



Awarding Centre Assessment Grades 2020

Policy (August update 11/08/20)

Contents

Introduction	3
Information the school needs to provide.....	3
Purpose of this policy.....	3
Determining Centre Assessment Grades.....	4
Required evidence	4
Baseline testing and predictive data.....	4
Internal summative assessment data	4
Non-Examination Assessment (NEA).....	4
Performance at AS.....	4
Tier of entry	5
Expected improvement.....	5
Reasonable adjustment.....	5
Special consideration.....	5
Other evidence.....	5
Progress records.....	5
Performance.....	5
Historical evidence.....	6
Expected grade distributions and standardisation at subject level	6
Expected grade distributions and standardisation at centre level.....	6
Determining a rank order within each grade	6
Statistical standardisation.....	7
Included pupils.....	7
Signing-off centre assessment grades	7
Department sign-off.....	7
Head of Centre sign-off.....	7
Conflicts of interest.....	8
Appeals	8
Sharing information and compliance with GDPR and DPA.....	10
Appendix 1	12
Checklist for the determination of centre assessment grades 2020	12
Appendix 2.....	13
Checklist for determination of centre assessment grade ranking 2020.....	13
Appendix 3.....	14
References.....	14
Appendix 4.....	15
Objectivity in grading and ranking.....	15

Introduction

On 18 March 2020, the Secretary of State announced that the summer 2020 exam series would be cancelled in order to help fight the spread of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) and that pupils due to sit the exams would be awarded a grade based on an assessment of the grade they would have been most likely to achieve had exams gone ahead. On 23 March, in a written statement to Parliament, the Secretary of State explained the Government's intention that results would be issued to this year's cohort based on a range of evidence and data, including performance in mock exams and non-exam assessment.

Exam boards have asked exam centres to generate, for each subject, centre assessment grades for their pupils, and then to rank order the pupils within each of those grades.

The centre assessment grades submitted to exam boards must reflect a **fair, reasonable and carefully considered judgement** of the **most likely** grade a pupil would have achieved if they had sat their exams this summer and completed any non-exam assessment.

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.

Information the school needs to provide

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

- A **centre assessment grade** for each pupil – the judgement submitted to the exam board by the Head of Centre about the grade that each pupil 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 heads of department
- The **rank order** of pupils within each grade – for example, for all those pupils 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 pupil, and so on. This will also apply to the Advanced Extension Award (AEA) in maths and the Extended Project Qualification (EPQ).

For GCSE English language spoken language and A level biology, chemistry, physics and geology 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 should be generated and submitted.

Purpose of this policy

Heads of Centre are required to emphasise the need for judgements to be objective and fair. This policy serves to inform staff and other stakeholders of the school's approach to underwrite this requirement.

Supplementary guidance (published 15/05/20) can be found in Appendix 4 – objectivity in grading and ranking.

Determining Centre Assessment Grades

This will be a comprehensive professional judgement, balancing the different sources of evidence gained during each pupil's course of study. Teachers and Heads of Department (HoDs) will draw upon their understanding of their pupils' performance and how they compare to other pupils within the department/subject this year, and in previous years.

Teachers should draw on existing records and available evidence in determining their centre assessment grades.

HoDs and teachers will consider each pupil's performance over the course of study and make a realistic estimation of the grade they would have most likely been awarded if they had taken their exam(s) in that subject in the summer session, accounting for any non-exam assessment, if appropriate. This could include U (ungraded). In coming to this holistic judgement, the College will assume that it is no easier or harder for a pupil to achieve a particular grade this year compared to previous years.

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

In order to ensure fairness and objectivity, teachers and HoDs will need to confirm that the following evidence has been considered when reaching their centre assessment grade.

Required evidence

In order to achieve fairness and objectivity across the curriculum, teachers and HoDs **will be required to confirm** that the following evidence, where such evidence exists, has been taken into consideration in determining the pupil's centre assessment grade.

Baseline testing and predictive data

Based upon the national dataset, any independent baseline testing data, for example MidYIS or ALIS.

Internal summative assessment data

This will include performance in internal examinations; mock examinations; block (topic) tests, or similar assessments carried out during the course of study.

Non-Examination Assessment (NEA)

For subjects with contributing non-examination assessment (NEA) the expected contribution the pupil's NEA would make to their final grade, even if the work had not been fully completed.

Judgements regarding the contribution of NEA components will be balanced with expected performance in their written paper(s).

Performance at AS

For any A-level pupil who sat an AS in 2019, the grade awarded.

Tier of entry

If applicable, the tier of entry in tiered subjects (9 to 3 for higher; 5 to 1 for foundation, as well as U).

Expected improvement

In evaluating performance in mock examinations and subsequent assessments up to March 20th, 2020, any expected improvement by the time the examination was scheduled to have been sat.

Reasonable adjustment

Where a pupil has an agreed reasonable adjustment (for example a reader or scribe), or other agreed access arrangement, the judgement will take account of likely achievement with the reasonable adjustment/access arrangement in place.

Special consideration

Judgements will reflect how the students would have performed under **ordinary** circumstances. Where illness or other personal circumstances might have affected performance in **mock** exams or **prior assessments**, teachers and HoDs will take this into account when making their judgements.

Other evidence

According to the nature of the individual subject and its method of assessment, other evidence, as described below, may be felt to be representative in determining a pupil's centre assessment grade. Where such evidence exists, teachers or HoDs **may confirm** that it has been taken into consideration in determining the pupil's centre assessment grade.

Progress records

Any records which evidence a pupil's performance over the course of study, including, for example, classwork, written work, prep or eRC comments.

Performance

Any evidence of performance or participation in, for example, music, drama or PE where relevant to the assessment criteria for examinations.

In accordance with the Ofqual guidance, the College notes that centre assessment grades are not the same as:

- Age-related grades (usually defined as the grade a pupil would receive if they took the GCSE, AS or A level now)
- Working at grades (the grade a pupil is currently working at)
- Target grades (often set a little higher than likely to be achieved at the time they are posted to motivate pupils)
- Predicted grades provided to UCAS in support of university applications

Historical evidence

In addition to evidence held regarding the performance and expected performance of individual pupils, the school will have due regard for the performance of previous cohorts as an indicator of likely outcomes.

Evaluating the centre assessment grades against historical outcomes serves as a means to quality assure the fairness and objectivity of awarding grades based upon evidence held by the school.

The school recognises however, that historical performance may not be representative of expected outcomes for the current cohort. Thus, the evidence described above will outweigh any historical evidence when making judgements of centre assessed grades.

Expected grade distributions and standardisation at subject level

To ensure fair and objective assessment against previous outcomes, the following process will be applied:

1. Teachers and HoDs will make evidence-based assessment of pupils' expected centre assessment grades within the current cohort, as described above.
2. HoDs will make comparison of the grade distribution to **measure** centre assessment grades against the historical outcomes in their subject.
3. To ensure fairness and objectivity, HoDs will sample and standardise grades across individual teachers within the cohort.
4. **If appropriate** HoDs will make modification to the centre assessment grades such that they are aligned with the historical performance of pupils in that subject.

In circumstances in which making **historical** comparison is inappropriate (e.g the introduction of a new subject) or where no such evidence exists, then the expected outcomes of the current cohort will stand without modification on this basis.

A **checklist** for Heads of Department to acknowledge due diligence with respect to the evidence base when determining centre assessment grades can be found in Appendix I.

Expected grade distributions and standardisation at centre level

The Deputy Head (Academic) will analyse the centre assessed grades for each department and make measurement against the historical outcomes for the College as a whole.

Determining a rank order within each grade

Teachers and HoDs will agree **one** rank order for all pupils in the College taking that subject at GCSE and **one** rank order for all pupils in the College taking that subject at A-level.

Teachers within a subject will discuss the rank order and come to a shared view in accordance with the standard being applied **across the school**. This will mostly link to the **required** evidence described above.

Tied ranks are not permitted.

As required by Ofqual, in cases where more than one specification is offered for a subject, a ranking will be created for all pupils within each grade for the **whole cohort**. The rank order will then be submitted according to the requirements of each exam board.

A **checklist** for Heads of Department to assure due diligence with respect to the evidence base when determining the rank order can be found in Appendix 2.

Statistical standardisation

Exam boards, using a model developed with Ofqual, will use a statistical model to standardise grades across centres in each subject. Such standardisation falls outside of the College's control. This may mean that final grades awarded to pupils will differ from those the school proposes to the boards.

Included pupils

In circumstances where the College has accepted entries from private candidates, they will be included where the Headmaster is confident that there is sufficient evidence of the candidate's achievement to make an objective judgement.

The school will communicate its decision to any private candidates and take advice from the relevant exam board(s) where cases are not straightforward.

Following a period of consultation, on May 5th 2020 Ofqual confirmed that pupils from other year groups (e.g. early entry candidates in years 10 or 12) **would be included** if an entry had been made for them in the summer series and **sufficient evidence** was available for the school to propose a centre assessment grade.

Signing-off centre assessment grades

Department sign-off

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

Head of Centre sign-off

The Head of Centre is the Headmaster, who will confirm that the centre assessment grades and the rank order of pupils are a true representation of pupil performance. If the Headmaster is unavailable to do this, it may be delegated to the Deputy Head (Academic).

The Headmaster will be required to submit the following declaration:

I confirm that these centre assessment grades, and the rank order of students are accurate and represent the professional judgements made by my staff, and that entries were appropriate for each candidate.

Having reviewed the relevant processes and data, I am confident that they honestly and fairly represent the grades that these students would have been most likely to achieve if they had sat their exams as planned, and that they have not been disclosed to either the candidate or their parent/guardian. I understand that exam boards will conduct a statistical standardisation exercise, using a model developed with Ofqual, and that, if the profile of grades submitted is substantially different from what might be expected based on my centre's historic results and the prior attainment of this year's students, the grades for my centre will be adjusted to bring them into line with national standards.

Conflicts of interest

The conflict of interest process is designed to protect the integrity of the exams system, and also helps to ensure that staff members are protected if there is an allegation of malpractice due to a perceived, or real, personal interest.

In reaching centre assessment grades the College will observe the JCQ regulatory requirements regarding conflict of interest as detailed in the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres Booklet, page 11, section 5.3 (d).

Appeals

Following consultation across the sector, in August Ofqual published final guidance regarding the appeals process for grades awarded in 2020. All appeals must be authorised by the Head of Centre (The Headmaster).

A candidate can:

- Ask the College to request
 - relevant information from awarding bodies in respect of their result(s); and
 - submission of an appeal by the centre on their behalf; and
- appeal any decision by the College that such a request should not be made, and for the centre to determine that appeal.

Appeals cannot be submitted before the published results day, must be supported by evidence and must provide a clear explanation of the basis for the appeal in all cases.

An appeal may be submitted if the Head of Centre considers that:

- a) the awarding body did not apply procedures consistently, or procedures were not followed properly and fairly; or
- b) the awarding body used the wrong data in calculating results; or
- c) the result generated was incorrectly issued by the awarding body to one or more candidates.

Wrong data in (b) above includes where:

- the centre provided the awarding body with incorrect data (centre error); or
- the awarding body used an incorrect data set, which includes the transposition of data sets from two or more centres (awarding body error); or

- the awarding body introduced errors into a specified data set (awarding body error); or
- in exceptional circumstances, the centre establishes an exceptional factor that undermines the assumption that using a default data set is the most appropriate basis to calculate results. This would require a centre to establish that its previous cohorts of candidates are not sufficiently representative of the 2020 cohort to reliably inform the calculation of results.

An appeal cannot be made in relation to an error in a data set specified by the regulators in requirements published under Condition GQCov3.2(a)(i) where that error was not introduced by the awarding body.

Possible scenarios for appeal, according to the detail of the grounds set out in paragraphs 10 and 11 above, are provided on the JCQ website - <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals/>

Any action taken by the awarding body to rectify an error identified as the result of an appeal could result in grades being raised or lowered or remaining the same for those candidates on whose behalf the appeal has been made. The College must therefore obtain the written consent of all candidates for whom an appeal is being submitted and keep a record of that consent.

Full details of the examination appeals process in 2020 can be found by downloading the JCQ document *Guide to the awarding bodies' appeals process June 2020 examination series* available at:

www.jcq.org.uk

The College will not appeal to an awarding body on a candidate's behalf if it does not believe the centre itself made an error when submitting a centre assessment grade or rank order information or if it does not believe an awarding body made a mistake when calculating, assigning or communicating a grade.

A candidate can:

- Make an **internal** appeal against the College's decision not to appeal to the awarding body (see below)

A candidate cannot:

- appeal against their centre assessment grades and position in the rank order
- appeal in respect of the process or procedure used by the College in calculating the centre assessment grades and position in the rank order
- appeal directly in any respect to the awarding body

Candidates who feel that they have grounds to appeal should speak to the Deputy Head (Academic) in the first instance. The Deputy Head (Academic) will liaise with the relevant Head(s) of Department to determine the validity of the appeal based upon the evidence held. If the request for appeal is not upheld, explanation will be provided and the candidate will have the opportunity to ask for the decision to be reviewed by the Head of Centre (the Headmaster).

Awarding bodies charge a fee for each stage of an appeal against results. Ordinarily, the fee is refunded if the appeal is upheld, other than when the upheld ground of appeal is a centre error.

Any candidate who feels that they have been subject to bias or discrimination should make their concern known to their hsm or tutor without delay. Circumstances which suggest there may have been bias or discrimination in awarding centre assessed grades will be escalated through the school's complaints procedure under the direction of the Second Master.

At the time of writing, higher education institutions have extended their conditions of entry deadline to **September 7th**. Thus, any **applicants considering an appeal to meet a conditional offer must seek guidance without delay**.

The Ofqual deadline for submission of appeals is **September 17th 2020**. In order to assess and process any appeals in good time, final **internal** deadlines (17:00) are as follows:

Wed 02 Sept 2020

Deadline for candidates to make request to appeal any examination outcomes in 2020

Wed 09 Sept 2020

Deadline for confirmation of the school's decision whether to support the appeal based upon the evidence presented

Fri 11 Sept 2020

Deadline for requests for the Head of Centre to review the school's decision if the request for an appeal is not upheld

Wed 16 Sept 2020

Confirmation of Head of Centre's final decision on whether an appeal will be made

Sharing information and compliance with GDPR and DPA

We hope that this policy provides reassurance that the College's processes for generating centre assessment grades are rigorous, objective and fair.

Once centre assessment grades have been submitted to exam boards, the process to produce the final grades will start. In accordance with the Ofqual guidance published in April 2020, the school is not permitted, under any circumstances, to share the centre assessment grades nor the rank order of pupils with pupils, or their parents/carers or any other individuals outside the centre, before final results have been issued.

Data subjects (pupils) are able to request their personal data under Article 15 of the General Data Protection Regulation 2018 (GDPR). However, in respect of personal data such as marks or other information processed by a Data Controller for the purposes of determining results, an exemption from disclosure exists under paragraph 25(2) of the Data Protection Act 2018. This allows Data Controllers (in this case the school) to delay disclosure of such information until after results have been issued. This exemption exists to protect the integrity of the process and ensures that results are unbiased.

The centre assessed grades proposed to the awarding bodies are subject to national standardisation and therefore may differ from final outcomes. Once results are published the College will make the centre assessed grades available to candidates who request them, along with a copy of the checklist the relevant Head(s) of Departments have completed to confirm the evidence upon which the grade was based. A request may be relevant, for example, for a candidate who believes they have been significantly disadvantaged by this year's process, particularly those for whom there may be implications for their progress to the next stage of education or employment. It may also be relevant to those candidates considering an appeal (see below).

In almost all circumstances we hope to be able to provide the centre assessment grade(s) unless there is a clearly justifiable reason not to (for example, concern over someone's safety). Under GDPR it may not be possible to share information if so doing could lead to the indirect disclosure of personal information regarding other candidates (for example, if the cohort is small).

Under data protection regulations, requests for centre assessed grades must come from the candidate themselves. The Privacy Officer will respond as soon as practically possible to provide the requested information, or to provide explanation of why the information cannot be provided under GDPR or DPA.

The College's primary aim is to help pupils understand and reflect on their grades and assist them in making the transition to the next stage. As is the case in any examination year, pupils should first discuss their results with their hsm, tutor, teachers and Heads of Department. Miss Gordon, Head of Futures and Mr Gilbert, Deputy Head (Academic) are also available to help support and advise. It is important that those conversations are prioritised in the first few days following the publication of final results.

Thereafter, candidates may request their centre assessed grades as follows:

- A-level candidates from the week beginning August 17th 2020
- GCSE candidates from the week beginning August 24th 2020

Under GDPR regulations, the College will ordinarily respond to subject access requests within one calendar month of the request being received. The Information Commissioner's Office understand that resources, whether they are finances or people, might be diverted away from usual compliance or information governance work and wider ranging requests may take longer to process during the COVID-19 pandemic. We recommend requests are restricted to grade data to expedite the process and would expect to respond within 48 hours of the request being made.

The school's Privacy Officer is Mr. Joseph Burge jcburge@eastbourne-college.co.uk

Appendix I

Checklist for the determination of centre assessment grades 2020

Subject:	<input type="text" value="Enter here"/>	Exam board:	<input type="text" value="Enter here"/>
Level:	<input type="text" value="GCSE or A-level etc."/>	Spec. code:	<input type="text" value="Enter here"/>

Required Evidence	YES	N/A	Enc. Ref
Baseline testing and predictive data (e.g. MidYIS or ALIS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Internal summative assessment data (e.g. end of year / mock examinations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Non-Examined Assessment (NEA) if applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Performance at AS or other relevant preparatory qualification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tier of entry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Expected improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reasonable adjustment (for candidates with agreed access arrangements)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Special consideration (circumstances in which any of the evidence used may have been impacted by illness, injury or bereavement)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Other Evidence	YES	N/A	Enc. Ref
Progress records (e.g. classwork, written work, prep etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Evidence of performance (e.g. in music, drama or PE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Any other evidence (please add rows as appropriate)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Historical Evidence and Standardisation	YES	N/A	Enc. Ref
The use of historical data to quality assure the fairness and objectivity of the proposed grades	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Evidence of standardisation across sets / teachers / the department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Further Comments
Please add any further comments if helpful in providing relevant context etc.

I confirm that these centre assessment grades are accurate and represent the fair and objective professional judgements made by my department staff, and that entries were appropriate for each candidate. Having reviewed the relevant processes and data, I am confident that they honestly and fairly represent the grades that these students would have been most likely to achieve if they had sat their exams as planned.

Signed (Teacher)

Signed (Head of Department)

Appendix 2

Checklist for determination of centre assessment grade ranking 2020

Subject:	<input type="text" value="Enter here"/>	Exam board:	<input type="text" value="Enter here"/>
Level:	<input type="text" value="GCSE or A-level etc."/>	Spec. code:	<input type="text" value="Enter here"/>

Required Evidence	YES	N/A	Enc. Ref
Baseline testing and predictive data (e.g. MidYIS or ALIS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Internal summative assessment data (e.g. end of year / mock examinations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Non-Examined Assessment (NEA) if applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Performance at AS or other relevant preparatory qualification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tier of entry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reasonable adjustment (for candidates with agreed access arrangements)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Special consideration (circumstances in which any of the evidence used may have been impacted by illness, injury or bereavement)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Other Evidence (if applicable)	YES	N/A	Enc. Ref
Evidence of performance (e.g. in music, drama or PE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Ranking determined by predicted grades	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Any other evidence (please add rows as appropriate)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Internal Standardisation	YES	N/A	Enc. Ref
Evidence of standardisation across sets / teachers / the department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Further Comments
Please add any additional comments if helpful in providing further context etc.

I confirm that this ranking is accurate and represents the fair and objective professional judgements made by my department staff, and that entries were appropriate for each candidate. Having reviewed the relevant processes and data, I am confident that they honestly and fairly represent the ranking of the students within the cohort.

Signed (Head of Department)

Appendix 3

References

Awarding qualifications in summer 2020 (Ofqual)

Information for schools, students and parents on how GCSE, AS, A level, vocational and technical qualifications will be graded and awarded in summer 2020.

First published April 3rd 2020 updated July 27th 2020

Available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/awarding-qualifications-in-summer-2020>

Summer 2020 grades for GCSE, AS and A level, Extended Project Qualification and Advanced Extension Award in maths (Ofqual)

Additional information for Heads of Centre, Heads of Department and teachers on objectivity in grading and ranking.

First published May 15th 2020

Available at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/885337/Guidance_on_objectivity_in_grading_and_ranking_15MAY2020.pdf

General Regulations for Approved Centres (JCQ)

1 September 2019 to 31 August 2020

Available at:

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations>

Student guide to post-16 qualifications results summer 2020

A guide for those receiving qualification results in England this summer.

Published July 27th 2020 updated August 7th 2020

Available at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/904344/Student_Guide_Summer_2020_20200728_1233_-_access.pdf

JCQ guidance A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes June 2020 examination series

Published August 7th 2020

www.jcq.org.uk

Appendix 4

Objectivity in grading and ranking

The importance of objectivity

In these unprecedented circumstances, schools and colleges are best placed to judge the likely performance of their students if teaching and learning, and exams, had continued as planned. Centres know their students well and will have regularly assessed their performance throughout the course of study.

We are conscious that these arrangements have had to be put in place very quickly due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, so it has not been possible to provide national training to school and college staff to standardise these judgements.

We are providing the following additional information on objectivity in grading and ranking to help schools and colleges play their role in ensuring this year's grading is as fair as possible. This is based on existing research and analysis about how centre-based assessments can be carried out as objectively as possible.

Objectivity in grading and ranking decisions

Each centre assessment grade should be a holistic professional judgement, balancing different sources of evidence and data. It is important that the centre's grading and ranking judgements are objective; they should only take account of existing records and available evidence of a student's knowledge, skills and abilities in relation to the subject. This evidence should inform teachers' professional judgements about each student's likely performance at the time of the exam. Other factors should not affect this judgement, including characteristics protected under equalities legislation such as a student's sex, race, religion/belief, disability status, gender reassignment or sexual orientation. Similarly, judgements should not be affected by a student's behaviour (both good and poor), character, appearance or social background, or the performance of their siblings.

Unconscious effects on objectivity

To avoid unconscious bias, centres are urged to reflect on and question whether they may have any preconceptions about each student's performance and whether their perception of the evidence might be affected by any irrelevant factors.

Centres should be aware of:

- confirmation bias, for example noticing only evidence about a student that fits with pre-existing views about them
- masking or halo effects, for example a particular view about an aspect of a student that hides, or overly accentuates, their actual knowledge, skills and abilities
- recency effects, for example giving undue weight to the most recent interaction with a student or the most recent piece of work done by a student
- primacy effects, for example giving undue weight to 'first impressions' of a student
- selective perceptions, for example giving undue weight to a student's performance on a particular part of the content of the specification rather than considering performance across all the material
- contrast effects, for example over- or under-estimating a student's likely performance having first considered a large number of students who are all working at a different standard

Information from previous data

The effects described above may not be consistently seen across different centres or individuals. To understand more about possible effects in a particular centre, a centre could look back at previous years' data, for example, over the past 2 to 5 years, where this is available. Considering data in this way is unlikely to identify all possible effects and may prove inconclusive. Contextual information is likely to be important in considering what weight to give any such data. For example,

significant personnel changes may mean that effects in previous years may not be assumed to carry forward, or may reduce the benefits of aggregating data between different years.

A centre could use such data to identify whether there may be any indications of systematic under- or over-prediction for different groups of students, for example, those with particular protected characteristics. For example, a centre may find that it has routinely under-estimated predicted A level maths grades to UCAS compared to grades actually achieved for students with particular characteristics; or routinely over-estimated target English GCSE grades compared to grades actually achieved for students with particular characteristics. The centre could use any such findings as it checks whether its proposed centre assessment grades for this summer might have been influenced by preconceptions or irrelevant factors. In doing any such analysis, centres should be aware of and take into account contextual factors. Awareness of the limitations of data and the context in which it was generated may help centres to consider which data is relevant, which is not, and what conclusions may and may not be supported.

Reviewing judgements

Having considered possible unconscious effects on objectivity and any information from available data from previous years, centres are asked to use this information to reflect carefully on their grading and ranking judgements. Dialogue between heads of departments, teachers and the Head of Centre can support such reflection and review.

Where any possible unconscious effects, or previous systemic under- or over-prediction for particular groups, have been identified, careful consideration would be needed to ensure, for example, that this was not over-compensated for.

Nonetheless, analysing information, reflection and dialogue as outlined above could help a centre to assure itself that it has effectively fulfilled its duties to promote equality and avoid discrimination as set out under the Equality Act 2010, and to assure itself that it has maximised objectivity and fairness in the judgements that it has made.