



# The Crossley Heath School Centre Policy for determining teacher assessed grades – Summer 2021

## Contents

Background	3
Definitions	3
Policy adoption statement	4
Statement of intent	4
Roles and responsibilities	5
Head of Centre	5
Deputy Head Achievement and the Senior Leadership Team	6
Heads of Department	6
SENCo	7
Examinations Officer, Exams Manager and Data Manager	8
Data Protection Officer	8
Teachers	9
Training, support and guidance	10
Use of appropriate evidence	11
Determining teacher assessed grades	13
Internal quality assurance	14
Comparison of teacher assessed grades to results for previous cohorts	15
Access arrangements, special considerations and mitigating circumstances	16

Access arrangements	16
Special consideration	16
Mitigating circumstances and addressing differential lost learning	17
Addressing Disruption	17
Objectivity	18
Recording decisions and retention of evidence and data	19
Authentication of evidence	21
Examples of authentication methodologies that will be used by the centre	21
High confidence data such as assessments or work carried out under supervision at the centre	21
Confidentiality, malpractice and conflicts of interest	22
Confidentiality	22
Conflicts of interest	22
Private candidates	24
External quality assurance	25
Results	26
Appeals	27
Stage 1: centre review	27
Stage 2: appeal to the awarding organisation	27
Managing appeals	27
Annex 1 - The Head of Centre Declaration	28
Annex 2 - Ofqual guidance on recommended types of assessment evidence	29
Annex 3 - Unconscious effects on objectivity	30
Annex 4 - Non-exhaustive list of examples of the types of malpractice that may be investigated in relation to the awarding of grades in Summer 2021.	31

## Background

On 4 January 2021 the Prime Minister announced that the government considers that most exams could not be held in a way which is, and which is perceived to be, fair. Ofqual published, on 25 February, its high level decisions on how grades for GCSEs, AS and A levels should be determined in summer 2021. The results of a further technical consultation were published on 24 March 2021 concurrently with the publication of the “Information for heads of centre, heads of department and teachers on the submission of teacher assessed grades: summer 2021” and “Information for centres about making objective judgements in relation to awarding qualifications in 2021”.

The Joint Council for Qualifications, JCQ, published, on 26 March 2021, its guidance for schools and colleges on how GCSE and AS/A level grades will be determined in England this summer. Fundamental to the internal quality assurance process is the Centre Policy. This sets out the processes centres will follow for determining grades, in an appropriate, consistent and fair way. The policy should reference all of the relevant external advice and guidance provided by Ofqual, the JCQ and by the awarding organisations. A template for a Centre Policy is available on the JCQ website, and centres can adopt and adapt this document. Each Head of Centre will then need to produce a summary of the policy which will be submitted to the awarding organisations for review.

## Definitions

“AAM” - ‘Additional assessment materials’ - qualification specific sets of questions, provided by the awarding bodies and covering key knowledge, understanding and skills, provided with mark schemes and mapping grids

“Assessment Record” - every centre must produce an Assessment Record for each subject cohort, that includes the sources of the assessment evidence being used and the rationale for the choice of evidence, the level of control for assessments considered, and any other evidence that explains the determination of the final teacher assessed grades. Any necessary variations for individual students must also be recorded.

“Awarding organisations” - this encompasses ‘exam boards’ and ‘awarding bodies’

“Head of Department Checklist” - a Head of Department checklist should be completed for each subject before submitting the grades for internal standardisation.

“JCQ” - The Joint Council for Qualifications

“Ofqual” - The Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulations

“CHS” – The Crossley Heath School (Centre Number 37323)

“Private candidates” - In the context of CHS, this term covers:

- Former students who completed their A level studies with us and have left, but who are seeking to resit a qualification completed with us while they were a pupil;
- Current students resitting qualifications from earlier in their academic career, but who are not currently taught the subject at that level within their school timetable (for example a year 12 or 13 student seeking to resit a GCSE level qualification).

- Current students seeking to receive a teacher assessed grade in school, for which they receive tuition outside school (for example in GCSE Chinese)

### **Policy adoption statement**

CHS has chosen to adopt an adapted version of the JCQ template to ensure that the policy is appropriate to our centre, and to ensure that Ofqual regulations relating to the Summer 2021 grading process and JCQ guidance are implemented in full, including, but not limited to:

- Guidance: Information for heads of centre, heads of department and teachers on the submission of teacher assessed grades: summer 2021, Ofqual, 24 March 2021
- Guidance: Information for centres about making objective judgements in relation to awarding qualifications in 2021, Ofqual, 24 March 2021
- Instructions for conducting examinations 1 September 2020 to 31 August 2021 For the attention of heads of centre, senior leaders within schools and colleges and examination officers JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for Summer 2021, JCQ, 26 March 2021

### **Statement of intent**

CHS will at all times use its best endeavours to:

- ensure the integrity of the teacher assessed grades process at CHS.
- contribute to the integrity of the wider teacher assessed grades process in England in Summer 2021.
- ensure that teacher assessed grades are determined fairly, consistently and effectively within and across subject departments.
- ensure that the teacher assessed grades are evidence-based and determined objectively by:
  - basing decisions on evidence in line with JCQ guidance
  - being aware of unconscious effects on objectivity
  - using other evidence to identify possible bias
  - reviewing judgements with others
  - providing training to ensure objectivity and to minimise unconscious effects on objectivity.
- implement effective processes and provide clear guidelines and support for staff.
- ensure that all staff involved in the processes clearly understand their roles and responsibilities.
- consider historical centre data for A levels and GCSEs from 2017-2019 to support appropriate decision making in respect of Summer 2021 teacher assessed grades.
- support a high standard of internal quality assurance in the allocation of teacher assessed grades.
- meet our obligations in relation to equality legislation.
- ensure clarity in communicating the process of teacher assessed grades to candidates and their parents/carers to maintain trust and confidence.
- collaborate with the awarding organisations at all stages of the quality assurance process.
- ensure our centre meets all requirements set out by the Department of Education, Ofqual, JCQ and awarding organisations for Summer 2021 qualifications.

## Roles and responsibilities

This section gives details of the roles and responsibilities within our centre. The Head and Senior Leadership Team may, at their discretion, delegate to an alternative suitable member of staff, the performance of any of the functions of the roles listed below, with the exception of the duties falling within the remit of the Head and Senior Leadership Team, where to do so will be expeditious and beneficial to the interests of students and in so doing will not have breached this Centre Policy.

### Head of Centre

Our Head of Centre, Lynnette Cassidy, is responsible for approving this Centre Policy for determining teacher assessed grades.

The Head of Centre has overall responsibility for CHS as an examinations centre and will use her best endeavours to ensure:

- clarity of roles and responsibilities for all staff participating in the teacher assessed grades process in Summer 2021.
- the teacher assessed grade decisions made by staff represent an appropriate exercise of academic judgement.
- that checks are in place to ensure these align with the guidance on standards provided by awarding organisations.
- the implementation of a robust internal quality assurance process that is 'signed-off' in advance of results being submitted.

The Head of Centre will sign and submit a Head of Centre declaration in the form specified by Ofqual (see Annex 1 below), confirming all the statements declared therein.

## Deputy Head Achievement and the Senior Leadership Team

Our Deputy Head Achievement, Jonathan Brownlie, and members of the Senior Leadership Team comprising Penny Doig, Lee Chesters, Adam Smith and Glyn Hirst, will use their best endeavours to:

- support the Head of Centre in exercising her role and responsibilities under this policy.
- engage with any training or guidance provided by JCQ or the awarding bodies as part of the process.
- produce and provide training and support to Heads of Department and other staff as required by this process.
- participate in the robust internal quality assurance process prior to sign-off by the Head of Centre in advance of results being submitted.
- in respect of the Equality Act 2010 consider, as part of internal quality assurance, the range of evidence for students of different protected characteristics that are included in our internal standardisation.
- ensure staff have a clear understanding of the internal and external quality assurance processes and their role within them.
- oversee communications regards the grade awarding process with staff, students and parents.
- ensure consistency across departments through the internal quality assurance process.
- authenticate the preliminary outcome from single teacher subjects.
- delegate to Heads of Department the responsibility for providing guidance and support to subject teachers, where appropriate.
- ensure that a Head of Department Checklist and Assessment Record is completed for each qualification.
- manage the process of internal standardisation within and across subject departments.
- manage the internal processes relating to any post results appeal including liaising with awarding bodies and provision of evidence and information as requested by the awarding body.
- delegate the provision of any request for information made by a student as a Subject Access Request to the Data Protection Officer, and support the Data Protection Officer to fulfil this in accordance with the associated legal requirements.

## Heads of Department

Our Heads of Department will use their best endeavours to:

- support the Head of Centre in exercising her role and responsibilities under this policy.
- participate in the robust internal quality assurance process prior to sign-off by the Head of Centre in advance of results being submitted.
- engage with any training or guidance provided internally, or by JCQ or the awarding bodies as required by this process.
- ensure an effective approach to teacher assessed grading within their department.
- provide guidance and support to staff within their department.
- carry out robust internal standardisation to ensure that all teachers within their department make consistent judgements about student evidence in deriving a grade.
- ensure all staff in their department conduct assessments under the appropriate levels of control with

reference to guidance provided by JCQ.

- ensure that reasonable adjustments for disabled students and access arrangements are in place when evidence is generated and where they were not, teachers should take that into account when coming to their judgement.
- ensure teachers in their departments have sufficient evidence to make accurate and fair judgements.
- produce an Assessment Record for each subject cohort, that includes the nature of the assessment evidence being used, the level of control for assessments considered, and any other evidence that explains the determination of the final teacher assessed grades. Any necessary variations for individual students will also be recorded.
- complete a Student Data Record (spreadsheet) for each qualification in their subject area.
- complete a Head of Department Checklist for each qualification within their subject.
- securely store and be able to retrieve sufficient evidence to justify the decisions made by teachers within their department.

## SENCo

Our SENCo, Chris Davis, supported by the wider Learning Support team will use his best endeavours to:

- support the Head of Centre in exercising her role and responsibilities under this policy.
- engage with any training or guidance provided internally, or by JCQ or the awarding bodies as required by this process.
- ensure that reasonable adjustments for disabled students and access arrangements are shared with Heads of Department and support is in place to ensure these are facilitated when evidence is generated.
- identify students for whom access arrangements changed over their course of study or for whom access arrangements were not applied.
- ensure that by working with senior leaders the teacher assessed grades assigned to particular students who benefit from access arrangements are a fair, valid and reliable reflection of the assessed evidence available for each of those students.
- ensure, by the provision of advice and guidance to the Head of Centre, Senior Leadership Team and Heads of Department, that the centre meets its obligations under the Equality Act 2010.
- support Heads of Department and teachers in dialogue about how to prevent possible biases or unconscious effects from affecting judgements for students with special educational needs or disabilities.
- contribute to the Assessment Record as appropriate.

## Progress / Pastoral Leaders

Our Year Group Leaders supported by the pastoral Team will use their best endeavours to:

- provide teaching staff with relevant information about extenuating circumstances that may have impacted non-SEN student performance on assessments used as part of the evidence base.

## Examinations Officer, Exams Manager and Data Manager

Our Examinations Officer, Sally Thristan, Exams Manager, James Stead, and Data Manager, Elaine Masters will use their best endeavours to:

- provide support and guidance to teachers, Heads of Department, the SENCo and Senior Leadership Team as requested to ensure that assessments are conducted under the appropriate levels of control with reference to guidance provided by JCQ.
- compile information on the grades awarded to our students in past June series in which exams took place (2017-2019) giving appropriate regard to potential mixtures of A\*-G and 9-1 grades in GCSEs. Where required, we will use the Ofqual guidance to convert legacy grades into the new 9 to 1 scale.
- compile any other data sources that will help to quality assure the grades we intend to award in 2021, for example tracking data, prior assessment data, or data that reflects a change in the profile of the cohort.
- ensure that teacher assessed grades remain confidential and stored securely, compliant with arrangements outlined in the JCQ guidance.
- keep and maintain a register of staff conflicts of interest for the Summer 2021 season.
- execute the administration of our final teacher assessed grades using the internal Student Data Record and external Centre Assessment Portal (CAP)
- provide guidance on the process for awarding special consideration in line with JCQ guidelines.
- support the Data Protection Officer in the provision of information pursuant to a Subject Access Request made by a student, in accordance with the associated legal requirements.
- manage the administrative responsibilities of the post-results services.
- review our general centre policies regarding malpractice, maladministration and conflicts of interest to ensure they address the specific challenges of delivery in Summer 2021.

## Data Protection Officer

Our Data Protection Officer, Jonathan Lees will use his best endeavours to:

- provide, in a timely fashion, information pursuant to any request for information made by a student as a Subject Access Request in accordance with the associated legal requirements.
- ensure that the 2021 Teacher Assessed Grades process is carried out in accordance with the school's Data Protection Policy and that students' personal data is handled appropriately and securely in the way it is stored, communicated and shared.
- ensure that teacher assessed grades remain confidential and evidence is stored securely, compliant with arrangements outlined in the JCQ guidance.

## Teachers

Our teachers will use their best endeavours to:

- support the Head of Centre in exercising her role and responsibilities under this policy.
- engage with any training or guidance provided internally, or by JCQ or the awarding bodies as required by this process.
- ensure that students have comparable experiences in terms of exam preparation and provision of resources
- ensure they have sufficient evidence to make accurate and fair judgements in line with this Policy and guidance from Ofqual and JCQ.
- ensure they conduct assessments under the appropriate levels of control with reference to guidance provided by JCQ and to seek the advice or guidance of the Head of Department, Exams Officer or Senior Leadership team if unsure.
- ensure that reasonable adjustments for disabled students and access arrangements are in place when evidence is generated and where they were not, take that into account when coming to their judgement.
- ensure that the teacher assessed grade they assign to each student is a fair, valid and reliable reflection of the assessed evidence available for each student. Each teacher assessed grade should be a holistic professional judgement balancing different sources of evidence.
- ensure that the teacher assessed grade is based on records and evidence that demonstrate a student's performance in relation to the subject content that they have been taught and assessed on.
- Work with their Head of Department to contribute to an Assessment Record for each subject cohort, that includes the nature of the assessment evidence being used, the level of control for assessments considered, and any other evidence that explains the determination of the final teacher assessed grades. Any necessary variations for individual students will also be recorded.
- contribute to a Student Data Record (spreadsheet) for each qualification in their subject area
- ensure the evidence used to justify grading decisions is passed to the Head of Department so that it can be securely stored and retrieved if necessary.
- keep all information pertaining to final grades (and any associated assessment evidence) confidential and refrain from discussions with students and parents about final grades.

## Training, support and guidance

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the training, support and guidance that our centre will provide to those determining teacher assessed grades this year.

- Teachers involved in determining grades in our centre must engage with any centre-based training to help achieve consistency and fairness to all students.
- Centre devised training may be delivered in person or remotely.
- A teacher's attendance at, or completion of, centre devised training will be recorded by the Senior Leadership Team.
- Teachers are also expected to engage fully with all training and support that has been, and may from time to time be provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications and the awarding organisations.
- Teachers who, in the opinion of their Head of Department, are less experienced with assessment will be supported directly by their Head of Department.
- Contributions towards the teacher assessed grade process by teachers considered by their Head of Department to be less experienced in assessment will be internally reviewed directly by the Head of Department and this review noted on the Assessment Record for that subject and qualification.
- In the case of a single person department the Senior Leadership Team will validate the outcomes after comparing with historical data from 2017-2019 in that subject as well as outcomes in associated subject areas if that is appropriate. Such departments may also choose to collaborate with subject colleagues in another school.
- Cross centre collaboration between CHS and C6 partner schools will be implemented for students studying an A level outside their home sixth form.

## Use of appropriate evidence

This section of our Centre Policy indicates how our centre will give due regard to the section in the JCQ guidance entitled: *Guidance on grading for teachers*

- Teachers making judgements will have regard to the Ofqual Head of Centre guidance on recommended evidence, and further guidance provided by JCQ and the awarding organisations.
- Evidence should relate to the specification content and should reflect, as far as possible, the sorts of questions and tasks that students would normally undertake in preparation for the qualification.
- Questions and tasks should be appropriately accessible for lower ability students and appropriately demanding to allow higher ability students to demonstrate performance to support higher grades.
- All recent (after 24<sup>th</sup> March) candidate evidence used to determine teacher assessed grades, and associated documentation, will be retained and made available for the purposes of external quality assurance and appeals.
- Evidence dating from before 24<sup>th</sup> March may not be available (e.g. because it was from earlier in the course and evidence was not retained at that point), therefore marks can be used in determining the final grade.
- CHS intends to use different types of assessment evidence detailed in the Ofqual guidance and reproduced in Annex 2. The evidence used will be determined by the Head of Department for each subject and qualification.
- As far as possible, the sources of evidence should be consistent across a class or cohort of students, and Heads of Department should record the reasons for their selection.
- The optional awarding body Additional Assessment Materials or additional centre devised tasks or assessments may be used at the discretion of the Head of Department, where use of these assessments:
  - gives students the opportunity to show what they know, understand or can do in an area of content that has been taught but not yet assessed.
  - gives any student who, through no fault of their own, has missed a contributing assessment an opportunity to complete their evidence base.
  - supports consistency of judgement between teachers or classes by giving everyone the same task to complete.
- Assessment materials may be used in the form provided or tailored to better match the content that has been taught, at the discretion of the Head of Department.

Our centre will ensure the appropriateness of evidence and balance of evidence in arriving at grades by considering the following as appropriate:

- We will consider the level of control under which an assessment was completed, for example, whether the evidence was produced under high control and under supervision or at home.
- We will ensure that we are able to authenticate the work as the student's own, especially where that work was not completed within the school.
- We will consider the limitations of assessing a student's performance when using assessments that have been completed more than once, or drafted and redrafted, where this is not a skill being assessed.

- We will consider the specification and assessment objective coverage of the assessment.
- We will consider the depth and breadth of knowledge, understanding and skills assessed, especially higher order skills within individual assessments.
- We will consider the recency of the evidence
- We will be flexible where some students have missed particular assessments, through no fault of their own, and may substitute other evidence if available.

## Determining teacher assessed grades

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the approach our centre will take to awarding teacher assessed grades based on evidence.

- Our teachers will determine grades based on evidence which is commensurate with the standard at which a student is performing, i.e. their demonstrated knowledge, understanding and skills across the content of the course they have been taught.
- Each teacher assessed grade should be a holistic professional judgement balancing different sources of evidence that demonstrate a student's performance in relation to the subject content that they have been taught.
- Other factors should not affect this judgement. These include characteristics protected under equalities legislation, such as a student's sex, race/ethnicity, religion/belief, disability status, gender reassignment or sexual orientation. These also include factors such as social background, socio-economic status or perceived English language proficiency. Similarly judgements should not be affected by a student's behaviour, character or personality, appearance, performance of their siblings, parental opinions or the knowledge of grades needed to meet a university offer.
- Support and training will be provided to enable the highest level of objectivity to be maintained in forming judgements that are free from bias, further detail on Objectivity can be found in the appropriate section below.
- Our teachers will contribute to an Assessment Record for each subject cohort that will be collated by their Head of Department. Any necessary variations for individual students will also be shared along with details of any additional support provided to teachers such as NQTs or those less experienced in assessment.

## Internal quality assurance

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the approach our centre will take to ensure internal standardisation of teacher assessed grades, to ensure consistency, fairness and objectivity of decisions.

- We will ask all teachers involved in the teacher assessed grades process to read, and support them to understand, this Centre Policy document.
- In subjects where there is more than one teacher and/or class in the department, we will ensure that Heads of Department carry out an internal standardisation process.
- We will ensure that all teachers are provided with training and support to ensure they take a consistent approach to:
  - Marking of evidence
  - Applying the use of grading support and documentation
  - Reaching a holistic grading decision
- We will conduct internal standardisation across all subjects and qualifications.
- We will ensure that the Assessment Record will form the basis of internal standardisation and discussions across teachers have taken place to agree the awarding of teacher assessed grades.
- Where necessary, we will review and reflect on individual grading decisions to ensure alignment with the standards as outlined by our awarding organisations.
- Where appropriate, we will amend individual grade decisions to ensure alignment with the standards as outlined by our awarding organisations.
- Where there is only one teacher involved in marking assessments and determining grades, then the output of this activity will be reviewed by an appropriate member of the Senior Leadership Team within the centre.

## Comparison of teacher assessed grades to results for previous cohorts

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the approach we will take to compare our teacher assessed grades in 2021 with results from previous cohorts in our centre taking the same qualification.

- We will ensure that grade judgements have been recorded for students in the current assessments before considering historical records of mark data and grade distributions for students in previous assessments at the centre.
- We will compile information on the grades awarded to our students in previous June series during which exams took place (e.g. 2017 - 2019). However, grading judgements will not be driven by this data.
- We will consider both subject and centre level variation in our outcomes during the internal quality assurance process. Having regard to the fact that it is likely that the size of the cohort and the stability of the outcomes will be higher for all subjects combined than for a single subject.
- Private candidates will be excluded from the data.
- We will prepare a succinct narrative on the outcomes of the review against historic data

This section gives details of the approach our centre will follow if our initial teacher assessed grades for a qualification are viewed as overly lenient or harsh compared to results in previous years.

- If outcomes are much higher than in previous years, or much lower, the centre will consider possible reasons.
- The centre will identify evidence for any recurring trends in the profile of performance at the centre over previous years, such as strong results for some subjects or specific student groups.
- We will consider the grades awarded to different groups of students, including those with protected characteristics, as well as considering gender and disadvantage.
- We will take particular care when assessing patterns of grades for small groups, where a single candidate may have a large effect.
- We will make a record of these comparisons and the rationale for any variations as part of the internal quality assurance process, in order that it can be discussed with the awarding organisation during any external quality assurance checks.
- Following this review, the centre may need to reflect on the grading standard that has been applied in one or more subjects.
- No individual student's grade will be changed as a result of a review against historical data. At all times, the evidence of students' work will form the basis for each student's grade.

## Access arrangements, special considerations and mitigating circumstances

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the approach our centre will take to provide students with appropriate access arrangements and take into account special consideration and mitigating circumstances in particular instances.

### Access arrangements

- To ensure consistency with the Equality Act 2010 we will continue to process online applications for reasonable adjustments and access arrangements as if examinations were taking place this summer.
- Every effort will be made to ensure that students' approved access arrangements and/or reasonable adjustments are put in place for any assessments used to determine teacher assessed grades.
- Teachers will be required to confirm whether the approved access arrangement/reasonable adjustment was in place for assessments which will be used to determine the student's grade. This must be recorded on the Assessment Record.
- If the access arrangement/reasonable adjustment was not in place, we will consider using other evidence or take it into account when coming to our judgement where this is in the best interests of the student to do so and disregarding it would disadvantage the student. This should include input from the SENCo and it must be appropriately recorded/documentated in the Assessment Record.

### Special consideration

The usual process of submitting special consideration applications to awarding organisations for qualifications will not apply this summer. The school will seek to select work completed by a student where they were unaffected by adverse circumstances. Special consideration cannot be applied due to lost teaching and learning.

Where a temporary illness, a temporary injury or some other event outside of the student's control may have affected their performance in assessments which will be used to determine a grade, teachers should take this into account and document how they have done so in the Assessment Record.

In applying special consideration CHS must be satisfied that the issue or event has had, or is reasonably likely to have had, a material effect on a student's ability to demonstrate his or her normal level of attainment in an assessment. CHS will record how we determined the impact of the misfortune.

To ensure consistency in the application of Special Consideration, we will ask teachers to read, and support them to understand the document: JCQ – A guide to the special consideration process, with effect from 1 September 2020.

Students must be reminded to raise any mitigating circumstances which warrant special consideration. It is important that students raise these issues as soon as possible, ideally at the time of the assessment and prior to the submission of the teacher assessed grade.

A special consideration panel consisting of at least two members of the Senior Leadership Team one of which may be the Head of Centre will review the application for special consideration. The Exams Officer may also be involved in these discussions and evidence used from, *inter alia*, invigilator logs.

The Exams Officer and school Data Manager will securely retain any confidential evidence provided in support of the student's request for circumstances to be taken into account.

#### Mitigating circumstances and addressing differential lost learning

- Teacher assessed grades will be determined based on evidence of the content that has been taught and assessed for each student.
- In cases where a student has experienced significant disruption the centre will adopt a flexible approach to the range of evidence that is available.
- Any differences in the evidence taken into account will be documented in the Assessment Record along with a description of the reason for the mitigation.
- If time and circumstances permit, additional assessments, such as the AAM materials may be used to provide any evidence that may be missing from a student's basket of evidence.
- In some cases, individual students might have missed substantially more teaching than their peers, and are therefore unable to produce sufficient evidence to support a grade. Although the centre will work closely with a student in this situation and provide every practical opportunity as described above, the centre gives no guarantee that every student who has entered for a qualification will be able to receive a grade.

#### Addressing Disruption

- Grades will be based on teachers' assessments of the standard at which students are performing and will be based on the student's demonstrated knowledge and skills.
- If the content for any of the pieces of evidence have not been taught, then the teacher should remove that piece of evidence entirely or remove the questions that assess that specific content.
- If teachers need to remove any evidence at this point, they should consider whether they need to and can replace it with anything else.

## Objectivity

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the arrangements in place to ensure objectivity of decisions. Assessing students' performance objectively is crucial to determining outcomes that are as fair as possible and minimise bias. We will follow Ofqual's Guidance: Information for centres about making objective judgements in relation to awarding qualifications in 2021 referred to in this section as "the Guidance" to assure ourselves that we have effectively fulfilled relevant duties to promote equality and avoid discrimination, as set out in the Equality Act 2010.

The Head of Centre, Senior Leadership Team and Heads of Department will use their best endeavours to:

- ensure that each teacher assessed grade is a holistic professional judgement objectively balancing different sources of evidence and data.
- ensure that teacher judgements only take account of existing records and available evidence of a student's knowledge, skills and abilities in relation to the subject.
- produce and deliver internal training or facilitate the delivery of externally produced training on maintaining objectivity during the teacher assessed grade process.
- ensure that all staff involved in determining teacher assessed grades read the Guidance and receive training on how to assess students' performance objectively based on evidence.
- read and assimilate from the Guidance knowledge of a range of unconscious effects on objectivity (see Annex 3) and review the Assessment Records produced by Heads of Department to satisfy themselves that there is no evidence of intentional bias or unconscious bias in the teacher assessed grades.
- ensure that dialogue between teachers in departments and the SENCo takes place during the teacher assessed grade process to support effective reflection and review, since different perspectives help minimise bias.

To ensure that the process is as fair as possible, and minimises bias, all staff involved in determining teacher assessed grades will:

- be asked to read the Guidance and receive training and support to help them to understand it.
- be made aware that unconscious bias, such as unconscious beliefs about others present a risk to objective judgements.
- be made aware that such effects can be minimised by:
  - valuing the evidence on its own merit as an indication of performance and attainment;
  - not permitting the influence of characteristics such as candidates' positive or challenging personal circumstances, character, behaviour, appearance, socio-economic background, or protected characteristics to affect the judgement; and
  - taking time to come to a decision since unconscious bias is more likely to occur when quick opinions are formed.

During the internal quality assurance process the Head of Centre, Senior Leadership Team and Heads of Department assisted by the Data Manager will have regard to other relevant sources of evidence that may be available to check whether there might be bias in judgements, as described in the Guidance.

## Recording decisions and retention of evidence and data

This section of our Centre Policy outlines our arrangements to record decisions and to retain evidence and data.

Teachers will use their best endeavours to:

- ensure the evidence used to justify their decisions is passed to the Head of Department so that it can be securely stored and retrieved if necessary.
- evidence should include copies of the student's work where available and any mark records. All student work should be retained from 24 March 2021 onwards.
- keep a record of any discussions with students around the evidence on which the grades will be based.
- contribute to an Assessment Record for each subject cohort, that includes the nature of the assessment evidence being used, the level of control for assessments considered, and any other evidence that explains the determination of the final teacher assessed grades. Any necessary variations for individual students will also be recorded.

Heads of Department will use their best endeavours to:

- securely store and be able to retrieve sufficient evidence to justify the decisions made by teachers within their department or faculty.
- ensure as much of the student work used to form judgements is retained as possible and to ensure that any assessment completed on or after 24 March 2021 must be securely retained.
- ensure that evidence is maintained across a variety of tasks to develop a holistic view of each student's demonstrated knowledge, understanding and skills in the areas of content taught.
- keep a record of any discussions with students around the evidence on which the grades will be based.
- complete an Assessment Record for each qualification they oversee including:
  - the evidence selected for the subject cohort
  - explanation of any assessment objective omitted at cohort level
  - the rationale for the choice of assessment evidence used
  - variations for individual students for example due to COVID related disruption, access arrangements, reasonable adjustments or mitigating circumstances.
- complete a Head of Department checklist.

The SENCo and Learning Support Team will use their best endeavours to:

- maintain a record of each student's reasonable adjustments or access arrangements and contribute to the Assessment Record for students with reasonable adjustments or access arrangements.
- ensure that such evidence is retained electronically or on paper in a secure centre-based system that can be readily shared with our awarding organisations.

The School will use its best endeavours to:

- create a record pertaining to individual circumstances that might have affected students' performance in an assessment. This will be retained by the school in case of any appeal.
- maintain a log of special consideration awarded, in instances where this has been applied according to the guidance provided by JCQ, and securely store any personal information or evidence provided to support this.

- securely retain invigilator records from assessments where exam invigilators were used.
- contribute any relevant details from these records to the Assessment Record for each student as appropriate.
- ensure that such evidence is retained electronically or on paper in a secure centre-based system that can be readily shared with our awarding organisations.

The Data Protection Officer will use his best endeavours to:

- ensure that the 2021 Teacher Assessed Grades process is carried out in accordance with the school's Data Protection Policy and our obligations regarding data protection legislation and that students' personal data is handled appropriately and securely in the way it is stored, communicated and shared.
- ensure that teacher assessed grades remain confidential and evidence is stored securely, compliant with arrangements outlined in the JCQ guidance.

The Senior Leadership Team will use their best endeavours to support teachers, Heads of Department, the Data Protection Officer and Exams Officer to ensure that:

- the Assessment Record provides a complete picture of how the teacher assessed grades process operated, including the rationale for decisions in relation to individual marks/grades and with input from each of the groups of individuals referred to above.
- evidence referred to in the Assessment Record is retained electronically or on paper in a secure centre-based system that can be readily shared with our awarding organisations.
- we comply with our obligations regarding data protection legislation.

## Authentication of evidence

This section of our Centre Policy details the mechanisms in place to ensure that teachers are confident in the authenticity of evidence, and the process for dealing with cases where evidence is not thought to be authentic.

- Robust mechanisms, as detailed below will be in place to ensure that teachers are confident that work used as evidence is the students' own and that no inappropriate levels of support have been given to students to complete it, either within the centre or with external tutors.
- It is understood that awarding organisations will investigate instances where it appears evidence is not authentic. We will endeavour to follow guidance that may be provided from time to time by awarding organisations to support these determinations of authenticity.

### Examples of authentication methodologies that will be used by the centre

High confidence data such as assessments or work carried out under supervision at the centre

- Heads of Department must, to their best endeavours, ensure that staff in their department conduct assessments under the appropriate levels of control with reference to guidance provided by JCQ.
- If it is decided that all students in a cohort sit the same activity under test conditions this should happen on the same day to maximise fairness for all students in the centre.
- If a student cannot sit an assessment due to illness, the test may be substituted for an equivalent alternative assessment at the discretion of the Head of Department.
- Where an activity has been completed under supervision, the time the student has spent on the task, what materials have helped them and whether they have received any additional support should be considered in assessing student performance and recorded in the Assessment Record.
- Evidence from a private tutor will not be taken into account for any candidate.

In all cases, if there is evidence that the work is not that of the student themselves the work must not be included as part of the evidence and an alternative piece of evidence may, at the discretion of the Head of Centre, need to be produced. This should be recorded in the Assessment Record. Where such evidence points to possible malpractice it is the centre's policy to carry out an investigation and if there is evidence of malpractice this will be reported to the appropriate awarding organisation. Further information relating to malpractice can be found in the section below.

## Confidentiality, malpractice and conflicts of interest

### Confidentiality

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the measures in place to ensure the confidentiality of the grades our centre determines, and to make students aware of the range of evidence on which those grades will be based.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the need to maintain the confidentiality of teacher assessed grades.
- The school will give details of the range of evidence on which students' grades will be based, while ensuring that details of the final grades remain confidential.
- This Policy, including requirements around sharing details of evidence and the confidentiality requirements, will be available to parents on our website.

### Malpractice

This section of our Centre Policy outlines how the centre will take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of malpractice, maladministration and other breaches of exam regulations, and to deal with such cases if they occur, in accordance with awarding organisation requirements.

- Our general centre policies regarding malpractice, maladministration and conflicts of interest will be reviewed to ensure they address the specific challenges of delivery in Summer 2021.
- All staff involved will be made aware of these policies.
- All staff involved have been made aware of and will receive training on the specific types of malpractice which may affect the Summer 2021 series examples of which are detailed in Annex 4.
- If the centre identifies any potential instance of malpractice by the centre or centre staff it will be investigated and reported to the appropriate awarding organisation using the JCQ M2 form.
- If a student attempts to gain an unfair advantage during the centre's process by, for example, submitting fabricated evidence or plagiarised work this would constitute malpractice and the centre will report this to the appropriate awarding organisation using the JCQ M1 form.
- Students, or individuals acting on behalf of a student, such as parents/carers, might also try to influence grade decisions by applying pressure to centres or their staff. In dealing with such cases we will retain clear and reliable records of the circumstances and the steps taken, and that students are made aware of the outcome.
- If a student continues to inappropriately attempt to pressure centre staff then we will inform the relevant awarding organisation using the JCQ M1 form.

### Conflicts of interest

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the measures in place to address potential conflicts of interest.

- To protect the integrity of assessments, all staff involved in the determination of grades have a duty to declare any conflict or potential conflict of interest to our Head of Centre.
- A record of conflicts of interest is kept and maintained by the Exams Officer.
- Any members of centre staff who are teaching and preparing members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family

(e.g. son/daughter) for qualifications will be declared to relevant AO and appropriate measures put in place by the centre to manage any conflict of interest.

- Our Head of Centre will take appropriate action to manage any conflicts of interest arising with centre staff in accordance with the JCQ documents - General Regulations for Approved Centres, 1 September 2020 to 31 August 2021.
- We will also carefully consider the allocation of roles and responsibilities to ensure fairness in internal standardisation, quality assurance and appeals.

## Private candidates

This section of our Centre Policy outlines our approach to working with Private Candidates to arrive at appropriate grades.

- Our centre will only accept private candidates falling within the following categories:
  - students at our school who have studied an additional subject outside of the school; and
  - current or former students requesting to resit a qualification.
- Our centre will assess such Private Candidates using a range of evidence, in a similar way to other students.
- The types of evidence for a Private Candidate may differ from those used to determine grades for Internal Candidates as they may have covered different content or generated different forms of evidence. Private Candidates at Crossley Heath will be required to complete the same assessments taken by internal candidates.
- The rationale for the evidence chosen for Private Candidates will be documented separately within the Assessment Record to the rationale for internal candidates.
- The assessment approach will be communicated to the candidate to ensure the candidate and centre have the same expectation of the process.
- Pre-existing evidence will not be accepted if the centre has concerns about its authenticity.
- The evidence that will be taken into consideration is at the discretion of the centre having regard to the JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for Summer 2021.
- For subjects taught in school all evidence will need to have been generated from assessments carried out by the school.
- If we accept a Private Candidate for a subject we do not teach we will engage third party subject expertise.
- The teacher assessed grades awarded to Private Candidates will not form part of the review of cohort grades against the centre's historical performance.

## External quality assurance

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the arrangements in place to comply with awarding organisation arrangements for External Quality Assurance of teacher assessed grades in a timely and effective way.

The centre will use all reasonable endeavours to:

- share with all staff involved in the teacher assessed grade process, the awarding organisation requirements for External Quality Assurance as set out in the JCQ Guidance.
- ensure that the Assessment Record, Head of Department Checklist and other records pertaining to decision-making in relation to determining grades have been properly kept and can be made available for review as required.
- ensure that where it is available, student evidence pertaining to the determination of grades has been retained and can be made available for review as required.
- ensure that in circumstances where student evidence used to decide teacher assessed grades is not available, this will be clearly recorded on the appropriate documentation.
- brief staff on the possibility of interaction with awarding organisations during the different stages of the External Quality Assurance process.
- support staff to respond promptly and fully to enquiries, including attendance at Virtual Visits should this prove necessary.
- put arrangements in place to respond fully and promptly to any additional requirements/reviews that may be identified as a result of the External Quality Assurance process.
- make Staff aware that a failure to respond fully and effectively to such additional requirements may result in further action by the awarding organisations, including the withholding of results.

## Results

This section of our Centre Policy outlines our approach to the receipt and issue of results to students and the provision of necessary advice and guidance.

- Appropriate staff will be made aware of the arrangements for the issue of results in Summer 2021, including the issuing of A/AS on Tuesday 10 August 2021 and GCSE results on Thursday 12 August 2021.
- Arrangements will be made to ensure the necessary staffing, including exams office and support staff, to enable the efficient receipt and release of results to our students.
- Arrangements will be in place for the provision of all necessary advice, guidance and support to students.
- The centre will respond promptly to any requests for information from awarding organisations.
- Parents/guardians will be made aware of arrangements for results days.

## Appeals

This section of our Centre Policy outlines our approach to Appeals, to ensure that they are handled swiftly and effectively, and in line with JCQ requirements.

To limit the need for appeals post-results the following information will be shared with students before grades are submitted to the awarding bodies:

- The Centre Policy
- The sources of evidence used to determine their grade
- Where Special Consideration has been taken into account in determining their grade and where access arrangements have been in place

### Stage 1: centre review

If a student does not consider that they have been issued with the correct grade, they can ask us to check if an administrative or procedural error has occurred.

- We will inform the student that their grade could go up, or down or stay the same.
- If we find that an error has occurred we will submit a request to the awarding organisation to correct the error and amend the grade.

### Stage 2: appeal to the awarding organisation

The centre will submit an appeal to the awarding organisation on behalf of a student where the student considers:

- that the centre did not follow its procedure properly;
- the awarding organisation has made an administrative error; or
- the grade was an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement.

We will inform the student that their grade may go up, or down or stay the same.

### Managing appeals

- Internal arrangements will be in place for the swift and effective handling of centre reviews in compliance with the requirements.
- Students will be appropriately guided if they indicate their desire to initiate an appeal.
- Arrangements will be in place for the timely submission of appeals to awarding organisations, including any priority appeals, for example those on which university places depend.
- Arrangements will be in place to obtain the consent of students to the initiation of appeals, and to record their awareness that grades may go down as well as up on appeal.
- Appropriate information on the appeals process will be provided to parents/carers.

## Annex 1 - The Head of Centre Declaration

The head of centre will be required to submit the following declaration when the data is submitted.

I confirm that:

- these grades have been checked for accuracy, reviewed by a second member of staff and are accurate and represent the professional judgements made by my staff
- entries were appropriate for each candidate in that students entered were those already studying the course, and each candidate has no more than one entry per subject
- my centre has met the requirements set out by exam boards/JCQ for internal quality assurance
- I am satisfied that each student's grade is based on an appropriately broad range of evidence, including evidence from other centres, providers or specialist teachers if relevant, and is their own work
- exam board requirements have been met for any private candidates
- access arrangements and reasonable adjustments were provided with appropriate input from the SENCo and other specialists (and where they were not, that has been taken into account)
- I and my staff have taken note of the Ofqual guidance on making objective judgements, judgements have not been influenced by pressure from students, parents or carers, and I am confident that the judgements are fair
- all relevant student evidence and records are available for inspection, as necessary

## Annex 2 - Ofqual guidance on recommended types of assessment evidence

- Student work produced in response to assessment materials normally provided by the exam board including past papers, and the groups of questions being provided to support evidence gathering this summer, or similar materials such as practice or sample papers.
- Non-exam assessment (NEA) work (often referred to as coursework), even if this has not been fully completed.
- Student work produced in centre-devised tasks that reflect the specification, that follow the same format as exam board materials and have been marked in a way that reflects exam board mark schemes. This can include substantial class or homework (including those that took place during remote learning), internal tests taken by pupils and mock exams taken over the course of study.
- Records of a student's capability and performance over the course of study in performance-based subjects such as music, drama and PE.
- Records of each student's standard of work over the course of study.

### Annex 3 - Unconscious effects on objectivity

Centres should be aware of:

- confirmation bias, for example noticing only evidence about a student that fits with pre-existing views about them
- halo effects, for example where a particularly positive impression of a student overly accentuates their actual knowledge, skills and abilities. Or the opposite, where negative impressions or low expectations of a student hides their actual knowledge, skills and abilities
- primacy effects, for example giving undue weight to 'first impressions' of a student
- recency effects, for example giving undue weight to the most recent interaction with a student
- selective perceptions, for example giving undue weight to a student's performance on a particular piece of work
- contrast effects, for example over-estimating a student's likely performance having first considered a large number of students who are all at a much lower standard
- exception effects, for example, under- or over-grading a student's performance if it is significantly out of line with (above or below) other students in that centre
- conformity bias, for example, placing undue weight on the opinions of others where these are not necessarily supported by the evidence
- affinity bias, having a more favourable impression of a student's performance because the student or their qualities/attributes are relatable or similar to one's own qualities or attributes

This is not an exhaustive list, but is designed to raise awareness of the main biases that could negatively impact on the quality of centre judgements.

## **Annex 4 - Non-exhaustive list of examples of the types of malpractice that may be investigated in relation to the awarding of grades in Summer 2021.**

### **Centre/Centre Staff**

- Exam entries are created for students who had not studied the course of entry or had not intended to enter for June 2021.
- Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that grade.
- A teacher deliberately and inappropriately disregarding the centre's published policy when determining grades.
- A teacher fabricating evidence of candidate performance to support an inflated grade.
- A teacher deliberately providing inappropriate levels of support before or during an assessment, including deliberate disclosure of mark schemes and assessment materials, to support an inflated grade.
- Over direction of students in preparation for common assessments.
- A teacher intentionally submitting inflated grades.
- Allegations that centres have submitted grades that they know to be inaccurate.
- A failure to retain evidence used in the determination of grades in accordance with the JCQ Grading guidance.
- A systemic failure to follow the centre's policy in relation to the application of Access Arrangements or Special Consideration arrangements for students in relation to assessments used to determine grades.
- A failure to take reasonable steps to authenticate student work.
- A failure to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest (COIs) within a centre.
- A Head of Centre's failure to submit the required declaration when submitting their grades.
- Grades being released to students (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results
- Failure to cooperate with an awarding body's quality assurance, appeal or investigation processes.
- Failure to conduct a centre review or submit an appeal when requested to do so by a student.
- Breaches of internal security.
- Deception.

### **Students**

- Students attempting to influence their teachers' judgements about their grades.
- Students attempting to gain an unfair advantage during the centre's process by, for example, submitting fabricated evidence or plagiarised work. Such incidents would constitute malpractice.
- Students, or individuals acting on behalf of a student, such as parents/carers, trying to influence grade decisions by applying pressure to centres or their staff. The awarding organisations will contact your centre if we receive credible allegations that such pressure has been applied in order that appropriate steps can be taken.