



Trinity School

Centre Number: 14382

*Teacher Assessed Grade Process for the Awarding of A Levels, Pre U,
(I)GCSE, Level 2 and Project Based Qualifications.*

CENTRE POLICY

Last Updated: 9th April 2021 (AXC)

This policy supersedes any other examination policies if there is duplication.

CONTENTS

Rationale and Statement of Intent	2
Roles and Responsibilities.....	3
Training, Support and Guidance.....	5
Use of Appropriate Evidence	6
Determining Teacher Assessed Grades.....	8
Internal Quality Assurance.....	9
Comparison of Teacher Assessed Grades to Historic Data	10
Access Arrangements and Special Considerations	12
Addressing Disruption and Differential Lost Learning (DLL)	13
Objectivity	14
Recording Decisions and Retention of Evidence	15
Authenticating Evidence	16
Confidentiality, Malpractice and Conflicts of Interest	17
Confidentiality.....	17
Malpractice.....	17
Reporting Malpractice	18
Conflicts of Interest.....	20
Private Candidates.....	21
External Quality Assurance.....	22
Results.....	23
Appeals.....	24

Rationale and Statement of Intent

The purpose of this policy is:

- To ensure that teacher assessed grades are determined fairly, consistently, free from bias and effectively within and across departments.
- To ensure the operation of effective processes with clear guidelines and support for staff.
- To ensure that all staff involved in the processes clearly understand their roles and responsibilities.
- To support teachers 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.

Please note that any JCQ / Ofqual associated documentation can be found within the All Staff Team / Academic / TAGs 2021 folder, [here](#).

Roles and Responsibilities

Headmaster (Head of Centre)

- Our Head of Centre, the Headmaster, will be responsible for approving our policy for determining teacher assessed grades.
- Our Head of Centre has overall responsibility for the School 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.

Deputy Head Academic and Heads of Department

Our Deputy Head Academic and Heads of Departments will:

- provide training and support to our other staff.
- support the Head of Centre in the quality assurance of the final teacher assessed grades.
- ensure an effective approach within and across departments and authenticating the preliminary outcome from single teacher subjects.
- be responsible for ensuring staff have a clear understanding of the internal and external quality assurance processes and their role within it.
- ensure that all teachers within their department make consistent judgements 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.
- 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.
- ensure that a Head of Department Checklist is completed for each qualification that they are submitting. For CAIE qualifications, this is a Rationale Document.

Teachers, Specialist Teachers and Head of Learning Support (SENCO)

Our teachers, specialist teachers and Head of Learning Support (SENCO) will:

- ensure they conduct assessments under our centre's appropriate levels of control and have sufficient evidence, in line with this Centre Policy and guidance from the Joint Council for Qualifications, to provide teacher assessed grades for each student they have entered for a qualification.

- ensure that the teacher assessed grade they assign to each student is a fair, valid and reliable reflection of the assessed evidence available for each student.
- make judgements based on what each student has been taught and what they have been assessed on, as outlined in the section on grading in the main JCQ guidance.
- 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 our final teacher assessed grades and for managing the post-results services. The data processing policy for the TAGs can be located [here](#).

Training, Support and Guidance

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.

Training resources will be provided in the Teams Academic folder and all those involved in the teacher assessed grades process will be asked to record that they have seen this and understood the material. Additional advice and training will be provided to those who request additional support.

Support for Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) and Teachers Less Familiar with Assessment

Heads of Department will provide mentoring from experienced teachers to NQTs and teachers less familiar with assessment.

The Heads of Department will put in place additional internal reviews of teacher assessed grades for NQTs and other teachers, as appropriate. This may include sampling of live marking to ensure that the mark scheme is being fairly and consistently applied.

The involvement of NQTs and any support provided will be recorded by the relevant Head of Department. This must be documented on the MS Forms survey by Thursday 22nd April.

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](#).

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

Summer Term Assessments (Additional Assessment Materials)

- It is expected that the Summer Term Assessments (additional assessment materials) will be used in most cases to generate the teacher assessed grade. This must be accompanied by any NEA (coursework) components undertaken. We believe that this is the fairest way of assessing the best performance of each student in each subject. The data collected will ensure judgements are objective, evidence-led and capture all the progress made by each student throughout the entirety of the course.
- We will use the Summer Term Assessments (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 formally assessed.
- We will use Summer Term Assessments (additional assessment materials) to give students an opportunity to show improvement and to capture all the progress made throughout the course.
- We will use Summer Term Assessments (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.

For Pearson IGCSE qualifications, we have decided that each grade will be based on at least three pieces of evidence. It is expected that this will include all the Summer Term Assessments as well as any NEA or whole-cohort assessments which meet the Ofqual and Pearson guidance for reliability and validity.

Please note that CAIE qualifications also require three pieces of work for each candidate. Further evidence on collecting the right evidence can be found [here](#).

Course Evidence

Teachers making judgements will have regard to the [Ofqual Head of Centre guidance on recommended evidence](#) as well as the [Pearson IGCSE guidance](#), and further guidance provided by awarding organisations. We are conscious that any must feel confident that any evidence used for the teacher assessed grades is completed by the student with no unreasonable levels of support. Therefore, this limits the range of evidence available to us.

- 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. As per JCQ guidance, for work completed prior to Friday 26th March, a record of assessment is possible when the physical evidence is not available.

- 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). However, it is deemed that homework will rarely be used as we are unable to determine whether this has been done solely by the student with no inappropriate levels of support.
- We will use internal tests taken by pupils. However, we will be mindful of any assessments that have not been completed by students at the same time and under the same conditions.
- 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. It is expected that recordings are kept, where possible, and certainly after Friday 26th March.

For most students, we expect the Summer Term Assessments and NEA components (if applicable) to be the main evidence-base for awarding teacher assessed grades. However, course evidence will be accrued to support those who have had disrupted learning and may have underperformed.

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

- We will consider the level of control under which an assessment was completed, for example, whether the evidence was produced under high control and under supervision or at home.
- We will ensure that we are able to authenticate the work as the student's own, especially where that work was not completed within the school or college.
- We will consider the limitations of assessing a student's performance when using assessments that have been completed more than once, or drafted and redrafted, where this is not a skill being assessed.
- We will consider the specification and assessment objective coverage of the assessment.
- We will consider the depth and breadth of knowledge, understanding and skills assessed, especially higher order skills within individual assessments

Determining Teacher Assessed Grades

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

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

- Our departments 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.
- Departments will be aware of the validity and reliability of the evidence they use, as well as any potential bias or prejudice associated. They should ensure that they have read the guidance produced by Ofqual to help avoid this. This can be found [here](#).
- NEA components do not have to be weighted as per the original specification. It should be considered that NEA components often score more highly than examined components and it would be rare for this component to lead on the awarding of a grade alone.
- Departments are encouraged to consult the worked examples provided by JCQ [here](#). Departments should also ensure they use the Grade Descriptors ([GCSE](#) and [A Level](#)) when awarding the final allocation of grades. These will be used to reinforce any decisions made in borderline cases.
- Pearson iGCSE Grade Descriptors can be found in the subject-specific area. How these should be applied is suggested below by Pearson:
 - Each descriptor contains several statements describing features of typical performance at a grade, against which a student's evidence can be reviewed. If a student's evidence securely matches the statements in a specific grade (e.g. Grade 6), consider the next descriptor above (e.g. Grade 8).
 - If a student's evidence goes beyond aspects of the statements at grade 6 in some areas, but does not match any (or few) of the statements in the higher descriptor (e.g. Grade 8), then the teacher can provide the intermediary grade, where one exists (e.g. Grade 7).
 - The same logic can apply across the grade range (e.g. Grade D for International AS and A level).
 - Where a student's evidence has been graded, this may provide further assurance for the decision on a student's grade.
- For CAIE, teachers should read the following [guidance](#). This provides worked examples which look at how to base a grade on a portfolio of evidence.
- Our departments will record how the evidence was used to arrive at a fair and objective grade, which is free from bias.
- Our departments will produce an Assessment Record for each subject cohort and will share this with the Deputy Head Academic. Any necessary variations for individual students will also be shared.

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.

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

- We will ensure that all teachers involved in deriving teacher assessed grades read and understand this Centre Policy document.
- In subjects where there is more than one teacher and/or class in the department, we will ensure that our centre carries out an internal standardisation process. For any CAIE qualifications, an internal moderator should be appointed. This will be the Head of Department unless the Deputy Head Academic is told otherwise.
- We will ensure that all teachers are provided with training and support to ensure they take a consistent approach to:
 - Arriving at teacher assessed grades
 - Marking of evidence
 - Reaching a holistic grading decision
 - Applying the use of grading support and documentation
- We will conduct internal standardisation across all grades.
- 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. This will be the Deputy Head Academic.
- 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 Historic Data

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.

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.

At the beginning of the Summer Term, the Deputy Head Academic will create and circulate a report which:

- Will compile information on the grades awarded to our students in past June series in which exams took place (e.g. 2017 - 2019). For CAIE qualifications, there is a greater focus on the 2019 statistics.
- Will consider the size of our cohort from year to year.
- Will consider the stability of our centre's overall grade outcomes from year to year.
- Will consider both subject and centre level variation in our outcomes during the internal quality assurance process.

As part of the internal quality assurance, the Deputy Head Academic:

- 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.

Accompanying this guidance, it will be made clear that the awarding of teacher assessed grades will be evidence-led and based on the current attainment of the student alone. However, it will be expected for historic data, along with grade descriptors and exemplification material to be consulted when undertaking the final award of grades.

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 include grades from international GCSEs (for example, in mathematics) because we have previously offered these.

We will bring together other data sources that will help to quality assure the grades we intend to award in 2021. The Deputy Head Academic and Head of Centre will discuss any discrepancies with the department, ensuring that historic data, grade descriptors and exemplary material have been consulted. We will be careful when considering cohorts fewer than 15 students in any sort of statistical comparison. This process will be very limited to cohorts of fewer than 5 students.

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. This is not relevant to our centre, however, we will be mindful of smaller subjects who may not have consistently entered students for examinations.

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.

All students and parents/carers have been asked to submit any Special Consideration requests which may have limited their son's or daughter's attainment in any piece of assessed work. A panel of pastoral and academic leads will meet to see whether an adjustment to the raw mark is necessary. This process will be conducted in accordance to the JCQ guidance found here: [JCQ – A guide to the special consideration process, with effect from 1 September 2020](#).

During the Summer Term Assessment periods, students and parents/carers have been asked to inform the school of any Special Consideration requests up to 72 hours after the incident (or issue) arose.

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.
- 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 this is not possible, we will consider whether a Special Consideration may be appropriate.
- 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 and Differential 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.

Objectivity

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

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).
- bias in teacher assessed grades.

To ensure objectivity, all staff involved in determining teacher assessed grades will be made aware that:

- unconscious bias can skew judgements.
- the evidence presented should be valued for its own merit as an indication of performance and attainment.
- teacher assessed grades should not be influenced by candidates' positive or challenging personal circumstances, character, behaviour, appearance, socio-economic background, or protected characteristics.
- unconscious bias is more likely to occur when quick opinions are formed.
- our internal standardisation process will help to ensure that there are different perspectives to the quality assurance process.

Recording Decisions and Retention of Evidence

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

- We will ensure that teachers and Heads of Departments maintain records that show how the teacher assessed grades process operated, including the rationale for decisions in relation to individual marks/grades.
- 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.
- **Any spoken examinations should be recorded with a copy provided to the Exams Officer before Friday 28th May.**
- 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

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. This is achieved through the selection of evidence used for teacher assessment grades.
- For most students, the Summer Term Assessments provide the most reliable and valid assessment of attainment at the end of the course. Supplementary evidence will be outlined and communicated to students at the beginning of the Summer Term. This will also be communicated via Firefly, our school VLE. This list of evidence will include work for which we are confident that students worked independently and did not receive an unfair level of additional support.
- 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. This will involve exploring any guidance within any subject's specification and speaking to the Subject Specialist Advisor, where appropriate.

Confidentiality, Malpractice and Conflicts of Interest

Confidentiality

This section of our Centre Policy outlines the measures in place to ensure the confidentiality of the grades our centre determines, and to make students aware of the range of evidence on which those grades will be based.

- All staff involved have been made aware of the need to maintain the confidentiality of teacher assessed grades.
- All teaching staff have been briefed on the requirement to share details of the range of evidence on which students' grades will be based, while ensuring that details of the final grades remain confidential.
- Relevant details from this Policy, including requirements around sharing details of evidence and the confidentiality requirements, have been shared with parents/guardians.

Malpractice

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

- Our general centre policies regarding malpractice, maladministration and conflicts of interest have been reviewed to ensure they address the specific challenges of delivery in Summer 2021.
- All staff involved 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.
 - failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and teacher assessed grades.

Principally, in accordance with the regulations Trinity School will:

- take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after the determination of grades process
- inform the awarding body immediately of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or a member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation, including:
 - the [JCQ M1 form](#) in a case of suspected candidate malpractice
 - the [JCQ M2 form](#) in a case of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving a member of centre staff
- as required by an awarding body, investigate any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication [JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2020-2021](#) and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require

Reporting Malpractice

Candidates (or an individual acting on their behalf)

In accordance with [JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for Summer 2021](#) each candidate will be made aware of the evidence that is going to be used and understand that the range of evidence used to determine a grade is not negotiable.

Where a candidate might attempt to gain an unfair advantage during the centre's process on the determination of grades by, for example, submitting fabricated evidence or plagiarised work, or any other act deemed as malpractice in the [JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2020-2021](#), Trinity School will submit a report of suspected candidate malpractice to the relevant awarding body.

Where a candidate, or an individual acting their behalf such as a parent/carer, might try to influence grade decisions by applying pressure to the centre or any of its staff, Trinity School will keep and retain clear and reliable records of the circumstances and the steps taken, and make the candidate aware of the outcome. This will include a record that confirms the candidate had been made aware of the evidence that was going to be used and understand that the range of evidence used to determine a grade was not negotiable.

However, if a candidate or an individual acting on their behalf continues to inappropriately attempt to pressure centre staff, a report of suspected candidate malpractice will be submitted to the relevant awarding body.

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form [JCQ M1 Report of suspected candidate malpractice](#).

- This form must be used by the head of the centre to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected candidate malpractice in the conduct of examinations or assessments.
- It can also be used to provide a report on investigations into instances of suspected malpractice.

- In order to prevent the issue of erroneous results and certificates, it is essential that the awarding body concerned is notified immediately of instances of suspected candidate malpractice.

Centre staff

Trinity School will report any instances of potential malpractice (which includes maladministration) where any centre staff fail to follow the published requirements for determining grades.

Examples of potential malpractice taken from the [JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for Summer 2021](#) includes but is not limited to:

- Exam entries are created for students who had not studied the course of entry or had not intended to enter for June 2021.
- Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that grade.
- A teacher deliberately and inappropriately disregarding the centre's published policy when determining grades.
- A teacher fabricating evidence of candidate performance to support an inflated grade.
- A teacher deliberately providing inappropriate levels of support before or during an assessment, including deliberate disclosure of mark schemes and assessment materials, to support an inflated grade.
- A teacher intentionally submitting inflated grades.
- A failure to retain evidence used in the determination of grades in accordance with the JCQ Grading guidance
- A systemic failure to follow the centre's policy in relation to the application of Access Arrangements or Special Consideration arrangements for students in relation to assessments used to determine grades.
- A failure to take reasonable steps to authenticate student work
- A failure to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest (COIs) within a centre
- A Head of Centre's failure to submit the required declaration when submitting their grades.
- Grades being released to students (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results.
- Failure to cooperate with an awarding body's quality assurance, appeal or investigation processes.
- Failure to conduct a centre review or submit an appeal when requested to do so by a student.

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form [JCQ M2 Notification of suspected malpractice / maladministration involving centre staff](#).

- This form must be completed by the head of centre before an investigation commences to notify an awarding body of an instance of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration.
- The form must be completed and submitted to the appropriate awarding body immediately a suspicion is raised or an allegation received.

Where reference is made to candidates, this includes any private candidates accepted by the centre.

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.

- 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.

The process of acknowledging and dealing with any conflicts of interest began in Autumn Term 2020.

Private Candidates

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

- Our arrangements for assessing Private Candidates to arrive at appropriate grades are identical to the approaches utilised for internal candidates.
- Students who are taking qualifications offered by the school must take the Summer Term Assessments in order for a grade to be given. The individual timetables as well as the information provided to students will be sent out by Thursday 1st April.
- Students who are taking qualifications not offered by the school, must offer the following information to the Deputy Head Academic by Wednesday 31st March:
 - Department for Education number (or equivalent) of the language school, or previous relationship the external tutor has had with the school.
 - Any evidence of exam-style questions, past papers or mock examinations completed and assessed under exam conditions. This should include the date on which it was completed. We would expect at least three pieces of evidence.
 - A copy of the External Tutor's markbook over the course – ideally with dates, types of work and mark (or grade)
 - A report from the External Tutor which outlines:
 - The overall GCSE / A Level performance with an overall grade.
 - The performance in each examined module with a grade
- After which, the Deputy Head Academic will discuss with the candidate whether there is enough evidence for a teacher assessed grade to be given.
- 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.

- 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

Results Days are as follows:

10 August: A/AS Levels and relevant other Level 3 **results day**

12 August: GCSE and relevant other Level 2 **results day**

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

- All staff involved have been made aware of the specific arrangements for the issue of results in Summer 2021, including the issuing of A/AS and GCSE results in the same week.
- Arrangements will be made to ensure the necessary staffing, including exams office and support staff, to enable the efficient receipt and release of results to our students.
- Arrangements will be in place for the provision of all necessary advice, guidance and support, including pastoral support, to students on receipt of their results.
- Such guidance will include advice on the appeals process in place in 2021 (see below).
- Appropriate staff will be available to respond promptly to any requests for information from awarding organisations, for example regarding missing or incomplete results, to enable such issues to be swiftly resolved.
- Parents/guardians have been made aware of arrangements for results days.

Appeals

There are two routes: priority and non-priority appeals. A priority appeal may be requested of the Awarding Body if a place in Higher Education is reliant on the outcome.

Appeals timings are as follows:

10 August to 7 September: priority appeals window **10 August to 16 August:** student requests centre review

10 August to 20 August: centre conducts centre review

11 August to 23 August: centre submits appeal to awarding organisation

10 August to end October: majority of non-priority appeals take place **10 August to 3 September:** student requests centre review

10 August to 10 September: centre conducts centre review

11 August to 17 September: centre submits appeal to awarding organisation

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

- All staff involved have been made aware of the arrangements for, and the requirements of, appeals in Summer 2021, as set out in the **JCQ Guidance**.
- 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