



Saint GREGORY'S
Bath

FOR A/AS LEVELS AND GCSES FOR SUMMER 2021

Centre Policy for determining teacher assessed grades – Summer 2021

St Gregory's Catholic College, Bath

Centre number 50727

CONTENTS

1 - 2	Contents
3	<u>Statement of Intent</u>
4 – 5	<u>Roles and Responsibilities</u>
6	<u>Training, Support and Guidance</u>
7 – 8	<u>Use of Appropriate Evidence</u>
9	<u>Determining Teacher Assessed Grades</u>
10	<u>Internal Quality Assurance</u>
11	<u>Comparison of TAGs to Results from Previous Cohorts</u>
12	<u>Access Arrangements and Special Consideration</u>
13	<u>Addressing Disruption / Differential Lost Learning</u>
14	<u>Objectivity</u>
15	<u>Recording Decisions and Retention of Evidence and Data</u>
16	<u>Authenticating Evidence</u>
17 – 18	<u>Confidentiality, Malpractice and Conflicts of Interest</u>
19	<u>Private Candidates; External Quality Assurance</u>
20	<u>Results</u>
21	<u>Appeals</u>

APPENDICES

[Appendix 1 Assessment Record Form](#)

[Appendix 2 Head of Subject Checklist](#)

[Appendix 3 Student Top Sheet](#)

[Appendix 4 Student / Staff Declaration](#)

[Appendix 5 Timeline](#)

[Appendix 6 Quality Assurance Checklist](#)

Please note that this policy should be read in conjunction with the following policies:

- Exams Policy
- Exams Contingency Plan
- Exams Internal Appeals Policy
- Exams Equalities Policy
- Exams Complaints and Appeals Policy
- Data Protection Policy
- Access Arrangements Policy
- Exams Word Processor Policy
- Exams Non-Examination Assessment Policy
- Exams Lockdown Policy
- Conflict of Interests Policy
- Malpractice Policy

Statement of Intent

Statement of Intent

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

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, and 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

Head of Centre

- Our Head of Centre, Ann Cusack, will be responsible for approving our policy for determining teacher assessed grades.
- Our Head of Centre has overall responsibility for St Gregory's 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

Senior Leadership Team leads are Director of Studies, Jo Tidball, Assistant Head (Teaching and Learning), Julia Cleveland and Assistant Head (Director of Sixth Form), Lucy Staves.

Our Senior Leadership Team and Heads of Faculty will:

- provide training and support to our other staff.
- support the Head of Centre in the quality assurance of the final teacher assessed grades.
- ensure an effective approach within and across departments and authenticating the preliminary outcome from single teacher subjects.
- be responsible for ensuring staff have a clear understanding of the internal and external quality assurance processes and their role within it.
- ensure that all teachers within their department make consistent judgements about student evidence in deriving a grade.
- ensure all staff conduct assessments under the appropriate levels of control with reference to guidance provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications.
- ensure teachers have the information required to make accurate and fair judgments.
- ensure that a Head of Subject Checklist is completed for each qualification that they are submitting.

Teachers/ Specialist Teachers / SENCo

Our teachers, specialist teachers and SENCo (Amy Morriss) will:

- ensure they conduct assessments under our centre's appropriate levels of control and have sufficient evidence, in line with this Centre Policy and guidance from the Joint Council for Qualifications, to provide teacher assessed grades for each student they have entered for a qualification.
- ensure that the teacher assessed grade they assign to each student is a fair, valid and reliable reflection of the assessed evidence available for each student.
- make judgements based on what each student has been taught and what they have been assessed on, as outlined in the section on grading in the main JCQ guidance.
- produce an Assessment 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.
- securely store and be able to retrieve sufficient evidence to justify their decisions.

Examinations Officer

Our Examinations Officer, Hannah Quinn, will:

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

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

- Teachers involved in determining grades in our centre 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.
- On 19 April and 26 April all teaching staff will receive training on the grading process, marking, standardisation, unconscious bias, quality assurance, data protection and mitigating circumstances.

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.
- We have four NQTs currently. Three teach no Y11 or Y13, one teaches a Y11 class and no Y13. We will give all of them full training.

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

- Teachers making judgements will have regard to the Ofqual Head of Centre guidance on recommended evidence, and further guidance provided by awarding organisations.
- All candidate evidence used to determine teacher assessed grades, and associated documentation, will be retained and made available for the purposes of external quality assurance and appeals.
- 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 students.
- 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 PE.

We provide further detail in the following areas:

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 has not been taught.
- Each subject will produce a summary of what assessment materials and evidence they have used

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. All students will sign a declaration that the assessments used are all their own work.
- 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 our centre will take to awarding teacher assessed grades.

Awarding teacher assessed grades based on evidence

- 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.
- 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.
- Each student will have a subject “top sheet” detailing any special considerations, changes or mitigating circumstances.

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

- 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 an holistic grading decision
 - Applying the use of grading support and documentation
- We will conduct internal standardisation across all grades.
- 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.
- 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, then the output of this activity will be reviewed by an appropriate member of staff within the centre. There will also be standardisation with other schools.
 - This will be for Food Preparation and Nutrition GCSE - Head of Art and Technology
 - For computing GCSE - Head of Maths
 - For music GCSE - Head of Performing Arts
 - For dance GCSE - Head of Performing Arts
 - For Enterprise and Marketing Cambridge National - Head of Maths
 - For German, French and Spanish the teachers of each language will review each other's grading.
- 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 use 4Matrix/FFT for GCSE and 4Matrix/ALPS for A level to compare with the results for 2017, 2018 and 2019.• We will consider the size of our cohort from year to year. (The whole cohort was 151 in 2017, 159 in 2018 and 157 in 2019. This year it is 164.• We will consider the stability of our centre's overall grade outcomes from year to year.• We will consider the curriculum and courses on offer and staffing 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.
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 have never offered international GCSEs.• We will bring together other data sources that will help to quality assure the grades we intend to award in 2021, e.g. KS2 scores, CAT scores showing prior attainment.
<p>This section gives details of changes in our cohorts that need to be reflected in our comparisons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We will omit subjects that we no longer offer from the historical data. This year this applies to Mandarin Chinese, BTEC travel and tourism, Italian, and Russian.• New courses with no historical data for comparison are Enterprise and Marketing and Child Development.

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.
- Where an assessment has taken place without an agreed reasonable adjustment or access arrangement, we will remove that assessment from the basket of evidence and alternative evidence will be obtained.
- Where illness or other personal circumstances might have affected performance in assessments used in determining a student's standard of performance, we will take account of this when making judgements.
- 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

Addressing disruption/differential lost learning (DLL)

B. 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.
- Where possible, the same evidence will be used for whole cohorts or groups.
- If a student has had significant lost learning in addition to the rest of the cohort, this will be taken into consideration. Alternative assessments will be used in this case.

Objectivity

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

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; so we will adopt a strong process and give teachers time to consider their decisions

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

- We will ensure that teachers and Heads of Faculty 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 an 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, which will include using high control conditions assessments as part of the judgement, student and staff declaration sheets and comparison of student work across the course, 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.
- 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

- 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/carers.

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

- 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.

C. Conflicts of Interest

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

Private candidates

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

A. Private Candidates

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

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

- 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

- 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/carers have been 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

- 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 1



Assessment Record Form

FOR A/AS LEVELS AND GCSES FOR SUMMER 2021

DEPARTMENT	
SUBJECT	
LEVEL	
QUAN CODE	

- Please detail the assessments used for the subject cohort (i.e. assessment resource, mock examination, controlled assessment, homework etc.).
- The Assessment Form should include the sources of the assessment evidence being used and the rationale for the choice of evidence, the level of control under which assessments were completed (i.e. exam-type conditions would provide a high degree of control), and any other evidence that explains the determination of the final teacher assessed grades.

Note: Ideally, the evidence used will be consistent across the class or cohort but that may not always be the case if a student has missed some teaching, or one or more assessments, for valid reasons. Any necessary variations for individual students should be recorded on their top sheet.

Assessment	Date	Type of Assessment	Unit __				Unit __				Unit __				Level of Control H, M, L
			AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	
Assessment 1: <i>e.g. Mock</i>		<i>[e.g. Examination]</i>	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	<i>[e.g. H]</i>
Assessment 2: <i>[identifier]</i>															
Assessment 3: <i>[identifier]</i>															
Assessment 4: <i>[identifier]</i>															
Assessment 5: <i>[identifier]</i>															
Assessment 6: <i>[identifier]</i>															
Assessment 7: <i>[identifier]</i>															
Assessment 8: <i>[identifier]</i>															
<i>[add/delete as necessary]</i>															
If an assessment objective has been omitted at subject cohort level please briefly outline the reasons why:-															
Outline the rationale for the choice of assessment evidence used, i.e. why the evidence above was used and how it supports the grading decision:-															

Indicate which assessment objectives were covered in each piece of assessment evidence (Y/N), and whether the assessment was conducted with a High (H), Medium (M) or Limited (L) level of control.

Subject title	
Subject code	
Head of Department signature / date	
Subject teacher signature / date	
<i>Add additional teachers as required</i>	

Appendix 2 – Head of Subject Checklist



Saint GREGORY'S
Bath

Head of Subject Checklist / Declaration

FOR A/AS LEVELS AND GCSES FOR SUMMER 2021

Head of Subject Checklist / Declaration

Department	
Subject	
Level	
Qan code	

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

Declaration	Y/N
1. Students' grades have been determined using only the evidence detailed in the subject's Assessment 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 Assessment 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 Assessment 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. Significant deviations are explained below.	
7. At departmental level, we have determined which evidence will be 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 school assessment and teacher assessed grades policies. 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. <i>[Note: the Head of Centre may provide the second signature where there is a one teacher department.]</i>	
Provide detail and justification where you have indicated N to any of the above:	

Head of Subject Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Second Teacher Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 3 – Student Top Sheet



Saint GREGORY'S
Bath

Student Top Sheet

FOR A/AS LEVELS AND GCSES FOR SUMMER 2021

Name of student	
Candidate Number	
Centre	St Gregory's Catholic College, Bath
Centre Code	50727
Subject title	
Qan Code	

Assessment	Date	Type of Assessment	Level of Control H, M, L	Grade or Mark	Evidence stored?
Assessment 1: <i>e.g. Mock examination</i>		<i>[e.g. Examination]</i>	<i>[e.g. H]</i>		
Assessment 2: <i>[identifier]</i>					
Assessment 3: <i>[identifier]</i>					
Assessment 4: <i>[identifier]</i>					
Assessment 5: <i>[identifier]</i>					
Assessment 6: <i>[identifier]</i>					
Assessment 7: <i>[identifier]</i>					
Assessment 8: <i>[identifier]</i>					
Add / delete as required					

Section 1: COVID Related Disruption – Learner Context	Y/N/NA
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?	
<p>If 'yes' please provide details of how the disadvantage has been considered (including 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.)</p>	

Section 2: Access Arrangements/Reasonable Adjustments	Y/N/NA
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?	
If 'no' please provide details of how the lack of access arrangements/reasonable adjustments have been taken into account when determining the grade:	

Section 3: Mitigating circumstances (Special Consideration)	Y/N/NA
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.	
Reason for mitigating circumstances – see confidential panel notes	

Teacher Assessed Grade	
Subject teacher signature / date	
Head of Subject signature / date	

Appendix 4 – Student Declaration



Student Declaration

Name of student	
Candidate Number	
Centre	St Gregory's Catholic College, Bath
Centre Code	50727
Subject title	
Qan Code	

Work submitted for assessment must be the candidate's own. If candidates copy work, allow candidates to copy from them, or cheat in any other way, they may be disqualified.

Candidate declaration: I have read and understood the above. I confirm that I have not received help or information from anyone in the completion of these assessments.

Teacher declaration: I confirm the candidate's work was conducted under the conditions laid out on the assessment record form. I have authenticated the candidate's work and am satisfied (to the best of my knowledge) that the work produced is solely that of the candidate.

	Signature	Date
Candidate		
Teacher		

Appendix 5 - Timeline



Saint GREGORY'S
Bath

Timeline for Teacher Assessed Grades Process

MONTH	ACTIONS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All subjects decide what evidence will be used and complete the "Assessment Record Form". JCQ Centre Policy uploaded by 30 April 2021. All teaching staff attend training on both Monday 19 and Monday 26 April Letter sent to all students and parents outlining which assessments will be used for TAGs and a Google Form opens to declare mitigating circumstances. 	Subject leaders JTI All teachers JTI / HQU / PHA
May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete assessments in class and mark. Reduce unconscious bias by anonymising papers and splitting marking Moderate standardise marking Use data analysis tools (4 Matrix) to consider vulnerable groups. Attend any relevant training from awarding bodies Begin internal QA Letter sent to students / parents outlining Results Days and the Appeals Process 	All teachers All teachers Subjects leaders, KTY, JTI, JCL, LST, HQU All teachers JTI / JCL / LST JTI / PHA
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue moderation/standardisation Collate records of evidence Collate work which has been retained. Internal quality assurance. Grade Submission by 18 June 2021 	All teachers Subject leaders / teachers Subject leaders / teachers JTI / JCL / LST JTI / HQU
June / July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 June to 16 July 2021 Exam boards complete quality assurance. 	Awarding bodies / JTI / HQU
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Level results day: 10 August 2021 GCSE results day: 12 August 2021 	SLT, HQU, KTY, Admin and pastoral staff

Appendix 6



Saint GREGORY'S
Bath

TEACHER ASSESSED GRADES INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE RECORD

Subject	
Head of Subject	
Qualification	
Qan Code	
Date of meeting	
Staff undertaking QA	

Checklist:

Subject Assessment Record completed for this subject	
Head of Subject checklist and declaration completed for this subject	
Data on Subject Assessment Record satisfactory, e.g. number of assessments, range of AOs covered	
Spreadsheet of marks for all assessments used completed and available	
Folder of evidence completed for each student	
Top sheet completed for each student, which details any changes/ substitutions due to mitigating circumstances or access arrangements	
All students and teachers have signed to authenticate that the work is solely that of the student	
Confirm that access arrangements in place for all students entitled to them	
Confirm that mitigating circumstances applied where SLT have directed	
Confirm that all teachers in this subject have attended the compulsory training and completed the Google Form	
Confirm that TAGs match the evidence on the top sheet	
Compare the grades with 2017, 2018 and 2019. If there is significant variation, detail the reasons why below.	
Evaluate the grades for vulnerable groups (Pupil Premium, SEND and EAL) to ensure there is no bias or discrimination.	

Details must be added below if any of the above are NOT ticked.