

Sacred Heart High School - Centre Policy for determining teacher assessed grades

FOR A/AS LEVELS AND GCSES FOR SUMMER 2021



Centre Policy for determining teacher assessed grades –
summer 2021:

SACRED HEART HIGH SCHOOL

212 Hammersmith Road, LONDON W6 7DG

Centre number 10160

Statement of intent

This section outlines the purpose of this document in relation to our centre.

Statement of Intent

This section provides details of the purpose of this document, as appropriate to our centre:

Our commitment in determining teacher assessed grades for summer 2021 is:

- To provide maximum opportunity for students to demonstrate their learning and achievement
- To respect the integrity of the assessment process and ensure confidence in outcomes and differentiation across the full range of attainment
- To ensure that the process is open and transparent and communicated clearly to all stakeholders

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 to take evidence-based decisions in line with Joint Council for Qualifications guidance.*
- *To ensure the consideration of historical centre data in the process, and the appropriate decision making in respect of, teacher assessed grades.*
- *To support a high standard of internal quality assurance in the allocation of teacher assessed grades.*
- *To support our centre in meeting its obligations in relation to equality legislation.*
- *To ensure our centre meets all requirements set out by the Department of Education, Ofqual, the Joint Council for Qualifications and awarding organisations for Summer 2021 qualifications.*
- *To ensure the process for communicating to candidates and their parents/carers how they will be assessed is clear, in order to give confidence.*

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.

Roles and Responsibilities

This section gives details of the roles and responsibilities within our centre:

Head of Centre

- *Our Head of Centre, Marian Doyle, will be responsible for approving our policy for determining teacher assessed grades.*
- *Our Head of Centre has overall responsibility for Sacred Heart High School (centre number 10160) 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 will:

- *support the Head of Centre in the quality assurance of the final teacher assessed grades.*

The Headteacher (Head of Centre) (Marian Doyle), Associate Head (Sharon O'Donovan) and Assistant Head (Achievement and Standards) (Philip Hambleton) will be responsible for quality assurance of the totality of the process. They will

- *review and approve subject assessment plans*
- *meet with SLT subject line managers to review teacher assessed grades*
- *review a sample of evidence from each subject department*
- *review teacher assessed grades in light of the historic profile of subject outcomes for 2017-19*
- *review the overall profile of teacher assessed grades for 2021 in light of the historic profile of school performance for 2017-19*
- *lead on training and support for SLT subject line managers, heads of department and subject teaching staff*
- *make appropriate arrangements for authenticating the preliminary outcome from single teacher subjects and small subject departments*

The Associate Head and Assistant Heads responsible for KS4 (Eleisha Maton) and KS5 (Jacky Greenwood) will

- *draft a policy relating to special consideration and mitigating circumstances*

The Assistant Heads responsible for KS4 (Eleisha Maton) and KS5 (Jacky Greenwood) will

- *be responsible for the implementation of the agreed policy at their own key stage*

SLT subject line managers will

- *meet with heads of department to*
 - *review and approve subject assessment plans for submission to the Headteacher and Assistant Head (Achievement and Standards)*
 - *ensure that due process has been followed and that recommended grades are supported by the evidence*
 - *investigate any surprising or questionable grade recommendations*
 - *investigate the reasons and evidence for any significant departure from historic profiles and trends*
- *be accountable to the Headteacher for the robustness and reliability of the outcomes of the subject grading process*

The SENCO (Zara Carey) will

- *liaise closely with the Assistant Heads for KS4 and KS5 concerning reasonable adjustments for mitigating circumstance*
- *provide training and support for heads of department and teaching staff in relation to special consideration for candidates with special needs*
- *ensure that appropriate arrangements are made for candidates with special needs or mitigating circumstances*
- *participate as required in the final SLT QA of the whole school process with regard to candidates with special needs or mitigating circumstances*

Heads of departments

Heads of departments will

- *draft a subject assessment plan for submission to the Headteacher and Assistant Head (Achievement and Standards). The subject assessment plan will provide for an assessment evidence base from a broad range of specification content (knowledge, understanding and skills) taught*
- *ensure and monitor the implementation of the subject assessment plan*
- *ensure through standardisation and moderation that a common standard is applied by all markers*
- *give direction on the correct interpretation of mark schemes in cases of disagreement or difficulty*
- *ensure that the standardisation and moderation process is fully documented*
- *ensure that grades are best-fit and supported by the range of assessment evidence*

- 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.
- ensure teachers have the information required to make accurate and fair judgments.
- have regard to the historic profile of the school's results in the subject
- ensure that student work is retained and securely stored
- ensure, in consultation with the SENCO, that reasonable adjustments are made and special consideration implemented for candidates with special needs or mitigating circumstances
- provide training and support to our other staff
- be responsible for ensuring staff have a clear understanding of the internal and external quality assurance processes and their role within it.
- ensure that a Head of Department Checklist is completed for each qualification that they are submitting.
- produce an Assessment Record for each subject cohort, that includes the nature of the assessment evidence being used, the level of control for assessments considered, and any other evidence that explains the determination of the final teacher assessed grades. Any necessary variations for individual students will also be recorded.

Subject teachers

Subject teachers 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, in consultation with the SENCO, that reasonable adjustments are made and special consideration implemented for candidates with special needs or mitigating circumstances
- carry out marking in careful adherence to the agreed interpretation of the mark scheme and to directions given by the HOD
- 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.
- securely store and be able to retrieve sufficient evidence to justify their decisions.

Examinations Officer

Our Examinations Officer will:

- be responsible for the administration of final teacher assessed grades and for managing the post-results services, including the storage and security of assessment evidence

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.

Training

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

Senior Leadership team will:

- provide detailed written guidance to heads of department and subject teachers as appropriate for the implementation of *this Centre Policy and guidance from the Joint Council for Qualifications*
- *Provide online or face-to-face briefings on the assessment process* for heads of department and subject teachers as appropriate

Heads of department will:

- provide training as necessary to subject staff
- provide detailed guidance on marking and grading and the interpretation of marking schemes
- lead standardisation exercises and activities
- carry out moderation and quality assurance of teacher assessed grades

Teachers involved in determining grades

- *will attend any centre-based training to help achieve consistency and fairness to all students.*
- *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*

Heads of department (or appropriately experienced postholders delegated by them)

- *will provide mentoring to NQTs and teachers less familiar with assessment.*
- *will ensure careful 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*.

A. Use of evidence

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

Heads of department and teachers involved in determining grades will:

- *have regard to the Ofqual Head of Centre guidance on recommended evidence, and further guidance provided by awarding organisations*
- *adhere strictly to the Centre policy as determined by the Headteacher*
- *closely follow guidance issued by the Assistant Head (Achievement and Standards) on GCSE and A-level grading for 2021, and internal standardisation moderation and internal quality assurance processes*
- *adhere strictly to the subject assessment plan as approved by the Headteacher*

We will use the following evidence base for grading decisions:

- *Ongoing assessment data from throughout the course*
- *NEA / coursework (whether this is complete or not)*
- *Michaelmas Term 2020 return-to-school exams (formerly “mock exams”)*
- *Lent Term 2021 return-to-school assessments (from Wednesday 17th March)*
- *First half of Trinity Term **core assessment tasks** as set out in subject assessment plans*

Core assessment tasks will be drawn or closely adapted from past papers, additional assessment materials published in March 2021 or other appropriate assessment materials or exemplars produced by exam boards and will be assessed using appropriate exam board marking schemes and guidance on grading

Evidence will be weighted as follows:

- *NEA: the same weighting as in a normal year*
- *The remainder after taking account of NEA: core assessments 60%; return-to-school assessment (Lent Term) & Michaelmas mock exam 30%; assessment data from throughout the course 10%*

These weightings may be varied in subject assessment plans for subjects with a significant practical component e.g. DT, by agreement with the subject SLT line manager and subject to the approval of the Headteacher

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.

All candidate evidence produced since 24th March 2021, 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 student work produced before 24th March 2021 has not been retained, relevant assessment data records must be provided to support grading judgments

We provide further detail in the following areas:

Additional Assessment Materials

Additional Assessment Materials may be used either exactly as published, or adapted, or as models, in subject core assessment tasks as outlined in subject assessment plans

- *We will use additional assessment materials (or adapted, or as models, in subject core assessment tasks) 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.*
- *Subject assessment plans will specify core assessment tasks to be undertaken by all candidates, and the required level of control for each, to be implemented by subject teachers*

Determining teacher assessed grades

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

Awarding teacher assessed grades based on evidence

We give details here of our centre's approach to awarding teacher assessed grades.

Heads of department and subject 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.*
- *record how the evidence was used to arrive at a fair and objective grade, which is free from bias.*
- *have regard to the weighting of evidence specified in the Centre policy and associated guidance*
- *adopt a "best-fit" approach across the range of evidence being taken into consideration, avoiding the use of a simple formula or algorithm, to arrive at an objective, holistic judgment*
 - *notwithstanding the above, evidence should demonstrate achievement at the awarded grade in at least 70% of the assessed material*
- *produce an Assessment Record for each subject cohort and will share this with their subject SLT line manager prior to submission to the Headteacher and Assistant Head (Achievement and Standards). Any necessary variations for individual students will also be shared and any provision or reasonable adjustments for special consideration or mitigating circumstances duly documented*

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 and associated school guidance*
- *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 ensure that the Assessment Record will form the basis of internal standardisation and discussions across teachers to agree the awarding of teacher assessed grades.*
- *We will implement a three-stage internal quality assurance process:*
 1. *Standardisation of marking and moderation of marks and grades within subject departments*
 2. *Review of evidence and grades by heads of department and SLT subject line managers*
 3. *Final review by Headteacher, Associate Head and Assistant Head (Achievement and Standards) and SENCO in relation to candidates with special needs*

At each stage we will

- *ensure that due process has been followed and that recommended grades are supported by the evidence, including by sampling portfolios of student assessment evidence*
- *investigate any surprising or questionable grade recommendations*
- *investigate the reasons and evidence for any significant departure from historic profiles and trends*
- *Where necessary, we will review and reflect on individual grading decisions to ensure alignment with the standards as outlined by our awarding organisation(s).*
- *Where appropriate, we will amend individual grade decisions to ensure alignment with the standards as outlined by our awarding organisation(s).*
- *Where there is only one teacher involved in marking assessments and determining grades, or where the leaders of small subjects or departments are relatively inexperienced in assessment and grading, we will make arrangements for close monitoring by subject SLT line managers and the Head of Centre may engage external personnel to assist her and*

the SLT in QA of head of department judgments prior to stage 3 of the internal QA process outlined above.

- *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.*

Comparison of teacher assessed grades to results for previous cohorts

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

Comparison of Teacher Assessed Grades to results for previous cohorts

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

- *We will compile information on the grades awarded to our students in past June series in which exams took place (e.g. 2017 - 2019).*
- *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 at each stage of 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, which address the reasons for this divergence. This commentary will be available for subsequent review during the QA process.*

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

- *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.*
- *We will investigate reasons for significant divergence from historic profiles and seek in the first instance to provide supporting commentary and evidence for 2021 judgments*
- *Where investigation and interrogation of the evidence does not support the divergence from historic profiles, we will review the profile of teacher assessed grades through line management and make the necessary adjustments*

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.*
- *We will exclude private candidates from comparisons of grade profiles*

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)

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

- *Where students have agreed access arrangements or reasonable adjustments (for example a reader or scribe) we will make every effort to ensure that these arrangements are in place when assessments are being taken. Individual subject teachers will be made aware of students who have access arrangements or reasonable adjustments and these will be included as part of the core assessment timetable.*
- *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 assessment*
- *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*

Addressing disruption/differential lost learning (DLL)

B. Addressing Disruption/Differentiated Lost Learning (DLL)

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

- *Teacher assessed grades will be determined based on evidence of the content that has been taught and assessed for each student.*
- *Where individual students have suffered disruption to learning and learning loss above and beyond that experienced by the whole school cohort, we will document and address this through reasonable adjustments for mitigating circumstances at both subject and whole-school level*

Objectivity

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

Objectivity

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

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

Senior Leaders, 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; and*

Core assessment tasks undertaken in the final stage of the assessment process (as outline in subject assessment plans) will be marked "blind", scripts being identified only by candidate number, with sampling and over-marking as part of the moderation process

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 Centre Policy outlines our arrangements to recording decisions and to retaining evidence and data.

C. Recording Decisions and Retention of Evidence and Data

This section outlines our approach to recording decisions and 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.*
- *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.*
- *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).*

Authenticating evidence

D. 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 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.*
 - *Core assessment tasks will be completed under controlled condition and under the supervision of subject teachers*
 - *Candidates will sign a declaration that each core assessment task is their own work*
 - *In subjects other than drama, DT, music and PE, and excluding any NEA element, 90% of the total assessment evidence base will have been completed under exam or highly controlled conditions*
 - *For NEA, normal mechanisms will be in place*
 - *Where mitigating circumstances (e.g. extended absence from school for self-isolation or other COVID circumstances) require that a candidate be permitted to complete assessment tasks at home, reasonable adjustments will specify conditions for ensuring that work submitted is the candidate's own*
- *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.

A. Confidentiality

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

- *All staff involved have been made aware of the need to maintain the confidentiality of teacher assessed grades.*
- *For core assessment tasks, raw scores only will be shared with students*
- *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 outlines the measures in place to prevent malpractice and other breaches of exam regulations, and to deal with such cases if they occur.

B. Malpractice

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

- *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.*
- *Malpractice is defined here as "Any act, or failure to act, that threatens or compromises the integrity of the assessment process or the validity of qualifications and their certification. This includes: maladministration and the failure to maintain appropriate records or systems; the deliberate falsification of records or documents for any reason connected to the award of qualifications; acts of plagiarism or other academic misconduct.*
- *Student malpractice*

- o *This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:*
 - *plagiarism of any nature*
 - *collusion by working collaboratively with other learners of produce work that is submitted as individual learner work*
 - *false declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio, coursework or NEA*
 - *impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment / examination / test.*
 - *introducing inappropriate or illicit material into the examination room, such as mobile phones or revision notes*
 - *causing a disturbance to other candidates in the exam room, other than as a result of illness or disability*
- *Staff or centre malpractice*
 - o *This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:*
 - *improper assistance to candidates, including over direction of students in preparation for core assessments*
 - *inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework, portfolio evidence, core assessments or NEAs) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made*
 - *failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios/core assessments/NEAs secure*
 - *assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the learner*
 - *producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated*
 - *misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as an amanuensis. This is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment*
 - *falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud*
 - *failure to appropriately authenticate a student's work*
 - *breaches of internal security*
 - *deception*
 - *submitting teacher assessed grades which are known to be inaccurate*
 - *entering 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*
- *failure to report any instances of suspected malpractice to an awarding body, and failure to cooperate fully with that awarding body*
- *revealing to students, the final teacher assessed grades, prior to the awarding of results by the awarding bodies*
- *To support the implementation of this policy*
 - *Staff receive training and briefings on the rules surrounding the delivery of exams or core assessments*
 - *Students are made aware of their expectations at the start of each core assessment*
 - *Rooms are prepared in a manner conducive to the implementation of exam regulations*
 - *This policy, or relevant extracts from it, are placed on the school's website*
- *The Head of Centre, via delegation, will investigate any allegations of malpractice by students or staff*
 - *All parties will be invited to submit written statements as to their involvement in any instances of malpractice*
 - *In cases of student malpractice, parents will be informed as soon as possible after an allegation is made*
 - *In cases of staff malpractice the school's normal policies on staff conduct will apply, enhanced by reference to awarding bodies' policies and sanctions*
 - *In all cases of alleged malpractice, the accused has a right to appeal*
- *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.

C. Conflicts of Interest

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

- *To protect the integrity of assessments, all staff involved in the determination of grades must declare any conflict of interest such as relationships with students to 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.*

[Optional section if your centre is accepting Private Candidates – if not, then this section can be deleted]

Private candidates

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

A. Private Candidates
<p><i>This section details our approach to providing and quality assuring grades to Private Candidates.</i></p> <p><i>It is not the school's policy to accept private candidates for assessment in 2021 with the following very limited exceptions:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <p><i>(Three) Sacred Heart students following GCSE Latin courses provided as part of an outreach programme by St. Paul's School, Barnes</i></p> <p><i>SPS will submit teacher assessed grades to the Headteacher of SHHS with comprehensive supporting assessment evidence and details of their own internal quality assurance processes</i></p> <p><i>One former SH student (left August 2020) re-sitting two A-level subjects</i></p> <p><i>This candidate will undertake the same core assessment tasks as internal candidates under controlled conditions in school and will have access to revision lessons provided for internal candidates in the areas for core assessment</i></p> <p><i>The JCQ Guidance on Private Candidates has been followed and any divergences from our approach for internal candidates have been recorded on the appropriate class/student documentation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In undertaking the review of cohort grades in conjunction with our centre results profiles from previous examined years, the grades determined by our centre for Private Candidates will be excluded from our analysis.</i>

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.

A. External Quality Assurance

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

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

A. Results

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

- *All staff involved have been made aware of the specific arrangements for the issue of results in Summer 2021, 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.

A. Appeals

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

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

APPENDIX: BTEC Qualifications

Centre Policy for Q-TAGs

All centres will be required to confirm their adherence to this policy via the Q-TAG submission and Head of Centre Declaration process this year. It is essential you follow the guidance and steps outlined below, and existing BTEC policies for Quality Assurance.

Aims of this Policy:

1. To make it clear the steps all centres must take to ensure that the Q-TAGs they determine for their learners are sufficiently valid and reliable a centre must:
 - Review the specification grading information i.e.. unit-level assessment criteria and grade descriptors with the subject teaching team
 - Consider what evidence you will have from the content you have taught
 - Collect the evidence
 - Evaluate the quality of the evidence
 - Assign a Qualification-Level Teacher Assessed Grade (Q-TAG)
 - Reflect on your judgement before submission
 - Further detail in relation to the above steps must be referred to and is available in our guidance, here, with supporting information on our webpage:
quals.pearson.com/BTEC2021assessment
2. To ensure that learners can feel confident in the process their centres have taken to determine their Q-TAG.
3. To summarise the existing BTEC policies, and confirm that they now also apply in the context of Q-TAG judgements.
4. To reflect and incorporate Ofqual's Vocational Contingency Regulatory Framework (VCRF) and Guidance that any Q-TAG is based on appropriate sources of evidence and has gone through an internal quality assurance process (which includes final sense check of outcomes against historical centre outcomes).
5. To ensure that the methodology used to determine the Q-TAG is consistent across centres and sufficiently valid, reliable and does not advantage or disadvantage any group of, or individual, learners.

In order to do this the centre will, for each qualification and learner, submit a Q-TAG and Head of Centre Declaration confirming that they have:

1. Ensured that all relevant teaching staff (i.e. Assessors, Internal Verifiers, Heads of Department and Heads of Centre) will use the guidance provided by Pearson to confirm the Q-TAG, and refer to supplementary guidance from JCQ and Ofqual where required.

2. Ensured that the evidence that has been used for each Q-TAG judgement is sufficiently documented to ensure that it can be explained to the learner or Parent or Carer in the case of Appeals, and to Pearson. Centres must take into account previous years' results, if there is a material difference in the results profile expected in 2021, a Centre must be able to explain why its results are significantly out of line with past performance (be that higher or lower).

3. Ensured that all assessment evidence is retained in line with Ofqual's Vocational Contingency Regulatory Framework (evidence which is used to support the Qualification-Level Teacher Assessed Grade should be retained until 6 months after the date of the issue of the result, or the conclusion of any appeal in relation to that result, whichever is later). In some cases, evidence may no longer be available, JCQ has released guidance on the retention of evidence in these circumstances. Evidence must be made available for the purposes of further external quality assurance or an Appeal. This will include documentation that demonstrates the above process for the Q-TAG judgement has been followed, i.e.:

- Records of Standardisation of Assessors and Internal Verifiers and other relevant members of staff, in relation to the Q-TAG process and holistic judgements
- Evidence sheets for learners (Existing BTEC templates for actual assessment and Pearson will provide a template for documenting alternative evidence)
- The alternative sources of evidence that have been considered
- Any additional Assessment and Internal Verification materials
- Any assessed learner work assessment records
- Records of performance data used for sense check, with explanation for any deviation in the 2021 Q-TAG judgements (if there is a material difference in the profiles expected in 2021).

4. Ensured they follow all other policies as set out in our Pearson Annual Centre Declaration signed in 2021, including Pearson Terms and Conditions. You can find more information on our Quality Assurance webpages

This includes:

- Equality and Diversity
- Safeguarding
- Health and Safety (including any arrangements for employer Involvement)
- Special Consideration and Reasonable Adjustment
- Recognition of Prior Learning
- Registration and Certification of Learners
- Assessment
- Internal verification
- Plagiarism and Assessment Malpractice
- Appeals & Complaints