

FINAL DRAFT

ULIDIA INTEGRATED COLLEGE 2021 CENTRE DETERMINED GRADES Policy Statement



The 2021 Centre Determined Grades Policy

Applies to all staff and examination level students

Summary:

This policy outlines the expectations and standards for determining Grades in 2021

Mr M. Houston
Principal

Additional Notes

Policy Number: 2021/4

Revision:

- March 2021
- April 2021

Board of Governors

Approved: 22.04.21

Issued to Staff:

Issued to Stakeholders:

Issued to CCEA:

FINAL DRAFT

Statement of Intent

On 6 January 2021, the Minister of Education, Peter Weir MLA, cancelled all CCEA GCSE, AS and A2 examinations scheduled for January, February, May and June 2021. Instead, by Formal Direction of the Minister dated 2 March 2021, the approach to awarding grades in Summer 2021 will be based on teacher professional judgements, with moderation. This policy, which applies to GCSE, AS and A level qualifications offered by CCEA and all other awarding organisations, is intended to support teachers and school leaders in submitting appropriate Centre Determined Grades for each student.

In 2021, centres are asked to use a range of evidence to arrive at a professional and academic judgement of the standard at which each student is performing in the context of the specification for which they are entered and from this provide a grade to CCEA and other awarding bodies. This is different from 2020, when centres were asked to supply a centre assessment grade based on their judgement of the grade a student would likely have achieved if they had been able to complete examinations.

The purpose of this policy is:

- to ensure that the effective operation of the Centre Determined Grades process produces fair, objective, consistent and timely outcomes within and across departments;
- to ensure that all staff involved in producing Centre Determined Grades know, understand and can complete their roles in the process as published by CCEA;
- to ensure that Centre Determined Grades are produced in line with the process as published by CCEA, using the professional judgement of teachers, with internal moderation, ensuring quality and accuracy of the grades submitted to CCEA; and
- to ensure that the centre meets its obligations in relation to relevant legislation.

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the generation of Centre Determined Grades to read, understand and implement this policy. The Centre Determined Grades policy will be in line with:

- ‘CCEA Alternative Arrangements – Process for Heads of Centre’,
- subject specific guidance
- and other CCEA, and JCQ guidance and information issued in relation to Summer 2021.

All staff involved in centre determined grades will support the implementation of alternative arrangements as set out by CCEA, including the CCEA review stage. Staff will familiarise themselves with all relevant guidance provided by CCEA, the JCQ requirements and the relevant centre policies.

Process Overview

There is a five-step process for the Summer 2021 awarding arrangements as shown below and explained in more detail in the ‘CCEA Alternative Arrangements – Process for Heads of Centre’ &

FINAL DRAFT

'Alternative Awarding Arrangements for CCEA GCSE, AS and A Levels in 2021- A high level guide for schools and Colleges.'



Ulidia Integrated College Internal Deadlines for the 5 Step Process

Step and Indicative Timeframe	Activity	Personnel	Internal Deadlines (subject to change)

FINAL DRAFT

Step 1	Guidance, Information and Readiness (March, April)	CCEA and other awarding bodies guidance documentation shared and understood by all involved staff. The key documents are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCEA Alternative Arrangements – Process for Heads of Centre' • GCSE, AS and A Level Awarding Summer 2021 Alternative Arrangements – Technical Questions and Answers. • 'Alternative Awarding Arrangements for CCEA GCSE, AS and A Levels in 2021- A high level guide for schools and Colleges.' • and key information from other awarding bodies when published 	SLT. Subject Leaders. Exams Officer.	16/03/21 (Ongoing as updates are made available)
		Centre fully participates in support offered by CCEA and other partner bodies, such as EA and CCMS. The key training is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principals' CCEA Bi-monthly meeting • Chartered Institute of Educational Assessors (CIEA) CCEA Alternative Arrangements – Process for Heads of Centre.' • Subject Specific training. • And any other training made available but currently not published. 	Head of Centre - Principal Bi-monthly meeting. X2 SLT - CIEA training. Subject Leaders – Subject Specific training.	Bimonthly commencing in January Feb-March From March 19th A level From March 26 th GCSE
		Centre policy for awarding Centre Determined Grades developed, documented and shared with all staff. Policies to be sent to CCEA by 23 April so they are available for review at grade submission stage.	SLT BoG Subject Leaders All Staff	Early March draft policy written and shared with SLT Mid-March Policy Ratified by BoG 23/04/21 Policy sent to CCEA
		Centres agree their quality assurance process to ensure consistency across teachers, subjects and departments.	SLT Subject Leaders All Staff	29/03/21 Evidence submitted to SLT and agreed.
		Preliminary consideration of value of available evidence	SLT Subject Leaders	29/03/21
		Step 2	Evidence Gathering and Provision of Assessment Resource (March, April and May)	Completion and marking of defined assessments in line with centre Policy. At UIC this will consist of up to two 'Attainment Opportunities '(AO), and a minimum of TWO pieces of robust evidence, one of which in most cases will be: The CCEA assessment resources (or other awarding bodies material).
All other available evidence collated and documented (Evidence will be used from September through to May)	SLT Subject Leaders All Staff			Ongoing until moderation dates: A Level -17/05/21 GCSE- 28/05/21
Step 3	Centre Professional Judgement			All available evidence moderated in line with centre policy

FINAL DRAFT

and Moderation (April and May)	Any potential bias in Centre Determined Grades and outcomes considered	HoD and teaching staff	Evidence moderated: A Level -17/05/21 GCSE- 28/05/21	
	Centre Determined Grade outcomes reviewed by senior leadership teams	SLT	CDG reviewed: A Level -19/05/21 GCSE- 01/06/21	
	Head of Centre sign-off and submission of Centre Determined Grades	Head of Centre	A Level -21/05/21 GCSE- 04/06/21	
Step 4	Review of Evidence and Award (June and July)	Centre evidence and grade outcomes reviewed	CCEA personnel	Awarding Body internal deadlines
	If evidence submitted is considered reasonable, centre grades proceed to award. If necessary, additional evidence requested and reviewed.	CCEA personnel	Awarding Body internal deadlines	
	Where CCEA still has concerns, there will be engagement with the centre and, in some cases, this may require the centre to re-run their grading process.	Head of Centre and CCEA personnel	Awarding Body internal deadlines	
Step 5	Post-Award Review Service (August and September)	After the issue of results, students will have the right to appeal to their centres and to CCEA.	Head of Centre and CCEA personnel	Awarding Body internal deadlines

Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities of Ulidia Integrated College staff are outlined below:

Chairperson of the Board of Governors:	Mr E W Bleakley;
Principal & Head of Centre:	Mr M Houston
Lead Assessors:	Mrs J Allen, Mr D Barnard
Senior Leadership Team (SLT):	Mrs G Bonar, Miss D Connolly, Mrs M McColgan,

FINAL DRAFT

Mrs S Knight Geddes, Mrs C Ford

Examinations Officer:

Mr D Barnard

Heads of Department and Class Teachers:

Please refer to: <https://ulidiacollege.com>

The **Board of Governors** is responsible for approving the policy for producing Centre Determined Grades and must notify CCEA of arrangements should the Head of Centre be unavailable to confirm the Centre Determined Grades.

The **Head of Centre** has overall responsibility for the centre as an examinations centre and will ensure the roles and responsibilities of all staff are defined.

The Head of Centre will confirm that Centre Determined Grade judgements are accurate and represent the professional judgement made by staff. The Head of Centre will ensure that the method of determining grades by the centre (in line with processes published by CCEA) uses the professional judgement of teachers, with internal moderation and participation in an external review process set out by CCEA.

The Head of Centre will work collaboratively with CCEA in terms of engaging with professional dialogue and the provision of evidence as requested.

The **Senior Leaders** will provide support to staff involved in producing Centre Determined Grades. They will support the Head of Centre in the quality assurance of the final Centre Determined Grades. They have a role in achieving a consistent approach across departments and authenticating the preliminary outcomes in subjects where there is only one teacher. This will be agreed on a case-by-case basis but may include, for example, Senior Leaders or the Head of Centre validating the outcomes after comparing them with outcomes in associated subject areas where applicable.

CIEA Attendees - Those who attended the CCEA Chartered Institute of Educational Assessors (CIEA) training will act as Lead Assessors in their centre and disseminate the content of the programme to all teachers involved in producing Centre Determined Grades.

The **Examinations Officer** is responsible for ensuring accurate and timely entries are submitted to CCEA. They must ensure that all information from CCEA is shared promptly with all relevant staff. The Examinations Officer will ensure that they know, understand and can use the CCEA Centre Manager Applications. They will ensure that the centre's systems for data capture are enabled and that the Centre Determined Grades are submitted for each candidate entry by the published date(s) for Summer 2021.

The Examinations Officer is responsible for the administration of the final Centre Determined Grades and for managing the post-results services within the centre.

Heads of Department are responsible for supporting departmental staff and ensuring all staff conduct assessments under the appropriate levels of control and have the information required to make accurate and fair judgements. They will ensure that a Head of Department Checklist is completed for each qualification that they are submitting.

Additional support and, where appropriate, quality assurance measures will be provided for newly qualified teachers.

Teachers are responsible for ensuring that they conduct assessments (which may include the optional assessment resource) under the centre's appropriate levels of control, where it is safe to do so, and that they have sufficient evidence, in line with the centre policy, to support Centre Determined Grades for each candidate they have entered for a qualification. They must ensure that the Centre Determined Grade they assign to each candidate is a fair, valid and reliable reflection of the assessed evidence available for each candidate. They

FINAL DRAFT

must complete the Candidate Assessment Record to include a description of the assessment evidence used, the level of control for each assessment considered, and any other evidence that explains the final Centre Determined Grade submitted. Teachers have the responsibility for internal standardisation and moderating candidates' work, in conjunction with departmental colleagues and Senior Leaders as required. They must securely store and be able to retrieve evidence to support their decisions.

The knowledge, expertise and professionalism of the staff of Ulidia Integrated College is central to determining Centre Determined Grades.

Students will be expected to have good attendance, to submit work which is the best of their ability, to adhere to school policy and meet internal deadlines for submission of work. Where the centre or individual teachers are put under improper pressure from a candidate to influence the decision-making on a grade this will be reported to CCEA or any other awarding body, who may investigate this as potential malpractice or maladministration.

Parents should support learners by ensuring good attendance, awareness of school policy and ensuring their children adhere to internal deadlines for submission of work. Where the centre or individual teachers are put under improper pressure from a candidate or their parent/guardian to influence the decision-making on a grade this will be reported to CCEA or any other awarding body, who may investigate this as potential malpractice or maladministration.

Training, Support and Guidance

Teachers involved in determining grades must attend any centre-based training provided. Ulidia Integrated College will engage fully with all training and support that CCEA has provided, including web-based support and training. Further general and subject-specific support and guidance can be found on the CCEA website at www.ccea.org.uk.

The centre policy will be supported through training provided by CCEA to Senior Leaders through the CIEA. Senior Leaders will disseminate this training to all teachers involved in producing Centre Determined Grades.

If relevant staff are unable to attend subject support meetings or training, they must delegate to the most suitable alternative member of staff and ensure that the information is shared at the earliest possible opportunity with all relevant staff. Mrs G Bonar, Vice Principal, should be notified if no one from a department has been able to attend support meetings and Mrs G Bonar will consider how this is addressed.

Appropriate Evidence

See Appendix 1

Ulidia Integrated College will consider the following candidate evidence in arriving at Centre Determined Grades. The first part of the list indicates the key evidence that will be considered, and the asterisked evidence will be used if key evidence is not available. The nature of these pieces of evidence are outlined below, these have been detailed to encourage a level of consistency across the College. However, it is also important to note that different departments may decide to prioritise other pieces of evidence based on a number of factors, such as the characteristics of different subjects and the evidence at their disposal. Such variations will be made available to students. Any student specific variations will be identified on a Candidate Assessment Record.

FINAL DRAFT

In order of preference where available:

1. **CCEA Assessment Resources** – To support the evidence gathering process, CCEA will provide assessment resources for each subject. These assessments will be a good indicator of the standard of student performance as they are fully aligned to specification content and the level of demand of past papers. These unseen papers, or part of, will be used by Ulidia Integrated College during April 2021.
2. **Performance in CCEA past paper questions and mark schemes performed under high control** - These are likely to be a good indicator of performance, particularly if they are taken under high control conditions and assess the skills, knowledge and understanding required by the CCEA specification or are similar to CCEA question papers.
3. **Mock Exams, Performance in CCEA past paper questions and mark schemes, Coursework or controlled assessments** (even where not completed:)- These are also likely to be good indicators of performance. Their strength will be partly depended upon the level of control that they were completed in.
4. ***Class tests; homework, work produced during remote learning that relates directly to the specification and assessment objectives.** A series of such assessments, that sample the key aspects of the specification, could also provide good evidence of student performance. As this tends to be less robust evidence, several pieces should be used to support the grade. Staff should also satisfy themselves that they can authenticate the work produced.

Ulidia Integrated College will aim to arrive at a holistic judgement for each Centre Determined Grade based on up to 4 sources of evidence where available.

DEFINITIONS OF LEVELS OF CONTROL

Levels of control for the conditions under which students have completed assessments that are internally marked in school are defined as High, Medium and Limited at GCSE. These definitions also align with the conditions of control for GCE and other CCEA qualifications.

In recording the levels of control for evidence to be used in Centre Determined Grades for Summer 2021, the following should be used.

High	The use of resources is tightly prescribed. The centre must ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• all students are within direct sight of the teacher/supervisor throughout the session(s);• display materials which might provide assistance are removed or covered;• there is no access to email, the internet or mobile phones;• students complete their work independently;
-------------	---

FINAL DRAFT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interaction with other students does not occur; and • no assistance of any description is provided.
Medium	<p>Students do not need to be directly supervised at all times. The use of resources, including the internet, is not tightly prescribed. Centres should ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is sufficient evidence to ensure that the individual work can be authenticated; and • the work an individual student submits for assessment is their own. <p>If work has been completed in groups, teachers must ensure that they can determine and assess the individual student's contribution to the work.</p> <p>If work has been completed remotely, it may be useful to ask questions about what they did and how/why they did it, to help authenticate the work.</p>
Limited	<p>Work is completed without any direct supervision and would not normally contribute to assessable outcomes.</p>

Unit Omissions

Ulidia Integrated College has taken into account the information provided by CCEA about unit omissions before the cancellation of examinations. The unit omissions announced by the Minister for GCSE subjects in October 2020 and for AS and A2 subjects in December 2020 will still apply. This means that evidence can be drawn from across all assessment units or can be restricted to those which align with previous policy announcements. Details of the unit omissions are detailed in the [Summary of Assessment Arrangements: GCSE, AS and A Level Qualifications Summer 2021](#), published in December 2020. Details can also be found on the Summer 2021 Information Pre-Examination Cancellation section of the CCEA website.

Individual lost learning

In this series, students do not need to have completed a specified amount of content, or demonstrate skills, knowledge and understanding across every area of the specification, as they would normally. Therefore, students will not be disadvantaged as a result of lost learning. If the grade awarded reflects the evidence available, the student should be awarded that grade, irrespective of content coverage.

FINAL DRAFT

Ulidia Integrated College is taking account of disruption that candidates have faced to their learning as a result of COVID-19. Any adaptations that have been made will be recorded in the checklists provided by CCEA and will be based on the 'CCEA Alternative Arrangements – Process for Heads of Centre.'

To ensure individual lost learning is accounted for, Ulidia Integrated College, Covid Officer, holds a record of all students that have had additional periods of absence from school due to the Covid-19 Pandemic. This includes:

- Students that have contracted Coronavirus
- Students that have been asked to self-isolate (either by the school, track and trace or through the PHA guidance)
- Students that have missed school due to families being impacted by coronavirus.

In the communication that all parents received in August 2020, it states that the school must be informed if a child is tested for Covid-19, if a child is confirmed as positive case for covid-19 or if they are self-isolating due to being a close contact with a positive case. As with all absences in school, it is the responsibility of the parents to inform the school and to give reasons for the absence.

Where a student has missed a piece of evidence due to Covid-19, the teacher will seek to use alternative pieces of evidence. This will be recorded on the Candidate Assessment Record.

If a parent/student is concerned that the information stored by the school may be incomplete, it is the responsibility of the parent/student to inform the school, with appropriate evidence as soon as possible.

Communication of Evidence

Candidates will be made aware of the evidence that will be used in determining their grades.

Ulidia Integrated College will share this information with the candidates before the grades are submitted to CCEA.

Centre Determined Grades

Ulidia Integrated College will determine grades based on evidence that reflects the standard at which a candidate is performing, i.e. their demonstrated knowledge, understanding and skills in regard to the specification content they have covered.

To make accurate judgements, teachers must have a clear understanding of:

- the range of skills, knowledge and understanding covered by the specification;
- the assessment requirements and the structure of the specification;
- the grade descriptions at key grades;
- the level of demand of the qualification assessments; and
- the weighting of each component/unit and the type of assessment.

FINAL DRAFT

Information on these aspects for each qualification will be drawn from the CCEA specification, specimen assessment materials, past papers, controlled GCSE, AS and A Level Awarding Summer 2021: Alternative Arrangements – Process for Heads of Centre, assessment/coursework assessment tasks, and Chief Examiner and Principal Moderator reports, which are available on the CCEA website at www.ccea.org.uk

All teachers are responsible for ensuring that all evidence has been stored safely and is accessible to support the CCEA Review of Evidence and Award process. It is important that decisions are justified and recorded to show how the evidence was used to arrive at a fair and objective grade.

Internal Standardisation

In subjects where there is more than one teacher and/or class in the department, it is a requirement to carry out internal standardisation.

In Departments with only one teacher, Ulidia Integrated College will still require a standardisation process to take place, it should occur with a nominated colleague and all meetings recorded as with subjects with multiple teachers.

The purpose of internal standardisation is to provide teachers with confidence in the grades they have assigned, to ensure fairness and objectivity of decisions, and to ensure consistency in the application of assessment criteria and standards. This allows for any teachers' differences to be resolved.

Internal standardisation should include cross-checking of marking across the full range of marks and include candidates from each class.

The Candidate Assessment Records should form the basis of discussions around decisions made.

As a result of the internal standardisation process, it may be necessary for a teacher or the Head of Department to adjust the original decision:

- to match the standards as established and understood in the guidance provided; and
- to bring judgements into line with those of other teachers in the department.

In the context of internal standardisation, any necessary decisions will be made by the Head of Department. They should complete the relevant checklist, which will record any adjustments and relevant information.

Head of Centre Moderation and Declaration

Ulidia Integrated College undertakes to have a consistent approach across departments/subjects. Senior Leaders and the Exams Officer (M Houston- Principal, G Bonar- Vice Principal, J Allen – Senior Teacher, D Connolly –Senior Teacher, D Barnard – Exams Officer) will carry out moderation, to include a review of marking and the internal standardisation arrangements, and will investigate whether decisions have been justified. Unexplained grade profiles will be considered and may result in a review of the evidence used or remarking. A record of decisions should be retained.

The moderation exercise will include professional discussions with Heads of Department. The above named Senior Leaders will consider both the subject and centre outcomes based on the evidence available.

The Head of Centre will submit a declaration on behalf of the centre. This will include a confirmation that the Centre Determined Grades for candidates are a true representation of their performance.

FINAL DRAFT

Access Arrangements

Where candidates have agreed access arrangements or reasonable adjustments (for example a reader or scribe or extra time), Ulidia Integrated College will make every effort to ensure that these arrangements are in place when assessments are being taken. Details on access arrangements can be found in the JCQ document '**Adjustments for candidates with disabilities and learning difficulties**,' which is available on the JCQ website.

Special Consideration

As public examinations have been cancelled, the normal application process to the awarding organisation for special consideration will not apply this summer in the usual manner. However, where illness or other personal circumstances, covered by the JCQ guidelines, might have affected the candidate's standard of performance in a piece of evidence used in the consideration of a student's Centre Determined Grade, Ulidia Integrated College will take account of this when making a judgement. Due to the flexibility in approaches to assessments for Summer 2021, it is anticipated that special consideration requests will be limited.

The JCQ special consideration framework remains unchanged for Summer 2021. The injury or event must relate to the candidate's performance(s) at the time of taking relevant assessments/piece of evidence. Candidates will not be eligible for special consideration if preparation for or performance in their assessments is affected by:

- long-term illness, disability, or other difficulties, unless the illness or circumstances manifest themselves at the time of an assessment;
- bereavement occurring more than six months before the assessment, unless an anniversary has been reached at the time of the assessment or there are ongoing implications such as an inquest or court case; and/or
- consequences of disobeying the centre's internal regulations.

Special consideration is never applied due to lost teaching and learning time. Lost teaching and learning is being addressed this summer via the assessment methods and the flexibility afforded to the centre in the content that will be assessed. (See example 5 below).

Class teachers will record how they have determined any impact of illness or personal circumstances and how this was incorporated into their judgements in the Candidate Assessment Record. Ulidia Integrated College will ensure consistency in the application of special consideration by following the guidance on pages 4–7 of the JCQ document '**A guide to the special consideration process**', with effect from 1 September 2020.

Some examples of Special Circumstances provided by CCEA have been outlined below:

Example 1

A student's parent sadly died six weeks before they were due to sit their mock GCSE History paper. The paper had a total possible raw mark of 100, and the student scored 60/100 in the paper.

As per JCQ guidance, this circumstance would attract the maximum allowance of 5%, which will be calculated on the total raw marks available, i.e. 5% of the 100 = 5. The student's new mark will therefore be 65/100.

Example 2

A student broke their non-writing arm the day before a class assessment was due to take place. The student took the assessment but was in obvious discomfort throughout. The assessment had a total of 50 marks available, and the student scored 35/50.

As per JCQ guidance, this circumstance would attract an allowance of 3%, which will be calculated on the total raw marks available, i.e. 3% of 50 = 1.5, which is rounded up to 2 raw marks. The student's new mark will therefore be 37/50.

FINAL DRAFT

*Special consideration **should not** be applied retrospectively if the Centre has made some adjustment at the time of the mock examination/assessment, for example by giving the candidate 25% extra time to complete their assessment.*

Example 3

A student's grandmother was admitted into hospital with a serious condition the night before the student's assessment. The student was very upset and worried. The assessment had a total possible raw mark of 60. The student scored 45/60 in the examination.

As per JCQ guidance, this circumstance would attract an allowance of 3%, which would be calculated on the total raw marks available, i.e. 3% of 60 = 1.8. The student's new mark will therefore be 47/60 (after rounding).

Example 4

A student suffered from severe hay fever on the day of their assessment. The assessment had a total possible raw mark of 80. The student scored 55/80 in the examination.

As per JCQ guidance, this circumstance would attract an allowance of 1%, which would be calculated on the total raw marks available, i.e. 1% of 80 = 0.8. The student's new mark will therefore be 56/80 (after rounding).

Example 5

A student has missed an additional 10 weeks of face-to-face teaching due to having to self-isolate on more than one occasion. Can they apply for special Circumstances?

As per JCQ guidance, a special consideration allowance cannot be applied or considered for lost teaching and learning due to COVID-19 or for any other reason. Lost teaching and learning due to COVID-19 is managed through the omission of a component for each subject taken and the subsequent flexibility in assessments chosen by the Centre to inform their academic judgements.

Bias and Discrimination

Ulidia Integrated College will fulfil its duties and responsibilities concerning relevant equality and disability requirements.

Senior Leaders (M Houston- Principal, G Bonar- Vice Principal, J Allen – Senior Teacher, D Connolly – Senior Teacher, D Barnard – Exams Officer) will disseminate guidance from the CIEA training on potential bias in judgements, including the challenges and solutions relevant to a holistic approach to assessing the validity of assessment judgements. This will include information on:

- sources of unfairness and bias (situations/contexts, difficulty, presentation and format, language, conditions for assessment and marker pre-conceptions);
- minimising bias (how to minimise bias in questions and marking, and hidden forms of bias); and
- bias in teacher assessments.

To avoid bias and discrimination, all staff involved in Centre Determined Grades will consider that:

- unconscious bias can skew judgements;
- the evidence should be valued for its own merit as an indication of performance and attainment;
- Centre Determined Grades should not be influenced by positive or challenging personal circumstances, character, behaviour, appearance, socio-economic background, or the performance of candidates' siblings;
- unconscious bias is more likely to occur when quick opinions are formed; and
- having effective internal standardisation will help to ensure that there is consideration from different perspectives.

Recording Decisions and Retention of Evidence and Data

FINAL DRAFT

It is fundamental that teachers and Heads of Department maintain records that show how Centre Determined Grades have been produced and internally standardised, including the rationale for decisions in relation to individual marks/grades. All evidence used to support the grade determined for each candidate will be retained electronically on the C2k network.

The records of decisions and retention of evidence will comply with data protection legislation and will be available for CCEA centre moderation, the CCEA Review of Evidence and Award process and any possible appeals. Ulidia Integrated College will upload evidence via the CCEA application system when requested.

It is essential that there are robust, accurate and secure records of decisions and retention of evidence to comply with data protection legislation and in anticipation of centre moderation and the CCEA Review of Evidence and Award process and potential appeals.

The following CCEA documentation must be fully and accurately completed and retained securely:

- Candidate Assessment Records;
- Head of Department Checklists and Departmental Assessment Evidence Grid; and
- Head of Centre Declaration.

Confidentiality

Ulidia Integrated College will not disclose any candidates' Centre Determined Grades in advance of the official issue of results. This is in keeping with the centre's GDPR policy and CCEA requirements.

Malpractice/Maladministration

Ulidia Integrated College will act ethically, to uphold the integrity of the qualifications system and to report potential cases of malpractice or maladministration to CCEA for investigation. There may be instances where the centre or individual teachers are put under improper pressure from a candidate or their parent/guardian to influence the decision-making on a grade. Any improper pressure must be reported to CCEA, who may investigate this as potential malpractice or maladministration.

Other examples of potential malpractice include:

- deception;
- improper assistance to a candidate;
- failure to appropriately authenticate a candidate's work;
- over-direction of candidates in preparation for assessments;
- the centre submitting grades not supported by evidence or that they know to be inaccurate;
- centres entering candidate(s) who were not originally intending to cash in a grade in the Summer 2021 series;
- failure to engage as requested with CCEA during the review stage of the process; and
- failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and Centre Determined Grades.

The consequences of malpractice or maladministration are as published in the JCQ guidance Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures, which is available on the JCQ website, and include the risk of a delay to candidates receiving their grades, up to and including removal of centre status.

FINAL DRAFT

Private Candidates

For subjects where entries have been made for private candidates, centres will ensure that they have sufficient evidence to confidently submit an objective Centre Determined Grade. If evidence is limited, it is essential that these candidates complete the CCEA assessment resource or an appropriate adaptation of the assessment resource. Thereafter, decisions for the private candidate should be made with the same approach as for all other candidates at Ulidia Integrated College.

Conflicts of Interest

To protect the integrity of assessments, staff must declare any potential conflicts of interest to the Head of Centre. Instances when there may be a conflict include teaching and preparing members of their family or close friends for qualifications that include internally assessed components.

The Head of Centre will take the appropriate actions to manage any potential conflicts of interest arising with centre staff, following the requirements set out in CCEA's Alternative Arrangements – Process for Heads of Centre document issued in March 2021.

Ulidia Integrated College will also carefully consider the requirements of their centre policies, particularly in relation to the separation of duties and personnel to ensure fairness in later process reviews and appeals.

Internal Appeals Procedure Relating to Centre Determined Grades

A written internal appeals procedure is available to permit candidates recourse in relation to the production of a Centre Determined Grade.

It outlines the roles and responsibilities for centre staff and provides clarity on the various steps in the internal procedure.

The various steps of the internal appeals procedure are time-bound and in line with CCEA requirements. Candidates will be updated at each stage and will be informed in writing of the outcomes and recourse procedures.

Complaints Procedure

Ulidia Integrated College's internal complaints procedure permits candidates to challenge the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification (including failure to follow their internal appeals procedure correctly) as follows:

How to make an appeal or complaint

If you wish to:

- appeal a grade you have been awarded, based on a potential clerical error, **or** based on evidence of bias or malpractice, you should use Ulidia Integrated College's Centre Determined Grades Internal Appeals Process which is available for staff, candidates and parents on the following pages of this policy document and on the College website:
<https://ulidiacollege.com/about/policies/>

FINAL DRAFT

- make a general complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification (including failure to follow their internal appeals procedure correctly), you should use Ulidia Integrated College's Complaints Handling Policy which is available for staff, candidates and parents on the college website:
<https://ulidiacollege.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Complaints-Handling-2018-FINAL.pdf>

FINAL DRAFT

UIC CENTRE DETERMINED GRADES 2021 INTERNAL APPEALS PROCESS

Rationale:

The lockdown of schools in the Northern Ireland has meant that for the second year running, Ulidia Integrated College had to submit awards for students in place of public examinations.

These awards are known in 2021 as 'Centre Determined Grades' (CDGs).

The general appeals process and accompanying guidance against the final Examination Board grades awarded in summer 2021 is available on the OFQUAL website.

- OFQUAL, the body which oversees the examination process, is clear that students and/or parents have no automatic right of appeal against the Centre Determined Grade submitted by the school.
- However, a student will be able to ask their centre to check whether an error was made either when submitting the Centre Determined Grade. **(Stage 0)**
- They will **only** be able to raise an appeal to their centre if they have **evidence** of bias or that they were discriminated against. Any evidence should also be passed on to the exam board who may investigate for potential malpractice.

This Centre Determined Grades 2021 appeals process is for cases where students and/or parents **have evidence** that the school has been biased or discriminatory in submitting a Centre Determined Grade or rank order.

Stage 1

The student and/or parent should contact the Principal to discuss in detail the **evidence** that they have that the centre acted in a biased or discriminatory manner, and that on the basis of this evidence they may wish to make an appeal on the grounds of bias or discrimination. Appeals without evidence or grounds for bias or discrimination will not be considered.

Stage 2

If, after the initial consultation with the Principal, the student and/or parent decides to pursue the complaint, they should submit to the Ulidia Integrated College Examinations Officer all of their evidence that the school has been biased and/or discriminatory when determining the centre assessment grade and/or rank order information submitted to the Examination Board.

The Examinations Officer should then gather all the available evidence that, cumulatively, was used to arrive at the CDG(s) in question. Once the Examinations Officer has evidence from the student and/or parent and the school-based evidence, s/he submits the evidence to a panel comprising the Principal and the Chair of the Governors to consider the evidence.

FINAL DRAFT

Stage 3

There are only two possible outcomes of the hearing:

1. On the balance of probabilities, the school did **not** behave with bias or discrimination when determining the centre Determined grade and/or rank order.
2. On the balance of probabilities, the school **did** behave with bias or discrimination when determining the centre Determined grade and/or rank order.

There is no further right of appeal under this policy against the panel's judgement. The Principal will write an explanation of the judgement that will be sent to the student and/or parent. If the panel concludes that bias, discrimination did play a part in the school arriving at the CDG(s) and rankings in question, this finding will form part of the evidence submitted to the examination board in cases where the student and/or parent pursue an appeal against the final Examination Board grade(s).

However, if a candidate or parent or staff member is not satisfied with the outcomes of this Centre Determined Grades 2021 Internal Appeals Process, they have the right to avail of the Ulidia Integrated College Complaints Handling Policy which is available on the college website:

<https://ulidiacollege.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Complaints-Handling-2018-FINAL.pdf>

Requirements as a JCQ Registered Centre

Ulidia Integrated College has reviewed and amended, where necessary, all assessment and examination-related policies and procedures in line with the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres, 1 September 2020 to 31 August 2021 to ensure appropriateness for the unique context of Summer 2021 qualifications.

Learning Community

Ulidia Integrated College is a member of the Carrickfergus Learning Community.

Ulidia IC students taking post-16 courses at other member schools will be subject to the policies of the schools in question, and will follow their procedures in relation to the allocation of centre determined grades and consequent policies, including any appeals.

FINAL DRAFT

Associated/Related Centre Documents – Exemplars of records provided by CCEA that MAY be used HOD Checklist

This must be completed for the overall cohort, one for each subject at each qualification level.

Centre Name:	
Centre Number:	
Specification Title/Code:	
Level:	

The Head of Department must complete the following checklist before submitting subject outcomes for internal centre moderation.

Checklist	Y/N
1. Candidates' grades have been determined using only the evidence detailed in the Candidate Assessment Record and this evidence is available, if requested, for review.	
2. The evidence has been authenticated as the candidates' own work.	
3. Internal standardisation has been completed in line with the School Assessment and Centre Determined Grades policies. Records have been retained detailing all staff involved in the process, work reviewed, judgements and adjustments made as a result of internal standardisation. These records are readily available.	
4. Consideration has been given to ensure that judgements are fair, free from bias and compatible with legislative requirements in respect of equality and discrimination.	
5. Where applicable, the candidates were given their approved access arrangements while producing the evidence contributing to the final grade, and the access arrangements have been documented.	
6. Where applicable, special consideration was given to the candidates if they were disadvantaged when producing their evidence contributing to their final grade, according to the JCQ Special Consideration Guidance, and this has been documented.	
7. Subject cohort outcomes have been compared with those of previous years, and any significant changes can be justified with evidence.	
8. The Centre Determined Grades for this subject have been signed off as accurate by the Head of Department and one other teacher within the subject. (The Head of Centre may provide the second signature where there is a one-teacher department.)	
Provide detail and justification where you have indicated 'N' to any of the above:	
Head of Department:	
Signature:	Date:

FINAL DRAFT

Departmental Assessment Evidence Grid

This must be completed by the Head of Department for the overall cohort, one for each subject at each qualification level.

Please detail the assessments used for the subject cohort (for example CCEA assessment resource, mock examination, controlled assessment and/or homework).

Indicate which assessment objectives were covered, as relevant, in each piece of evidence (Y/N), and whether the assessment was conducted with a High (H), Medium (M) or Limited (L) level of control. A definition of [levels of control is provided](#).

			Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Assessment 4
Type of Assessment						
Level of Control H, M, L						
Unit _	A01	Y/N				
	A02	Y/N				
	A03	Y/N				
	A04	Y/N				
	A05	Y/N				
Unit _	A01	Y/N				
	A02	Y/N				
	A03	Y/N				
	A04	Y/N				
	A05	Y/N				
Unit _	A01	Y/N				
	A02	Y/N				
	A03	Y/N				
	A04	Y/N				
	A05	Y/N				
If an assessment objective has been omitted at cohort level and/or further adaptations to assessments have been made, please briefly outline the reasons why:						
Head of Department:						
Signature:						Date:

FINAL DRAFT

Candidate Assessment Record

This must be completed by the subject teacher – one per candidate for each qualification.

Candidate Name:	
Candidate Number:	
Centre Name:	
Centre Number:	

Select Level:	GCE A2	GCE AS	GCSE	ELQ	OS	OLA	Other
---------------	--------	--------	------	-----	----	-----	-------

Section 1: COVID-Related Disruption – Learner Context	Y/N
Did the candidate face <u>additional</u> disruption to their teaching and learning as a result of COVID-19, <u>when compared with</u> their class peers?	
Was there any other specific disadvantage considered for this candidate in arriving at their Centre Determined Grade, when compared with their class peers?	
If 'yes', please provide details of the action taken to ensure the candidate was not disadvantaged (for example, content reduction):	

Section 2: Access Arrangements and Special Consideration	Y/N
Is the candidate entitled to access arrangements?	
Were the approved access arrangements in place during the assessments used in candidate evidence?	
Please provide details:	
Record any enhancements to the mark as a result of a special consideration in line with JCQ – A Guide to the Special Consideration Process .	Tariff
Reason for Special Consideration tariff:	

Candidate Assessment Record (continued)

FINAL DRAFT

Section 3: Subject-Level Assessment of Individual Candidate Evidence

Record student attainment for each of the assessments contributing towards the overall grade awarded. Attainment for each assessment may be captured by recording marks in percentages and/or grades.

	Date of Assessment	Mark %	Grade
Assessment 1			
Assessment 2			
Assessment 3			
Assessment 4			

Overall Grade Awarded	
-----------------------	--

Please provide any additional information that you feel is relevant to support the grade awarded. In line with your policy, this should include justification of any variation from the **Departmental Assessment Evidence Grid** (maximum

Section 4: Teacher Checklist

Please indicate that you have complied with the conditions outlined below (Y/N).

FINAL DRAFT

For Conditions 3 and 4, indicate Y, N or N/A.

Compliance conditions

1. The grade for the candidate has been determined on the basis of the evidence produced by the candidate and available to me.	
2. The grade awarded has been determined using only the evidence detailed in the Departmental Assessment Evidence Grid. Justification for the need to use any alternative evidence has been provided in Section 3, as per centre policy.	
3. Where applicable, the candidate was given their approved access arrangements while producing the evidence contributing to the final grade, and the access arrangements have been documented.	
4. Where applicable, special consideration was given to the candidate according to the JCQ Special Consideration Guidance, if they were disadvantaged when producing their evidence contributing to their final grade, and this has been documented.	
5. Consideration has been given to ensure that judgements are fair, free from bias and compatible with legislative requirements in respect of equality and discrimination.	
6. To the best of my knowledge, the assessment evidence used to contribute to the candidate's overall subject grade is the candidate's own work.	

Teacher Signature:		Date:	
--------------------	--	-------	--