Instructions for Moderation
- Using Moderation Manager

These instructions apply to all Moderation which uses Moderation Manager

Please familiarise yourself with this document even if you have previously moderated for OCR
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Suspected Malpractice (Appendix 1)

It is important that all suspected malpractice is reported immediately to the OCR Malpractice Team. This is because it is likely that the Malpractice Team will need to contact the Centre and, to avoid delays to the investigation, this should be done before the end of term. If a case is not resolved before Results Day then candidates’ results will be withheld.

Please note the centre must not be contacted if issues of suspected malpractice arise.

New Section A 13: Moderator’s Reports to centres

Update to Section B 21: Monitoring

Update to Section B 22: Checking Moderator’s Reports to centres
SECTION A

1. TECHNICAL INFORMATION

Moderation Manager is compatible with the following internet browsers:

- Internet
- Firefox
- Safari (Mac users)

You will be unable to use the following internet browsers due to withdrawal of support for Jaba:

- Google Chrome
- Microsoft Edge

Users should ensure that the latest versions of the following software are installed on their PC:

Adobe Reader - https://get.adobe.com/reader/?loc=uk

Be aware that PCs based at educational establishments may have firewalls that will not allow the software to be downloaded.

It is not advised that you use Moderation Manager between 00.00-03.00 as the scheduled ‘overnight’ data-feed will cause access and data disruption problems.

If Moderation Manager remains inactive for more than 20 minutes you will automatically be logged out and any unsaved work will be lost. Therefore you should save your work at regular intervals. Our strong advice is that, wherever possible, you moderate off-line and only access Moderation Manager when actually inputting data or cutting and pasting text.

Technical Support
For help with using Moderation Manager consult the Help section accessed via the Moderation Manager Home page.

Contact your supervisor for help with moderation issues or minor technical issues with Moderation Manager.

Use the Customer Contact Centre on 01223 552556 for all other technical enquiries.

If you are intending to decommission, dispose of, or recycle your laptop or PC, you must ensure that all OCR information, documents and data are permanently erased. Files which have been deleted can, in fact, be recovered by specialist software. To prevent this, free downloads of hard drive eraser software are available from the web which will securely overwrite the contents of your hard drive. For more information, advice, and software download recommendations, visit http://www.microsoft.com/en-gb/

2. INTRODUCTION TO MODERATION

Types of Moderation
Moderation can be undertaken by:
OCR Repository
Candidate material is uploaded to the OCR Repository by the centre. It moderated by you and your moderation is sampled by your supervisor via the OCR Repository.

Post
Candidate material is posted by the centre to the assessor. It is moderated by you and your moderation is sampled by your supervisor via post.

Visit
Candidate material is moderated by the assessor at the centre. Your supervisor may be required to accompany you to ensure the OCR standard is being applied.

Purpose of Moderation
The purpose of moderation is to bring the marking of an internally assessed component/unit to an agreed standard in all participating centres.

Moderation Manager is a secure, web-based tool to help you with moderation. Moderation Manager will enable you to communicate your professional judgments regarding individual pieces of internally assessed candidate work electronically to OCR or to your supervisor.

Your sample will be chosen for you and communicated to the centre automatically by email. You will either receive work by post or access it electronically via the OCR Repository, or you will visit the centre (Cambridge Nationals). For Cambridge Nationals, you may be required to moderate using all three methods.

When moderating, you must consider the sample in the context of the centre as a whole, looking for trends and patterns in the internal marking. You must not review the work with a view to changing the marks of individual candidates in isolation, but with a view to ensuring that the agreed standard is applied to all candidates. This is a fundamental principle that applies to all moderation.

A regression algorithm will recommend any adjustments to the centre’s marks based on the decisions you make based on the sample you review.

The OCR Repository is a secure, web-based tool accessible through Moderation Manager, or OCR Interchange, which enables you to view candidate work which has been submitted electronically by centres.
Support and Guidance

Moderation Manager User Support and Guidance

These videos provide guidance on how to use Moderation Manager to complete your moderation tasks:

• The e-Moderation process
• Getting started with Moderation Manager
• Communicating with centres
• Communication within the team
• Helpful hints

These can be found in the Library>User guidance section of the Assessor Communications website: http://www.ocr.org.uk/assessor-communications/

User guides for the key processes can be found in the Help section of Moderation Manager. Moderators who are new to Moderation Manager will be required to undertake online training prior to standardisation.

OCR Repository User Support and Guidance

• OCR Repository - Assessor user guide

This can be found in the Library>User guidance section of the Assessor Communications website: http://www.ocr.org.uk/assessor-communications/
3. GENERAL INFORMATION

Security of Material
On the rare occasions when you may have to take any OCR materials outside the UK, it is your responsibility to ensure that all such materials are kept secure in transit. OCR materials include, but are not limited to, hard copy material, discs, memory sticks, and laptops containing OCR related information. The taking of such materials outside the UK and their return to the UK must always be undertaken by you personally. You must not ask someone else to do this on your behalf. Once in the UK if you need to return the materials to OCR please utilise the specified returns service.

Contact Information
You must ring the Assessor Support Line on 01223 552556 to advise of changes in personal circumstances and for enquiries about administrative matters, such as apportionment and illness or other circumstances which may prevent you from meeting deadlines. If you are going to use a different address during the moderation period, please ensure that your supervisor is advised and also email preferredaddress@ocr.org.uk well in advance.

Emails sent within Moderation Manager will use the name held on the system (ie your full name). If you wish this to be changed, contact Examiners and Assessors Deployment at preferredaddress@ocr.org.uk no later than the appropriate date for the receipt of centre marks for the relevant examination series.

For permanent changes of contact information, email permanentaddress@ocr.org.uk.

Please be aware that centres may be provided your address as early as April, therefore if you are moving house, or have supplied a preferred address some packets may still be sent to your previous address. It is advised that you have an arrangement in place to forward any to your current address such as the Royal Mail Redirection service.

Tell the Finance Office if you change your bank details (this should be done 3-4 weeks before submitting any claim forms to ensure details are updated in time), or if you have any questions about examiner payments and expenses, email examiner.pmts@cambridgeassessment.org.uk.

We will not usually send you work from centres with which you have a potential conflict of interest. If this does happen, contact the Assessor Support Line on 01223 552556.

Important Information
Before you undertake the moderation task, please read Safeguarding: The Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults which can be found in the Library>Legal/Policy/Malpractice section of the Assessor Communications website: http://www.ocr.org.uk/assessor-communications

Please ensure you are familiar with the most up-to-date health and safety advice and guidance which can be found at: http://www.hse.gov.uk/

You need to be aware of the JCQ instructions (see link below) to centres for conducting controlled assessment/coursework and their relevance to the moderation process.

Instructions for conducting controlled assessments
http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/controlled-assessments

Instructions for conducting coursework
http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework

You should keep copies of all emails requesting samples from centres for the duration of the examination series.
If you are involved in visiting moderation, centres may require you to provide photographic identification when you arrive to undertake assessment tasks for OCR. You should ensure that you always have recognised identifying documentation with you, such as a photocard driving licence or passport, when you visit a centre and evidence of a CRB check if available.

**Expenses**

Go to the online *Assessor Expenses Information* which can be found in the Library>Expenses claims section of the *Assessor Communications* website:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/assessor-communications
4. OCR MODERATION PROCESS (Using Moderation Manager)
5. IMPORTANT DATES

It is important that you comply with the key dates in the moderation process. When provided with the information, make sure you know the dates of the following:

a) where this is face-to-face, the date of the Standardisation Meeting which is shown on your invitation to moderate
b) the deadline date for the receipt of centres’ marks
c) the date(s) for the submission of sample material to your supervisor
d) the date for the completion of moderation and submission of marks
e) the date for returning candidate work to centres (not necessary if utilising the OCR Repository).

Full information about these dates will either be contained in other documents issued with these instructions or will be notified at the Standardisation Meeting.

6. STANDARDISATION - PREPARATION

It is a requirement of your agreement to provide assessment services that you participate in standardisation. It is essential that you are thoroughly familiar with:

a) the requirements of the specification and the criteria for assessment
b) the instructions to centres concerning moderation in the specification
c) specification-specific instructions, if any
d) the instructions/user guides on how to use Moderation Manager/OCR Repository (accessed via the online Help page in Moderation Manager)
e) the screens/webforms used for recording marks, viewing sub, full and additional samples and reporting to centres.

7. STANDARDISATION OF MODERATION

You are required to participate in discussions to establish standards. You are expected to carry out your moderation in line with the standardisation decisions agreed.

Your supervisor will be responsible for the selection of materials to be considered.

Standardisation has three purposes:

a) to brief you on the administrative procedures and technical processes that will be used during moderation
b) to enable the Principal Moderator to explain the coursework requirements of the specification to you, with particular reference to the assessment objectives and the marking criteria
c) to enable you to become familiar with the application of the marking criteria, by undergoing a training session, having a discussion with your supervisor and the Principal Moderator, and, for some specifications, taking part in the moderation exercise.
8. ITEMS RECEIVED FROM THE CENTRE

Centres will submit marks to OCR either electronically or by sending Mark Sheets (MS1). In all cases Moderation Manager will be populated with these marks.

You should receive from a centre the following items completed by the member of staff responsible for the centre's internal assessment and moderation:

- computer-printed Mark sheets (MS1, IMS1 or centre generated equivalent)
- specification-specific assessment forms, as applicable
- Centre Authentication Form (CCS160)

If the centre sends these in hard copy these may be included with the sample of work (postal moderation only) or may arrive separately.

Marks will be uploaded into Moderation Manager once received by OCR. Following the deadline(s) for the submission of marks, if none of your apportioned centres have marks loaded within two days of the deadline for receipt of centre marks, you should contact the Assessor Support Line 01223 552556. If marks are missing for some of your centres you should wait a further two weeks before informing the Assessor Support Line.

Please refer to the supplementary booklet Instructions for the Movement by Post of Moderated Work for further details.

If you receive any top (OCR) copies of MS1 Form by mistake, please forward these straight away to: OMR unit, Cambridge Assessment, DC10, Hill Farm Road, Whittlesford CB22 4FZ. Mark the envelope clearly with ‘MS1’.
9. SELECTING THE SAMPLE – THE SAMPLE ALGORITHM

A sample algorithm will select the sub, full and additional samples of work for moderation for you. The algorithm will be triggered automatically once the marks have been received from the centre. The centre will be informed of the total sample automatically by email and you will be copied into the email. Where the sample of work is to be uploaded into the OCR Repository, the details of those candidates will also be available within the Repository environment.

The sample will be selected using the following common criteria:

a) Where there are **15 or fewer** candidates:

   the centre is instructed to send the complete work of all candidates.

b) Where there are **more than 15** candidates:

   the sample algorithm will select the total sample as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of cohort</th>
<th>Sub-sample</th>
<th>Full Sample (sub sample plus)</th>
<th>Additional Sample</th>
<th>Total Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>Up to 5 candidates</td>
<td>Up to 5 candidates</td>
<td>Up to 5 candidates</td>
<td>All candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 100</td>
<td>6 candidates</td>
<td>4 candidates</td>
<td>5 candidates</td>
<td>15 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 200</td>
<td>6 candidates</td>
<td>9 candidates</td>
<td>5 candidates</td>
<td>20 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 200</td>
<td>6 candidates</td>
<td>14 candidates</td>
<td>5 candidates</td>
<td>25 candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample will include a representative coverage of the range of marks in the centre, the sub-sample of which will include the top and bottom marks.

For visiting moderation, you must view and record the candidates in the sub, full and additional samples identified in Moderation Manager prior to the visit. The In-centre Recording Form must be used to record this information.

c) If a centre has failed to send a Centre Authentication Form (CCS160) with the MS1 (or equivalent) as requested, the email requesting the sample contains a reminder. If a centre fails to provide a CCS160, complete standard letter CW/L5. This process is the same for both Repository and non-Repository units.

If you are moderating by visit, if the centre has not yet sent you the CCS160 prior to the visit then they should provide it to you during the visit. If necessary, you should inform the centre that if you do not receive this by the end of the moderation period then the marks will not be released on results day.

The CW/L5 letter will be available as a template within Moderation Manager and can be emailed to the centre, or printed and sent in hard copy.
If a centre still fails to send you the CCS160, email all relevant details to:
CCS160missing@ocr.org.uk

d) Consortia

Where a group of centres are operating as a consortium, Moderation Manager will produce one rank order per unit across the consortium and the algorithm will choose a representative sample. The aim is to treat the consortium as one ‘centre’. Not all constituent centres will necessarily be required to contribute sample candidate work, but such centres will receive acknowledgement by automatically generated email should this be the case. **Such centres not contributing to the sample will remain in your Worklist and you will be unable/not required to submit these.**

### 10. CANDIDATES WITH SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

a) For candidates whose work has been lost, partially lost, or damaged, the centre must inform you that an online application for special consideration has been made.

b) If the work of this candidate was originally chosen as part of the sample, the centre is instructed to replace it with the work of another candidate on, or as near as possible to, the same mark. For Postal and Repository, if this is not supplied, contact the centre by telephone to request the work.

You must set such original candidates to a status of *Unavailable* in Moderation Manager and use the *Select Replacement Candidates* function to add the equivalent candidate, cancelling the automatically generated email. Initiate this procedure at *Full Sample* stage where the centre has more than 5 entries.

### 11. CHECKING THE RECEIPT OF CANDIDATE WORK (Postal and Repository)

a) You should check the contents of each parcel (or, in the case of the OCR Repository, the candidate work uploaded by the centre) on receipt to ensure that you have:

   I. the sample requested
   II. the relevant documentation.

b) If there is anything missing you must contact the centre. Candidate work required in the sample must be obtained from the centre if it is not sent to you. In these circumstances the *Unavailable* status must not be used unless the centre confirms the work is lost. If you have any difficulty then you should contact the Assessor Support Line on 01223 552556 and give details of the situation.

c) If you receive candidate work for a centre or a specification/unit that you have not been asked to moderate, you must contact the Assessor Support Line on 01223 552556 for advice on what to do.

d) **If you do not receive candidate work from the centre within 7 days of the request being sent, contact the centre by telephone.**
For Postal Moderation only:

e) if the package is missing (either you have had no response from the centre, or they have confirmed the sample was sent), report this to OCR for further investigation using form EX5. OCR will try to locate the sample and will keep you updated on progress. If the sample is confirmed as lost, OCR will instruct you to request an alternate sample, where possible.

f) If any damaged packets of work are received, where the damage to the package is such that the work could have been tampered with and/or damaged:

   i. report the matter to the Assessor Support Line on 01223 552556. Please supply the centre number, specification/unit and component involved.

   ii. moderate the work if you can. However, where some work cannot be moderated either partly or wholly, request another sample from the centre (if possible) and inform the Assessor Support Line on 01223 552556.

g) If you receive work that had been reported as missing, you must notify OCR immediately so that we can stop our searches by emailing scriptreceipt@ocr.org.uk. You will need to tell us the centre number, specification/unit number and component, your team and position number. We will then inform the centre(s).
12. MODERATION

Detailed instructions to cover every contingency cannot be provided, but these instructions should be sufficient in most cases. If you need additional guidance, contact your supervisor in the first instance. You must follow all instructions in forwarding appropriate documents and work.

a) Purpose
The purpose of moderation is to bring the marking of an internally assessed component/unit to an agreed standard in all participating centres. You must therefore look for trends and patterns across the centre as a whole. You must not review the work with a view to changing the marks of individual candidates in isolation, but with a view to ensuring that the agreed standard is applied to all candidates.

b) Scrutiny of work and of marking
Given the evidence available, check whether:

i. the addition of sub-marks and transcription of marks is correct across the total sample
ii. the specified marking criteria have been satisfactorily applied
iii. internal standardisation has been carried out satisfactorily (if appropriate)
iv. the centre has carried out any specific instructions issued by OCR regarding Special Arrangements for candidates with incomplete work/portfolio.

You must not annotate candidates’ work in any way.

d) Sub-sampling and move to full sample
You initially moderate the sub-sample chosen and identified within Moderation Manager.

If the centre’s marking of the sub-sample is within tolerance, then moderation of the work will be complete at this point.

Visiting Moderation:
If you are moderating in the centre and you identify one or more candidates in the sub-sample as being out of the tolerance for the unit, you must moderate the full sample as previously identified. You must record your decisions/marks on the In-centre Record Form to enable you to complete your moderation using Moderation Manager after your visit.

If, on the basis of the sub-sample, one or more marks are outside the tolerance, the full sample will be identified within Moderation Manager once you have input your marks for the sub-sample, and pressed the Submit button. These candidates that make up the full sample must also be moderated. For example you would have a full sample size of 10 from a centre of 30 candidates.

Having moved to full sample, if you have a situation where, for example, one candidate’s mark difference lies clearly outside the pattern of mark differences of all other candidates then you can treat this as an outlier mark. You may set this candidate to Not Needed within Moderation Manager, following consultation with your supervisor, as necessary, to prevent it impacting on any potential centre scaling.
e) Arithmetical and/or transcription errors

You should do a clerical check of the total sample before beginning moderation, noting down all errors to reference when you begin moderation.

If you find an error in addition or transcription you must not attempt to correct the error by keying new marks into Moderation Manager. You must use the Clerical Error status in Moderation Manager to generate an automatic web form. The form will be populated with the candidate(s) you have set to Clerical Error, but you should also edit the form, detailing the clerical error as appropriate.

If you are unable to set a candidate to Clerical Error because the candidate is beyond the level of sample open in Moderation Manager, there is an alternative form available. More details on when and how to use this alternative form is available in the How to Understand the Clerical Error process document in the Help section of Moderation Manager.

The form(s) will be sent to the centre and OCR by automatic email. OCR will normally key the correct new raw unmoderated marks within 2 working days and you will be notified by email when the new marks have been uploaded.

In certain circumstances OCR may have to contact the centre to clarify the position and this may delay the uploading of the new mark(s). OCR will try to keep you informed of any delay, but please be patient while this happens.

You may continue to moderate the rest of the centre and complete your Report to Centre, but you must wait for these new marks to be uploaded into Moderation Manager before you can fully complete your moderation and submit the centre.

Ensure the Full Sample is checked and moderated if a clerical error is found and that you enter the relevant status and, where appropriate, the moderated mark for the full sample before initiating the Clerical Error procedure.

Visiting Moderation:

You will need to clarify the correct raw marks(s) for the sample if you identify a clerical error with the centre. You should inform the centre that following your visit they will receive an email detailing the clerical error which they will need to process to allow the completion of the moderation process.

After the visit you must process the clerical error as described above in Moderation Manager.

e) Move to additional sample

If the centre’s marks are deemed to be ‘inconsistent’ then Moderation Manager will alert and instruct you to select and moderate the additional sample already sent to you by the centre. You will need to select the additional sample from the View Sample Screen. A centre is deemed ‘inconsistent’ if the range between the most extreme values of the differences between the centre mark and the moderator mark difference is more than twice tolerance. For example, if for a unit the tolerance is 4 and the moderator mark differs from the centre mark by -7 marks at one extreme and +2 at the other, the total difference is 9. This is more than twice tolerance so the centre would be flagged as ‘inconsistent’ indicating the additional sample of work must be moderated. If, after, moderating the additional sample, the centre is still flagged as inconsistent, you may submit the centre unless there is a significant disagreement in the rank order which would require the centre to remark the whole cohort.

Please note: A large but consistent difference between centre and moderator marks, is not of itself sufficient grounds to extend the sample.
Visiting Moderation:

At the centre you will need to calculate whether or not the centre’s marking is inconsistent using the guidance above.

If the centre is inconsistent you should moderate the additional sample in Moderation Manager, which you have already noted on the In-centre Recording Form. In addition, you must organise with the centre for them to despatch the total sample including the additional candidates’ work moderated after the visit has been completed.

f) Disagreement with the order of merit

If, following your scrutiny, you significantly disagree with the centre’s order of merit, do not carry on with the moderation. You must contact your supervisor for guidance. Your supervisor will decide whether you need to return the work to the centre and require the teachers to re-mark it.

Visiting Moderation:

If you are undertaking visiting moderation you must inform the centre of your concern. You must contact your supervisor for guidance. Your supervisor will decide whether you need to require the centre to re-mark it.

If your supervisor requires the work to be re-marked (Postal/Repository), you should set all candidates to Invalid Order of Merit status in Moderation Manager to generate an automatic web form to the centre. The form will be populated with all the candidates’ details, but you should edit the form, as appropriate, to give guidance to the centre as to where the problem lies. The form will be sent via an automatic email. The centre will be instructed to re-mark the work and re-submit marks by forwarding the completed form to OCR. You must wait for these new marks to be uploaded into Moderation Manager. Only then will you be able to continue moderation and submit your moderated marks and report for that centre. If the original sample is no longer fully representative of the new rank order, then additional candidates to supplement the original sample may be requested in the usual way.

You must be proactive in chasing late work and marks.

In exceptional circumstances OCR may specially instruct you to re-mark the work of all the candidates at a centre with a small number of candidates, if you already have the work of all the candidates.

g) Adjustment to marks

We expect that in most cases the pattern of the centre’s marking will be within tolerance and no adjustment to their marks will be necessary.

When you scrutinise the sample you must look for the overall trends and patterns of the centre’s marking. This will help you identify:

- aspects of the assessment criteria that have not been accurately and/or consistently applied
- trends and patterns to highlight in your Report to Centre
- whether you need to seek advice from your supervisor regarding a disagreement in the order of merit or request additional work.

Only once this review process is complete, will you be in a position to decide upon and then enter your marks for the sample into Moderation Manager. Using a regression algorithm, OCR will make any necessary adjustments to all candidate marks at that centre based on the decisions you have made.

Note:

The tolerance for this component/unit will be confirmed at Standardisation.
If one (or more) centre marks differs from yours by more than twice the tolerance, you must consult your supervisor, as the centre will be escalated within Moderation Manager and they will need to see the work. However, if one candidate potentially has a mark greater than twice tolerance and can be regarded as an outlier - as described in 12(c) – it is not necessary for your supervisor to review the work of the whole centre. You should, after consultation with your supervisor, set this candidate to Not Needed to prevent unnecessary escalation.

The minimum mark for escalated work is (twice tolerance + one mark).

This value will be given to you at Standardisation.

Visiting Moderation:
If one (or more) centre marks differs from yours by more than twice tolerance you must request that the centre provides you with the full sample.

h) Word count
If you detect that the application of the word limit by the centre contravenes the guidance/instruction within the specification and the extent of this contravention raises concerns about the validity of the centre’s assessment of the work submitted then:

- adjust the centre’s marking as appropriate, or

- return all the sample work to the centre to be re-marked. You should use the Invalid Order of Merit procedure in Moderation Manager in this instance.

In all cases where word count has been exceeded, the Moderator’s Report to Centre should indicate that word count has been exceeded and draw the attention of the centre to the specification and the potential consequences of submitting work that exceeds permitted limits.

i) Unresolved problems
If you have seen sufficient evidence but there are still problems with the work or the marking then you must inform your supervisor, who will be able to advise.

j) Completion of Report to Centre
The report is a web-based form which you open and complete within each centre in Moderation Manager. See the User Guide in the Help section of Moderation Manager for more information.

You must complete a report for every centre to provide feedback on the sample of candidate work that you have moderated. This must refer to aspects of the marking criteria that have not been accurately or consistently applied, focussing on trends and patterns that have been identified in the centre’s marking. Further guidance can be found Section 13

You must not comment on any likely scaling adjustments. You will be given a standard set of comments that you can choose from to help you complete this report.
Visiting Moderation:

This report is still the mechanism for feedback to the centre on the rationale for moderation outcomes. For guidance on verbal feedback within the centre, see Cambridge Nationals Centre Visit Instructions.

**k) Time-out**

Moderation Manager operates through a secure web-based portal (OCR Interchange). For security reasons this will time-out if left inactive for more than 20 minutes. Some routine activities are not recognised as ‘activity’ within Moderation Manager, so you must, therefore, save your inputs regularly. You should routinely save before moving between screens or moving to the next stage of any of the moderation processes within Moderation Manager. For example, you should save after entering comments on individual candidates or the centre, when moving between the sub and full sample, and when typing your Report to Centre. You should arrive at your marks and write your Report to Centre off-line, then log-in once you are ready to enter marks and comments and paste text into your web report form.

**l) Using Moderation Manager to submit marks**

Once you have moderated your sample and completed your report, you must submit marks to OCR within Moderation Manager.

**m) Consortia**

If you moderate a consortium and one or more of the centres involved was not sampled, then the warning message Marks Pending will remain throughout the process. This centre(s) will remain in your Worklist. However, your mark judgements on the consortium sample will be processed and any appropriate centre scaling applied to all the centres involved.

**n) Issues of concern**

If while undertaking your assessment task you come across something that causes you concern you must report this immediately to your supervisor.
a) The purpose of moderator's reports to centres

The purpose of the report is to provide *personalised* and *concise* feedback to the centre that is not generic and displays a clear knowledge of the work undertaken by candidates in that year's series of assessment. The feedback should be constructive, objective and supported by fact or judgement. There are three main subsections that moderators should be feeding back on:

i. Administration of coursework

- Was the work submitted in time with the correct supporting documents?
- Was there anything particularly notable about the administration of this submission that deserves praise/comment? (Be careful where access arrangements have been made)

ii. Interpretation of the Marking Criteria

- Feedback on the level of accuracy that the centre has applied to the Marking Criteria generally or to specific elements. This should be clear and concise and not a simple reiteration of the specification, marking criteria or 'Examiner's Report'.
- Feedback on overall trends and patterns of marking where appropriate i.e. general misinterpretation/strength of a particular criteria point or broad misinterpretation.
- It is not necessary to comment in depth on the full Marking Criteria; areas of discrepancy should be given appropriate feedback; areas of accuracy can be given collective recognition.

iii. Quality of the sample submitted

- Provide praise or suggestions for improvement of the centres submitted work so that, in future series, candidates have full access to the marks available. In doing so it may be appropriate to highlight individual examples from the given sample to support your comments and advice. (When referring to candidates use numbers not names and double check the number and correct candidate is being referenced)
- Were centre set tasks appropriate for assessment in this unit? Or, were the board set tasks contextualised by the centre appropriately?

b) Responsibilities

It is your responsibility as a moderator to provide a report for *every* centre that you moderate and to ensure the report is correctly uploaded. In order to deliver consistent and professional presentation, it is also your responsibility to ensure that your reports are accurate and error free. If there are any issues with the moderation of the centres sample, the report should not be completed or put into Moderation Manager until those issues have been resolved by the centre and subsequently cross checked by you.

Your supervisor is responsible for reviewing and checking all of your reports, amending minor corrections or highlighting more significant alterations that you need to make to the delivery of your reports.

You must not comment on the scaling of centre marks as you will not have sight of this information. OCR Subject Specialists will ensure any such alterations are made to reports if required. The Subject Specialists will not have the capacity to review all reports, but those being scaled will offer them sight of the quality of reports delivered.
c) Style
In order to ensure consistent, high quality reports there are some tips to consider:

- Remember that the report constitutes OCR’s formal evaluation of the centre’s work and marking, so the tone should be detached and professional (e.g. first person should not be used)
- Check spelling, grammar and punctuation, using a UK spell check and writing in full paragraphs.
- It is recommended to always produce your reports in Word using unformatted text (no styles or text boxes) for consistency before pasting them into ModMan. Once pasted, they text should appear in a serif font. More information can be found in the ‘Understanding the Basic Moderation Process’ file in the Help section on ModMan.
- The following example has been given to demonstrate constructive rather than critical feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Version (Critical)</th>
<th>Preferred Version (Constructive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of the responses were excellent with detailed arguments on either side of the debate; however many were too brief and lacked detail and balance.</td>
<td>Some excellent responses contained detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Others needed to develop thoroughly explained/more detailed and balanced arguments in order to achieve high marks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Content
The centre should be able to understand clearly what the moderator is giving feedback on using the three subtitled sections. The following support is presented in bullet points, but your reports should be presented in full paragraphs. This support is for guidance only and you should check over all of your reports careful to make sure they are in complete context to the work you have moderated for each individual centre.

- Try to begin with a positive whenever possible
- The report needs to remain concise and clear. Extensive, non-direct reports are counter-productive
- Moderators’ should always signpost the content of their report using the three headings from the sections listed above (Administration of Coursework; Interpretation of Marking Criteria; Quality of the Sample Submitted). All subtitles should be followed by an appropriate level of feedback.
- Avoid additional subject specific subheadings unless they give clarity when communicating feedback.

The following statements demonstrate some appropriate wording for moderators’ Reports to Centres. The statements are not an exhaustive list, but contain examples of the appropriate wording to use.

i. Administration of non-examined assessment / coursework

- Thank you for sending the moderation sample and associated paperwork.
- The annotation on the candidates’ work and on the mark sheets was very helpful, particularly in indicating where you thought levels had been met and criteria reached.
Thank you for sending the moderation sample and associated paperwork. Your careful and detailed annotations on the XXX form were very informative and the organisation of your sample helped the moderation process run very smoothly.

The assessment forms were thorough and clear and it was easy to see how the assessment criteria had been applied.

Please note for future series that the moderator only requires the sample as requested by email once you have submitted marks to OCR, not the work of the whole cohort.

Please note that work should be sent within three days of receipt of the sample request email

ii. Interpretation of the marking criteria

- Your internal marking and moderation was accurate demonstrating a clear understanding of the requirements for assessment.

- The marking was inconsistent / too generous / too harsh in the ….mark band, especially for the ….element.

- Your application of the marking criteria was quite close to the nationally agreed standards.

- Your application of the marking criteria was quite close to the nationally agreed standards, but with a tendency to be severe / lenient when assessing …. 

- It was not always clear how the marks submitted related to the assessment criteria. It is advisable to include annotation or supporting documents to support your internal assessment in the future, in order to clarify your thinking.

iii. Quality of the sample submitted

- It was good to see a detailed analytical commentary accompanying the data presentation techniques, so encouraging candidates to analyse all the results from their field work.

- The candidates collected a wide range of data, retained a focus on the Investigation title and produced some interesting and geographically sound pieces of work.

- It would be beneficial if the candidates were encouraged to offer more in the way of analysis and conclusions which were often less developed. One strategy to help candidates to achieve this is to guide them to analyse each chart or graph as they appear in their work. This has the added benefit of ensuring that all data is analysed sufficiently and also helps candidates draw general conclusions at the end.

- Though there was examples of good research and use of appropriate sources within your centres’ sample, in particular candidate XXXX. There were other folders where research was excessive and irrelevant in content, raising questions over some candidates understanding.
KEY POINTS TO NOTE

DO...

- Make sure you write a report for every centre regardless of assessment outcomes
- Write in complete sentences and paragraphs
- Ensure you write concisely and clearly
- Ensure that your statements are written from a positive approach to the work or improvement
- Make sure that the comments on the report show that you have read the work
- Make sure that your comments reflect what you have assessed in the sample
- Make sure that any terminology or references in your report are appropriate to the qualification and specification
- Make sure that any references used are accurate
- Include advice that will support the approach of future cohorts
- Check the report you have entered on ModMan is for the correct centre
- Check the report carefully before submitting to the centre in ModMan

DON’T...

- Complete or upload reports where there are still outstanding moderation issues
- Simply replicate reports. Each centre is entitled to individualised feedback
- State the actual number of marks being adjusted
- Be negative about a candidate, their individual work or an issue
- Criticise, imply or speculate about the teaching and learning of the unit
- Mention the word ‘awarded’ in relation to marks. Marks are ‘submitted’ by centres, not awarded
- Abbreviate words, e.g. v for very
- Write in lists
- Use words that carry value judgements, such as ‘good’, ‘bad’ etc...
- Communicate any suspected malpractice in your reports

**Do not under any circumstances** mention **scaling** in your report, the process of scaling or the possibility of scaling. You will not know how the regression algorithm has interpreted your assessment of the sample. You will know trends and patterns once you submit to ModMan, but not how your recommendations will actually look.
14. SUPERVISION

Your supervisor will need to see two samples of your moderation decisions before they can give you Approved status within Moderation Manager. You will still be able to moderate whilst Unapproved but you must not submit more than five centres before you receive Approved status.

If you only have Postal and Repository moderation, your supervisor will be able to view all the centres you have moderated and will request that the work from at least two centres is posted to them (using DHL). One will be from a centre where the centre’s marks for the sample are within tolerance and the other will be a centre where a range of candidates in the sample are outside of tolerance. (This will not be necessary for units using the OCR Repository as the supervisor will be given access to the same centres.) This will enable them to give you advice if necessary and ensure you are meeting the required standard for moderation. If necessary, and following consultation, your supervisor may return a centre to your Worklist for you to review your marks and/or your Report to Centre.

For each of these sample centres you must send all the candidate work you have in the sample and all centre and moderator documentation. Your supervisor will be able to access your marks and Report to Centre through Moderation Manager.

Your supervisor may also require the work of a centre you have consulted them about.

Visiting Moderation:

You will be accompanied on one of your visits by your supervisor. For Cambridge Nationals you may be moderating centres using all three modes (Visiting, Postal, Repository). If you are accompanied on a visit, then only one further sample (Postal or Repository) will need to be sent to/accessed by your supervisor.

If you are moderating the qualification for the first time, your first visit should be an accompanied visit.

Where appropriate a reminder will appear on screen to prompt the supervisor to save both the moderation outcome and the Report to Centre, whether or not changes have been made to the data input by the original moderator.

15. DESPATCH OF DOCUMENTATION

You will receive instructions at Standardisation regarding forwarding any documentation you receive from centres to OCR during, or following, the moderation period.

16. SELECTION OF CANDIDATE WORK FOR AWARDING AND ARCHIVING

You and your supervisor will be required to assist in obtaining candidate work suitable for use at the Awarding Meeting and subsequent archiving. Criteria for the selection of work will be provided. It is important that your supervisor is informed without delay of any work which might be suitable for these purposes. You will be issued with subject-specific instructions for the collection of this work.
17. RETURN OF CANDIDATE WORK (where applicable)

You will be told, either at standardisation or by your supervisor, when to return candidate work to the centre.

Using the DHL courier service, arrange the return of candidate work to the centre promptly to avoid material being delivered during holiday periods.

The DHL courier service is described in the Assessor Courier Guide, available from the Courier Services tab of the Assessor Communications website: http://www.ocr.org.uk/assessor-communications/

- You should re-parcel the sample of work using the centre’s original packing where possible.

- Complete the template CW/L4:
  - add this letter as an attachment within Moderation Manager when you submit the centre if you are returning this parcel to the centre
  - email this letter to your supervisor if you are sending a centre’s work to them.

- You may be advised by OCR or your supervisor to retain samples of work after the end of the moderation period. You should not retain work for any other reason. Details of candidates retained should be listed on the CW/L4 letter.

- Return all other work to centres, when instructed, along with a hard copy of the completed CW/L4.

You must record the despatch details for all the work you have moderated, including the samples you have sent to your supervisor, on the CW/MOD/DESP Form which can be found as a template in Moderation Manager.

- You must return this form by email (which is automatically routed) as soon as you have completed your allocation.

- You should not send candidate work to OCR unless specifically instructed.

This is important for processing centre queries and will limit the amount of information we might otherwise require from you after the moderation process.

18. SPENT DOCUMENTATION

This must be returned to OCR once the examination series is completed using the Spent Moderation Manager documentation for destruction label. Ensure that live candidate work or specific centre communications are not included.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRINCIPAL MODERATORS AND TEAM LEADERS
(in addition to the Moderation instructions sections 1–18)

SECTION B

19. SAMPLING OF THE PRINCIPAL MODERATOR’S/TEAM LEADERS’ MODERATION

a) Sampling of the Principal Moderator’s Moderation

This check is performed outside of Moderation Manager. At the Standardisation Meeting the Principal Moderator will determine who will sample their moderation. If the Principal Moderator is also the Chief Examiner, and there are no Team Leaders, then the most appropriate moderator should be selected.

This person will sample the Principal Moderator’s moderation from ONE centre as soon as possible and ideally within one week of the mark submission deadline.

The Principal Moderator must send to the checker a record of their judgements on the supplied Mod/Ad/Reg form along with a hard copy of the completed Report to Centre.

The checker will then record their marks onto the Mod/Ad/Reg Form, and send it with the checked Report to Centre and work back to the Principal Moderator with their feedback.

The Principal Moderator must not submit the centre in Moderation Manager until they have received this feedback from the checker.

The Principal Moderator must then send the PM Check (Mod/Ad/Reg) form to Post Assessment Services at SEM@ocr.org.uk

It is unlikely that any action will be needed, but if it is then it will be discussed with the relevant Monitoring and Support Manager.

The following checks are performed in Moderation Manager and should follow the processes outlined in Sections 20 to 22.

b) Sampling of Team Leaders’ Moderation (Postal)

Each Team Leader will need to send the candidate work from two centres to the Principal Moderator. These should be the complete samples of two centres covering, where possible, the whole mark range. The first sample should be the first centre you moderate from your own allocation and be sent as soon as possible after the standardisation meeting.

Ideally the second centre will be that from the allocation of an Assistant Moderator for which you are confirming in Moderation Manager that at least one mark lies more than twice outside the tolerance. Assistant Moderators should be encouraged to identify and choose suitable centres from their allocation to facilitate this; such centres will automatically escalate to the Principal Moderator in Moderation Manager.

c) Sampling of Team Leader’s Moderation (OCR Repository)

Sampling should be carried out in the same way as for postal moderation. However, the relevant centre work of the assessor whose moderation is to be sampled will be accessed by the Principal Moderator through the OCR Repository.

d) Sampling of Team Leader’s Moderation (Visiting)

Each Team Leader will need a moderation check of a centre in their own allocation and on a centre which has been escalated from one of their team members. The check on their allocation
will be done, where possible, by an accompanied visit, or by a centre (postal or Repository) in their own allocation.
20. SAMPLING OF MODERATORS' MODERATION

a) When reviewing centres from Team Leader’s own allocation, their immediate supervisor (Assistant Principal Moderator or Principal Moderator) acts in the role of Team Leader and must carry out the function of Team Leader as described below:

- For postal moderation, Moderators must send work from a sample of their allocation of centres to their Team Leader to be checked.
- For visiting moderation, moderators will be accompanied on an early centre visit by their supervisor and will need to send a sample of work from another centre to their supervisor to be checked.
- As Team Leader you will need to see enough evidence to be confident of approving, or not approving, each Moderator’s standards. Until you approve a Moderator, all the centres they submit will continue to be escalated to you.
- The check should consist of full samples from two centres which cover, where possible, the whole mark range, and, if possible, include one for which mark differences lie within the tolerance and one where several candidates are outside tolerance. Moderators are instructed to complete the moderation of no more than five centres prior to receiving Approved Status.
- As Team Leader you will receive further escalated samples of centres from a moderator if there are mark differences of more than twice tolerance or where a Malpractice status has been selected against one or more candidates.

b) As Team Leader you should scrutinise the work and documentation from the Moderator’s sample. You should:

- record your marks for the sample in the grid under ‘Team Leader Mark’ within Moderation Manager and submit the centre. Detailed guidance on how to do this can be found in the Help section of Moderation Manager
- check the Report to Centre, amending as necessary and save both the report and the moderation outcome. A reminder will appear on screen to prompt the supervisor to save both the moderation outcome and the report
- contact the Moderator immediately if there are any problems with the sample, or the Moderator’s judgements, i.e. If you disagree with any of the judgements. The centre should be returned to the moderator with a request to reconsider their judgement in the light of their Team Leader’s comments, and for it to be resubmitted
- when retaining any further work for Archive/Award, amend the CW/L4 sent to you by the Moderator and attach the letter in Moderation Manager and submit the centre, then return the remaining work from the team of Moderators directly to the centres concerned with a hard copy of the CW/L4 letter. Ensure that the Moderators send you the identification to do so (eg centre address label)
- update your MOD/DESP form with the appropriate despatch details.
21. MONITORING

Every centre of each Moderator’s allocation will appear in your Submission for Review Worklist until you have given them Approved status. Once you have approved a Moderator, centres in their allocation will only appear in your Worklist for the following reasons;

a) The moderator mark for one or more candidates differs from the centre mark by more than twice tolerance

In these cases you will need to see this work and input and save your moderator marks, review the Report to Centre then submit your marks for that centre’s sample.

If you identify that there is an invalid order of merit in the sample in need of centre remarking, which the moderator has not addressed, you must contact the moderator and revert the centre back to them for them to address. You cannot invoke an Invalid Order of Merit form from your Submissions for Review Worklist.

b) A Malpractice status has been selected for one or more candidates

If the Moderator suspects Malpractice they should consult with you, following the procedures stated in Appendix 1.

If, having looked at the SUS/MAL/REP and the work, you agree that there is suspected malpractice, edit, save locally, and reattach the SUS/MAL/REP, and arrange for the work to be sent to the OCR Malpractice Team as soon as possible. There is now no need to select a Malpractice status when you enter marks into Moderation Manager. Selecting a Malpractice status will escalate the centre further up the chain, even if the centre is not over twice tolerance.

c) The centre is within tolerance, but you have either selected a status, entered a mark against a candidate, or edited the report and saved already.

Moderation Manager will save your data, and therefore retain the centre in your worklist, even when you have approved the moderator.
22. CHECKING MODERATOR’S REPORTS TO CENTRES

You must check reports for all centres in your team members’ allocations. You must check carefully that any comment written in the Moderator’s Report to Centre is appropriate according to the guidance given in Section 13.

a) Centres which are escalated

These reports can be accessed in Moderation Manager through your Submissions for Review worklist. A reminder will appear on screen to prompt you to save both the moderation outcomes and the report, whether changes have been made or not. If significant changes need to be made by the moderator and therefore you plan to revert the centre back to the moderator, do not edit the report first. If you have made significant changes to the report enough to deem it necessary to replace the Moderator’s name with your own you should tick the appropriate box at the bottom of the screen. Once you have submitted the centre you will not be able to review the report again.

b) Centres not escalated

These reports can only be accessed via the Reports to Centres menu. Again, it is important to save the report once you have reviewed it. You will not be able to replace the Moderator’s name with your own. Any additional documentation that moderators are required to complete and attach will also be available to view in the Reports to Centres menu alongside the centre report.

23. REPORTING ON THE PERFORMANCE OF MODERATORS AND TEAM LEADERS

a) Team Leaders:

Please complete the Team Leader’s Report on the Performance of Assistant Moderators, one form per Assistant Moderator, and forward to your Principal Moderator.

b) Principal Moderators:

If you have Team Leaders leading your teams, please complete the Principal Moderator’s report on the Performance of Team Leaders, one form per Team Leader your team.

If you do not have Team Leaders, please complete the Team Leader’s Report on Performance form, one form per Assistant Moderator in your team.

Please send your completed Report on Performance forms, together with those received from your Team Leaders, to the relevant Examiners and Assessors Deployment no later than 5 days after the Batch return date:

OCR Coventry
Progress House
Westwood Way
Coventry
CV4 8JQ
Moderators may need to refer work to their Team Leader or Principal Moderator where they are unable to proceed.

Where a Moderator identifies a difficult case and this is referred to the Team Leader, the Team Leader may, in exceptional circumstances, have to take over total responsibility for the centre rather than supervising and helping the moderator deal with it themselves.

Before you take over a problem centre please ensure the following conditions have been met:

- the sample presents a major problem to the original Moderator and justification can be given as to why it cannot be dealt with as part of the normal escalation process
- approval prior to taking over the centre has been obtained from a Monitoring and Support Manager by emailing senior.assessors@ocr.org.uk
- the approval stage for that moderator has already been completed (i.e., has re-moderated at least two samples from the original Moderator)

If the following conditions have been met the Team Leader can claim payment for this centre by completing claim form EC33 (Postal Moderation Sampling of Problem Centres by Team Leaders), that the Monitoring and Support Managers will issue to you at the time of approval. An email confirming approval will be sent to you by the Monitoring and Support Managers and must be attached to your claim form in order for payment to be made.

Centres escalated through the automatic Moderation Manager process are not classified as problem centres and payment is covered by the normal supervision fee.
25. **RETENTION OF WORK (postal moderation only)**

You must also tell Moderators about any samples of work that must be retained for Awarding, archiving, or training purposes.

Notify Moderators when they can return candidate work to centres and instruct them to arrange this return promptly to avoid material being delivered during holiday periods.

26. **SPENT DOCUMENTATION**

This must be returned to OCR once the examination series is completed using the *Spent Moderation Manager documentation for destruction* label. Ensure that live candidate work or specific centre communications are **not** included.

27. **ISSUES OF CONCERN**

**Team Leader:**
If while undertaking your moderation task you come across something that causes you concern you must report this immediately to your Principal Moderator.

If a moderator in your team reports a concern to you, you must acknowledge receipt and then, where appropriate, escalate this to the Principal Moderator.

**Principal Moderator:**
If while undertaking your assessment task you come across something that causes you concern you must report this immediately to OCR, via the Monitoring and Support Manager.

If a moderator or Team Leader in your team reports a concern to you, you must acknowledge receipt and then, where appropriate, escalate this to OCR.
APPENDIX 1

SUSPECTED MALPRACTICE

Malpractice is when you suspect that a candidate or centre may have breached the regulations in some way, intentionally or not. It is important that all cases of suspected malpractice be reported to OCR as quickly as possible to allow the Malpractice Team to investigate and apply penalties where appropriate.

Procedures

Moderated

Moderate any suspect work in the usual way.

Use the Malpractice statuses in Moderation Manager to flag the work to your supervisor. Send the work to the supervisor immediately with a report of the reasons for your suspicions written on the Suspected Malpractice Reports Folder (the SUS/MAL/REP – template is available in the Templates area of Moderation Manager). Attach a copy of the SUS/MAL/REP to the centre in Moderation Manager before submitting.

On the Report Folder you should state which regulation has been broken (if you know) or what the suspected malpractice is. Refer, where possible, to the rubric, the specification or guidelines.

It is important that all suspected malpractice is reported immediately to the OCR Malpractice Team. This is because it is likely that the Malpractice Team will need to contact the Centre and, to avoid delays to the investigation, this should be done before the end of term. If a case is not resolved before Results Day then candidates’ results will be withheld.

Common types of malpractice

Copying

You can usually detect copying between candidates by one of the following:

- identical unusual errors, especially in calculations
- correct answers after wrong working
- identical wording, often with identical unusual grammar or vocabulary
- impossibly identical results in scientific experiments or in practical examinations
- numerous identical corrections by a group of candidates (especially in multiple choice papers).

If you suspect copying then it is helpful if you can indicate who has copied from whom, and which passages are affected. If it seems that both candidates have willingly been copying then this offence is described as collusion.

Collusion

Collusion is defined as evidence that the candidate has worked collaboratively with other candidates beyond what is permitted by the specification. Collusion can occur between two or more candidates, and is apparent when:

- candidate work follows an unusually identical plan
- sections of candidate work are similar or identical.
False or incomplete declaration of authenticity
A false or incomplete declaration of authenticity occurs when a candidate presents work (or sections of work) as their own, when in fact someone else has produced it. If you suspect that there has been copying, collusion or plagiarism then use these terms when reporting. However, there may be occasions when a candidate has been helped by a family member. Clues to this may be sections of the work where a more advanced vocabulary is used, or where there is a greater level of understanding or depth to the work than is generally found elsewhere.

Inappropriate, offensive or disturbing material
As an Assessor you are the judge of what is offensive in a candidate’s work. As a guide – if it offends you, report it. You can ignore facetiousness, mild criticism of the examination and political statements. However, obscenities, lewd comments or drawings, offensive comments aimed at a member of staff or assessor, and racist remarks should all be treated as malpractice. If you are assessing a foreign language then it is helpful if you could translate the offensive material in your report. You should also report any material which suggests that the candidate is disturbed, or gives you cause for concern. Please refer to Safeguarding – The protection of children and vulnerable adults.

Improper assistance by Teachers or others
This occurs when a teacher or assistant gives excessive guidance with internally assessed work to an individual candidate (who may have fallen behind) or to the whole group. The moderator must express a view on this if they suspect improper assistance. Clues to this may be:

- marked drafts are included with the final copy
- comments and suggestions for improvements are found in the margins of internally assessed work
- “writing frames” or other handouts are found in the candidate’s portfolios
- the candidate’s work is formulaic, and suggests the use of templates.

Plagiarism
Plagiarism means unacknowledged copying from published and electronic sources. It also includes incomplete referencing, where it is clear that a candidate has not acknowledged the source of a piece of writing. Some of the clues in writing that point to plagiarism are:

- varying quality of content or style of writing
- dated expressions and references to past events as being current
- use of American expressions, vocabulary or spelling
- use of specialised words or jargon
- inconsistent use of font or format (if the document is typed).

It would be helpful to try to find the source of a piece that you suspect is plagiarised. You can often do this by typing in a few distinctive phrases from the piece into Google, or another internet search engine, but we suggest that you do not spend much time on this. Even if you cannot find the source then you should still inform the Principal Moderator. The Malpractice Team are able to use software to detect plagiarism.

You must not attempt to make allowance for plagiarism by downward adjustment of the candidates’ marks.

For further information on plagiarism, it may be helpful to consult the JCQ guidelines on Plagiarism in Examinations.

In all cases, please mark the work in the usual manner.

The centre must not be contacted if issues of suspected malpractice arise.
Please keep your comments factual and do not use emotive language. We aim to avoid needless offence. Remember - if this incident goes to the Malpractice Committee or the Regulations Committee your comments will be read by the centre, although your identity will be protected.

It would be helpful if you could include in your report a judgement as to whether the malpractice might affect a limited number of candidates, a particular teaching set, or the whole cohort from the centre (in which case all the centre’s results for this unit might be suspect). If you find any communication from a centre in the moderation sample relating to an examination irregularity then you should forward it to your supervisor, who will pass it to the Malpractice Team, OCR Risk and Compliance, 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU.

You should make a report even if the candidate has not gained from the breach of regulations or if they have clearly failed. It is the evidence of malpractice that is important. OCR may make routine checks in other subjects if there is a report of suspected malpractice to discover whether the offence is more widespread.
APPENDIX 2

MODERATING THE INTERNALLY ASSESSED WORK OF CANDIDATES WHO HAVE HAD ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS

Access Arrangements are permitted to candidates who have disabilities, learning difficulties or temporary conditions which mean they require particular types of support. Centres can make their applications for most arrangements online. The website produces cover sheets and this represents the permission agreed. It is important to remember that candidates who have access arrangements include candidates of all levels of ability.

1. CANDIDATES USING A Scribe

- Candidates who dictate answers are still using language to convey their ideas. They may be able to structure their arguments, use appropriate vocabulary to convey ideas, use technical vocabulary correctly and use an appropriate writing style for the context. They will use their own grammar and vocabulary. They may dictate punctuation but this is not always possible for candidates with a severe disability. If the candidate can dictate punctuation, this will be noted on the Scribe Cover Sheet attached to the work. However, in these circumstances the candidate is not able to provide the spelling as this is not practical. The exception is in Modern Languages coursework, where the candidate is not allowed to use a scribe unless the candidate is able to dictate the spelling letter by letter.

- Candidates who do not have access arrangements are assessed according to the instructions given in the specification. They will include candidates who cannot spell accurately. Each team of Moderators will decide on how important accurate spelling will be for their specification.

- Candidates who have used a scribe are in the same position as those who cannot spell and should be treated accordingly. They should be credited with the marks that they can be given for the other skills being assessed. Where there are separate marks available for spelling, their work will be marked in exactly the same way as any other candidate who has not gained marks for spelling. You should check that the internal assessor has not made allowances for disability in the marking.

- Centres will attach a Cover Sheet to any work where a scribe was used. The centre should show on the Cover Sheet whether the candidate or the scribe completed any graphs and diagrams.

Please do not detach the Cover Sheet from the work as the marking cannot be checked without this information.
2. CANDIDATES USING A PRACTICAL ASSISTANT

- The work should be covered by a Practical Assistant Cover Sheet. The centre is asked to note down the tasks performed by the Practical Assistant. If the candidate also had a scribe, there is a question on the form relating to who did the graphs and diagrams. Credit should be given for those tasks completed independently by the candidate. This may need to be discussed with your supervisor or the Principal Moderator.

For instance, a candidate might not be able to perform a titration. If marks are available in the mark scheme for this particular skill, no marks can be credited. If the assistant has merely held the equipment still and the candidate has controlled the titration independently, marks can be credited.

Please do not detach the Cover Sheet from the work as the marking cannot be checked without this information.

- A Practical Assistant will not be permitted in those assessments where the practical skill is the focus of the assessment, such as Art, Design and Technology or Music, unless minimal help is required, such as holding equipment still or handing paints to the candidate. Where there is particular cause for concern, the Moderator will be informed of the arrangements permitted.

- If it is clear that a Practical Assistant has done the artwork, or made the realisation and that marks have been credited to the candidate, the Moderator should refer the incident to your supervisor as possible malpractice.

3. CANDIDATES FOR WHOM A TRANSCRIPT HAS BEEN PROVIDED

It is unlikely that a centre will transcribe coursework because candidates can usually use a word processor for the majority of subjects. However, blind students may have produced coursework in Braille and the centre must provide a transcript of the Braille. The candidate has used written communication in the Braille and the transcript should be assessed in the usual way.

Please do not detach the Cover Sheet from the work as the marking cannot be checked without this information.

4. CANDIDATES USING SIGN LANGUAGE

BSL and other sign languages are not permitted in any Foreign Language or any English Language coursework. In other subjects they can only be used for signing one word answers or where it is possible, to fingers spell. Moderators should not be sent coursework which has been signed and scribed. If they do, they should refer the matter to your supervisor as possible malpractice.