

**Leaders in Learning Multi Academy Trust**

**Policies and Procedures**

**Item:** Centre Policy for 2021 Teacher Assessed Grades

**Date of last review:** N/A

**Date due for review:** April 2021

**Staff responsible:**

This document has been reviewed and agreed in accordance with statutory and Trust requirements:

**Print Name:** Mr S Rhodes  
**(Headteacher)**

**Sign:** 

**Date:** April 2021

**Centre Policy for Teacher Assessed Grades 2021****CONTENTS**

| <b>Section</b> | <b>Content</b>  |
|----------------|---|
| 1              | Policy Statement  |
| 2              | Roles and Responsibilities  |
| 3              | Training, Support and Guidance  |
| 4              | Use of Appropriate Evidence   |
| 5              | Determining Teacher Assessed Grades                                   |
| 6              | Internal Quality Assurance  |
| 7              | Comparison of Teacher Assessed Grades to Results for Previous Cohorts |
| 8              | Access Arrangements and Special Considerations                        |
| 9              | Addressing Disruption/Differential Lost Learning                      |
| 10             | Objectivity   |
| 11             | Recording Decisions and retention of Evidence and Data                |
| 12             | Authenticating Evidence   |
| 13             | Confidentiality, Malpractice and Conflicts of Interest                |
| 14             | Private Candidates  |
| 15             | External Quality Assurance  |
| 16             | Results   |
| 17             | Appeals   |

**1. Policy Statement**

Winterhill School recognises it has an obligation to adopt formal policies and establish workplace procedures for determining teacher assessed grades for the examination window 2021. To ensure this is the case, the following factors have to be addressed across the school:

- To ensure that teacher assessed grades are determined fairly, consistently, free from bias and effectively within and across departments.
- To ensure the operation of effective processes with clear guidelines and support for staff.
- To ensure that all staff involved in the processes clearly understand their roles and responsibilities.
- To support teachers to take evidence-based decisions in line with Joint Council for Qualifications guidance.
- To ensure the consideration of historical centre data in the process, and the appropriate decision making in respect of, teacher assessed grades.
- To support a high standard of internal quality assurance in the allocation of teacher assessed grades.
- To support our centre in meeting its obligations in relation to equality legislation.
- To ensure our centre meets all requirements set out by the Department of Education, Ofqual, the Joint Council for Qualifications and awarding organisations for Summer 2021 qualifications.
- To ensure the process for communicating to candidates and their parents/carers how they will be assessed is clear, in order to give confidence.

## **2 Roles and Responsibilities**

Staff within Winterhill School have several different and distinct roles to fulfil to ensure that the procedures are followed when creating the teacher assessed grades for the examination window 2021. These are:

### **Head of Centre**

- The Head of Centre, Mr S Rhodes, will be responsible for approving the policy for determining teacher assessed grades.
- The Head of Centre has overall responsibility for Winterhill School as an examinations centre and will ensure that clear roles and responsibilities of all staff are defined.
- The Head of Centre will confirm that teacher assessed grade decisions represent the academic judgement made by teachers, and that there are checks in place ensure these align with the guidance on standards provided by awarding organisations.
- The Head of Centre will ensure a robust internal quality assurance process has been produced and signed-off in advance of results being submitted.

### **Senior Leadership Team and Curriculum/Subject Leaders**

The Senior Leadership Team and Curriculum/Subject Leaders will:

- Provide training and support to our other staff.
- Support the Head of Centre in the quality assurance of the final teacher assessed grades.
- Ensure an effective approach within and across the curriculum and authenticating the preliminary outcome from single teacher subjects.
- Be responsible for ensuring staff have a clear understanding of the internal and external quality assurance processes and their role within it.
- Ensure that all teachers within their Subject/Curriculum Area make consistent judgements about student evidence in deriving a grade.
- Ensure all staff conduct assessments under the appropriate levels of control with reference to guidance provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications.
- Ensure teachers have the information required to make accurate and fair judgments.

**Teachers/ Specialist Teachers / SENCo**

Our teachers, specialist teachers and SENCo will:

- Ensure they conduct assessments under our centre's appropriate levels of control and have sufficient evidence, in line with this Centre Policy and guidance from the Joint Council for Qualifications, to provide teacher assessed grades for each student they have entered for a qualification.
- 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.
- Make judgements based on what each student has been taught and what they have been assessed on, as outlined in the section on grading in the main JCQ guidance.
- Produce an Assessment Plan 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.
- Securely store and be able to retrieve sufficient evidence to justify their decisions.

**Examinations Officer**

Our Examinations Officer will:

- Be responsible for the administration of our final teacher assessed grades and for managing the post-results services.

**3 Training, Support and Guidance**

This section provides details of the approach our centre will take to training, support and guidance in determining teacher assessed grades this year.

- All staff involved in determining grades in our centre will attend any centre-based training to help achieve consistency and fairness to all students. The dissemination of the training has been appropriate and the Head of Centre has allocated a consistent lead teacher for the facilitation of this process.
- All staff have ready access to the training materials and guidance placed on Google Drive.
- All staff involved in the determination of the grades will engage fully with all training and support that has been provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications and the awarding organisations.

This section provides details of our approach to training, support and guidance for newly qualified teachers and teachers less familiar with assessment.

- Additional support will be put in place alongside additional internal reviews of teacher assessed grades for NQTs and other teachers as appropriate. This will be addressed on a case by case basis.
- If this is required, the specific support will be detailed and stored centrally.

#### 4 Use of Appropriate Evidence

This section gives details in relation to our use of evidence.

- All 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.
- The evidence base that will be used for determining the grade is as follows:
  - Student work produced in response to assessment materials provided by the awarding organisation, including groups of questions, past papers or similar materials such as practice or sample papers.
  - Typically, three subject assessments taken from April to May 2021, and performed under high control measures.
  - Non-exam assessment work, 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 awarding organisation materials, and have been marked in a way that reflects awarding organisation mark schemes.
  - Substantial class or homework (including work that took place during remote learning).
  - Internal tests taken by students.
  - Mock exams taken over the course of study. Mainly from the end of Y10 until the end of Y11.
  - Records of a student's capability and performance over the course of study in performance-based subjects such as music, drama and PE.

Typically, three subject assessments (Additional Assessment Materials) will be used during the period of April to May 2021. These will form the basis of the most recent assessments and will provide validation of a student's final grades. These assessments will be created by combining and/or removing elements of questions where, for example, a multi-part question includes a part that focuses on an element of the specification that has not been taught.

These Additional Assessment Materials will:

- Give 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.
- Give students an opportunity to show improvement, for example, to validate or replace an existing piece of evidence.
- Support consistency of judgement between teachers or classes by giving everyone the same task to complete.

Winterhill School will ensure the appropriateness and balance of evidence and in arriving at grades in the following ways:

- 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.
- Ensure that we are able to authenticate the work as the student's own, especially where that work was not completed within the school or college.
- 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.
- Consider the specification and assessment objective coverage of the assessment.
- Consider the depth and breadth of knowledge, understanding and skills assessed, especially higher order skills within individual assessments.

### **5 Determining Teacher Assessed Grades**

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the approach Winterhill School will take to awarding teacher assessed grades.

- Winterhill School staff 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.
- Winterhill School staff will record how the evidence was used to arrive at a fair and objective grade, which is free from bias.

## 6 Internal Quality Assurance

This section gives details of our approach to internal standardisation, within and across subjects.

- All staff involved in deriving the teacher assessed grades sign that they have access to, and would have read and understood, the Centre Policy document.
- In subjects where there is more than one teacher and/or class we will ensure that our centre carries out an internal standardisation process, as detailed in the 'Curriculum Leader Quality Assurance Checklist and Declaration' document.
- All staff are provided with training and support to ensure they take a consistent approach to:
  - Arriving at teacher assessed grades
  - Marking of evidence
  - Reaching a holistic grading decision
  - Applying the use of grading support and documentation
- All subjects will conduct internal standardisation across all grades.
- Where necessary, all staff will review and reflect on individual grading decisions to ensure alignment with the standards as outlined by our awarding organisations.
- Where appropriate, all staff 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 staff within the centre.
  - This will be either Dr Andrew Reeder or Mrs Charlotte McDonald.
- In respect of equality legislation, we will consider the range of evidence for students of different protected characteristics that are included in our internal standardisation. The 9 protected characteristics are:
  - Age
  - Disability
  - Gender reassignment
  - Marriage and civil partnership
  - Pregnancy and maternity
  - Race
  - Religion or belief
  - Sex
  - Sexual orientation



## 7 Comparison of Teacher Assessed Grades to Results for Previous Cohorts

This section gives details of our internal process to ensure a comparison of teacher assessed grades at qualification level to results for previous cohorts in our centre taking the same qualification.

- The examination series 2019 and 2018 will be referenced when comparing the performance of the 2021 cohort. These 3-year groups have similar KS2 entry profiles.
- The 2020 results series will be referenced to for progress rates only.
- Progress rates will be determined by KS2 prior attainment band for individual subjects from 2019 and 2020. The performance of the cohort in 2018 was very similar to that of the 2019 cohort.
- The size of our cohort from year to year.
- Consider the stability of Winterhill Schools overall grade outcomes from year to year.
- Consider both subject and centre level variation in our outcomes during the internal quality assurance process.
- A succinct narrative on the subject outcomes of the against historic data will be used to address any divergence from previously examined years. This commentary will be available for subsequent review during the QA process.

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.

- Compile historical data 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.
- Use other data sources that will help to quality assure the grades we intend to award in 2021. For example, KS2 prior attainment data and National GCSE performance statistics.

## 8 Access Arrangements and Special Considerations

This section gives details of our approach to access arrangements and mitigating circumstances (special consideration).

- Where students have agreed access arrangements or reasonable adjustments (for example a reader or scribe) the Head of Centre will make every effort to ensure that these arrangements are in place when assessments are being taken.
- Where an assessment has taken place without an agreed reasonable adjustment or access arrangement, this assessment will be removed from the evidence base. Alternative evidence will be obtained.
- Where illness or other personal circumstances might have affected performance in assessments used in determining a student's standard of performance, the Head of Centre will take account of this when making the final judgements. This will be recorded for possible external moderation.
- To ensure consistency in the application of Special Consideration, all staff have read and understood the document: [JCQ – A guide to the special consideration process, with effect from 1 September 2020](#)

### **9 Addressing Disruption/Differential Lost Learning**

This section gives details of our approach to address disruption or differentiated lost teaching.

- Teacher assessed grades will be determined based on evidence of the content that has been taught and assessed for each student. This may include work that has been issued remotely during periods of National Lockdown.

### **10 Objectivity**

This section gives a summary of the arrangements in place within our centre in relation to objectivity.

Staff will fulfil their duties and responsibilities in relation to relevant equality and disability legislation.

Senior Leaders, Curriculum Leaders and Exams Officer will consider:

- Sources of unfairness and bias (situations/contexts, difficulty, presentation and format, language, conditions for assessment, marker preconceptions).
- How to minimise bias in questions and marking and hidden forms of bias).
- Bias in teacher assessed grades.

To ensure objectivity, all staff involved in determining teacher assessed grades will be made aware that:

- Unconscious bias can skew judgements;
- The evidence presented should be valued for its own merit as an indication of performance and attainment;
- Teacher assessed grades should not be influenced by candidates' positive or challenging personal circumstances, character, behaviour, appearance, socio-economic background or protected characteristics;
- Unconscious bias is more likely to occur when quick opinions are formed;

Internal standardisation process will help to ensure that there are different perspectives to the quality assurance process, as outlined in the 'Curriculum Leader Quality Assurance Checklist and Declaration' document.

**11 Recording Decisions and retention of Evidence and Data**

This section outlines our approach to recording decisions and retaining evidence and data. Winterhill School will:

- Ensure that Curriculum Leaders maintain records that show how the teacher assessed grades process operated, including the rationale for decisions in relation to individual marks/grades.
- 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.
- Recording requirements for the various stages of the process to ensure the accurate and secure retention of the evidence used to make decisions. This will be electronically based within BromCom.
- Comply with our obligations regarding data protection legislation.
- Ensure that the grades accurately reflect the evidence submitted.
- Ensure that evidence is retained electronically or on paper in a secure location, nominated by the Curriculum Leader, that can be readily shared with our awarding organisations (even in the case of a cyber-attack).

**12 Authenticating 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.

- The Curriculum Leader will complete the 'Quality Assurance and Declaration Checklist' which highlights the steps that all staff must follow to ensure that staff are confident that work used as evidence is the students' own and that no inappropriate levels of support have been given to students.
- It is understood that awarding organisations will investigate instances where it appears evidence is not authentic. They will follow all the guidance provided by awarding organisations to support these determinations of authenticity.

## 13 Confidentiality, Malpractice and Conflicts of Interest

### 13.1

This section details the measures in place in our centre to maintain the confidentiality of grades, while sharing information regarding the range of evidence on which the grades will be based.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the need to maintain the confidentiality of teacher assessed grades.
- All teaching staff have been briefed on the requirement to share details of the range of evidence on which students' grades will be based, while ensuring that details of the final grades remain confidential.
- Relevant details from this Policy, including requirements around sharing details of evidence and the confidentiality requirements, have been shared with parents/guardians.

### 13.2

This section details the measures in place in our centre to prevent malpractice and, where that proves impossible, to handle cases in accordance with awarding organisation requirements.

- The general policy examination policy identifies that malpractice can be categorised into staff and student.
  - Examples of staff malpractice can be defined as, but it is not exhaustive:
    - Tampering with candidates' work prior to external moderation/verification;
    - Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance;
    - Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statement;
    - Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance;
    - Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone or go to the toilet unsupervised;
    - Tampering with scripts prior to internal/external moderation taking place.
  - Examples of student malpractice can be defined as, but it is not exhaustive:
    - Plagiarism: the copying and passing off as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work;
    - Collusion: working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only;
    - Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor – this may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use;
    - Not following the guidance relating to the control measures that the assessment is being performed;
    - Leaving the examination room without permission;
    - Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate.
- All staff have received training in performing the assessments with the students for 2021. This has been achieved via a cascade model, using the line management structure as a vehicle.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the specific types of malpractice which may affect the Summer 2021 series including:
  - breaches of internal security;
  - deception;
  - improper assistance to students;
  - failure to appropriately authenticate a student's work;
  - over direction of students in preparation for common assessments;
  - allegations that centres submit grades not supported by evidence that they know to be inaccurate;
  - centres enter students who were not originally intending to certificate a grade in the Summer 2021 series;
  - failure to engage as requested with awarding organisations during the External Quality Assurance and appeal stages;
  - failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and teacher assessed grades.
- The consequences of malpractice or maladministration, as published in the relevant JCQ guidance, may result in the risk of a delay to students receiving their grades, up to, and including, removal of centre status have been outlined to all relevant staff.

### 13.3 Conflicts of Interest

This section details our approach to addressing conflicts of interest, and how we will respond to such allegations.

- To protect the integrity of assessments, all staff involved in the determination of grades must declare any conflict of interest such as relationships with students to the Head of Centre.
- The 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 need if to separate duties and personnel to ensure fairness in later process reviews and appeals.

### 14 Private Candidates

This section details our approach to providing and quality assuring grades to Private Candidates.

- Our arrangements for assessing Private Candidates to arrive at appropriate grades are identical to the approaches utilised for internal candidates.
- Where it has been necessary to utilise different approaches, the JCQ Guidance on Private Candidates has been followed and any divergences from our approach for internal candidates have been recorded on the appropriate class/student documentation.
- In undertaking the review of cohort grades in conjunction with our centre results profiles from previous examined years, the grades determined by our centre for Private Candidates have been excluded from our analysis.

### **15 External Quality Assurance**

This section outlines the arrangements we have in place to ensure the relevant documentation and assessment evidence can be provided in a timely manner for the purposes of External Quality Assurance sampling, and that staff can be made available to respond to enquiries.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the awarding organisation requirements for External Quality Assurance as set out in the JCQ Guidance.
- All student evidence on which decisions regarding the determination of grades has been retained and can be made available for review as required.
- Instances where student evidence used to decide teacher assessed grades is not available, for example where the material has previously been returned to students and cannot now be retrieved, will be clearly recorded on the appropriate documentation.
- All staff involved have been briefed on the possibility of interaction with awarding organisations during the different stages of the External Quality Assurance process and can respond promptly and fully to enquiries, including attendance at Virtual Visits should this prove necessary.
- Arrangements are 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.
- Staff have been made 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.

### **16 Results**

This section details our approach to the issue of results to students and the provision of advice and guidance.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the specific arrangements for the issue of results in Summer 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, including Welfare support, to students on receipt of their results.
- Appropriate staff will be available to respond promptly to any requests for information from awarding organisations, for example regarding missing or incomplete results, to enable such issues to be swiftly resolved.
- Parents/guardians have been made aware of arrangements for results days.

## 17 Appeals

This section details our approach to managing appeals, including Centre Reviews, and subsequent appeals to awarding organisations.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the arrangements for, and the requirements of, appeals in Summer 2021, as set out in the JCQ Guidance.
- Internal arrangements will be in place for the swift and effective handling of Centre Reviews in compliance with the requirements.
- All necessary staff have been briefed on the process for, and timing of, such reviews, and will be available to ensure their prompt and efficient handling.
- Learners have been appropriately guided as to the necessary stages of appeal.
- Arrangements will be in place for the timely submission of appeals to awarding organisations.
- Arrangements will be in place to obtain the written 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.

Before any Appeal can be instigated by the student the following information has to be collated by the student:

- The Centre Policy (published via the school website before the publication of the final grades by the awarding organisation)
- The sources of evidence used to determine their grade along with any grades/marks associated with them
- Details of any special circumstances that have been taken into account in determining their grade, e.g. access arrangements, mitigating circumstances such as illness.

The Appeals Process is outlined below, for further clarification please refer to JCQ Guidance (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/JCQ-Guidance-on-the-Determination-of-Grades-for-A-AS-Levels-and-GCSEs-Summer-2021.pdf>):

### Stage 1: Centre Review

The first stage of the process is referred to as a Centre Review (CR), which is performed by the Head of Centre or a suitable person identified by the Head of Centre. If a student does not consider that they have been issued with the correct grade, they can ask their centre to check if an administrative or procedural error has occurred.

The centre will need to ensure the student is aware that their grade could go down, up or stay the same.

If the centre finds that an error has occurred, they will be able to submit a request to the awarding organisation to correct the error and amend the grade without the need to make an appeal to the awarding organisation.

## Stage 2: Appeal to the Awarding Organisation

The second stage of the process is referred to as an appeal to the awarding organisation (submitted by the centre on the student's behalf).

An appeal should be submitted if the student considers that the centre did not follow its procedure properly, the awarding organisation has made an administrative error, or the student considers that the grade awarded was an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement. The centre will need to ensure the student is aware that their grade could go down, up or stay the same.

## Ofqual Exam Procedures Review Service

If the student or centre considers that the awarding organisation has made a procedural error, they can apply to Ofqual's Exam Procedures Review Services (EPRS) to review the process undertaken by the awarding organisation.

## Grounds for Appeal

There are four grounds upon that a centre review or an appeal to an awarding organisation may be requested:

At Stage 1: The centre made an **administrative error**, e.g. an incorrect grade was submitted; an incorrect assessment mark was used when determining the grade.

At Stages 1 and 2: The centre did not apply a **procedure correctly**, such as the centre did not follow its Centre Policy, did not undertake **internal quality assurance**, did not take account of **access arrangements** or **mitigating circumstances** such as illness.

At Stage 2: The awarding organisation made an **administrative error**, e.g. the grade was incorrectly changed by the awarding organisation during the processing of grades.

At Stage 2: The student considers that the centre made an **unreasonable exercise of academic judgement**.

A reasonable judgement is defined as one that is supported by evidence. An exercise of judgement will not be unreasonable simply because a student considers that an alternative grade should have been awarded, even if the student puts forward supporting evidence. There may be a difference of opinion without there being an unreasonable exercise of judgement. The reviewer will not remark individual assessments to make fine judgements but will take a holistic approach based on the overall evidence.