



# **The Brittons Academy**

## **The Brittons Academy Policy for Determining Teacher Assessed Grades; Summer 2021**

**Approved: April 2021**

**Next Review Date: March 2022**

**Reviewed By: Principal**

## Background

Every centre is required to create a Centre Policy that reflects its individual circumstances for the Determining of Teacher Assessed Grades, summer 2021. The ELAT Trust is working collaboratively across its three secondary school members to ensure thorough scrutiny and moderation of assessments and fair and accurate Teacher Assessed Grades. The Trust has based its policy around the JCQ template but with the appropriate adaptations for each individual school. This policy fully takes account of the [JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for summer 2021](#).

## Statement of Intent

The purpose of this policy is:

- 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 in making 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 to give them confidence in the fairness of the processes used.

## Roles and Responsibilities

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the personnel in our centre who have specific roles and responsibilities in the process of determining teacher assessed grades this year.

### Head of Centre

- Our Head of Centre, Will Thompson, will be responsible for approving our policy for determining teacher assessed grades.
- Our Head of Centre has overall responsibility for The Brittons Academy as an examinations centre and will ensure that clear roles and responsibilities of all staff are defined.
- Our 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.
- Our 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 Heads of Faculty/Department

Our Senior Leadership Team and Heads of Departments 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 on 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.

- Ensure that a Head of Subject Checklist – Appendix 1 is completed for each qualification that they are submitting.
- Ensure that all Teacher Assessed Grades are checked and signed off internally by two subject experts before submission. Where there is only one subject expert within a department, the second signature will be given by either the head of a closely related subject or the head of centre.
- Engage with all training provided by their relevant awarding organisation and support staff within their department(s) to share this information.

### **Teachers/SENCo**

Our 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 a 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 GCSE Grading Evidence Record - Appendix 2 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 on the Individual Variation Record – Appendix 3.
- Securely store and be able to retrieve sufficient evidence to justify their decisions until after any possible appeals.
- Engage fully with all training provided by the Academy and by their relevant awarding organisation.
- The SENCo will disseminate information relating to access arrangements for all students and will support teachers to ensure that all students receive the arrangements to which they are entitled.

### **Head of Examinations and Exams Officer**

Our Head of Examinations, Sally Pearson, and Exams Officer, Martine Purton, will be responsible for the administration of our final teacher assessed grades and for managing the post-results services, with support from all members of the Senior Leadership Team.

### **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 will attend any centre-based training to help achieve consistency and fairness to all students and have Trust wide INSET dedicated to moderation.
- All staff will be provided with training designed to help them identify and protect against sources of bias within the marking process.
- Heads of department will be provided with training on how to moderate and check marking standards effectively and will be directed to complete all training provided by the relevant awarding organisation and share this information with their staff.
- Five hours of after school meeting time and one afternoon of INSET time have been provided for the purposes of moderation, assessment development, training and standardisation. In addition, teachers in core departments have an hour per week of protected time to dedicate to assessment, marking and moderation activities.
- At least 50% of assessments administered since March 2021 will be either blind marked using candidate numbers instead of names, or marked by a subject specialist that is **not** the student’s class teacher.
- Teachers will engage fully with all training and support that has been provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications and the awarding organisations.

## **Support for Newly Qualified Teachers and teachers less familiar with assessment**

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

- We will provide mentoring from experienced teachers to NQTs and teachers 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**

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 individual 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.
- Subjects will use student work produced in response to assessment materials provided by our awarding organisations that assess the GCSE course content that has been taught, in line with awarding organisation specifications. Assessments will include groups of questions, past papers or similar materials such as exam board material produced for this year, practice or sample papers; each subject has set out the evidence they are using in the GCSE Grading Evidence Record Template - Appendix 2.
- We will use non-exam assessment work, NEA, 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 taken by pupils.
- We will use mock exams taken 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 sport.

## **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 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.

**Our centre will ensure the appropriateness of evidence and balance of evidence in arriving at grades in the following ways:**

- 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 or 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 Centre Policy outlines the approach 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.
- Our teachers will record how the evidence was used to arrive at a fair and objective grade, which is free from bias - see Appendix 4
- Our departments will produce an GCSE Grading Evidence Record – Appendix 2 for each subject cohort and will share this with the Assistant Principal in charge of Assessment (Sally Pearson). Any necessary variations for individual students due to access arrangements and special considerations will also be recorded by teachers on the Individual Variation Record – Appendix 3.

## **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.

### ***Head of Centre Internal Quality Assurance and Declaration***

## **Internal Quality Assurance**

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

- We will ensure that all teachers involved in deriving teacher assessed grades read and understand this Centre 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.
- We will ensure that all teachers 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
- We will conduct internal standardisation across all grades following normal school moderation procedures and in addition, in Trust wide moderation, between the three secondary schools of the ELAT Trust; the process for which is outlined below in the section **ELAT Trust Moderation**.
- We will ensure that the GCSE Grading Evidence Record forms 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 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 their SLT line manager or an appropriately experienced member of staff from the within the Trust.
- 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. More detailed guidance to those making assessments is set out in the document Unconscious Bias - Appendix 4.

## **ELAT Trust Moderation**

The timeline for this process is set in in the ELAT Grading and Moderation Timeline – Appendix 5

### **Key Principles:**

- No student or school will be disadvantaged by the approach
- Teachers know their students well and are trusted to use their professional judgement
- We will grade the student holistically, not pieces of work individually.
- The key question is: Does the work gathered provide the evidence to support the student's awarded grade?

### **In school moderation and standardisation:**

- Supports and assures teachers about the accuracy and validity of their professional judgement, as well as giving guidance to those who are less experienced and need further support.
- Provides space for professional discussion across the department.
- Provides a mechanism for checking objectively for conscious and unconscious bias.
- Is used at each Evidence Gathering point in order to review the work of a sample of students and will be regular and led by the HoD.
- Involves professional discussion about the strength of the evidence that has been gathered to date of a sample student with a focus on borderline work.
- Includes recorded marks, changes, discussions in one coherent document.
- Identifies additional sources of evidence that are necessary to secure a judgement, where appropriate.
- Provides support or assurance for teachers about their overall judgements.
- Uses exam board materials and training to support the allocation of grades and consistent application of mark schemes.
- Ensures there is sufficient curriculum coverage to feel confident in making a judgement.

### **Trust moderation:**

- Will support Heads of Department to award grades with confidence, depending on need.
- Provides a mechanism for checking objectively for conscious and unconscious bias.
- Will be chaired by ELAT Subject Chairs.
- Will be recorded on a set pro-forma – Appendix 6.

### **Before the Meeting**

- Evidence gathering will have already taken place in departments.
- Folders of work\* will have already been standardised across departments.
- Moderation meetings will take place in a 'host school' or virtually using Microsoft Teams by 21<sup>st</sup> May 2021.
- Heads of Department will agree to moderate boundary folders (4/5, 5/6, 7/8 or P/M/D) or to bring samples of their top/ middle/ bottom five folders of work.

*\*Please note – the 'folder' may well include marks and the assessments from historic assignments/exams for which the work is no longer readily available, as explained in the JCQ guidance.*

### **During the Meeting**

- Those hosting the meetings are there to facilitate discussion, not push others down one particular line of assessment.
- Optional second meeting to be agreed to review samples (with a narrow focus) if marks cannot be agreed, which needs to be completed by 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021.

### **After the Meeting**

- Any major concerns or inconsistencies to be flagged by the Chair to the Headteachers who will provide additional internal support.
- The Trust Moderation Record Template will be completed at moderation meetings – Appendix 6

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

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

- We will compile information on the grades awarded to our students in past June series in which exams took place (e.g. 2017 - 2019) both at a subject and overall cohort level.
- We will consider the size of our cohort from year to year.
- We will consider the stability of our centre's overall grade outcomes from year to year.
- We will consider both subject and centre level variation in our outcomes during the internal quality assurance process.
- We 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, will address the reasons for this divergence. This commentary will be available for subsequent review during the QA process.

If our initial teacher assessed grades for a qualification are viewed as overly lenient or harsh compared to results in previous years;

- We 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 at key points.
- We will bring together other data sources that will help to quality assure the grades we intend to award in 2021. We will omit subjects that we no longer offer from the historical data to reflect changes in our entry profiles that need to be considered in comparisons.

This section gives details of changes in our cohorts that need to be reflected in our comparisons.

- We will omit subjects that we no longer offer from the historical data.
- As the size of our overall cohort has reduced in the last few years, percentages will be used for comparisons.

### **Access Arrangements and Special Considerations**

This section of our Centre 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 assessments are being taken.
- The SENCo will disseminate all relevant information on agreed access arrangements for students and will support teachers to ensure that students receive all of the access arrangements to which they are entitled.
- 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 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.
- 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.
- 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](#)
- Where individual alterations are made in assessing a grade because of Access Arrangements or Special Considerations the teacher and Head of Department, in consultation with the Exams Officer and SENDCo (Laurie Cossey-Atkins), will complete an Individual Variation Record – Appendix 3

#### **Addressing Disruption/Differentiated Lost Learning (DLL)**

- Teacher assessed grades will be determined based on evidence of the content that has been taught and assessed for each student.

### **Objectivity**

This section of our Centre 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.

#### **Senior Leaders, Heads of Department and 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 and hidden forms of bias; and 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. Our internal standardisation process, alongside training sessions, 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 Centre Policy outlines our arrangements to recording decisions and to retaining evidence and data.

- We will ensure that teachers and Heads of Departments maintain records that show how the teacher assessed grades process operated, including the rationale for decisions in relation to individual marks/grades. Marks will be stored in Go4Schools Marksheets to ensure security and enable access to Senior Leaders and Heads of Department for the purposes of checking and to facilitate the appeals process.
- We will 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.
- We will put in place recording requirements for the various stages of the process to ensure the accurate and secure retention of the evidence used to make decisions.
- Any assessed work completed after 24<sup>th</sup> March 2021 will be retained as paper copies until such time as the appeals process has been concluded.
- We will comply with our obligations regarding data protection legislation.
- We will ensure that the grades accurately reflect the evidence submitted.
- We will ensure that evidence is retained electronically or on paper in a secure centre-based system that can be readily shared with our awarding organisation(s). Paper evidence will be stored centrally and securely.

### **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.

Robust mechanisms will be in place to ensure that teachers are confident 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. All assessments will be monitored in timetabled sessions by staff and will be undertaken within the school premises under exam style conditions.

- If a pupil is unable to attend, they will take the assessment at home and this assessment will be compared to other work done under supervision in school to ensure it is commensurate with that. Parents/carers will be asked to confirm in writing that the work was completed by the pupil unaided and without any access to notes, revision materials, books or the internet.
- It is understood that awarding organisations will investigate instances where it appears evidence is not authentic. We 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 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.
- 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.

#### **Malpractice**

This section of our Centre Policy details the measures in place in our centre to prevent malpractice 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 have been reviewed to ensure they address the specific challenges of delivery in Summer 2021.
- All staff involved have been made aware of these policies, and have received training in them as necessary.
- 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; and
  - failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and teacher assessed grades.

The consequences of malpractice or maladministration as published in the JCQ guidance: [JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures](#) 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.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the measures in place to address potential 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 our Head of Centre for further consideration.
- 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 need if to separate duties and personnel to ensure fairness in later process reviews and appeals.

### **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.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the awarding organisation requirements for External Quality Assurance as set out in the [JCQ Guidance](#).
- 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 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.

## 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.

- All staff involved have been 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.
- 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.

- 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](#). Pages 19 – 22, 33 and 41 - 42
- Internal arrangements are in place for the swift, effective handling of Centre Reviews in compliance with the requirements via the Head of Exams, in the first instance, who can be reached on [spearson@elatschools.co.uk](mailto:spearson@elatschools.co.uk). They will seek support from any necessary parties/subject experts or refer to the documentation pre-prepared by Heads of Subject as required.
- 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.
- Students 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, including any priority appeals, for example those on which university places depend.
- 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 through direct email and the school website before 30<sup>th</sup> June.

## Appendix 1

### The Brittons Academy HOD Checklist & Declaration

**Subject:**

**Course Code:**

**Awarding Organisation:**

The HOD must complete the following checklist/declaration before submitting subject outcomes for internal standardisation.

<b>Declaration</b>	<b>Y/N</b>
1. Students' grades have been determined using only the evidence detailed in the subject's GCSE Grading Evidence Record, including any variations for individual students.	
2. Where applicable, the students were given their approved access arrangements whilst producing the evidence contributing to the final grade and the access arrangements have been documented in the Individual Variation Record.	
3. Where applicable, mitigating circumstances (special consideration) that affected candidates in producing evidence that contributed to their grade was taken into account in determining candidates' grades according to the document <i>JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for summer 2021</i> , and this has been documented in the Individual Variation Record.	
4. The evidence has been authenticated as the candidates' own work.	
5. Where applicable, evidence from other centres has been taken into account (e.g. when a student has moved schools or is dual registered).	
6. The grades for this year's cohort have been compared to cohorts from previous years when exams have taken place (2019, 2018 and 2017). Significant deviations are explained below.	
7. At departmental level, we determined which evidence was considered and the relative merits of each to be consistently applied across all candidates, where appropriate, by all teachers.	
8. At departmental level, the teaching team have considered the various sources of potential evidence against the criteria (including consistency of marking for historic assessments).	
9. A review has been completed in line with the centre policy for teacher assessed grades. Records have been retained detailing all staff involved in the process, work reviewed, judgements and any adjustments made at a Department level. These records are readily available.	
10. Consideration has been given to ensure decisions made are free from bias and aligned to appropriate equality and discrimination legislation.	
11. The teacher assessed grades for this subject have been signed off as being accurate by the Head of Department and one other teacher within the department.	

**Provide detail and justification where you have indicated N to any of the above:**

**Head of Department Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Second Teacher Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix 2**

**GCSE Grading Evidence Record**

Subject:	HOD:	Date:
Class(es):		

<b>Name of Evidence:</b>	<b>Type of evidence and format:</b>	<b>Result Format:</b>	<b>Date completed:</b>	<b>AOs Covered</b>	<b>Validity:</b>	<b>Moderation:</b>	<b>Pupils not included:</b>
<i>What name would students know this as? For example, Y10 mock, WW1 essay, NEA for unit 1, graphs topic test, etc</i>	<i>For example, mock exam, unit test result recorded on Go4Schools, exam questions, essay, NEA task, etc. <b>Please specify if paper copy or recorded result.</b></i>	<i>This could be a percentage, an exam grade or a total mark. If a total mark, please specify what the total possible mark was.</i>	<i>The date or date range for when the assessment was completed or will be completed if in the future.</i>	<i>Which assessment objectives are/were covered by this assessment</i>	<i>Why is this a valid assessment to use as evidence? For example, completed under exam conditions, marked against exam board criteria, use of exam questions etc.</i>	<i>How was this assessment moderated? E.g. marking discussed in department time, sample taken for moderation etc.</i>	<i>List pupils who are not included in this evidence due to absence/special circumstances</i>

**Overall Grade Formulation**

Please explain below how the final grade will be formulated for each student.

--

**Rationale**

If an assessment Objective has been omitted for the cohort please outline below why this decision was taken
---

Please outline below the rationale for the choice of assessment evidence used. Why the evidence was used and how it supported the grading process.
--

Please list all the staff who were involved in the assessment and grading process and what their role was (teaching, marking, moderating, adjusting).
---

**Head of Department Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Second Teacher Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Appendix 3

#### Individual Variation Record

To be completed by the class teacher in conjunction with the HOD for each student where a variation from the Assessment Evidence Grid has been required, or where Access Arrangements or Special Consideration have been considered.

Candidate name:	Candidate Number:	Centre Number: 12829
Subject:	Course Code:	Completed by:

<b>Section 1: COVID Related Disruption – Learner Context</b>	<b>Y/N/NA</b>
Did the candidate face <u>additional</u> disruption to their teaching and learning as a result of COVID 19, <u>in comparison to</u> their class peers?	
Was there any other specific disadvantage considered for this candidate when compared with other candidates in the year group?	
<b>If 'yes' please provide details of how the disadvantage has been considered</b> (including <i>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.</i> )	

<b>Section 2: Access Arrangements/Reasonable Adjustments</b>	<b>Y/N/NA</b>
Is the candidate entitled to Access Arrangements/Reasonable Adjustments?	
Were the approved access arrangements/reasonable adjustments in place for assessments which were used to determine the candidate's grade?	
<b>If 'no' please provide details of how the lack of access arrangements/reasonable adjustments have been taken into account when determining the grade:</b>	

<b>Section 3: Mitigating circumstances (Special Consideration)</b>	<b>Y/N/NA</b>
Has the candidate made a request for mitigating circumstances to be considered, e.g. illness or other personal circumstances?	
Record any actions that have been taken as a result of this request, e.g. making an adjustment in determining the grade or using alternative evidence.	
<b>Reason for mitigating circumstances:</b>	

## Appendix 4 - Unconscious Bias

**This information was communicated to all staff involved with the assessment, grading and marking process in a training session delivered on 22/04/21.**

### **Being aware of unconscious effects on objectivity**

Without always realising it, everyone holds unconscious beliefs about others. These can be based on things like social factors or identities of others, as detailed above. There is a risk that objective judgements can be affected by unconscious beliefs and other types of bias.

Centres are urged to reflect on and question whether any of their judgements might be affected by factors not based on evidence of performance, such as unconscious beliefs or types of bias. These factors can affect judgements of student performance and can also affect the perception of particular pieces of evidence.

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.

### **Using other evidence to identify possible bias**

Other relevant sources of evidence may be available that could help to check whether there might be bias in judgements. Analysis may be useful to identify whether there may be any indications of systematic under- or over-grading (indicative of possible bias) in judgements made for different groups of students. This could relate to students with particular protected characteristics or from different socio-economic backgrounds.

For example, by comparing UCAS predictions with exam outcomes from previous years, a centre may find that it has routinely under-estimated predicted A level maths grades compared to grades actually achieved for students with particular characteristics; or routinely over-estimated target English language GCSE grades compared to grades actually achieved for students with particular characteristics. Any evidence of possible bias can be useful in challenging and quality assuring judgements.

When considering the evidence available and possible uses, centres should also consider possible limitations. For example, significant personnel changes may mean that effects in previous years may not be assumed to carry forward. Centres will also need to be aware of the need to avoid over- or under-compensating for any effects that may be found.



## Appendix 5

### Grading and Moderation Timeline

<b>Exam grading timeline</b>			
<b>wb 15/3/21</b>	Grading process agreed		
<b>wb 22/3/21</b>	Communication to parents and students		
<b>wb 5/4/21</b>	Easter Holiday (Assessment preparation time)		
<b>wb 12/4/21</b>			
<b>wb 19/4/21</b>	Assessments carried out as required		
<b>wb 26/4/21</b>			
<b>wb 4/5/21</b>		Moderation including ELAT networks	
<b>wb 10/5/21</b>			
<b>wb 17/5/21</b>			Grade formulation
<b>21/05/2021</b>	Deadline for 2nd ELAT Moderation		
<b>27/05/2021*</b>	Deadline for subjects to submit grades internally		
<b>wb 31/05/2021</b>	Half Term		
<b>wb 7/6/21</b>	Executive review and QA including Trust level review		
<b>11/06/2021</b>	Last day for Executive sign off		
<b>wb 14/06/2021</b>	Grade submission commences		
<b>18/06/2021</b>	Grade submission deadline		
	Deadlines		
	School holidays		
	Assessment & moderation		
*	27/5/21 Dep't moderation afternoon		

Appendix 6

ELAT TRUST MODERATION RECORD

Name of school:		Date:
<b>Subject moderated</b>	<b>Those involved</b>	<b>Sample size</b>

Overall the sample was found to be broadly: (Place a tick in the appropriate box)							
In line with grades assigned		Generously graded		Severely graded		Inaccurately graded without clear pattern	

**Summarise moderation findings:**

**Summarise any areas where evidence was lacking:**

**Actions to address any gaps in evidence (e.g. Adjusting curriculum plan):**

**Further moderation or support required: (e.g. Second meeting or meeting with HT)**

*\*Please do not include full names of teachers or pupils from the sample on this form; initials are acceptable.*