



Issued April 2020

Summer 2020 grades

Information for Middle Leaders and Teachers

Guidance documentation for summer 2020 grades for GCSE, AS and A level and Extended Project Qualification

Introduction

This information is relevant to all MLT Schools, using the following qualifications regulated by Ofqual and offered by AQA, OCR, Pearson, WJEC Eduqas, ASDAN and City & Guilds.

- GCSEs
- AS and A Levels
- Extended Project Qualifications
- Advanced Extension Awards(AEA) in maths

This information is provided in the context of the most up to date advice received by the trust, provided by **Ofqual**.

This information will look to set out how schools in the trust should generate the key pieces of information that have been requested by exam boards; for each subject a Centre Assessed Grade for every student doing a qualification and then a rank order of the students within each of those grades. These two key pieces of information will enable exam boards to issue the fairest possible results.

A timeline has been completed working back from 29th May, to allow for a thorough review of the submitted “moderated grades” see *Appendix 1*.

Information you need to provide

For every GCSE and A Level subject, your exam board will require you to submit the following information:

- A **Centre Assessed Grade** for each student - which is the grade that each student is *most likely* to have achieved if they had sat their exams. This professional judgement is derived from evidence held within the department that has been reviewed by **the individual class** teachers and the head of department. This will eventually be sent to the exam board.
- the **rank order** of students will also be required and will be particularly important where students have been given the same Centre Assessed Grade. This will be explained in more detail later in this documentation and an example has been provided in *Appendix 2*

This will also apply to the Extended Project Qualification (EPQ).

AQA have stated that the endorsements for the GCSE English language spoken language and A level biology, chemistry, physics practical work, will be required to be inputted as separate endorsements.

There will be no requirement to submit statements of curriculum requirements being met in subjects such as GCSE geography field work.

How to arrive at your Centre Assessed Grade

As Heads of Department and teachers within the trust, you will all have a good understanding of your students' performance and how they compare to other students within the department/subject this year, and in previous years. This data is also available on the spreadsheet provided for inputting Centre Assessed Grades.

You will need to consider each student's performance over the course of study and make a realistic judgement of the grade each student would have been most likely to get if they had taken their exam in the summer and completed any non-exam assessment.

Evidence to be used and called upon will be agreed by the Head of Department and the class teachers of that subject. *Travel to the school site to obtain evidence should only be done in consultation with your line manager and in the context of public health advice.*

It is important that the judgements are objective, and they should only take account of evidence about student performance. This will include the following, where it is available:

- records of each student's performance over the course of study, including for example classwork, bookwork, and/or participation in performances in subjects such as music, drama and PE
- data inputted for interims providing a current working grade, predicted grades and likely outcomes
- performance on any non-exam assessment (NEA), even if this has not been fully completed. You must not ask students to complete their NEA work and you do not need to submit marks for any completed NEA to the exam board. But you will need to bear in mind that many students achieve a higher grade on their NEA than in their exams, so you should not base your judgment on NEA alone. You should balance it with your judgement about their likely performance in the written paper(s), where appropriate. *In case students decide that they want to enter in a subsequent exam series, you should retain any NEA work completed to date in a safe secure location.*
- for re-sitting students, any information about previous grades achieved or NEA marks that would, under normal circumstances, have been carried forward
- performance on any class or homework assessments and mock exams taken over the course of study
- tier of entry in tiered subjects (Maths, Science and MFL only)– centre assessment grades must reflect the tier of entry (9 to 3 for higher tier; 5 to 1 for foundation, as well as U)
- previous results in your centre in this subject – these will vary according to a number of factors, including prior attainment of the students, but JCQ data shows that for most centres any year-on-year variation in results for a given subject is normally quite small
- the performance of this year's students compared to those in previous years considering the changes you have made to course delivery and assessments based on learning from previous cohorts

For SEND students or students with access arrangements, the judgement should take account of likely achievement with reasonable adjustment/access arrangements in place.

How to make sure the rank order of students is as accurate as possible

Exam boards will carry out a process to statistically standardise grades. For this process to be fair, it is important that teachers and then departments rank order students as accurately as possible. Whilst Ofqual themselves recognise this will be challenging, the rank order is essential in the standardisation process.

When the class teacher has entered the Centre Assessed Grades for their class they will then be required to rank the class. If the class is taught by more than one teacher, they will need to agree one rank order for all the students. The Head of Department will then need to collate all the data for the subject's cohort and complete rank order for the cohort.

In doing this, teachers should draw on examples of student work, including non-exam assessment where available. If two or more students are almost indistinguishable in terms of their subject performance (and are therefore judged likely to get the same grade) then it may be very difficult to put them into a rank order. However, exam boards will need a single rank order for all students. Tied ranks (that is, giving two students position 1) will not be allowed and will mean the submission is rejected by the exam board and returned to the centre for amendment.

For many subject areas there will be a large entry of students and therefore a timeline has been set out in appendix 1 to assist with the process and ensure all teachers across the trust are working to the same deadlines.

Department sign-off

Each set of centre assessment grades for a subject must be signed off by at least two teachers in that subject, one of whom should be the head of department (or where if there is only one teacher or only one teacher is available, by the Head of Centre). Where a staff member might have a personal interest in a candidate (for example as a relative), Heads of Centre should make sure that additional controls are put in place, as appropriate.

Head of Centre sign-off

The Head of Centre will be required to confirm that the centre assessment grades and the rank order of students are a true representation of student performance. In reviewing these centre assessment grades, the Head of Centre should consider how the distribution of centre assessment grades compares with grades achieved by the centre in previous years.

We expect to hear more from **individual** exam boards about this process **shortly**.

Confidentiality

Teachers must not, under any circumstances, share the centre assessment grades nor the rank order of students with students, or their parents/carers or any other individuals outside the centre, before final results have been issued. This is to protect the integrity of teachers' judgements, and to avoid teachers, heads of department, senior leaders or Heads of Centre being put under pressure by students and parents, to submit a grade that is not supported by the evidence. Since the final grades for some or all students in a centre could be different from those submitted, it also helps to manage students' expectations.

Time frame of actions

Stage	Timeframe	Actions
Stage 1 Departments	From 20.04.2020 KS5 to be completed by 27.04.2020 KS4 to be completed by 05.05.2020	Initial department meeting to consider what evidence is relevant in that subject area; discussion on how individual staff are to then weigh those relevant pieces of evidence e.g when considering an NEA mark what percentage of the overall mark would this represent. Staff will evaluate this alongside the data provided to arrive at a Centre Assessed Grade for each member of the class followed by a rank order. Heads of Department will also need to complete the Centre Assessed Grades pro-forma for each subject in each Key Stage.
Stage 2 Middle Leaders and SLT Links	From 06.05.2020 and to be completed by 13.05.2020	Middle Leaders and their links will meet (virtually) to review the data submitted for the cohort and information provided on the pro-forma. This may lead to follow up discussion with staff to re-evaluate data provided
Stage 3 SLT and Headteacher	KS5 to be completed by 14.05.2020 KS4 to be completed by 15.05.2020 Final amendments to be completed by 19.05.2020	Subject meetings to discuss cohort level data and what evidence has been included - to consider comparisons against targets and previous year(s) data. Analysis to be scrutinised by student across subjects and also within subjects, including key vulnerable groups.
Stage 4 MLT Review	From 25.05.2020 to 29.05.2020	Heads of Department to sign-off on completed data Exec Group to meet to check consistency of processes used in both schools – to sign off upload of data.

Appendix 2

Exemplar Data

Forename	Surname	Gender	Y13 Autumn	Y13 Autumn 2	Y13 Spring 2	Y13 FFT	Y13 Targets	Y13 Predicted	Y13 Likely Outcome	Centre Assessed Grade	Ranking	Grade distribution over time			
												2018	2019	2020	
A	A	Male	B	A	B	C+	B	A	A	A+	1				
B	B	Male	A	A	A	B+	A	A	A	A+	2	No. A* Grades	0	1	2
E	E	Female	B	A	B	B	A	A	A	A	3	No. A Grades	2	0	6
D	D	Male	B	B	B	C+	B	A	A	A	4	No. B Grades	7	3	7
C	C	Male	A	A	A	A	A*	A	A	A	5	No. C Grades	4	2	5
F	F	Female	B	B	B	C+	B	A	A	A	6	No. D Grades	2	5	2
G	G	Male	A	B	B	B+	A	A	A	A	7	No. E Grades	0	1	0
H	H	Male	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	8	No. U	0	1	0
O	O	Female	B	C	C	C	B	B	C	B	9	Total	15	13	22
N	N	Male	C	A	B	C	B	A	B	B	10				
L	L	Female	B	C	C	C-	B	B	B	B	11				
M	M	Male	C	C	C	C-	B	B	B	B	12				
K	K	Female	B	B	B	B	A	A	B	B	13				
J	J	Female	A	B	C	C	B	A	B	B	14				
I	I	Male	A	B	B	A-	A	A	A	B	15				
S	S	Male	C	C	C	C	B	B	C	C	16				
R	R	Male	C	C	C	C+	B	B	C	C	17				
Q	Q	Male	C	B	C	B	A	A	C	C	18				
P	P	Male	C	B	C	B-	B	B	C	C	19				

Pro-forma to be completed in conjunction with the submission of the data

Centre Assessed Grades Overview

Year Group:

Subject:

- Please provide an overview of
 - The evidence that has been used to justify and agree the grades
 - How the rankings were decided
- Where a student has been awarded a moderated grade that is two grades above the current working grade please explain this difference below
- How does the grade distribution for 2020 compare with the previous two years and what do you believe is the reason for this?
- Are there any students where extenuating circumstances were considered in arriving at the moderated grade? Please provide details below