

Submission of Data to Exam Board for the Summer 2020 GCSE, AS Level and A Level Exams

Introduction

Exam boards will ask exam centres to generate, for each subject, **centre assessment grades** for their students, and then to **rank order** the students within each of those grades. Given the current challenging circumstances, Ofqual and the DfE believe that providing these two key pieces of information will enable exam boards to issue the fairest possible results. Ofqual have, as far as was practical in the current circumstances, consulted with teachers and education leaders across the sector as they developed this approach.

The centre assessment grades submitted to exam boards must reflect a fair, reasonable and carefully considered judgement of **the most likely grade a student would have achieved if they had sat their exams this summer and completed any non-exam assessment**. Heads of Centre should emphasise the need for judgements to be objective and fair.

In the interests of fairness to students, judgements made by centres across the country should be consistent. However, it is not feasible in the current circumstances for exam boards to standardise the judgements of all teachers across all subject areas before grades are submitted. So that the final grades awarded are as fair as possible, exam boards will standardise the judgements across different centres once they have been submitted, using a statistical methodology developed in conjunction with Ofqual.

The **deadline will be no earlier than 29th May 2020** so we have time to do this.

Information we need to provide

For every GCSE, AS and A level subject, exam boards will require us to submit the following information:

- a **centre assessment grade** for each student – the judgement submitted to the exam board by the Head of Centre about 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 centre and which has been reviewed by subject teachers and relevant Subject Leaders.
- the **rank order** of students within each grade – for example, for all those students with a grade of 5 in GCSE maths, or a grade B in A level biology, a rank order where 1 is the most secure/highest attaining student, and so on.

For **GCSE English language spoken language and A level biology, chemistry and physics practical work**, exam boards will **also collect the grades for the separate endorsements**. If they have been completed, the grades should be submitted. If not, then centre assessment grades for the endorsement, as described in this document, should be generated and submitted. Exam boards will contact centres with further instructions about how to submit this data.

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

The process we will undertake

We will undertake a three stage process:

1. We will ask all teachers in conjunction with their Subject Leaders and Line Managers to provide a grade for each pupil they teach. If there are shared classes, it will need to be done in conjunction with both teachers.
2. The data will be collected and analysed to see how it compares to data from previous years, the prior attainment data for the cohort, Progress 8 score based on last year.
3. Once we are satisfied that it is as accurate, objective and fair as possible, teachers and Subject Leaders will be asked to rank pupils within each grade as outlined above. Tied ranks will not be accepted and teachers and Subject Leaders will have to think very carefully about the ranking.

Data on Individual Level and Cohort Level – a Cautionary Note

Whilst Ofqual and the Exam Boards will use statistical analysis to ensure the validity of the data that is submitted as best as possible, it is only possible for them to do this at a cohort level and not on an individual level. It has to be a decision for each teacher (with the support of their Subject Leader) to make a decision on **the most likely grade a student would have achieved if they had sat their exams this summer and completed any non-exam assessment.**

We have to be careful of applying data at an individual level. For each pupil, we can also calculate the Progress 8 score for each of the Progress 8 buckets. These range wildly for each pupil - pupils can perform significantly better or worse than expected if we were just to consider their prior attainment. In other words many pupils do significantly better (and worse) than they would be expected to based on their KS2 data alone. This is why the submission of centre assessed grades cannot be a data exercise! It just won't be accurate and won't be fair on pupils as it will not take into account the variation between the pupils in terms of their progress (and hence attainment).

Whilst any form of data analysis on an individual is a pointless exercise, when applied to a cohort or large group, it is **perfectly valid**. This cohort / groups analysis must be used to ensure the submissions are reasonable. For example, if we collect all the data and find that our Progress 8 score works out as +2.7, we know this is just not possible or realistic and Ofqual will not accept it. Exam boards have stated in their guidance that attempts to undermine the system are will be seen as malpractice. (Note that it is **perfectly possible** for an **individual** to have a Progress 8 score of +2.7 (for example), but the **cohort or group** cannot)

The grades that should be submitted should reflect a fair, reasonable and carefully considered judgement of **the most likely grade a student would have achieved if they had sat their exams this summer and completed any non-exam assessment.** This must be done by speaking to each teacher individually and them using their professional judgement to reach a fair and object grade that would

be realistic. This will take some time, but is the only way to do it to meet the requirements set out by Ofqual.

The Evidence Base for Centre Assessed Grades

This should be a holistic professional judgement, balancing the different sources of evidence. Teachers and Subject Leaders will have a good understanding of their students' performance and how they compare to other students within the department/subject this year, and in previous years. Subject Leaders and teachers 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(s) in a subject and completed any non-exam assessment this summer. This could include U (ungraded).

In coming to this holistic judgement, teachers and Subject Leaders should assume that it is no easier or harder for a student to achieve a particular grade this year, compared to previous years.

For GCSE combined science, the centre assessment grade should use the 17-point grade scale from 9-9 to 1-1.

Teachers and Subject Leaders should draw on existing records and available evidence (as far as possible in the context of current 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 **progress review data, classwork, bookwork, and/or participation in performances in subjects** such as music, drama and PE
- performance on any non-exam assessment (NEA), even if this has not been fully completed. **You should not ask students to complete their NEA work and you do not need to submit marks for any completed NEA.** 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**
- for re-sitting students, any information about previous grades achieved or NEA marks that would, under normal circumstances, have been carried forward
- for A Level students who took AS in 2019, **their AS results in that subject**
- performance on any **class or homework assessments and mock exams** taken over the course of study
- tier of entry in tiered subjects – 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 our 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
- **for larger subjects, the set they are in.** *Whilst within every set there is a range of grades, they do not vary that dramatically year-on-year and can be used as a guide for the centre assessment grade this year.*
- **early entry grades** from Year 10. *Whilst these are not the same subjects that we are required to submit data in, they are indicative of a pupil's performance. There is, of course, variation between subjects, but this is perhaps not as great as we may think.*
- **Results analysis from the last two years** which shows the distribution of grades with in their subjects (both across the cohort and within each class). *This would be a good starting point when thinking about the cohort.*
- any other relevant information

Given the timing of the announcement, Ofqual recognises that centres will have incomplete evidence, and that the range and amount of evidence will vary between different subjects. Judgements should be made on the evidence that is available.

For students who have an **agreed access arrangement**, the judgement should take account of likely achievement with the reasonable adjustment/access arrangement in place.

There is **no requirement** to set additional mock exams or homework tasks for the purposes of determining a centre assessment grade and no student should be disadvantaged if they are unable to complete any work set after schools were closed.

There will be **no requirement** to send any supporting evidence, such as student work, to the exam boards, but **centres should retain records** of this, in case exam boards have any queries about the data.

The **centre assessment grades** are **not** the same as the following and they **must not** be used when make the judgements.

- age related grades (usually defined as the grade a student would receive if they took the GCSE, AS or A level now)
- **working at grades** (the grade a student is currently working at)
- **target grades** (often set a little higher than likely to be achieved, to motivate students)
- **predicted grades** provided to UCAS in support of university applications

Sharing Data

Staff **MUST NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE**, 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.

All teachers taking part in the exercise will be required to **confirm in writing a statement to that effect**. Any breach of this will be **considered misconduct by the school and disciplinary action** may follow.

We must also guard against the possibility of accidental sharing via misdirected emails, etc. Data must be **kept secure** at all times with **adequate precautions** in place.

Internal Sign Off Procedures

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 Subject Leader**. For large departments, it would make sense if the other individual was the deputy Subject Leader or another TLR post holder. Where no one else is available, the Head of Centre will have to act as the other person.

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.

Statistical Standardisation

Exam boards, using a model developed with Ofqual, will use a statistical model to standardise grades across centres in each subject. Ofqual are working with technical experts within exam boards and others to develop this model, which will combine a range of evidence including:

- expected grade distributions at national level
- results in previous years at individual centre level
- the prior attainment profile of students at centre level

If, when compared to the evidence above, judgements submitted by us are more generous than would be expected, then the final grades for some or all of our students will be adjusted down. On the other hand, if it appears that our judgements are more severe, then the final grades for some or all of our students will be adjusted up.

This is why ranking is so important. If they are going to move anyone down, they will start with the ranking and move those at the bottom of the grade down. Likewise, those who are the most secure are most likely to move up. This is yet another reason as to why centres assessment grades or ranking **cannot be shared** with pupils or parents under any circumstance.

Next Steps

1. Check entries are correct and ensure we know who has been entered. Any withdrawals should be made immediately.
2. Exam fees need to be paid in full for all entries.
3. Check on any external entries that we have made this year.
4. Ask all subject teachers, Subject Leaders and Line Managers to sign a simple declaration about data sharing (see suggested wording below).
5. Begin work on assigning grades to every student once we have finalised the process we will use. Curriculum Leaders to use spreadsheet sent with exam numbers on
6. Once complete, the data is to be sent back for a statistical sense check by the Senior Leadership Team. This data is placed onto SISRA for analysis, locked down for internal analysis only.

7. The data will need to be rank ordered by Curriculum Leaders working with their teams. Teachers and Subject Leaders will need to work together again to ensure the ranking is as accurate as possible.
8. SLT to get back to Curriculum Leaders if we think there are issues with this. (AHTs)
9. Final check of rank ordering and statistical consistency overall. Agreed by the Senior Leadership Team. Resent and final checks confirmed by Curriculum Leaders
10. Send to examination boards.

Data Sharing Declaration

This is the proposed text that we ask all staff who are involved in the process of providing centre assessment grades and ranking to take part in.

I confirm the following for all pupils that I teach in Years 11, 12 and 13 for who were due to sit their GCSE, AS or A Level exam this year.

1. The **centre assessment grade** I have provided, based on all the available evidence, is the most likely grade a student would have achieved if they had sat their exams this summer and completed any non-exam assessment.
2. I have provided an **accurate ranking** for all pupils from highest to lowest in a given grades or, in the case of multiple classes within my subject, I have assisted the Subject Leader in ranking the pupils from highest to lowest within a given grade.
3. I agree **not to share, under any circumstances**, the centre assessment grade or ranking to any **pupil, parent or anyone outside Alderbrook School**. In addition, I agree:
 - a. **not to share** the **centres assessment grade** with **anyone** other than my Subject Leader, member of the Senior Leadership Team or the Head of Centre.
 - b. **not to share** the **ranking** I have provided (or contributed to) to **anyone other than members of my department**, a member of the Senior Leadership Team or Head of Centre.
 - c. to take adequate precautions to ensure this **data is stored securely** on any computer device or in paper form and that I will **permanently delete or destroy** the **centre assessment grade** and **ranking** (in any format that I have) when requested to do so by my Subject Leader or Line Manager.
4. I understand that the wilful or negligent sharing of the centre assessment grade or ranking will be considered (gross) misconduct and may lead to disciplinary action.

Full Name:

Date: