



ELTHAM COLLEGE

Eltham College Centre Policy

FOR A LEVELS AND GCSES FOR SUMMER 2021

Gloria Filiorum Patres

Eltham College

Grove Park Road, London SE9 4QF

Telephone 020 8857 1455

mail@eltham-college.org.uk

 @ElthamHead

www.elthamcollege.london

Eltham College is a company registered in England and Wales. Registered charity number 1058438. Limited by guarantee. Company number 3245525.



Centre Policy for determining teacher assessed grades in Summer 2021

1. Statement of intent

This policy outlines the process taken to ensure that Teacher Assessed Grades (TAGs) are:

- Awarded fairly, consistently and free from bias.
- An accurate reflection of the performance of each student based on a wide range of evidence.
- Derived using a consistent, rigorous whole school approach.

To do this, this document will provide:

- Effective processes with clear guidelines and support for staff.
- Details of training and communication to ensure that all parents, students and staff involved in the processes clearly understand their roles and responsibilities.
- An outline and timeline for the appeals process.
- Details of how evidence will be gathered and considered in each subject.



2. Determining teacher assessed grades

Effective communication between Eltham College, teachers, pupils and parents is essential to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the process of awarding TAGs. This open communication and transparency will inform students of the ability to raise any errors or circumstances relating to particular pieces of evidence to be considered at least 24 hours in advance of the grade submission at **9am on 18 June 2021**.

2a. Guiding Principals

All TAGs will be generated based on students' performance over the last two years using a range of assessment data.

TAGs will be awarded based on evidence of performance rather than potential. Prior On Track To Achieve grades and the UCAS predicted grades, which were based on students' past performance and potential, will not have a bearing on TAGs.

Departments will produce an Assessment Record for each subject cohort and will share this with the Academic team.

Any necessary variations from the Assessment Record for individual students will be recorded within that document.

Subject Teachers, Heads of Department, Exams Officers and Invigilators will ensure access arrangements are in place for students. Where an access arrangement is not accommodated for any reason, special consideration will be applied, and its application communicated to all involved.

To address disruption and differential lost learning, our TAGs will be determined based on evidence of the content that has been taught and assessed for each student. Each student will be graded on their performance in the subject content they have been taught and their demonstrated knowledge and skills.

Where a student's circumstances affect the performance or completion of an assessment, the relevant Department, in consultation with the Academic Team will apply reasonable special consideration by taking the circumstances into account in determining grades or by using alternative evidence that was unaffected by the adverse circumstances.

2b. Eltham College TAGs process

2b.(i) – New Formal Assessments

Data from new formal assessments will be gathered between April 12th and May 28th 2021. During this time, the school will facilitate four assessments per (I)GCSE and six assessments per A Level per subject. We will be using student work produced in response to assessment materials provided by our awarding organisations, including groups of questions, past papers or similar materials such as practice or sample papers.

Those assessments should cover all assessments objectives of each qualification and should contain enough content for students to demonstrate their understanding of the majority of the course. 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. Assessments will use a blended mix of papers in all years.

Of those new formal assessments, two pieces of evidence per (I)GCSE and three pieces of evidence per A Level will be gathered during 'Portfolio Building' time between May 10th and May 28th. Evidence gathered during 'Portfolio Building' time will be gathered in a manner consistent with formal public examinations, using an examination timetable and an exam hall.

In addition to the formal assessments during 'Portfolio Building' time, two pieces of evidence per (I)GCSE and three pieces of evidence per A Level will be gathered within lessons following the normal school timetable. These will include one or two pieces completed in supervised exam conditions in class whilst following the regular school timetable and one piece completed as homework.

Evidence will be classified using the following descriptors:

- **High Control** – Completed under supervision in timed, formal examination conditions ensuring that all students complete the task at the same time.
- **Medium Control** – Completed under supervision in timed formal examination conditions whilst following the regular school lesson timetable.
- **Limited Control** – Completed with limited supervision and accompanied by a student and parent declaration ensuring that it is the students' own work without outside assistance or access to prohibited materials.

Practical subjects where a large proportion of the course is assessed via the NEA may assess students differently from other subjects. Subject specific details of these new formal assessments have been included in the appendix of this document.

2b.(ii) – Historical Data

Data from formal assessment such as January/April Progress Tests, Mock examinations, End of year examinations and in-class tests Lower Sixth and Upper Sixth could be used to decide grades for A Level students. The similar data set recorded in Years 10 and 11 could be used to decide grades for (I)GCSE students. If applicable, non-examined assessment (coursework) work will also be considered using the same weighting as would have been used by exam boards, even if this has not been fully completed.

We will not be using work completed remotely as we do not believe that the measures in place during remote learning meet the required 'robust mechanisms' 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

2b.(iii) – Weighting Evidence

If applicable and if complete, non-examined assessments (coursework) will be weighted with the same weighting as would have been the case had the examinations not been cancelled. Should a NEA not be complete, then it will be considered on its merits at the point of hand-in and weighted accordingly.



We will consider the level of control under which an assessment was completed when considering the portfolio of evidence as a whole.

We recognise that students improve throughout their study, with their best performance in any normal academic year typically coming towards the end of the course. As such, we recognise that historical data may not appropriately reflect the current ability of an individual student. Should evidence gathered during the 'Portfolio Building' tasks at the end of the course of study demonstrate that a student has improved throughout the course as would normally be the case, 'Portfolio Building' data will be weighted more heavily than historical data.

2b.(iv) – Objectivity

All Eltham College staff will fulfil their duties and responsibilities in relation to relevant equality and disability legislation. To ensure objectivity, all 'Portfolio Building' tasks will be anonymised for marking and moderation. With particular reference to historical data, all staff involved in determining TAGs 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
- TAGs 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 within the Quality Assurance process.

2b.(v) – TAGs awarding process

Stage 1: Teachers ask students to return historical data to be stored centrally.

Stage 2: Students complete work during 'Portfolio Building' time using Portfolio Building Week Numbers instead of names. These are unique student identification codes known only to the Exams Officer.

Stage 3: Work is marked whilst student data is absent. Consistency is prioritised in the determination of marking policy.

Stage 4: Where there is more than one teacher of a subject, work is moderated within the department prior to being unmasked.

Stage 5: Once marking and moderation is complete, the exams officer returns student identifiers to the work and departments are able to collate the new evidence per student to be stored for potential exam board inspections.

Stage 6: Individual teachers assign grades based on evidence which is commensurate with the standard at which a student is performing using the range of evidence as outlined in the Subject Specific TAGs Information.

Stage 7: Grades assigned for individual pieces of work by individual teachers are moderated within the department in moderation meetings. A decision rationale for each student is recorded.

Stage 8: Lead Teachers present all grades generated and moderated by their department to the Senior Academic Team and Exams Officer. During this meeting, Lead Teachers present a summary of



evidence used for the grading process, comparing the grades generated against historical data in 2017-2019 and providing justifications for any results that are not following the trend.

Stage 9: The Senior Academic Team presents whole school grades to Mr Guy Sanderson as Head of Centre.

2b.(vi) – Retention of evidence

Eltham College will ensure that all new 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. All historic candidate evidence used to determine teacher assessed grades, and associated documentation, will be requested to be returned from students and, if returned, made available for the purposes of external quality assurance and appeals. If it is not returned, marks from that time will be used in proxy.

We will ensure that Exams Officer, Teachers and Heads of Department maintain records that show how the TAGs process operated, including the rationale for decisions in relation to individual marks and grades. We will ensure that the grades accurately reflect the evidence submitted and that evidence is retained electronically or on paper in a secure centre-based system that can be readily shared with our awarding organisation(s).

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.

2b.(vii) – Authenticating Evidence

In the Subject Assessment Record, all evidence will be graded based on the control under which it was completed. Evidence graded High or Medium control was completed in school under staff supervision and as such we are confident of the authenticity of this evidence. Evidence completed under limited control will be accompanied with a candidate declaration that the work is their own, completed unaided and without access to inappropriate material. The Senior Academic Team will review any Limited Control data that staff awarding TAGs raise concerns about.

2c. Student and Parent Communication Timeline

Date	Type	Description
15/1/21	Email	Details of the consultation
25/1/21	Video	Common questions about the consultation
28/1/21	Zoom	A Level Open Questions Evening
3/2/21	Email	Confirmation that Edexcel IGCSEs would take the same approach as GCSEs
9/2/21	Email	GCSE and A Level Q&A summary
25/2/21	Email	Email detailing consultation outcome
8/4/21	Email	Email detailing exam timetables and guidance released on March 31 st
15/4/21	Zoom	GCSE Meeting setting out plan for assessments in Summer Term
16/4/21	Zoom	A Level Meeting setting out plan for assessments in Summer Term



3. 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.

Name	Role	Responsibilities
Mr Guy Sanderson Headmaster	Head of Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approve the policy for TAGs.• Has responsibility for the school as an examinations centre and will ensure that clear roles and responsibilities of all staff are defined.• Communicate the Eltham College TAGs policy with students and parents.• Ensure and confirm that TAG 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.• Ensure a robust internal quality assurance process has been produced and signed-off in advance of results being submitted.
Mr Edward Wright Deputy Head (Academic) Mr James Martin Deputy Head (Staffing) Ms Rachel Gordon Assistant Head (Teaching and Learning) Mr Mark Chesterton Head of Initial Teacher Training and CPD	Members of the Eltham College Academic Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Communicate the policy for TAGs with all Eltham College teaching staff.• Support the Head of Centre in the quality assurance of the final TAGs• Meet with individual Heads of Department to ensure that a broad and balanced body of evidence is used to support the awarding of TAGs.• Provide training and support for staff to ensure a consistent application of the Centre Policy for TAGs.• Ensure that all teachers within their department make judgements consistent with the guidance issued by JCQ and Exam boards leading to an effective approach within and across departments.• Ensure that all teachers make consistent judgements about student evidence in deriving a grade.• Authenticate the preliminary outcome for the single teacher subjects of RS and Mandarin.• Ensure all staff conduct assessments under the appropriate levels of control with reference to guidance provided by the Joint Council for Qualifications.• Ensure that a Head of Department Checklist is completed for each qualification being submitted.



Heads of Department		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Complete the Head of Department Checklist for each qualification being submitted.• Decide the range of assessment data used 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.• Decide the weighting tariff for all assessment data used, ensuring that the whole school principle of weighting as outlined in Section 2b.(iii) is followed.• Ensure that all teachers within their department make consistent judgements about student evidence in deriving a grade including those who are eligible for special considerations.• Provide training to colleagues within the department to ensure that grades are generated in an objective way.• Provide extra training and support to NQTs to ensure objectivity in determining grades• 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.• Provide the Exams Officer with sufficient evidence to justify their decisions.
Mrs Maggie Dunbar Exams Officer	Exams Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Liaise with Ofqual, JCQ and Exam Boards and disseminate relevant information on TAGs to the Leadership Group and Lead Teachers.• Identify potential conflicts of interest and ensure that the relevant members of staff sign and date the Conflicts of Interest Declaration.• Ensure effective provision of access arrangements for all eligible students.• Ensure that all TAGs are submitted accurately by 18 June 2021.• Manage the post results service.• Collate evidence to be considered by the Academic team about mitigating circumstances for individual students.• Securely store and be able to retrieve evidence collated by Heads of Departments that justifies the TAG awarding decisions.



<p>Mrs Cath Georgulas SENCO</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure students with potential access arrangements are appropriately assessed in order to verify the individual access arrangements.
<p>Mr Scott Milne Assistant Head (Sixth Form)</p> <p>Mr Les Watts Assistant Head (Middle School)</p> <p>Mrs Melinda Pokorny Head of Upper Sixth</p> <p>Mr Christian Devellerez Head of Lower Sixth</p> <p>Mr James Chesterton Head of Year 11</p>	<p>Pastoral team</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that students complete their student declarations and that any issues that arise are communicated to the Academic Team. • Ensure that teachers are aware of students eligible for special considerations. • Collate evidence with the Exams Officer to be considered by the Academic team about mitigating circumstances for individual students.
<p>Teachers</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure effective provision of access arrangements for all eligible students in tasks that are sat outside of a formal exam hall setting. • Ensure any assessments are conducted under our centre's appropriate levels of control. • Assist Heads of Department in marking work in line with this Centre Policy and guidance from the Joint Council for Qualifications, to provide TAGs for each student they have entered for a qualification. • 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
<p>Invigilators</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure effective provision of access arrangements for all eligible students. • Ensure any assessments are conducted under our centre's appropriate levels of control
<p>Mr Dave Prince Data Manager</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that students are formally presented with a summary of the individual pieces of evidence ahead of the final submission to Exam Boards so that any administrative errors or academic queries can be raised prior to submission.



4. 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.

- All Heads of department have weekly meetings with one of the Senior Academic Team where their approach to TAGs has been discussed on a weekly basis.
- All Heads of Department attended a meeting on April 13th, 2021 where the school's plan for TAGs was explained and subjects specific questions could be asked.
- All teachers were invited to attend a meeting on April 14th, 2021 to to help achieve consistency and fairness to all students. Department meetings will ensure that teachers are aware of the subject-specific idiosyncrasies prior to Portfolio Building tasks.
- Newly and Recently Qualified Teachers will meet with the Head of Initial Teacher Training to ensure that they understand what is expected and are aware of the support available within the school and their own department.

5. Internal quality assurance

As outlined in Section 2b.(v), all grades submitted are reviewed through the nine-stage process to ensure the highest level of fairness and objectivity.

5a Head of Centre Internal Quality Assurance and Declaration

We will ensure that all teachers involved in deriving teacher assessed grades read and understand this Centre Policy document.

For all subjects where there is more than one teacher an internal standardisation process will be undertaken. In Mandarin and Religious Studies, where there is only one teacher involved in marking assessments and determining grades, the output of this activity will be reviewed by an appropriate member of staff within the Senior Academic Team.

We will ensure that all teachers are provided with training and support to ensure they take a consistent approach to:

- Arriving at TAGs
- 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 organisations. Where appropriate, we will amend individual grade decisions to ensure alignment with the standards as outlined by our awarding organisations.

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.



6. External Quality Assurance

The Head of Centre, Senior Academic Team and Exams Officer will be working closely and cooperatively with the relevant awarding body during the external quality assurance process. All staff involved have been made aware of the awarding organisation requirements for External Quality Assurance as set out in the JCQ Guidance.

All evidence is collected, recorded and maintained effectively and confidentially in order to respond fully and promptly to any additional requirements or reviews that may be identified as a result of the External Quality Assurance process.



7. Comparison of teacher assessed grades to results for previous cohorts

Heads of Department will complete an analysis of historical data as part of the Subject Assessment Record. However, a direct comparison is likely to yield misleading results. Eltham College's historical data from 2017, 2018 and 2019 demonstrates continual improvement that is reflective of both structural changes and improving academic intake based on baseline data. **As such, an average of historical data would significantly underestimate expected outcomes in 2021.**

The 2017 cohort either started Sixth Form in September 2015 or Year 7 in 2012. A new Headmaster, three new Deputy Heads, a new Assistant Head - Head of Sixth Form, a new Assistant Head - Head of Middle School, a new Assistant Head – Head of Lower School, a new Head of Upper Sixth and a significantly changed governing body have introduced extensive structural changes at Eltham College between 2015 and 2020. These changes have resulted in substantial improvements in GCSE and A level grades and an expectation of further improvements for the 2021 cohort.

A Level

2015/17 – 20.8% A* and 57.5% A*A

2016/18 – 22.4% A* and 63.2% A*A

2017/19 – 29.1% A* and 70.1% A*A

At A level, the first structural change that resulted in these improvements was an increase in the Sixth Form entrance criteria from 4 grade As at GCSE to 6 grade As at GCSE in 2017. This meant that the 2019 results are the first set to benefit from higher calibre students in the Sixth Form, although there were some concessions made during the first year of the change to appease parents who were long-standing supporters of the school. The result is an exceptional increase in the average ability of our cohort for 2021 in comparison to all previous year groups. The magnitude of the change can be quantified by the objective average GCSE points score of the candidates in our Sixth Form:

2015/17 – 7.18

2016/18 – 7.17

2017/19 – 7.46

2018/20 – 7.71

2019/21 – 7.86


In addition to the change of entrance criteria, we reduced the breadth of the A level curriculum from four subjects per student to three subjects per student in order to ensure that students received more teacher time per subject. The consequence of this restructuring was a 25% increase in lesson time per A level. Our new Sixth Form team have implemented changes to ensure underperforming students were identified and supported more swiftly and effectively than was previously the case.

The combination of these factors meant that, had students sat an exam in 2021 our expectation was to receive results that showed a significant increase on both 2019 and the Centre Assessed Grades of 2020. This should have been visible at both the top end and those who needed more support. To quantify this, our internal data suggested that the 2019/21 cohort would go on to achieve 45% A*, 85% A*A and 98% A*B. At the same point in 2019, our internal data underpredicted some 2019 final outcomes with 28.3% A*, 71.1% A*A and 96.2% A*B.




The changes made have not only seen an improvement in the base academic ability of the cohort, but also the value added by teachers throughout the course. The value-added data from CEM can quantify that improvement at A Level and GCSE:

Chart 1.1 SPC Chart - Results from all Qualifications



Rolling Three Year Average Statistical Process Control Chart
Nationally Representative Standardisation
GCSE OVERALL

Final Analysis. Based on results received by CEM up to 25/04/2021.





8. Confidentiality, malpractice and conflicts of interest

8a Confidentiality

All staff involved have been made aware of the need to maintain the confidentiality of TAGs. 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. All students will be issued with a record of the evidence used in determining their TAG. Relevant details from this Policy, including requirements around sharing details of evidence and the confidentiality requirements, have been shared with parents/guardians.]

8b 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
- 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.

8c Conflicts of Interest

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.



9. Private Candidates

Eltham College will be submitting results for three private candidates. All students are returning students who have previously studied at Eltham College. They will undertake the same assessments in exam conditions as the internal students. These assessments will be invigilated by the regular invigilation team. They will not have the same body of historical evidence that students who are currently studying do.

10. Results

The results day for A Level is August 10th, 2021 and the Results day for (I)GCSE is August 12th, 2021. All staff, students and parents have been informed of these date changes and Heads of Department and Senior Leaders within the school will be available on those days to answer any questions or queries from students and parents.

11. Appeals

11a Overview of Appeals Process

We believe the need for appeals should be limited as students should be confident in their grades because of the rigorous awarding process outlined in 2b.(v).

- 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.

11b Stages of Appeal

Appeals must be submitted in writing to Mr G Sanderson, Head of Centre, outlining the error(s) that the appellant believe have been made. Any appeals lodged after the Results Day will follow the process outlined below:

Stage 1: Centre Review

If a student does not consider that they have been issued with the correct grade, they can ask the centre to check if an administrative or procedural error has occurred.

The grade being reviewed could go down, up or stay the same.

The Head of Centre, Exams Officer and the Senior Academic Team will work with the relevant members of staff to investigate the review request. If we find that an error has occurred, we will



submit a request to the awarding organisation to correct the error and amend the grade without the need to make an appeal to the awarding organisation.

Stage 2: Appeal to the Awarding Organisation

Stage 1 must have been completed before Stage 2. During this stage, an appeal is submitted by the Centre to the awarding body on the student's behalf. An appeal should be submitted if the student considers that the Centre did not follow its procedure properly, the Awarding Organisation has made an administrative error, or the student considers that the grade awarded was an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement.

The grade under review could go down, up or stay the same.

Stage 3: Ofqual Exam Procedures Review Service

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

The grade under review could go down, up or stay the same.

11c Grounds for Appeal

There are four grounds upon which a Centre review or an appeal to an awarding organisation may be requested:

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

12. Data Breach and Cyber Attack Policy

We take cyber security very seriously and constantly strive to improve our defences. The college holds a current Cyber Essentials certification, which is a government-backed certification, awarded to organisations who follow the core principles of cyber security outlined by the Cyber Essentials scheme. This programme ensures organisations will be guarded against the most common threats faced.

In relation to the examinations, we specifically cover the following areas:

1. Technological barriers for the spread of malware:
 - a. Firewalls Intrusion
 - b. Detection Systems



- c. Anti-virus software
- 2. Policies ensuring that the IT related requirements as set by the examination bodies are met
- 3. That all examinations files are backed up and that the offline backups are kept for a sufficient amount of time
- 4. The backups are randomly tested to ensure that the data can be successfully recovered from the backups

Appendix 1: Subject Assessment Record

Assessment Record for determining teacher assessed grades in Summer 2021

[ADD DEPARTMENT AND LEVEL HERE] (e.g. Music GCSE)

Assessment Evidence Form

Title	Date	Historic	Type of Assessment	Unit __				Unit __				Unit __				Level of Control
				AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	H/M/L
<i>September Progress Test</i>	3.1.20	Y	<i>Examination</i>	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	<i>H</i>
Assessment 2: <i>[identifier]</i>																
Assessment 3: <i>[identifier]</i>																
Assessment 4: <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 supported the grading decision:-																

Subject Title: _____

Subject Code _____

Head of Department: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Subject teacher: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____



Details of marking and moderation process:

Title	Marked By	Moderated	Anonymised	Historic
<i>September Progress Test</i>	Class teacher	Y - ATH	N	Y
Assessment 2: <i>[identifier]</i>		N		
Assessment 3: <i>[identifier]</i>				
Assessment 4: <i>[identifier]</i>				
<i>[add/delete as necessary]</i>				

Analysis of Historical Data

	2017	2018	2019	2021
Cohort Size				
%A*				
%A*A				
%A*B				

	2017	2018	2019	2021
Cohort Size				
%98 or A*				
%987 or A*A				
%9876 or A*B				

I confirm that a decision rationale statement has been prepared for each student:

Head of Department: _____ **Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____



Variations for Individual Students

[To be completed by the Head of Department for each student where a variation from the Assessment Evidence Grid has been required, or where Access Arrangements or Special Consideration have been taken into account.]

Centre name: _____

Centre Number: _____

Circle Level:

A Level	(I)GCSE
---------	---------

Subject title: _____

Subject Code: _____

Section 1: Class based differences	Y/N/NA
We have some large cohort subjects with multiple classes. In these cases, individual classes may have historic evidence that is class specific rather than whole cohort. Please find a summary below of which classes have completed which pieces of historic evidence:	

Section 2: COVID Related Disruption – Learner Context	Y/N/NA
Did any candidates 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 any candidates when compared with other candidates in the year group?	



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.*)



Section 3: Access Arrangements/Reasonable Adjustments	Y/N/NA
Is there any candidate taking your subject that is 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 4: Mitigating circumstances (Special Consideration)	Y/N/NA
Has any 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:	



Appendix 2 – Candidate Confirmation Form

Candidate Confirmation Form 1 – pre-assessment

How grades will be awarded in Summer 2021 - This completed form must be returned to Form Tutors by 30.4.2021

Candidate name		Candidate number	
----------------	--	------------------	--

I confirm have been made aware of relevant guidance and documents intended for candidates who will be awarded grades in summer 2021, including: (Please tick each box to confirm each statement)

- the Joint Council for Qualifications^{CJC} (JCQ) document Guidance for students, parents and guardians: GCSEs and AS/A Levels in England Summer 2021 (published here www.jcq.org.uk/summer-2021-arrangements/)
- The Centre Policy for the awarding of Teacher Assessed Grades
- Subject Specific Documents relating to assessments for [Year 11](#) or [Upper Sixth](#)

I confirm my understanding specifically includes the following:

- What is happening, and when
- How candidates will be assessed
- That subject teachers will initially determine the grades, which will then be reviewed by other teachers in the school, so grades are determined consistently with the school's policy.
- Awarding bodies (exam boards) will check this policy to make sure it meets their requirements
- The professional judgement of teachers will only be based on what candidates have been taught and teachers will use a range of evidence from across the course of study to make their decision
- This evidence may include pieces of work that have already been completed or partially completed in addition to further assessments that will be set as detailed in the subject specific documents
- The range of evidence will be consistent across each class or cohort for each qualification. However, in exceptional circumstances, the school may decide that a different range of evidence may be more appropriate to fairly inform a grade, if, for example, a candidate missed significantly more teaching than others in the class
- Where a candidate has been granted approved access arrangements or reasonable adjustments the school will ensure that these are in place for assessments taking place during Portfolio Building time.
- Where appropriate reasonable adjustments were not in place when the candidate took historical assessments that are being used as evidence, teachers will take that into account when determining the candidate's grade.
- Teachers will tell candidates which pieces of work will be used as evidence to inform their overall grade.
- Candidates will have the opportunity to raise any concerns about the evidence being used after half term.
- Teachers will make the final judgement about what evidence is to be included.
- Teachers will not be able to tell candidates the grades they will be submitting to the awarding bodies
- I am aware that A Level results day is Tuesday, August 10th and GCSE Results day is Thursday, August 12th.
- After results have been received, there will be an appeals system as a safety net to fix any genuine errors.

If you feel unable to confirm the above or if you have any questions, please speak to Mr Wright as a matter of urgency. Please do not wait until after you receive your results.

By signing here, I am confirming my awareness and understanding of how grades will be awarded this summer

Candidate Signature:

Date of signature:

This record will be retained until the published deadline for appeals has passed or until any on-going appeal, malpractice investigation or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later



Candidate Confirmation Form 2 – post-assessment

How grades will be awarded in Summer 2021 - This completed form must be returned to the Exams Officer by 28.5.2021

Candidate name		Candidate number	
----------------	--	------------------	--

I confirm that the following has taken place: (Please tick each box to confirm each statement)

- I have been given an explanation of how my grades will be determined in summer 2021
- I have a full understanding of the process undertaken by my school which is line with Ofqual, JCQ and awarding body (exam board) requirements
- The professional judgement of teachers has been based on what I have been taught
- My teachers have used a range of evidence from across the course of study to make their decision
- My teachers have informed me of the pieces of work which have been used as evidence to inform my overall grade for each subject for which I am entered
- Where I have been granted any approved access arrangements or reasonable adjustments my school have ensured that these were in place when evidence was gathered.
- Where appropriate reasonable adjustments were not in place when I took an assessment that is being used as evidence, my teacher took this into account when determining my grade or considered alternative evidence
- I have had the opportunity to raise any concerns about the evidence being used with the school in writing, where for example, the evidence was affected by my personal circumstances, such as illness.
- My teachers have made the final judgement about the evidence used to determine my grades. Negotiation has not taken place between myself/my parent/carer/guardian and my teachers.
- After my teacher determined my grade in a subject it was reviewed by other teachers in my school. Therefore, grades were determined consistently with my school's policy
- My teachers or any other members of school staff have not informed me of the grades they will be submitting to the awarding body (exam board)
- I am aware that A Level results day is Tuesday, August 10th and GCSE Results day is Thursday, August 12th.
- I have been made aware that if I believe a genuine error has been made in determining my grade, I will have a right to appeal through my school who will provide specific details of the two stage process at that point

If you feel unable to confirm the above or if you have any questions, please speak to Mr Wright as a matter of urgency. Please do not wait until after you receive your results.

By signing here, I am confirming my awareness and understanding of how grades will be awarded this summer

Candidate Signature:

Date of signature:

This record will be retained until the published deadline for appeals has passed or until any on-going appeal, malpractice investigation or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later

Appendix 3 – Head of Department Checklist

JCQ - Head of Department Checklist / Declaration

Eltham College

[ADD DEPARTMENT NAME HERE] [ADD SUBJECT LEVEL HERE] (eg Music GCSE)

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 candidate, 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:	