

Centre Assessment Standards Scrutiny *Policy.*

A structured framework for scrutinising assessment evidence and decisions made by The AI Board approved centres — ensuring validity, reliability, and fairness consistent with Ofqual's General Conditions of Recognition.

SECTION 01

Purpose

The purpose of this Centre Assessment Standards Scrutiny (CASS) Policy is to ensure that assessment decisions made by The AI Board approved centres are:

Valid, reliable, and fair

Consistent with The AI Board assessment requirements

Aligned with national regulatory expectations, including Ofqual's General Conditions of Recognition

Sufficiently robust to support public confidence in The AI Board qualifications

CASS forms a core component of The AI Board's approach to maintaining standards in criterion-referenced qualifications.

Centre-based marking enables assessors with appropriate subject and contextual expertise to judge learner performance against defined assessment criteria, supporting the intended construct of the qualification and ensuring that assessment reflects real-world application of knowledge and skills. This approach aligns with The AI Board's criterion-referenced assessment model and supports accessibility, inclusivity, and flexibility across diverse delivery contexts while remaining compatible with robust quality assurance arrangements.

The AI Board believes this approach is appropriate as the learner evidence produced for The AI Board qualifications is typically qualitative, developmental, and multi-component in nature. Evidence often includes written analysis, artefacts, digital outputs, presentations, annotated work products, and records of practice that require professional judgement to assess against assessment criteria.

Such evidence is best evaluated by trained Centre assessors who can:

- interpret evidence holistically against published criteria,
- apply professional judgement consistently,
- take account of the delivery and assessment context, and
- engage with learners during assessment where appropriate.

The AI Board therefore considers Centre marking to be the most valid and proportionate method for assessing these forms of evidence, provided it is supported by clearly defined standards, assessment guidance, and external quality assurance.

SECTION 02

Procedure

This policy applies to:

All The AI Board qualifications

All The AI Board-approved centres

All assessment decisions carried out by Centre staff which contribute to the award of a The AI Board qualification

The AI Board staff, contractors, and External Quality Assurers (EQAs) involved in quality assurance

CASS operates alongside, but is distinct from, other quality assurance activities including centre approval, ongoing monitoring, malpractice investigations, and appeals.

Principles Underpinning CASS

The AI Board's CASS model is founded on the following principles:

Criterion-referenced standards 01

Learners are assessed against published assessment criteria, not against each other.

Transparency 02

Centres understand how standards are defined, applied, and reviewed.

Consistency 03

Comparable assessment decisions are made across centres, assessors, and cohorts.

Proportionality 04

The intensity of scrutiny is risk-based and responsive to evidence.

Improvement-focused 05

CASS supports continuous improvement in assessment practice.

Relationship to Ofqual Regulatory Requirements

This policy supports The AI Board's compliance with, but is not limited to, the following Ofqual General Conditions of Recognition:

Condition A4 – Conflicts of interest

Condition D1 – Management of assessment processes

Condition D2 – Assessment arrangements

Condition D3 – Consistency of marking

Condition D4 – Maintenance of standards over time

Condition H1 – Records and evidence

CASS provides The AI Board with assurance that assessment decisions are accurate, consistent, and defensible.

SECTION 03

Definition of Centre Assessment Standards Scrutiny

CASS is The AI Board's structured process for scrutinising assessment evidence and decisions from centres to confirm that:

- Assessment criteria have been correctly interpreted and applied
- Judgements are supported by sufficient and appropriate evidence
- Decisions are consistent with national standards and The AI Board expectations

CASS does not replace assessment or internal quality assurance at centre level. It provides an external check on the effectiveness of those processes.

SECTION 04

Roles and Responsibilities

The information below illustrates the key personnel and responsibilities in relation to CASS.

The Managing Director is responsible for:

- Ensuring The AI Board meets the Ofqual General Conditions of Recognition and the conditions of any other regulator The AI Board is approved by

The Head of Quality and Assessment is responsible for:

- Defining assessment standards and requirements
- Designing and maintaining the CASS process
- Appointing and training EQAs to carry out CASS activity
- Reviewing and approving CASS outcomes and acting on identified risks
- Maintaining records of scrutiny and decisions

The Head of Qualifications is responsible for:

- Design, development and review of The AI Board qualifications

Managing the process of defining assessment standards and requirements

Providing guidance to centres on The AI Board requirements for assessment and internal quality assurance

External Quality Assurers (EQAs) are responsible for:

- Reviewing sampled learner evidence and assessment decisions
 - Evaluating the application of assessment criteria
 - Identifying risks to assessment standards
 - Providing clear, evidence-based feedback to centres
 - Recommending actions where standards are not met
-

Centres are responsible for:

- Ensuring assessors and internal quality assurers are suitably qualified and competent
- Applying The AI Board assessment criteria accurately and consistently
- Retaining assessment and IQA records
- Cooperating fully with CASS activities
- Implementing required actions arising from CASS outcomes

Approving Centres

The AI Board approves Centres through a structured approval process designed to ensure that only Centres capable of delivering and assessing The AI Board qualifications to the required standard are permitted to operate. As part of this process, a The AI Board External Quality Assurer (EQA) reviews evidence and makes professional judgements against published approval criteria covering governance and management arrangements, assessment systems, internal quality assurance, human resources (including assessor and IQA competence), and the suitability of learning and assessment resources.

Approval decisions are risk-based and take account of the nature of the qualifications to be delivered and the Centre's prior experience and capacity. Where necessary, The AI Board may apply conditions, require actions, or restrict approval to specific qualifications or delivery models. Feedback will be provided to centres in the form of a report. Ongoing approval is subject to continued compliance with The AI Board requirements and satisfactory performance under external quality assurance.

SECTION 05

CASS Methodology

The AI Board applies a risk based methodology for sampling. The following rules apply for internal quality assurance (centres) and external quality assurance (The AI Board).

Internal Quality Assurance

The sample for each qualification will include:

- the judgements made by every assessor who has taken decisions,
- learner work for every unit which has been assessed in the qualification
- the work for each participant up to 10 learners and typically 10% of the remaining cohort. These figures will vary depending on the experience of assessors
- different types of learner work e.g., oral work, calculations, research reports etc.
- learner work where the work was judged not to meet the pass standards
- two examples of judgements made by any newly appointed assessors will take place
- where units are graded, samples are taken of work at pass, merit and distinction, where available.

External Quality Assurance

The sample will include:

- the judgements made by every assessor who has taken decisions on the qualification,
- learners work for every unit which has been assessed in the qualification
- at least one unit of the work for each learner up to 10 participants and then 10% of learners of the remaining cohort
- different types of learner work, e.g. oral work, calculations, research reports etc.
- at least two examples of judgements made by any newly appointed assessors
- an appropriate spread of mandatory and optional units are included
- work graded at pass, merit and distinction levels are included in the sample, as appropriate
- examples of learner work where the work was judged not to meet the pass standards (if, and where, relevant)
- Assessment briefs across all the units

This is regarded as a minimum and the criteria may change, for example when new qualifications are being assessed for the first time or when issues with assessment have been identified in previous internal quality assurance activities and/or previous EQA visits and appropriate actions being defined.

More information on guidance on sampling strategies for The AI Board qualifications can be found in the **Centre Handbook** (external document) and the **External Quality Assurers Handbook** (internal document).

When sampling Centre-assessed learner work, The AI Board External Quality Assurers (EQAs) are not re-marking or double-marking learner evidence. Instead, sampling is undertaken to evaluate the quality, consistency and robustness of assessment decisions and the effectiveness of a Centre's internal quality assurance arrangements.

EQAs will review a representative and risk-informed sample of learner evidence, which may include borderline or threshold decisions, a range of outcomes across assessors, any decisions flagged by assessors or IQAs, and evidence from new or higher-risk Centres or qualifications. In reviewing sampled work, EQAs consider whether assessment criteria and grade descriptors have been applied correctly, whether assessment decisions are appropriately justified by the evidence, whether internal quality assurance has been effective, and whether standards are being applied consistently across learners and assessors. The focus of sampling is therefore on assurance of standards and processes rather than substitution of Centre assessment judgement.

SECTION 06

Outcomes of CASS

01

Certification for the qualification by learner group is agreed as you have found that assessors are accurately undertaking their assessments, against The AI Board standards and assessment documentation is recorded correctly.

- a. assessment decisions are consistent with The AI Board standards and assessment criteria
 - b. learner evidence clearly supports the assessment decisions made
 - c. assessors demonstrate appropriate understanding and application of The AI Board requirements
-
-

01

- a. internal quality assurance is timely, proportionate and effective
- b. assessment records and documentation are complete, accurate and auditable

02

Certification for the qualification by learner group is agreed but the Centre will need to address the action points which you have identified for future visits, as you have found that aspects of qualification delivery and assessment require improvement.

This outcome is applied where standards are currently secure, but improvements are required to strengthen future delivery and assessment. Typical indicators include:

- a. assessment decisions broadly align with The AI Board standards but show minor inconsistencies or weaknesses
- b. internal quality assurance is in place but not yet fully embedded or sufficiently robust
- c. documentation or record-keeping requires improvement, but does not undermine current decisions
- d. assessor or IQA development needs have been identified
- e. actions are preventative or developmental rather than corrective in nature

Certification may proceed for the learner group sampled, but the Centre is required to address the identified actions within agreed timescales.

03

No certification is to take place as you have found that there are substantive assessment issues which require being addressed at the Centre.

This outcome is applied where the EQA identifies substantive issues that place the validity of assessment decisions at risk. Typical indicators include:

- a. assessment decisions are not supported by sufficient or appropriate learner evidence
- b. assessment criteria or grade descriptors have been misapplied
- c. internal quality assurance is absent, ineffective, or not implemented as required
- d. systemic issues affecting multiple learners, assessors or units
- e. insufficient confidence that standards have been applied consistently or accurately

In these circumstances, certification is withheld until the issues have been addressed and The AI Board is satisfied that standards and assessment integrity have been restored.

All EQA reports (including feedback) will be reviewed by the Head of Quality and Assessment or Managing Director before being issued to centres. The AI Board does not provide direct claim status to centres for any of its qualifications.

SECTION 07

Risk Management

The AI Board operates a policy to manage the level of risk in centres. The level of risk of a centre is primarily linked to the judgement of an EQA following one of the following visits/checks:

- centre approval
- monitoring and development
- external quality assurance of assessment decisions

However, a centres risk rating can also be affected by one of the following:

Late Registrations	Size & resourcing	Previous risk ratings
Location of centres	Website information	Companies House data
Age of organisation	Private or public	Malpractice incidents
Learner complaints	Other AO information	

The AI Board uses a Centre's risk rating to determine the nature, frequency and intensity of monitoring and support activity applied. Lower-risk Centres are subject to routine external quality assurance and standard monitoring arrangements, while higher-risk Centres may be subject to increased sampling, additional EQA visits or remote checks, enhanced scrutiny of assessment decisions, and closer review of data, records and systems. Where risks are identified, The AI Board provides targeted support and guidance, which may include action planning, developmental feedback, additional training or standardisation activity for Centre staff, and more frequent engagement with The AI Board quality staff. The level of monitoring and support is kept under regular review and adjusted in response to changes in Centre performance, compliance, or risk profile, with the aim of securing standards while supporting Centres to improve and maintain compliance with The AI Board requirements and the Conditions.

Linked Policies & Documents

- › Conflict of Interest
- › Reasonable Adjustments and Special Considerations
- › Malpractice and Maladministration

› Centre Handbook

› Enquiries and Appeals

› External Quality Assurers Handbook
(internal)

› Qualification Specifications

SECTION 08

Review

DOC ID	TITLE	WORK AREA	VERSION	ISSUE DATE	REVIEW DATE	AUTHOR	OFQUAL RELATED
POL	CASS	ADM	v0.1	February 2026	February 2027	J Jones	Y

Version Control

VERSION NUMBER	SUMMARY OF CHANGE	DATE CHANGED	NEW REVIEW DATE
