

Procedures for Awarding Teacher Assessed Grades

Summer 2021

1.	<p>Heads of subject identify the evidence they already have to support the awarding of TAGs and notify the SLT and the data team of the evidence. Heads of subject decide if the evidence they have is key evidence or supporting evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Based on awarding body assessments or past exam questions including NEA ○ Taken under exam/test conditions. ○ Marked using awarding body criteria/mark scheme. ○ Graded in-line with exam board boundaries. • Supporting evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other work completed by the students in less structure conditions that supports key evidence. <p>The data team collate all the prior evidence for each subject so that it can be easily reviewed for each subject. by 25th March</p>
2.	<p>Heads of subject plan the assessments they will use to provide evidence of the grade each student is working at.</p> <p>Prior to the Easter break each subject will publish to the students the topics/subject areas that will be assessed to gather further evidence and the time of when each assessment will take place.</p> <p>The data team create marksheets to collate all assessment information.</p> <p>SEND team to provide a list of all students requiring access arrangements to ensure all staff are aware of these prior to the centre assessments. by 25th March</p>
3.	<p>All teaching staff provide <i>provisional</i> Teacher Assessed Grades based on the evidence they already have and their professional judgement.</p> <p>Teaching staff inform students of the evidence that will be used to support the Teacher Assessed Grades. by 16th April</p>
4.	<p>Heads of Subject to complete evidence overview pro-forma. For each piece of evidence identify whether it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key or Supporting. • When it was produced. • Conditions under which it was taken. • If awarding body marking criteria was used. • If it was moderated. • How it was moderated. • Whether students had the opportunity to redraft work. • Assessment objectives covered. <p>by 26th April</p>

5.	<p>Staff mark centre assessments once they have been completed by the students using agreed mark schemes and graded using agreed grade boundaries.</p> <p>Once marked Subject Leaders lead the moderation process for their subject according to the agreed moderation plan.</p> <p>Once moderated all assessment results are entered into Sims. by 17th May</p>
6.	<p>Using all available evidence and being aware of making objective decisions (see notes below), Final Teacher Assessed grades are formulated by teachers and checked by Heads of Subject. Once agreed the Teacher Assessed Grades will be entered on Sims. by 19th May</p>
7.	<p>Heads of Subject will meet with SLT link to review the teacher assessed grades alongside the evidence and amendments made after discussion with teaching staff.</p> <p>All teacher assessed grades will be validated against FFT 50, FFT 20, FFT validation service, transition matrices, prior subject performances.</p> <p>An electronic evidence folder (sub-divided by tier if necessary) to be completed by Heads of Subject, containing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed evidence overview sheet (from section 4). • An explanation of how the evidence was used to award the grade. • A copy of each assessment task and mark schemes used. • Details of any student that who does not have a complete set of evidence and allowances made for this. • Details of any access arrangement considerations and other variations made during the TAG process. <p>by 28th May</p>
8.	<p>Heads of Subject complete online departmental sign off to say procedures have been followed.</p> <p>SLT checking of submitted grades against FFT 50, FFT 20, FFT validation service, transition matrices, prior subject performances. Any amendments made after discussion with teaching staff. by 11th June</p>
9.	<p>Heads of Subject compile all assessment evidence since the 24th March ready for a centre review or any appeals.</p> <p>Results uploaded to awarding body websites and verified.</p> <p>Headteachers sign off. by 18th June</p>
10.	<p><i>Final appeals process published to all students once published by Ofqual and the awarding bodies</i></p>

Making Objective Decisions and Avoiding Bias

Assessing students' performance objectively is crucial to determining outcomes that are as fair as possible and minimise bias.

The next sections set out what we can do to ensure their judgements are as objective as possible, by:

- basing decisions on evidence.
- being aware of unconscious effects on objectivity.
- reviewing judgements with others.

Without always realising it, everyone holds unconscious beliefs about others. These can be based on things like social factors or identities of others, as detailed above. There is a risk that objective judgements can be affected by unconscious beliefs and other types of bias.

Centres are urged to reflect on and question whether any of their judgements might be affected by factors not based on evidence of performance, such as unconscious beliefs or types of bias. These factors can affect judgements of student performance and can also affect the perception of particular pieces of evidence.

Centres should be aware of:

- confirmation bias, for example noticing only evidence about a student that fits with pre-existing views about them.
- halo effects, for example where a particularly positive impression of a student overly accentuates their actual knowledge, skills and abilities. Or the opposite, where negative impressions or low expectations of a student hides their actual knowledge, skills and abilities.
- primacy effects, for example giving undue weight to 'first impressions' of a student.
- recency effects, for example giving undue weight to the most recent interaction with a student.
- selective perceptions, for example giving undue weight to a student's performance on a particular piece of work.
- contrast effects, for example over-estimating a student's likely performance having first considered a large number of students who are all at a much lower standard.
- exception effects, for example, under- or over-grading a student's performance if it is significantly out of line with (above or below) other students in that centre.
- conformity bias, for example, placing undue weight on the opinions of others where these are not necessarily supported by the evidence.
- affinity bias, having a more favourable impression of a student's performance because the student or their qualities/attributes are relatable or similar to one's own qualities or attributes.

This is not an exhaustive list but is designed to raise awareness of the main biases that could negatively impact on the quality of centre judgements.

Evidence from each subject:

Evidence Summary Proforma including any variations.

Copies of student assessment evidence.

Notes of SLT/Subject Lead review of teacher assessed grades.

Notes of SLT review of teacher assessed grades.

Subject Lead sign off of process.

Headteacher sign off of process.