidelines. Candidates are expected to stay for the full exam time at the discretion of the senior leadership team.

Candidates who leave an exam room with the intention of returning to continue with the exam e.g. for a toilet break, must be accompanied by a member of staff at all times.

The Exams Officer is responsible for handling late or absent candidates on exam day.

Students who fail to attend a scheduled exam for which they are entered, and who are not able to provide satisfactory justification for their absence, will be liable for the exam fee.

Clash candidates

The exams officer will be responsible as necessary for supervising escorts, identifying a secure venue and arranging overnight stays.

Special consideration

Should a candidate be unable to attend an exam because of illness, suffer bereavement or other trauma, be ill or otherwise disadvantaged or disturbed during an exam, then it is the candidate's responsibility to alert the centre's main reception to that effect. Candidates are advised to do this before 08.30 in the case of morning exams, and 13.00 for afternoon exams, but as soon as possible in any case.

The candidate must support any special consideration claim with appropriate evidence within 3 days of the exam.

The exams officer will make a special consideration application to the relevant awarding body within 14 days

of the exam.

12. Internal assessment (see also Non-Examination Assessment Policy and Malpractice Policy Appendix)

It is the duty of subject leaders to ensure that all internal assessment is ready for dispatch at the correct time. The exams officer will assist by keeping a record of each dispatch that is made through the Exams Office, including the recipient details and the date and time sent. This will not happen where work or marks are uploaded directly to Awarding Body portals.

Marks for internally assessed work may be provided to the exams office by the subject leaders. The exams officer or Deputy Headteacher with responsibility for exams will inform staff of the date when appeals against internal assessments must be made by. Any appeals will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's Internal Appeals Policy (including EARS).

13. Results

Candidates will receive individual results slips on results days,
- in person at the centre
- by post to their home address - candidates to provide a self-addressed envelope (on request)
- electronically to their registered email address, on the morning of results day
- collected and signed for by a nominated family member, friend, or representative (on request)

The results slip will be in the form of a centre produced document.

Arrangements for the centre to be open on results days are made by the exams officer.

The provision of the necessary staff on results days is the responsibility of the Deputy Headteacher with responsibility for curriculum and assessment.

Enquiries about Results (EAR) (see also Internal Appeals Policy)

EARs may be requested by centre staff or the candidate following the release of results. A request for a re-mark or clerical check requires the written consent of the candidate, a request for a re-moderation of internally assessed work may be submitted without the consent of the group of candidates.

The cost of EARs will be paid by the centre or the candidate depending on who is making the request.

All decisions on whether to make an application for an EAR will be made by a member of the senior leadership team.

If a candidate's request for an EAR is not supported, the candidate may appeal and the centre will respond by following the process in its Internal Appeals Policy (including EARS).

All processing of EARs will be the responsibility of the exams officer, following the JCQ guidance.

Access to Scripts (ATS)

After the release of results, candidates may ask the Exams Officer to request the return of written exam papers within 21 days of the receipt of results.

Centre staff may also request scripts for investigation or for teaching purposes. For the latter, the consent of candidates must be obtained.

In line with regulations. an EAR cannot be applied for once an original script has been returned.

Candidates may be charged a reasonable administration fee for ATS services.

Processing of requests for ATS will be the responsibility of the exams officer.

14. Certificates

Candidates will receive their certificates
- in person at the centre
- by post to their home address (candidates to provide a self-addressed envelope) (on request)
- collected and signed for, by a family member or designated representative (on request)

Certificates are available from December following publication of results in August.

Certificates can be collected on behalf of a candidate by third parties, provided they have written authority from the candidate to do so, and bring suitable photographic identification with them that confirms who they are.

The centre retains certificates for 3 years. After this time, all certificates are returned to Awarding Bodies.

A new certificate may be requested from and issued by relevant Awarding Bodies. A transcript of results may be issued if a candidate agrees to pay the costs incurred. All such requests should be directed to Awarding Bodies.

Appendix 1 - Malpractice

Staff Malpractice Policy

Introduction

This section of the policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications and also regarding examinations invigilated by staff at the school and marked externally.

Please also refer to the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures: https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Malpractice_Sep25_FINAL.pdf.

Examples of Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity are unacceptable. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:
- Tampering with candidates work prior to external moderation/verification
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements
- Failure to take reasonable steps to check that the work submitted by students is their own
- Failing to report potential malpractice that they identify

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations:
- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

All cases of suspected malpractice should be reported to the Deputy Headteacher with responsibility for curriculum and assessment or the Headteacher.

Staff Malpractice Procedure

Investigations into allegations will be conducted by a member of the senior leadership team. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice, and will proceed as per the relevant school policy.

The member of staff will be:
- informed in writing of the allegation made against him or her
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding body and may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators Ofqual, the police and/or professional bodies including the GTC.

If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the candidate's own work, the awarding body may not be able to give that candidate a result.

Staff Malpractice Sanctions

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, the Executive Principal may impose the following sanctions:
1) Written warning: Issue the member of staff with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied
2) Training: Require the member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in both internal and external assessments to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of the training
3) Special conditions: Impose special conditions on the future involvement in assessments by the member of staff
4) Suspension: Bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time
5) Referral to the school governing body, through the school disciplinary process: Should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct, the member of staff may be referred to the school governing body.

Appeals

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in line with the school's relevant polices.

Candidate Malpractice Policy

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding candidate malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications and also regarding examinations marked externally.

Candidates will be informed about malpractice and how to avoid it during lessons in subjects where NEA is launched, as well as in an assembly ahead of each exam session.

Examples of Malpractice (see also AI – Malpractice)

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:
- Plagiarism: the copying and passing off as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work or work that has been generated through AI;
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only;
- Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor – This may refer to the use of resources which the candidate have be specifically told not to use;
- The alteration of any results document.

If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made.

If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred, he/she will be given the opportunity to repeat the assignment if appropriate. If found guilty of malpractice following an investigation, the teacher may decide to re-mark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified.

If the candidate is found to have committed malpractice, or suspected malpractice after signing the declaration of authentication then this will be reported to the awarding organisation. Otherwise, the school will keep records internally.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to examinations. This list is not exhaustive:

- Talking during an examination
- Taking a mobile phone into an examination
- Taking any item other than those accepted by the Awarding Body into the examination, such as a book or notes
- Leaving the examination room without permission
- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate

If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice during an examination, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate is found guilty of malpractice, the Awarding Body will be informed and the candidate's examination paper with be withdrawn. It is unlikely that the candidate will have the opportunity to repeat the examination.

Appeals

In the event that a malpractice decision is made, which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line with the Appeals Process as laid out in the Internal Appeals Policy.

AI Malpractice

In the event that a malpractice decision is made which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line with the Appeals Process as laid out in the Internal Appeals Policy.

What is AI?

AI use in this context refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments, which contributes to the award of qualifications. When properly referenced, this can be acceptable, although students cannot be credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own so the benefit to them of using AI is likely to be limited and they risk committing malpractice if AI is misused.

What are the risks of using AI?

The use of AI tools may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments, not least the risk of committing malpractice, for which serious sanctions can apply. AI responses cannot always be relied upon. AI tools often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI tools have been identified as providing answers to questions that can prompt inappropriate actions, and some can also produce fake references to books/articles.

What is AI misuse?
AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:
•   Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own.
•   Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content.
•   Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations.
•   Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information.
•   Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools.
•   Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

How will AI misuse be treated as malpractice?
AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

When may AI be used?
Students must demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. If a student uses an AI tool, it must be clearly referenced in their submission. The final submission must demonstrate the student's own understanding, skills, and knowledge. AI-generated content should not be presented as the student's own work.

How should AI be acknowledged?

It is essential students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. Guidance on this will be provided by teachers in relevant subjects during NEA / coursework / controlled assessment launch lessons.

If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students must ensure they independently verify the AI-generated content – and reference the sources they have used.

Students acknowledging the use of AI and showing clearly how they have used it allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether the use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, student acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. The student 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 included with the work the student submits for assessment, so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. If this is not submitted, but the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and must take action to assure themselves the work is the student's own. Where the teacher/assessor cannot assure themselves, they must follow their centre's internal procedures and the published guidance for assessment.

Confirming Authenticity of Student Work

Teachers should use a range of skills and observation techniques to assure themselves that student work is authentically their own. Teachers may compare it against other work created by the student. Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions. Where their work is made up of writing it is possible to make note of the following characteristics:

- Spelling and Punctuation
- Grammatical usage
- Writing style and tone
- Vocabulary
- Complexity and coherency
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e.. Whether handwritten or word-processed)

Private candidates

Verifying the authenticity of work submitted by private candidates can be more challenging, given they may not have a good understanding of the standard the student is currently working at. Before accepting entries from a private candidate for a subject that includes NEA or coursework, the centre will consider the steps they will take that will enable the teachers/assessors to ensure the work submitted for assessment is the student's own independent work. This may involve requiring the student to undertake some of the work under supervision, a

review of the student's portfolio of evidence across a range of qualifications and a short discussion with the student regarding their work.

Further guidance on authenticating student work can be found in the JCQ Instructions for conducting coursework (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ coursework/).

Potential indicators of AI misuse

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication the student has misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.
- A default use of language or vocabulary which may not accord with the qualification level (though be aware AI tools may be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content).
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected (though some AI tools will produce quotations and references).
- Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors).
- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which may be notable for some subjects.
- Instances of incorrect and/or inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended it.
- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected.
- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge.
- Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.
- The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output.
- The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.
- The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit.
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

Automated detection

AI tools, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means AI-generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who tend to use a variety of words in their normal writing. Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI, for example:

• Copyleaks (https://copyleaks.com/ai-content-detector)
• GPTZero (https://gptzero.me/)
• Sapling (https://sapling.ai/ai-content-detector)
• Turnitin AI writing detection (https://www.turnitin.com/solutions/topics/aiwriting/ai-detector/)

These may be used as a check on student work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of student work.

However, it should be noted that the above tools will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students, as they base their scores on the predictability of words. Spending time getting to know how the detection tools work will help teachers and assessors understand what they are and are not capable of.

AI detection tools, including those listed above, employ a range of detection models which vary in accuracy depending on the AI tool and version used, the proportion of AI to human content, prompt types and other factors (such as an individual's English language competency). In instances where misuse of AI is suspected it may be helpful to use more than one detection tool to provide an additional source of evidence about the authenticity of student work.

The use of detection tools, where used, should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information must be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns. Teachers will know their students best and so are best placed to assess the authenticity of work submitted to them for assessment – AI detection tools can be a useful part of the evidence they can consider.

Appendix 2 – Exams Contingency Plan

Exam Contingency Plan

Approved by: Barry Gray
Title: Deputy Headteacher

Date of next review: Summer 2026

Purpose of the plan

This plan examines potential risks and issues that could cause disruption to the management and administration of the exam process at South Hunsley School and Sixth Form. By outlining actions/procedures to be invoked in case of disruption it is intended to mitigate the impact these disruptions may have on our exam process.

Alongside internal processes, this plan is informed by scenarios contained in the *Joint contingency plan in the event of widespread disruption to the examination system in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.*

This plan complies with JCQ general regulations (section 5) in that:

> The centre agrees to *"have in place a written examination contingency plan/examinations policy which covers all aspects of examination administration. This will allow members of the senior leadership team to have a robust contingency plan in place, minimising risk to examination administration, should the examinations officer be absent at a crucial stage of the examination cycle;"*

Causes of potential disruption to the exam process

1. Exam officer extended absence at key points in the exam process (cycle)

Criteria for implementation of the plan

Key tasks required in the management and administration of the exam cycle not undertaken including:

- *Planning*
  - annual data collection exercise not undertaken to collate information on qualifications and awarding body specifications being delivered
  - annual exams plan not produced identifying essential key tasks, key dates and deadlines
  - sufficient invigilators not recruited and trained
- *Entries*
  - awarding bodies not being informed of early/estimated entries which prompts release of early information required by teaching staff
  - candidates not being entered with awarding bodies for external exams/assessment
  - awarding body entry deadlines missed or late or other penalty fees being incurred
- *Pre-exams*
  - exam timetabling, rooming allocation and invigilation schedules not prepared
  - candidates not briefed on exam timetables and awarding body information for candidates
  - exam/assessment materials and candidates' work not stored under required secure conditions
  - internal assessment marks and samples of candidates' work not submitted to awarding bodies/external moderators
- *Exam time*
  - exams/assessments not taken under the conditions prescribed by awarding bodies
  - required reports/requests not submitted to awarding bodies during exam/assessment periods e.g. very late arrival, suspected malpractice, special consideration
  - candidates' scripts not dispatched as required to awarding bodies
- *Results and post-results*
  - access to examination results affecting the distribution of results to candidates
  - the facilitation of the post-results services

Centre actions:

- Two colleagues other than the Exams Officer are trained and familiar with the exams process.
- Within the MAT there are two further exams officers available for support if needed.
- Data Manager and Leadership Team will ensure back-up and support is provided where necessary.

2. SENCo Exams Support extended absence at key points in the exam cycle

Criteria for implementation of the plan

Key tasks required in the management and administration of the access arrangements process within the exam cycle not undertaken including:

- *Planning*
  - candidates not tested/assessed to identify potential access arrangement requirements
  - evidence of need and evidence to support normal way of working not collated
- *Pre-exams*
  - approval for access arrangements not applied for to the awarding body
  - modified paper requirements not identified in a timely manner to enable ordering to meet external deadline

- staff providing support to access arrangement candidates not allocated and trained
- *Exam time*
  - access arrangement candidate support not arranged for exam rooms

Centre actions:

- School has an extended SEN team. This includes a SENCo Assistant and two trainee SENCOs at present. This team collectively is responsible for compiling lists of students that require testing for concessions, as well as recording, planning and providing access arrangements.
- All lists to be shared with the Exams team and the school pastoral team to arrange alternate seating for students. This ensures a minimum of two teams have oversight of arrangements for these students.
- Externally qualified assessor is available to support student testing process.
- Testing process takes place in year 9 for most students and with all students new to the school.
- Exam team will provide annual training for Teaching Assistants who provide student exams support.

3. Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle

Criteria for implementation of the plan

Key tasks not undertaken including:

- *Planning*
  - Early/estimated entry information not provided to the exams officer on time; resulting in pre-release information not being received
- *Pre-Exams*
  - Final entry information not provided to the exams officer on time; resulting in:
    - candidates not being entered for exams/assessments or being entered late
    - late or other penalty fees being charged by awarding bodies
  - Internal assessment marks and candidates' work not provided to meet submission deadlines

Centre actions:

- All core subjects have subject leaders working with directors, who can support in case of any staff absence. Acting Head of department may be appointed in case of extended absence where needed.
- Exam Officer has access to class lists for estimated entries from SIMS.
- School leadership team subject link to confirm final entries in subject leader's absence.

4. Invigilators - lack of appropriately trained invigilators or invigilator absence

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Failure to recruit and train sufficient invigilators to conduct exams
- Invigilator shortage on peak exam days
- Invigilator absence on the day of an exam

Centre actions:

- Invigilator recruitment drive takes place annually for each exam series.
- Number of invigilators held on books exceeds maximum number needed for exam series.
- Invigilator contract explains that throughout series that they may be called upon at short notice. Invigilator availability is recorded and held by exams team so in the event of absence, cover can be called in.
- Cover supervisors/ support staff in school are trained as invigilators to cover if needed.

5. Exam rooms - lack of appropriate rooms or main venues unavailable at short notice

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Exams officer unable to identify sufficient/appropriate rooms during exams timetable planning
- Insufficient rooms available on peak exam days
- Main exam venues unavailable due to an unexpected incident at exam time

Centre actions:

- Each day of exam period will be mapped in advance.
- Alternate venues for Access Arrangement candidates are planned, based on school timetable.
- Possible spare rooms available across the site are recorded by exams team and cover supervisor.
- Exams Officer will book rooms needed in advance with Estates team, PE department, Drama team, Catering team and other stakeholders, as well as Leadership Team.
- Additional Sports Centre space available if main venue is not available.
- Power cuts should not affect main exam spaces as natural light is available.

6. Failure of IT systems & equipment

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- SIMS system failure at final entry deadline
- SIMS system failure during exams preparation
- Computer malfunction for online exams/word processing Special Arrangements
- SIMS system failure at results release time

Centre actions:

- Final entry deadlines and results to be uploaded/downloaded from AO secure website, and recorded on paper.
- Printed copies of mark sheets kept to enable seating plans/timetables in preparation to be completed in Microsoft Word/Excel.
- Cover supervisor to identify and re-room alternative IT suite and for online exams, or students requiring IT access
- Exams officer to book IT equipment well in advance to ensure availability of functioning computers and exams logins.
- Laptops used all able to access relevant software without need for external network availability.
- IT support team available for all exams, and for results release to attend to any systems failure
- Download results from each AO website

7. Disruption of teaching time – centre closed for an extended period

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Centre closed or candidates are unable to attend for an extended period during normal teaching or study supported time, interrupting the provision of normal teaching and learning

The centre to communicate with parents, carers and students about the potential for disruption to teaching time and plans to address this. [Joint Contingency Plan (JCP) scenario 1]

Centre actions:

- Alternative teaching/exam venue will be organised locally in conjunction with LEA and partnership schools
- All normal communication channels used to inform parents, ABs and all other stakeholders.

8. Candidates unable to take examinations because of a crisis – centre remains open

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Candidates are unable to attend the examination centre to take examinations as normal

The centre to communicate with relevant awarding bodiess at the outset to make them aware of the issue. The centre to communicate with parents, carers and candidates regarding solutions to the issue. [JCP scenario 2]

Centre actions:

- If personal crisis, special consideration to be applied for on behalf of student.
- Pastoral team available at all times through exam period to support students and parents.
- Liaison with hospitals, home, or other venues to facilitate student exams where appropriate.
- All students attend Exams assembly before exam period to explain processes in case of illness or absence.

9. Centre unable to open as normal during the exams period

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Centre unable to open as normal for scheduled examinations

A centre which is unable to open as normal for examinations must inform each awarding organisation with which examinations are due to be taken as soon as is possible. [JCP scenario 5]

Centre actions:

- Alternate venue arranged and approval for holding examinations away from the centre sought from AO.
- Special consideration to be applied for candidates.
- Where closure is short term, centre will endeavour to supervise all students on site. If closure is long term, liaison with AO and MAT centres to look at alternative arrangements.

10. Disruption in the distribution of examination papers

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Disruption to the distribution of examination papers to the centre in advance of examinations

The centre to communicate with awarding bodiess to organise alternative delivery of papers. [JCP scenario 3]

Centre actions:

- Following communication with the AB, exam papers can be downloaded from the website on the day if necessary.

11. Disruption to the transportation of completed examination scripts

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Delay in normal collection arrangements for completed examination scripts

The centre to communicate with relevant awarding bodies at the outset to resolve the issue. [JCP scenario 4]

Centre actions:

- Completed papers to be packaged and kept securely until collection is available.
- AB to be notified immediately.
- School safe updated to meet JCQ requirements for safe storage of papers.

12. Assessment evidence is not available to be marked

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Large scale damage to or destruction of completed examination scripts/assessment evidence before it can be marked

It is the responsibility of the head of centre to communicate this immediately to the relevant awarding body(ies) and subsequently to students and their parents or carers. [JCP scenario 6]
Centre actions:

- Communication to the AB. Special consideration application made.

13. Centre unable to distribute results as normal

Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Centre is unable to access or manage the distribution of results to candidates, or to facilitate post-results services

Centres to contact awarding bodies about alternative options. [JCP scenario 11]
Centre actions:

- Results emailed to students via SIMS App where they are available, and system is operational.
- Post results service offered Via Email to Exam officer.
- AB and students/parents notified of potential delay.
- Centre will remain open on results days, and subsequent days if needed.

Causes 7-13 – all scenarios, criteria and specific communications have been taken directly from the *Joint contingency plan in the event of widespread disruption to the examination system in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*

Further guidance to inform and implement contingency planning:

Ofqual

Joint contingency plan in the event of widespread disruption to the examination system in England, Wales and Northern Ireland
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/exam-system-contingency-plan-england-wales-and-northern-ireland/joint-contingency-plan-in-the-event-of-widespread-disruption-to-the-examination-system-in-england-wales-and-northern-ireland

JCQ

General regulations

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

Guidance on *alternative site arrangements*

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

Instructions for conducting examinations

http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ice---instructions-for-conducting-examinations

A guide to the special consideration process

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

GOV.UK

Emergencies and severe weather: schools and early years settings
https://www.gov.uk/emergencies-and-severe-weather-schools-and-early-years-settings
Teaching time lost due to severe weather conditions
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teaching-time-lost-due-to-severe-weather-conditions/teaching-time-lost-due-to-severe-weather-conditions

Dispatch of exam scripts guide: Ensuring the service runs smoothly; Contingency planning
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dispatch-of-exam-scripts-yellow-label-service/dispatch-of-exam-scripts-guide

Appendix 3 – Cyber Incident Response Plan

Approved by: Barry Gray
Title: Deputy Headteacher

Date of next review: Summer 2026

Cyber Incident Response Plan

Introduction

As with any cyber incident, the impact will vary depending on the level of disruption. The following response plan presumes all networked devices have been corrupted and cannot be accessed. In line with JCQ guidance, the focus of the plan is to prioritise enabling candidates to take their examinations without compromising their integrity. For more information on a cyber incident response please refer to the TEAL Cyber Incident Response Plan.

Implementation during exams

If the school are aware of a cyber incident before the day of an exam, the following implementation should be followed:

- Inform JCQ that alternate provisions are to be made and special considerations should be considered for those who require an electronic reader.

- Laptops should be taken from the closest TEAL site. This can be pre-arranged with the support of IT to facilitate. Laptops should be prepared to allow a local log in and any media such as exam papers should be uploaded locally to the device. If a candidate requires the use of a laptop for typing, this should also be prepared at the alternate site. Exporting the document should happen at the site which is not affected.

- Language exams which require collective listening by candidates will require a laptop from the alternate site with the digital media already locally saved to the laptop. This should be connected to audio systems only in the exam rooms of the affected site.

- Exams where all candidates use a computer or laptop such as IT, Business or A-Level language would take place at another site. Students would travel under exam conditions if the travel and wait time extended beyond one hour after the published exam start time. Once at the alternative venue, should there be the need to wait for an available room this would be with the approval of JCQ, under alternative provision.

- Exams which require server and client setup such as Business A-Level, would require at least 24 hours for this to be setup at the alternative site. Where this is not possible, guidance will be sought from JCQ.

All seating plans should be printed in advance. If amendments need to be re-printed, the Exams Officer can login to Arbor on a non-domain joined device for example mobile phone or personal tablet or laptop.

Implementation during results day

If a cyber incident happened on or just before results day, IT will prepare a laptop with A2C installed and a 4G connection to tether the device. Alternatively a laptop or desktop at another site with A2C installed and internet connection may be used so that results can be downloaded from awarding bodies and imported to Arbor. No network access is required.

All schools should print out their A2C board passwords and store the access keys on media that is disconnected from the network, usually Onedrive.