

Capital City College Group

Teacher Assessed Grades

Summer 2021 Policy

Author:	Director of Group Quality & Compliance	Approved by:	General Senior Management Team (GSMT)
Version:	V3	Date of Approval:	9 th April 2021
Equality Impact Assessed		Review Date:	8 th November 2021

Table of Contents

POLICY STATEMENT	4
PURPOSE	4
LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT	5
SCOPE	6
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	7
Head of Centre (Executive Principal)	7
Senior Leadership Team, Deputy Directors and Heads of School, Heads of Quality & Compliance	7
Teachers/ Chief Examiners/ Lead Internal Verifiers/ Curriculum Managers & Leaders/ Specialist Teachers/ SENCo	7
Examinations Officers	8
Director of Management Information Systems	8
Director of Group Quality & Compliance	8
KEY DATES	9
TRAINING, SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE	9
Training and support	9
USE OF APPROPRIATE EVIDENCE	10
Internally generated evidence	10
Additional Assessment Materials	10
Appropriateness of evidence and balance of evidence in arriving at grades	10
DETERMINING TEACHER ASSESSED GRADES	11
INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE	13
COMPARISON OF TEACHER ASSESSED GRADES TO RESULTS FOR PREVIOUS COHORTS	15
ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AND SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	17
Reasonable adjustments and mitigating circumstances (special consideration)	17
Addressing Disruption/Differentiated Lost Learning (DLL)	17
OBJECTIVITY	17
RECORDING DECISIONS AND RETENTION OF EVIDENCE AND DATA	18
AUTHENTICATING EVIDENCE	19
CONFIDENTIALITY, MALPRACTICE AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	19

Confidentiality	19
Malpractice	20
Staff malpractice	20
Student malpractice	21
Conflicts of Interest	21
PRIVATE CANDIDATES	22
External Quality Assurance	22
RESULTS	23
APPEALS	24
ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS	26
IMPLICATIONS	27

POLICY STATEMENT

This policy outlines the main Teacher Assessed Grades processes and what staff need to do. It is a generic statement of policy that needs to be applied in context to subjects, programmes and qualification types at a local curriculum level.

Curriculum leaders across CCCG will agree Teacher Assessed Grades protocols for each Awarding Organisation subject and qualification type, which specify the details needed to meet Awarding Organisation requirements and meet the needs of the learners.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is:

1. To ensure that teacher assessed grades are determined fairly, consistently, free from bias and effectively within and across departments.
2. To ensure the operation of effective processes with clear guidelines and support for staff.
3. To ensure that all staff involved in the processes clearly understand their roles and responsibilities.
4. To support teachers to take evidence-based decisions in line with Joint Council for Qualifications guidance.
5. To ensure the consideration of historical centre data in the process, and the appropriate decision making in respect of, teacher assessed grades.
6. To support a high standard of internal quality assurance in the allocation of teacher assessed grades.
7. To support our centre in meeting its obligations in relation to equality legislation.
8. 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.
9. To ensure the process for communicating to candidates and their parents/carers how they will be assessed is clear, in order to give confidence.

LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

On 4 January 2021, the Government announced that it was no longer fair for the Summer 2021 examination series for GCSE, A/AS Level, Project Qualifications and Advanced Extension Award in maths to go ahead due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. The government set out its policy that centres will be submitting students' grades in a letter dated 25 February 2021 ([*Direction from the Secretary of State for Education to Ofqual's Chief Regulator*](#)). JCQ and the awarding organisations have been working together to prepare guidance and information to support the provision of grades to students this summer by centres.

The following documents were considered in writing this Centre Teacher Assessed Grade (TAG) Policy:

- [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 February 2021 (Ofqual/21/6749/4)
- [Direction from the Secretary of State for Education to Ofqual's Chief Regulator](#), Department for Education, 25 February 2021
- [General Qualifications Alternative Awarding Framework](#), Ofqual, 24 March 2021
- [Interim Guidance for Centres Accepting Private Candidate Entries for GCSE, AS and A level qualifications in Summer 2021](#) released on 15 March 2021 has been incorporated into the section on: [Guidance for exam centres accepting Private Candidates](#).
- [JCQ-Guidance-on-the-Determination-of-Grades-for-A-AS-Levels-and-GCSEs-Summer-2021](#).
- [JCQ-Guidance-for-Students-and-Parents-on-Summer-2021](#).

SCOPE

The scope of the policy covers:

- All Capital City College Group (CCCG) staff involved in the collation of assessment evidence, determination, collation and submission of grades for all General Qualifications (GQs) and Vocational & Technical Qualifications (VTQs).
- All Capital City College Group (CCCG) students whose grades will be determined based on Teacher Assessed Grades in summer 2021.

The policy is made of the following sub-sections:

- The roles and responsibilities of personnel within the college
- Training and support for staff and students
- The use of appropriate evidence to reach grades awarded
- The awarding of teacher assessed grades based on evidence
- The internal quality assurance process
- Comparison of teacher assessed grades to results from previous cohorts
- Access arrangements and special considerations
- Addressing disruption/differential lost learning (DLL)
- Objectivity
- Recording decisions and retention of evidence and data
- Authenticating evidence
- Confidentiality, malpractice and conflicts of interest
- External Quality Assurance
- Results
- Appeals

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Head of Centre (Executive Principal)

- The Head of Centre, (Executive Principal), will be responsible for approving our policy for determining teacher assessed grades.
- Our Head of Centre has overall responsibility for Capital City College Group 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 the 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, Deputy Directors and Heads of School, Heads of Quality & Compliance

- Our Group Leadership Team (GTL), The Senior Management Team (SMT), Deputy Directors, Heads of Schools and Heads of Quality & Compliance 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 departments 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 department 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 ([Appendix 1](#)).
 - Ensure teachers have the information required to make accurate and fair judgments.
 - Ensure that a Head of Department Checklist is completed for each qualification that they are submitting ([Appendix 10](#)).
 - Ensure that students and their parents/guardians are aware of the assessment process ([Appendix 11](#)).

Teachers/ Chief Examiners/ Lead Internal Verifiers/ Curriculum Managers & Leaders/ Specialist Teachers/ SENCo

- Our teachers, chief examiners, lead internal verifiers, curriculum managers/leaders, 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 ([Appendix 1](#)) and accompanying guidance.
- 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 ([Appendix 2](#)).
- Any necessary variations for individual students will also be recorded ([Appendix 3](#)).
- Securely store and be able to retrieve sufficient evidence to justify their decisions.

Examinations Officers

- Our Examinations Officers will:
 - Ensure that all learners are registered with the awarding organisations in line with JCQ and awarding organisation requirements.
 - Be responsible for putting mitigating plans in place for all staff who declare a conflict of interest
 - Be responsible for the administration of our final teacher assessed grades and for managing the post-results services.

Director of Management Information Systems

- Our Director of Management Information will:
 - Be responsible for the provision and quality checks of previous performance data
 - Support the Head of Centre by providing Teacher Assessed Grade performance data for different groups of students and comparing them with previous performances.

Director of Group Quality & Compliance

- Our Director of Group Quality & Compliance will:
 - Support the Head of Centre with their roles and responsibilities
 - Manage the Appeals Process

KEY DATES

22 nd March to 22 nd April 2021	Entry amendment window opens for Centres
22 nd March to 1 st April 2021	Teachers identify topics covered and assessment evidence to support grading decisions
26 th April to 4 th May 2021	Staff Training on Teacher Assessed Grades
5 th May to 21 st May 2021	Assessment window using additional support materials
26 th May – 18 th June 2021	Internal moderation of grades awarded and window for TAG submissions on Awarding Organisation portals
18 th June 2021	Deadline for grade submission
18 th June to 16 th July 2021	External Quality Assurance by Awarding Organisations
10 th August 2021	A level results day
12 th August 2021	GCSE results day
10 th Aug. to 7 th Sept. 2021	Priority Appeals window
10 th Aug. to end of Oct 2021	Non-priority Appeals window

TRAINING, SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE

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

Training and support

- Teachers and managers involved in determining grades in our centre will attend training to help achieve consistency and fairness to all students.
- Teachers and managers will engage fully with all training and support that has been provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications and the awarding organisations.
- We will provide mentoring from experienced teachers to newly qualified teachers (NQTs) and teachers less familiar with assessment. Mentoring will also be provided for less experienced managers less familiar with assessment.
- We will put in place additional internal reviews of teacher assessed grades for NQTs and other teachers as appropriate.

USE OF APPROPRIATE EVIDENCE

Internally generated evidence

- Teachers making judgements will have regard for the Ofqual Head of Centre guidance on recommended evidence, and further guidance provided by awarding organisations.
- 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. Where the actual student work is not available, we shall present the assessment tasks, mark scheme and scores to the Awarding Organisations.
- We will be using student work produced in response to assessment materials provided by our awarding organisation(s), including groups of questions, past papers or similar materials such as practice or sample papers.
- We will use non-exam assessment work (often referred to as coursework), even if this has not been fully completed.
- We will use 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.
- We will use substantial class or homework (including work that took place during remote learning).
- We will use internal tests and mock examinations taken by students over the course of study.
- We will use records of a student's capability and performance over the course of study in performance-based subjects such as music, drama and PE.

Additional Assessment Materials

- We will use additional assessment materials to 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.
- We will use additional assessment materials to give students an opportunity to show improvement, for example, to validate or replace an existing piece of evidence.
- We will use additional assessment materials to support consistency of judgement between teachers or classes by giving everyone in the same cohort the same task to complete.
- We will combine and/or remove elements of questions where, for example, a multi-part question includes a part which focuses on an element of the specification that hasn't been taught.

Appropriateness of evidence and balance of evidence in arriving at grades

- 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 college.
- 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.

DETERMINING TEACHER ASSESSED GRADES

This section of our policy outlines the approach our centre will take to awarding teacher assessed grades.

- 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. They will:
- **Consider and identify what they have taught** the students (this may vary by teacher, by cohort and by centre/campus) and base their assessments and grades on topics taught (See [Appendix 2](#))
 - All students will be informed of the evidence that will be used to reach their grades by their teachers.
 - All students will receive information about the additional assessment materials that will be used to reach the grade awarded from their teacher.
- **Collect the evidence of the student performance**, potentially collected over the course of study, to make a holistic judgement of each student's performance on a range of evidence relating to the qualification's specification content they have been taught (See [Appendix 2](#))
 - All students will receive the scores (or grades) they achieved for each piece of evidence used to reach their final grade from their teacher.
 - All evidence used to reach a grade must be retained and stored securely and made available as part of the quality assurance and/or appeals process.
- **Evaluate the quality of the evidence** used to reach the grade awarded. Consideration should be given to the coverage of assessment objectives, content coverage, authenticity of evidence, levels of control and marking.
 - The final grade awarded to the students will remain confidential and must not be shared with the students.
 - Our teachers will record how the evidence was used to arrive at a fair and objective grade, which is free from bias.
 - Our teachers will produce an Assessment Record for each subject cohort and will share this with their Chief Examiner, Lead Internal Verifier and Assistant Principal ([Appendix 2](#)).

- **Establish whether the proposed range of evidence is appropriate for all students** in a class or cohort. Students must be told what evidence is going to be used, so that they have the opportunity to raise any genuine and valid concerns. It is recommended that any student's views are recorded and documented along with reasons for the final decision.
 - Some students may have missed a section of teaching due to valid reasons such as bereavement or long-term illness, or it may be the case that reasonable adjustments or access arrangements weren't in place for a particular assessment. Where such adjustments/arrangements weren't in place, teachers must consider whether to either:
 - i. use the evidence when assigning a grade on the basis that it is the most appropriate evidence available, and disregarding it would disadvantage the student – if this is the case, the impact must be accounted for at stage 5 (see below), and the rationale recorded; or
 - ii. use alternative evidence to replace assessments that are not appropriately representative of individual students' performance and if so, document decisions appropriately.
 - Any necessary variations for individual students will also be shared ([Appendix 3](#)).

- **Assign a grade based on a holistic, objective judgement** of the evidence of students' performance on the subject content taught. Consider the quality of the work in relation to the assessment materials used as well as the grade descriptors and grading exemplification available to help reach a final grade.
 - Decisions about potential must not factor in the students grades. Further guidance on marking holistic grading decisions is provided in [Appendix 4](#) and Appendix 8 to assist teachers making grading decisions.
 - For tiered GCSEs, your grade must reflect the tier of entry.
 - Reasonable adjustments for disabled students and access arrangements should have been in place when evidence was generated. Where they were not, centres should consider using other evidence or take it into account when coming to their judgement. Where appropriate, this should include input from relevant specialist teachers and other professionals and it must be appropriately recorded/documentated.

 - **Grade descriptors** are general statements that give a high-level reflection of student performance characteristics. They are based on the assessment objectives for the relevant specification. Assessment objectives are found in the relevant subject specification. The grade descriptors apply to all awarding organisations (See [Appendix 5](#) & [Appendix 6](#)).

 - The **grading exemplification** uses student responses from historical examination scripts (and other sources) to illustrate midgrade performance in previous summer series in which exams took place. The exemplification gives examples of the standards you will use to make grading judgements. Each awarding organisation has created grading exemplification specific for each specification and it should be used to reflect the specification a teacher has taught (see relevant awarding organisation and subject specific portal for details).

- The evidence used to reach a grade will need to be internally moderated by another subject specialist teacher and the chief examiner/lead internal verifier (who must be a subject specialist) using the relevant document ([Appendix 15](#)).
- The Head of Department checklist will need to be completed and signed ([Appendix 10](#)).

INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

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

- All teachers involved in deriving teacher assessed grades will read and understand this CCCG Teacher Assessed Grade 2021 Policy document.
- In subjects where there is more than one teacher and/or class in the department, we will ensure that our centre carries out an internal standardisation process. The relevant Assistant Principal will provide details of the teacher, internal moderator, the chief examiner, lead internal verifier and the relevant manager.
- 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 by the curriculum leader who will work with the Director of Group Quality and Compliance to find an internal moderator from another Centre or College.
- The following documents will be used as part of the internal quality assurance process:
 - **AR2 – Additional Assessment Quality Assurance for GQs:** This will be used to internally moderate each additional assessment using the awarding organisation support materials ([Appendix 14](#)).
 - **AR3 – Overall Grade Quality Assurance for GQs:** This will be used to internally moderate the overall grades awarded to students based on the assessment evidence used to reach the grade ([Appendix 15](#)).
- All teachers and internal moderators 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
- The Assessment Record will form the basis of internal standardisation and discussions across teachers 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 organisation(s).
- We will conduct internal standardisation across all grades.

- As a rule of thumb, a minimum of 10% or 3 students (whichever one is highest) randomly selected by the chief examiner/lead internal verifier for **each grade** (A* - U for A levels, 9-1 for GCSES and Distinction/Merit/Pass for VTQs where applicable) will be presented for internal moderation for each subject and teacher at each centre/campus (AR3 forms to be completed for each sampled student – [Appendix 15](#)).
 - For NQT's or teachers new to assessment a 100% sample and grade verification will be carried out
 - Where internal standardisation identifies teacher grades which are inaccurate (overly lenient, harsh or where the evidence does not support the grade) 100% of the teachers cohort will be subjected to internal standardisation.
 - Malpractice investigations will be carried out in all cases where intentional, negligent or accidental malpractice is suspected and based on the JCQ guidelines.
- All the final grades will be collated on ProMonitor using a secure page that is not accessible to students. The teacher (assessor), moderator/lead internal verifier/chief examiner will be involved in presenting the grades.
 - Where appropriate, individual grade decisions will be amended by the Chief Examiner to ensure alignment with the standards as outlined by the awarding organisation(s).
 - The final grades submitted will be those presented by the Chief Examiner. The Chief Examiner will take full responsibility for their accuracy and validity.
 - In respect of equality legislation, consideration will be given to the range of evidence for students of different protected characteristics that are included in our internal standardisation.

COMPARISON OF TEACHER ASSESSED GRADES TO RESULTS FOR PREVIOUS COHORTS

This section of our policy 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 Director of MIS will compile information on the grades awarded to our students in past June series in which exams took place (e.g. 2017 - 2019) and cross reference it with the Awarding Organisation data. Any variations will be shared with the awarding organisation.
- The Chief Examiner/Lead Internal Verifier and relevant Assistant Principal will consider the size of our cohort from year to year, the stability of our centre's overall grade outcomes from year to year and both subject and centre level variation in our outcomes during the internal quality assurance process.
- The Chief Examiner/Lead Internal Verifier and relevant Assistant Principal will prepare a succinct narrative on the outcomes of the review against historic data which, in the event of significant divergence from the qualifications-levels profiles attained in previous examined years, which address the reasons for this divergence. This commentary will be available for subsequent review during the QA process.
- In the event that our initial teacher assessed grades for a qualification are viewed as overly lenient or harsh compared to results in previous years we shall take the following approach to review the grades:
 1. The Director of MIS will 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.
 2. The Chief Examiner/Lead Internal Verifier and relevant Assistant Principal will bring together other data sources that will help to quality assure the grades we intend to award in 2021.
 3. The relevant Assistant Principals will present circumstances such as new teachers on the course, a change of curriculum delivery and assessments, a change in qualifications on entry and average point scores and specific class or cohort profiles which may have affected the overall results.
 4. The Director of Group Quality and Compliance and the Head of Centre will review the evidence below to determine if further moderation is to be carried out by the Chief Examiner supported by the relevant Assistant Principal.
 - The Chief Examiners commentary and rationale explaining the variation accompanied by the relevant internal moderation and quality assurance documents.
 - The relevant Assistant Principal's commentary about the factors which may

have affected the overall results.

5. Grade amendments will not be made based on previous centre performance. **At all times it is the evidence of students' work that will form the basis for each student's grade.**

ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AND SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

Reasonable adjustments and mitigating circumstances (special consideration)

- Where students have agreed access arrangements or reasonable adjustments (for example a reader or scribe) we will make every effort to ensure that these arrangements are in place when the May 2021 assessments are being taken.
- Where an assessment has taken place without an agreed reasonable adjustment or access arrangement, we will remove that assessment from the basket of evidence and 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, we will take account of this when making judgements and back it up with the Assessment Record.
- We will record, as part of the Assessment Record, how we have incorporated any necessary variations to take account of the impact of illness or personal circumstances on the performance of individual students in assessments ([Appendix 3](#)).
- To ensure consistency in the application of Special Consideration, we will ensure all teachers have read and understood the document: [JCQ – A guide to the special consideration process, with effect from 1 September 2020](#) ([Appendix 7](#))

Addressing Disruption/Differentiated Lost Learning (DLL)

This section of our policy 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. [Appendix 2](#) and [Appendix 3](#) will be used as evidence to address disruption/differentiated lost learning (DLL).
- The Head of Centre will confirm that the students have been taught sufficient content to form the basis for a grade.

OBJECTIVITY

This section of our policy outlines the arrangements in place to ensure objectivity of decisions.

- Staff will fulfil their duties and responsibilities in relation to relevant equality and disability legislation and in line with Ofqual's guide on making objective judgements ([Appendix 8](#)).
- Senior Leaders, Curriculum Leaders and the Head of Centre 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
 - hidden forms of bias
 - bias in teacher assessed grades.
- To ensure objectivity, all staff involved in determining teacher assessed grades will be made aware through training 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
- Our internal standardisation process will help to ensure that there are different perspectives to the quality assurance process.

RECORDING DECISIONS AND RETENTION OF EVIDENCE AND DATA

This section of our policy outlines our arrangements to recording decisions and to retaining evidence and data.

- Teachers, Chief Examiners, managers and relevant Assistant Principals will maintain records that show how the teacher assessed grades process operated, including the rationale for decisions in relation to individual marks/grades.
- Evidence will be retained and 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 will be put in place to ensure the accurate and secure retention of the evidence used to make decisions.
- All staff will comply with our obligations regarding data protection legislation.
- The grades will accurately reflect the evidence submitted.
- All evidence used to reach a grade will be retained electronically or on paper in a secure centre-based system that can be readily shared with our awarding organisation(s).

AUTHENTICATING EVIDENCE

This section of our 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 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. These will include:
 - Ensuring that work presented as evidence was consistent for all students in that subject class or cohort.
 - Ensuring that all controlled assessments during remote education was supervised using the relevant technology.
 - The evidence provided is in line with the awarding organisation for the particular subject
 - Teachers must identify the level of authenticity assurance given for each piece of evidence used to inform the grade decision;
 - High- exam room conditions were used in production of evidence
 - Medium- evidence production was supervised by the teacher
 - Low- evidence was produced by the learner unsupervised
 - Where a teacher uses evidence in the Low authenticity assurance category an additional authenticity validation statement is required by the teacher to verify the evidence is in keeping with the expected performance of the learner in comparison to the High and Medium category evidence ([Appendix 2](#)).
- It is understood that awarding organisations will investigate instances where it appears evidence is not authentic. The Centre will follow all guidance provided by awarding organisations to support these determinations of authenticity.

CONFIDENTIALITY, MALPRACTICE AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Confidentiality

This section of our policy 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 will be made aware of the need to maintain the confidentiality of teacher assessed grades.
- All teaching staff will be 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, will be shared with students and their parents/guardians (where appropriate).

Malpractice

Staff malpractice

This section of our policy outlines the measures in place to prevent malpractice and other breaches of exam regulations, and to deal with such cases if they occur.

- Our general centre policies regarding malpractice, maladministration and conflicts of interest have been reviewed to ensure they address the specific challenges of delivery in Summer 2021.
- All staff involved will be made aware of these policies, and will receive refresher training on them as necessary.
- All staff involved will be informed of the specific types of malpractice which may affect the Summer 2021 series including:
 - 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.
 - A teacher intentionally submitting inflated grades.
 - A teachers 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 teacher's 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.
- The consequences of malpractice or maladministration as published in the JCQ guidance: **JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** ([Appendix 16](#)) and including 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.

Student malpractice

- It is possible that some students may attempt to influence their teachers' judgements about their grades.
 - Students might attempt to gain an unfair advantage during the centre's process by, for example, submitting fabricated evidence or plagiarised work. Such incidents would constitute malpractice and teachers are required to report these to the Chief Examiner.
 - 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 teachers. The awarding organisations anticipate that the majority of such instances will be dealt with by the centre internally – in such cases, the Chief Examiner is required to retain clear and reliable records of the circumstances and the steps taken, and that students are made aware of the outcome.
- However, if a student continues to inappropriately attempt to pressure centre staff then please inform the Director of Group Quality & Compliance who will report to the relevant awarding organisation using the JCQ M1 form ([Appendix 12](#)). The awarding organisations will contact the centre if we receive credible allegations that such pressure has been applied in order that appropriate steps can be taken.
- In all the scenarios listed above, as well as any others that have not been explicitly identified here, the **JCQ Suspected malpractice Policies and Procedures 2020-2021** ([Appendix 16](#)) continues to apply.

Conflicts of Interest

This section of our 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 must declare any conflict of interest such as relationships with students to our Head of Centre for further consideration.
 - All staff are required to complete the online declaration of conflict of interest form.
 - All conflicts of interest declared are passed onto the Head of Exams
- The Head of Exams supported by 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](#) ([Appendix 9](#))

- We will also carefully consider the need to separate duties and personnel to ensure fairness in later process reviews and appeals.

PRIVATE CANDIDATES

- Our Centre shall not accept private candidates and so no measures are needed at arriving at their grades.

External Quality Assurance

This section of our 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 participate in the 3 stages of the external quality assurance process:
 - **Centre Policy Review:** This involves submitting the Centre Policy for awarding grades in 2021 to the relevant awarding organisations. This is then reviewed and either '**accepted**' or there is a follow up by the awarding organisation to update the policy.
 - **Virtual Centre Visits:** Where the Centre Policy suggests that further support and guidance may be required, centres will be contacted to arrange a virtual centre visit by the awarding organisation. These visits will take place in May and June. The visits will be conducted virtually. They are likely to be held via Microsoft Teams or Zoom, and details will be confirmed at a later date.
 - **Post-submission sampling:** The final stage of the quality assurance process is to confirm that centres have implemented what was in their submitted policies and that their submitted grades reflect this. The sampling process will provide confidence that the grades awarded by awarding organisations across the system command assurance. The sampling process will take place following the submission of grades by centres. **Targeted sampling** (informed by the outcomes of Stage 1; Stage 2 policy review checks, where a centre's overall results profile for this year's cohort appears to diverge significantly compared to the profiles for cohorts from previous years when exams have taken place; and centres where awarding organisations had concerns about their policy) and in addition, **random sampling** will ensure appropriate subject/qualification, geographical and centre-type coverage by the awarding organisations.
- All staff involved have been made aware of the awarding organisation requirements for External Quality Assurance as set out in the **JCQ Guidance** ([Appendix 1](#)).
- All necessary records of decision-making in relation to determining grades have been properly kept and can be made available for review as required.
- 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 will be 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.

RESULTS

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

- All staff involved will be made aware of the specific arrangements for the issue of results in Summer 2021, including the issuing of A/AS and GCSE results in the same week.
- 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 pastoral support, to students on receipt of their results.
- Such guidance will include advice on the appeals process in place in 2021 (see below).
- 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.
- Students and Parents/guardians have been made aware of arrangements for results days.
- The results will be released earlier this summer:
 - A level results day/Level 3 VTQs 10th August 2021
 - GCSE results day/Level 2 VTQs 12th August 2021

APPEALS

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

- 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** ([Appendix 1](#)). There are 2 stages of the appeals process - The Centre Review (stage 1) and the Appeals to the Awarding Organisation (stage 2). Either the Centre or the student can apply to Ofqual's Exam Procedures Review Services (EPRS) to review the process undertaken by the awarding organisation in the event that a procedural error is made by the Awarding Organisation.
- The following ground of appeal will be considered:
 - 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 in the choice of evidence from which to determine the grade and/or the determination of the grade from that evidence.
- 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 will be appropriately guided as to the necessary stages of 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.
- The schedule for Priority appeals (university places depend on them) is provided below:
 - 10 August to 7 September: priority appeals window
 - 10 August to 16 August: student requests centre review
 - 10 August to 20 August: centre conducts centre review
 - 11 August to 23 August: centre submits appeal to awarding organisation

- The schedule for non-priority appeals is provided below:
 - 10 August to end October: majority of non-priority appeals take place
 - 10 August to 3 September: student requests centre review
 - 10 August to 10 September: centre conducts centre review
 - 11 August to 17 September: centre submits appeal to awarding organisation
- 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 ([Appendix 11](#)).

ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS

This section of our policy lists all the documents that have a bearing on the policy and may be a useful reference material for users of the policy.

- [JCQ-Guidance-on-the-Determination-of-Grades-for-A-AS-Levels-and-GCSEs-Summer-2021.](#)
- [JCQ-Guidance-for-Students-and-Parents-on-Summer-2021.](#)
- [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 February 2021 (Ofqual/21/6749/4)
- [Direction from the Secretary of State for Education to Ofqual's Chief Regulator](#), Department for Education, 25 February 2021
- [General Qualifications Alternative Awarding Framework](#), Ofqual, 24 March 2021
- [Interim Guidance for Centres Accepting Private Candidate Entries for GCSE, AS and A level qualifications in Summer 2021](#) released on 15 March 2021 has been incorporated into the section on: [Guidance for exam centres accepting Private Candidates.](#)
- JCQ Guidance Assessment Record Template Summer 2021
- JCQ Guidance Head of Department Checklist
- [JCQ Guidance Worked Examples](#)
- [JCQ Grade Descriptors for A & AS Levels](#)
- [JCQ Grade Descriptors for GCSE](#)
- [JCQ Guidance on Retention of Evidence](#)
- [JCQ Guide to the Special Consideration Process 202021](#)
- [General Regulations for Approved Centres 202021](#)
- [CCCG Assessment Malpractice and maladministration Policy](#)
- [CCCG Assessment Academic Appeals Policy](#)
- [CCCG Assessment Policy](#)
- [CCCG Assessment Review Policy](#)

IMPLICATIONS

Failure to follow this policy will result in the following:

- Incidences of malpractice and maladministration with its associated consequences
- Student and Parent complaints and appeals
- Reputational damage with will affect student recruitment and potential income