

Castle Rushen High School

Centre policy on assessment and quality assurance processes for the summer 2021 alternative arrangements

Centre Name: Castle Rushen High School	Centre Number: 45003
Policy adopted by Board of Governors 30 June 2021	Policy approved by WJEC on 27 April 2021 Policy approved by JCQ on 17 June 2021
Member of staff responsible for the policy: Keith Winstanley, Headteacher	

Statement of Intent

The purpose of this Centre Policy is:

- to ensure that Centre Determined Grades (CDG) 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 Qualification Wales requirements
- to achieve a high standard of internal quality assurance in the allocation of CDGs
- 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.

It will be the responsibility of everyone involved in the generation of Centre Determined Grades to read, understand, and implement the policy.

1. Roles and responsibilities

Governing Body: adopt the policy

Head of Centre: (HOC) (Keith Winstanley)

- Overall responsibility for the policy and processes
- Final sign off and approval of subject plans, quality assurance undertaken, and centre determined grades (CDGs), ensuring fairness and consistency
- Signs the Head of Centre declaration
- Supported by **Curriculum Lead**, (CL) (John Danielson):
 - Provides support and training to STLs/staff
 - Checks assessment plans, ensuring plans meet the WJEC Qualification Assessment Frameworks

- Monitors progress against agreed assessment plans, agreeing remediating action if appropriate
- Undertakes QA for in respect of processes and grades. This will include a review of subject level processes and the analysis of cohort results by subject, comparing these to prior years and estimated grades, seeking to resolve anomalies with the relevant STL, agreeing remediating action if appropriate
- approves communications with students and parents/carers

Examinations Officer, (EO) (Josephine Evans):

- ensures that relevant communications are sent on a timely basis to STLs, CL, HOC
- provides advice to STLs, liaising with CL and HOC as appropriate
- ensures entries and grades are submitted accurately and on time
- ensures results, appeals and any special consideration processes are managed in a timely way

Subject Team Leader, (STL):

- is responsible for their subject assessment plan and other documentation required, including implementation, monitoring progress and updating for actual events
- reads and follows relevant WJEC and centre guidance, including any subject specific guidance on how to organise and mark assessments, ensuring these are valid, reliable and fair to all learners
- works with the SENCo and EO to ensure that access arrangements are made and that assessment has been fair to learners with additional needs, ensuring records are kept
- ensures subject team members receive relevant training
- ensures relevant marking and moderation is correctly undertaken
- ensures that grades are submitted to the HOC and CL in time for the internal QA process prior to final submission of CDG
- ensures Learner Decision Records are completed and that all evidence (including copies of assessments, mark schemes and grade boundaries, as well as each individual learner's evidence) is stored securely, to be accessible to the EO, CL and HOC in case of appeals.

Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator, (SENCo) (Helen Almond):

- ensures that the identified additional learning needs of students have been assessed and any access arrangements have been agreed with the EO and relevant STL
- ensures the SEN register is accurate and available to STL
- selects a sample of students and reviews access arrangements and evidence submitted, reporting to HOC in respect of fairness and equitability.

Teacher:

- attends meetings and training about assessment and quality assurance
- ensures assessments are completed under the required levels of control and with any access arrangements in place
- is consistent and fair in marking and in making judgements, following guidance
- supports moderation processes, following guidance
- maintains accurate records, submitting marks and filing evidence as required
- assists in the completion of Learner Decision Records.

2. Subject assessment plans

STLs will submit draft subject assessment plans following the requirements of the WJEC Qualification Assessment Frameworks prior to Easter. These will be reviewed by the HOC and CL and updated as agreed. STLs will then submit final draft subject assessment plans which will be agreed by HOC later in April.

Plans will include:

1. Work which will be used for determining grades, and the reasons for choosing that
2. How the work will actually be used to determine a grade
3. When the work was produced / will be produced
4. The conditions in which work will or has been completed, and how authenticated
5. If not all assessment objectives will be assessed, which won't and why
6. How marking will be standardised and moderated
7. How objectivity will be ensured and how any access arrangements/reasonable adjustments will be met (including the support needed from the SENCo)
8. Process for signing off grading decisions within the subject team

If there are circumstances where a particular piece of evidence is not available or is not considered representative for a learner, this should be documented in the subject assessment plan along with any alternative evidence being considered, with rationale.

Subject assessment plans should be updated to reflect any significant deviations from the planned approach and with detail of actual events.

3. Centre devised assessments

Our policy is that we should use assessments which have been devised by the exam board (WJEC). These may be adapted, for example, by removing questions on content which has not been delivered to learners and/or adding questions on content which has been delivered. Such assessments should be marked using the published mark scheme. Non-examined assessment (NEA) (coursework) will also normally be used in making decisions about learner performance, where relevant to the course specification.

There may be limited circumstances where the above provides insufficient evidence to arrive at a holistic grade for a particular learner. If so, the STL may devise their own assessments ("centre-devised assessments"). If used, STLs are responsible for making sure that any centre-devised assessments are valid, reliable and fair to all learners, including those with protected characteristics. The approach adopted, including the rationale, design and quality assurance, should be recorded in the subject assessment plan.

4. Assessment delivery

Learners will be advised that a new assessment will contribute to the evidence through which their grade will be determined. We should document the duration of assessments and the conditions in which they will be or have been undertaken through the subject assessment plan. This should include access arrangements.

Where practicable, assessments should be undertaken in school in controlled conditions. This will mean we have reasonable assurance that the work is the learner's own. Any NEA should, as far as practicable, follow established protocols including for submission and authentication of work.

Feedback given in respect of the NEA process should be provided on a similar basis to a normal year. In the event of there being material used as evidence where learners have been given feedback and a subsequent chance to improve their submission, other than NEA following the normal rules, the nature of the feedback and consequences for the final assessment decision should be recorded in the subject assessment plans and reviewed in context as part of our quality control processes.

There may be circumstances where undertaking assessment in school is not practicable, for example due to lockdown or the specific situation of an individual learner, meaning that an assessment takes place at home. Where a learner has undertaken an assessment at home, they should be required to confirm that this is their own work. The standard demonstrated in the assessment should be corroborated against other work done by the learner in controlled conditions. If there are clear differences in the standard demonstrated, the home assessment should not be used and the learner should be informed of this.

STLs are required to securely store paper files containing the following:

A specification level file:

1. Subject assessment plan and supporting documentation, approved by the STL (and HOC)
2. Completed templates (e.g. Learner Decision Records) showing grades to be awarded, approved by the STL
3. Copies of assessments, mark schemes and grade boundaries used
4. Copies of mark book, if relevant

Files with a section for each student:

5. Copies of marked student work, filed consistently, one section per student. Photos of large or bulky items, and CDs of performance recordings should be included, where relevant.

The principle is that the EO should be able to extract all the evidence supporting a learner's CDG from these paper files; she should not have to go to another source.

Avoidance of malpractice

Teachers should be alert to the potential for plagiarism and other forms of malpractice. If malpractice is suspected, the normal malpractice procedures will apply.

There is enhanced risk of teacher malpractice because staff will know questions used in assessments in advance. STLs, the CL and the HOC need to be alert to this - where the results for a learner, or a group of learners, appear significantly better than would be

supported by prior evidence, we should investigate the circumstances. This could involve interviewing learners about the support provided in advance of an assessment, and/or arranging a brief “viva” in respect of relevant material to gain reasonable assurance that the standard demonstrated through the assessment is genuine.

No teacher can be involved in marking the work of or determining the CDG of their own child or near relative. Any such relationships must be disclosed via the exams officer, as normal, and documented in the subject assessment plan.

We provided training to all our STLs on 16 March 2021 setting out our approach and requirements to the awarding of grades in Summer 2021. This was given over Microsoft Teams by the HOC. We will continue to update staff over the course of the process.

5. Quality assurance of assessment and grading decisions

WJEC require quality assurance processes to be undertaken to ensure accuracy and consistency. The school will undertake a rigorous standardisation and quality assurance process to ensure the grades determined are valid, reliable, equitable and fair. In developing an approach to centre determined grades in 2021, we have taken steps to ensure we meets the Public Sector Equality Duty.

All subject assessment plans will be reviewed and approved by STL/CL/HOC and will be updated for actual events.

Training on requirements was provided to STLs on 16 March 2021. All staff involved in assessment have been requested by the HOC in w/c 12 April to review the training materials provided by WJEC on its website: “Objectivity in assessing learner evidence” and “Objectivity and unconscious bias”. Further training will be provided as required.

For new assessments being undertaken

- teachers will meet to standardise their approach to marking to ensure that mark schemes are applied consistently by different markers
- the STL will select a sample of learner work to be moderated. This will involve marking again by a second marker, with any anomalies addressed, involving the STL or a third person, if required to reach a conclusion.
- the moderation sample will not be less than 10% overall and will include all markers and a range of grade outcomes. Where practicable, STLs will anonymise papers for moderation
- In the event that the sample indicates a systematic marking deficiency, the STL will determine remediating action, which could include re-marking elements of work and/or increasing sample sizes, consulting with the HOC to the extent appropriate and documenting decisions made.

In addition, the SENCo will select a sample of students with known additional needs, reviewing with her team and STLs the access arrangements offered and the evidence generated. Her review will be in respect of fairness and equitability of our processes for students with additional needs.

Prior to submission, the HOC and CL will undertake an exercise comparing proposed grades against the results in that subject from prior years when there have been external exams. STLs will be requested to explain significant anomalies compared to prior years, having regard to cohort variation across years.

Additionally, the HOC and CL will undertake an exercise comparing proposed grades against estimates previously made for learners. Whilst all exam boards are clear that grades can only be awarded based on actual evidence, not predicted performance, if the estimate and the actual grade are significantly different this could highlight an anomaly, which the STLs will be requested to explain.

The STL will be required to approve the subject grades being submitted, having taken steps to ensure that all relevant subject teachers agree that they are fair, documenting any remaining disagreements and their ultimate resolution. The HOC will provide a formal sign off on all grades and processes to the exam board in the form prescribed by them.

All documentation will be retained securely for the specified period beyond the award of grades in August 2021, allowing for the potential for appeals.

Special consideration

Special consideration applies in individual situations where, for example, illness or bereavement at the time of an assessment has affected performance in it. Special consideration does not apply to lost teaching and learning time. In a normal year, requests for Special Consideration are passed to the exam board for consideration. This year, we are required to consider requests for special consideration in school, following the exam board rules. Such requests should be made to the EO who will investigate the circumstances and gather the evidence, applying the exam board rules to make a recommendation to the HOC. The EO will document our decisions in respect of Special consideration.

We will also consider the data protection impacts of following the exam board requirements in Summer 2021.

6. Learner and parents/carers communication

Communication to learners and parents/carers will take place on an ongoing basis.

Key communication has included / will include:

Date	Content
19 March 2021	High level overview and next steps (email to parents)
1 April 2021	Basis of assessment for each subject including assessment window (email to parents)
14 April 2021	Detailed calendar of assessments has been shared (micro website)
Following return from lockdown	Communication about key process and timeline; this will include Access and Special Consideration
Mid-June 2021	Communication about release of provisional CDGs and appeals processes
Late June 2021	Release of provisional CDGs (to students in paper form, via the EO)
August 2021	Reminder of results days and appeals processes (email to parents)



7. Internal reviews and complaints

Complaints in IOM schools are managed according to the DESC Complaints policy.

We are required to follow regulations issued by exam board regulators. We will read and take into account relevant documentation from regulators and exam boards in order to review and, to the extent necessary, update our appeals procedures in respect of Summer 2021 examinations.

In respect of WJEC, appeals are expected to follow a three stage process:

Stage 1 – School Review of Centre Determined Grades

We are required to submit CDGs to WJEC by the specified date. Prior to this point, students will be informed of their provisional CDGs. This will be done through the EO once all internal processes are complete. STLs and Teachers should not advise students or parents/carers of provisional CDGs. Students can request a review of the school's judgement of their grade. The school will conduct a review, however new or additional evidence cannot be considered as part of the process. Any grade adjustments could be up or down.

Stage 2 - Appeal

After results day, candidates can appeal to WJEC regarding their grade. WJEC will conduct a review. Any grade adjustments could be up or down.

Stage 3 – Exam Procedures Review Service (EPRS)

Following an unsuccessful appeal to WJEC, candidates can request an Exams Procedures Review Service which is the final stage of the appeals process.

8 Confidentiality of CDGs

STLs and Teachers should not advise students or parents/carers of provisional CDGs.

For WJEC, we are required to provide provisional CDGs to students in advance of our submission (see Stage 1 in Section 7). This will be arranged by the EO once all internal processes are complete.

For all other exam boards, provisional CDGs will **not** be released in advance of the relevant results day and must remain confidential until that time.