



KING WILLIAM'S COLLEGE

King William's College Teacher Assessed Grades Policy JCQ Summer 2021

Issue Date: 04/21

Clare Broadbent (Deputy Head Academic)

Susan Gibson (Examinations Officer)

KING WILLIAM'S COLLEGE
TEACHER ASSESSED GRADES POLICY
JCQ SUMMER 2021

1. Context

In light of the ongoing Covid-19 Pandemic, all GCSE and IGCSE examinations for King William's College students have been cancelled. Each exam board has slightly different requirements regarding the alternative arrangements in place for these students to be awarded grades in the summer of 2021

This policy relates to boards governed by the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ). For the Summer 2021 cohort at King William's College, this includes AQA, OCR and Pearson Edexcel.

The purpose of this Centre Policy is:

- to ensure that Teacher Assessed Grades (TAGs) are conducted fairly, consistently, free from bias and effectively within and across departments and maintained throughout the process
- 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 JCQ guidance
- To ensure the consideration of historical centre data in the process, and the appropriate decision making in respect of TAGs.
- to achieve a high standard of internal quality assurance in the allocation of TAGs
- to ensure the centre meets its obligations in relation to equality and disability legislation
- to ensure we meet all requirements set out in the Special Regulatory Conditions, Joint Council for Qualifications and Awarding Organisation instructions 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.

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the generation of Teacher Assessed Grades to read, understand, and implement this policy.

2. Roles and Responsibilities

Head of Centre: Joss Buchanan, Principal

- is responsible for approving our policy for determining teacher assessed grades.
- has overall responsibility for the school as an examinations centre and will ensure that clear roles and responsibilities of all staff are defined
- 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
- will ensure a robust internal quality assurance process has been produced and signed-off in advance of results being submitted
- will authenticate all TAGs prior to submission to the examination board with support from Clare Broadbent (Deputy Head Academic) and Susan Gibson (Examinations Officer)

Deputy Head Academic: Clare Broadbent

- will liaise with Heads of Department to review, authenticate and approve grades prior to submission to the Head of Centre
- will support the Head of Centre, with the assistance of the Examinations Officer, in the quality assurance of the final TAGs.
- will ensure an effective approach within and across departments and authenticating the preliminary outcome from single teacher subjects.
- is responsible for ensuring staff have a clear understanding of the internal and external quality assurance processes and their role within it.
- will ensure all staff conduct assessments under the appropriate levels of control with reference to guidance provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications and awarding bodies.

Examinations Officer: Susan Gibson

- is responsible for the administration of our final TAGs and for managing the post-results services.
- will support the Head of Centre, with the assistance of the Deputy Head Academic, in the quality assurance of the final TAGs.

Heads of Department

- will 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 TAGs. Any necessary variations for individual students will also be recorded.
- will securely store and be able to retrieve sufficient evidence to justify the TAGs
- will ensure teachers have the information required to make accurate and fair judgments.
- will oversee the assessment, collection and retention of evidence and award a grade to all GCSE candidate entries with support and approval from other teachers in the department.
- will ensure that all teachers within their department make consistent judgements about student evidence in deriving a grade.
- will ensure that a Head of Department Checklist is completed for each qualification that they are submitting

Subject Teachers

- will ensure they conduct assessments under our centre's appropriate levels of control and taking into account appropriate access arrangements in line with those that have been approved by the awarding body
- will ensure that they have sufficient evidence, in line with this Centre Policy and guidance from the Joint Council for Qualifications, to provide TAGs for each student they have entered for a qualification.
- will ensure that the TAG they assign to each student is a fair, valid and reliable reflection of the assessed evidence available for each student.
- will 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.

3. Training, support and guidance

- Guidance from JCQ and the relevant awarding bodies will be circulated to Heads of Department by the Examinations Officer. Heads of Department will share the relevant information with the teachers within their department in order to ensure that all teachers adhere to the guidance and to help achieve consistency and fairness to all students.
- The Deputy Head Academic will communicate with Heads of Department on a regular basis, both by e-mail and in person to discuss each department's approach to generating TAGs.
- The Deputy Head Academic and Examinations Officer will provide regular updates to all teaching staff in the weekly staff meetings (online or in person) and during staff INSET sessions.
- Heads of Department will maintain a record of any awarding body training sessions (webinars etc.) attended by members of their department.
- There are no Newly Qualified Teachers involved with the process of determining TAGs for the Summer 2021 cohort.
- For teachers new to assessment support will be provided by Heads of Department.

4. Process for determining TAGs

Subject Assessment Plans will be drawn up by the Heads of Department and approved by the Deputy Head Academic as part of the internal Quality Assurance process.

Teachers making judgements will have regard to the Ofqual Head of Centre guidance on recommended evidence, and further guidance provided by awarding organisations. TAGs will be determined based on a range of sources of evidence. Where possible, all candidate evidence used to determine TAGs, and associated documentation, will be retained and made available for the purposes of external quality assurance and appeals.

- 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. Teacher assessed grades will be determined based on evidence of the content that has been taught and assessed for each student.
- 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 Head of Department. Any necessary variations for individual students will also be shared.

Sources of Evidence:

- 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 taken by pupils.
- We will use mock exams taken over the course of study, in particular the February 2021 series of mock exams.
- Additional assessments will be conducted throughout May 2021:
 - 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.

We 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.
- Where possible, we will ensure that we are able to authenticate the work as the student's own, especially where that work was not completed within the school.
- We will consider the limitations of assessing a student's performance when using assessments that have been completed more than once, or drafted and redrafted, where this is not a skill being assessed.
- We will consider the specification and assessment objective coverage of the assessment.
- We will consider the depth and breadth of knowledge, understanding and skills assessed, especially higher order skills within individual assessments.

Notes:

- All assessments which use materials provided by the awarding bodies will be/have been marked according to the relevant markschemes.
- All formal assessments (particularly the February Mock examinations, and formal assessments carried out in May will adhere to the usual examination durations as per awarding body guidance, including extra time for those candidates who are entitled to it.
- There are no conflicts of interest for any subjects governed by JCQ in the Summer 2021 cohort.

Access Arrangements and 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.
- 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.

5. Internal Quality Assurance

As detailed above, Teacher Assessed Grades (TAGs) will be subject to a series of internal checks to ensure that they are calculated fairly, accurately, reliably and objectively and are supported with evidence.

This policy has been developed in line with guidance from JCQ, along with relevant school policy and wider legislation. Awarding body training materials have been circulated to all relevant parties and attendance at any training webinars etc. will be logged with the Deputy Head Academic and Examinations Office.

In line with this policy, TAGs and individual pupil records detailing the evidence used to generate them for each candidate will initially be calculated by individual subject teachers and submitted to the relevant Head of Department who will check that all procedures have been followed and that the results used to calculate the grades are accurate.

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.

In subjects where there is only one teacher, the Deputy Head Academic will meet with the teacher to discuss each individual pupil's TAG and the evidence used to determine it.

The Deputy Head Academic will meet with Heads of Department to discuss the overall pattern of TAGs in the context of the current cohort and historical data.

- We will compile information on the grades awarded to our students in past June series in which exams took place. Where we have changed specification or awarding body, historical data will be considered but the change in course/board will be considered.
- 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, which address the reasons for this divergence. This commentary will be available for subsequent review during the QA process.
- If results this year fall significantly outside of the typical pattern of historical results then further evidence (baseline testing, internal examination/assessments, class test results, records of classwork/homework etc.) will be required to justify the claim that this is an exceptional cohort.

The Deputy Head Academic and Examinations Officer will collate the results and will double check entries before conducting a further check along with the Head of Centre (the Principal) before final submission to the awarding bodies.

All data will be held securely in line with the school's Data Protection policies and GDPR Legislation. Records of TAGs, individual pupil records and copies of related evidence will be collated and stored securely. Records will be kept of meetings between the Heads of Department, Deputy Head Academic, Examinations Officer and Head of Centre.

TAGs will be calculated based on evidence of demonstrated achievement and any assessments will be conducted with due regard to equalities issues for students with protected characteristics as well as any identified access arrangements, in line with the school's Access Arrangements Policy, Equal Opportunities Policy and the Isle of Man Equality Act.

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

Our internal standardisation process will help to ensure that there are different perspectives to the quality assurance process.

6. Communication

Clare Broadbent, Deputy Head Academic is responsible for communicating to students, parents and staff a high-level overview of the process by which grades will be awarded in Summer 2021. Regular updates will be issued as further guidance is issued by the relevant examination boards. These updates may be in the form of letters to parents, student assemblies and briefings in person at Parents' Evenings.

Heads of Department will communicate subject specific details to the teachers in their departments and this information will then be communicated directly to students by their relevant teachers. Timetables and details of individual students' assessments will be communicated to them by their teachers.

7. Confidentiality and malpractice

- 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.

All staff involved have been made aware of our policies regarding malpractice and maladministration, 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.

8. External Quality Assurance

- All staff involved will be 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 will be properly kept and can be made available for review as required.
- All student evidence on which decisions regarding the determination of grades will be retained, where possible, 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.

9. Results

- All staff involved have been made aware of the specific arrangements for the issue of results in Summer 2021.
- Arrangements will be made to ensure the necessary staffing, including exams office and support staff, to enable the efficient receipt and release of results to our students.
- Arrangements will be in place for the provision of all necessary advice, guidance and support, including 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.

10. Appeals and Complaints

King William's College is committed to ensuring that whenever staff generate TAGs this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents. Should a student wish to appeal their result once it has been issued on Results Day (12th August), there are two stages to the appeals process.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the arrangements for, and the requirements of, appeals in Summer 2021, as set out in the JCQ Guidance.
- Internal arrangements will be in place for the swift and effective handling of Centre Reviews in compliance with the requirements.
- All necessary staff have been briefed on the process for, and timing of, such reviews, and will be available to ensure their prompt and efficient handling.
- Learners have been appropriately guided as to the necessary stages of appeal.
- Arrangements will be in place for the timely submission of appeals to awarding organisations.
- Arrangements will be in place to obtain the written consent of students to the initiation of appeals, and to record their awareness that grades may go down as well as up on appeal.
- Appropriate information on the appeals process will be provided to parents/carers.

The detail below is taken directly from the JCQ publication: *JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for summer 2021*

Stage 1: centre review

The first stage of the process is referred to as a centre review. If a student does not consider that they have been issued with the correct grade, they can ask their centre to check if an administrative or procedural error has occurred. The centre will need to ensure the student is aware that their grade could go down, up or stay the same. If the centre finds that an error has occurred, they will be able to submit a request to the awarding organisation to correct the error and amend the grade without the need to make an appeal to the awarding organisation.

Stage 2: appeal to the awarding organisation

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

Ofqual Exam Procedures Review Service

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

Grounds for appeal

In summary there are four grounds upon which a centre review or an appeal to an awarding organisation may be requested:

- At stage 1: The centre made an administrative error, e.g. an incorrect grade was submitted; an incorrect assessment mark was used when determining the grade.
- At stages 1 and 2: The centre did not apply a procedure correctly, such as the centre did not follow its Centre Policy, did not undertake internal quality assurance, did not take account of access arrangements or mitigating circumstances such as illness.
- At stage 2: The awarding organisation made an administrative error, e.g. the grade was incorrectly changed by the awarding organisation during the processing of grades.
- At stage 2: The student considers that the centre made an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement¹ in the choice of evidence from which to determine the grade and/or the determination of the grade from that evidence.

11. Related Documents:

JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for summer 2021

King William's College and the Buchan School Complaints Procedure

King William's College Equal Opportunities Policy

The Isle of Man Equality Act 2017

King William's College (I)GCSE Access Arrangements Policy

King William's College and The Buchan School Data Privacy Notice

¹ A reasonable judgement is one that is supported by evidence. An exercise of judgement will not be unreasonable simply because a student considers that an alternative grade should have been awarded, even if the student puts forward supporting evidence. There may be a difference of opinion without there being an unreasonable exercise of judgement. The reviewer will not remark individual assessments to make fine judgements but will take a holistic approach based on the overall evidence.