

# Teacher Assessed Grades and Appeals Process Summer 2021



**How has my child been graded this year?**

Grades for GCSEs, BTECs and A/AS-levels, and most other qualifications will be based on a process involving teacher assessment against national standards, internal quality assurance, and external quality assurance by the exam boards.

At Christleton, we have used a range of evidence to reach a holistic judgement for each student. This includes formal assessments sat under exam/test conditions, a selection of class and homework and non-exam assessment (NEA/coursework) and practical performance in some subjects.

You can read our Centre Policy, which has been approved by the exam boards here:

<https://www.christletonhigh.co.uk/uploads/files/policy-for-determining-teacher-1734.pdf>

This details the approach we have taken as a school. You can also find a student guide by following this link:

<https://www.christletonhigh.co.uk/uploads/files/ofqual-student-guide-to-awardi-1729.pdf>

**Why have there been so many assessments when exams were cancelled?**

National exams were cancelled in January, and all schools and colleges had flexibility on how to arrive at a fair and robust grade for each student.

Throughout the early summer term, we have been using exam-style assessments, past exam papers and other assessment materials, many provided by exam boards, as we believe this will produce the most reliable, and therefore fairest, evidence.

**What evidence has been used in each subject?**

Our Centre Policy details the high-level approach we are taking as a school. Your child's subject teacher will have already let students know what evidence is being used for the Year group or class.

You can also find this information here:

Year 11: <https://www.christletonhigh.co.uk/uploads/files/final-tags-2021-parent-and-stu-1727.pdf>

Year 12/13: <https://www.christletonhigh.co.uk/uploads/files/-1728.pdf>

We have already asked you to submit an application for special consideration if you felt there were mitigating circumstances affecting your child in line with the JCQ guidance. All requests submitted have been processed and accordingly applied if the criteria were met.

Please note, that senior teachers have used their professional judgements, guided by the JCQ rules, on how to respond to mitigating circumstances; this may vary between subjects depending on the impact it had on the assessment. We have recorded how any mitigating circumstances were responded to.

**My child usually has access arrangements (e.g. extra time) in exams. Have they this year?**

Staff at CHS accommodate access arrangements within lessons using Quality First Teaching. Some examples of these for each of the arrangements are listed below:

Exam access arrangement	Quality First Teaching
Extra Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide extra time in a timed piece of work</li> <li>• Allow all students as much time as required to complete work</li> </ul>
Scribe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff may scribe for the student</li> <li>• TAs act as scribes for formal assessments as requested</li> </ul>
Word Processor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students use chrome book or laptop to complete work</li> </ul>
Reader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAs may act as readers if available</li> <li>• Teachers read to students when requested</li> </ul>
Reading pen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers read requested words to students</li> </ul>
Coloured paper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff provide work on coloured paper</li> </ul>
Rest breaks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff will allow students to take a break when needed</li> </ul>
Smaller/individual room	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom acts as smaller room in most cases</li> <li>• Offices and the corridor are used if needed</li> </ul>
Prompt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff prompt students when necessary</li> </ul>
Bilingual dictionary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students use their own in class</li> </ul>

This list is not exhaustive and where staff cannot be sure that an arrangement has been given, this piece of work has been removed if it would be detrimental to the overall grade.

Formal access arrangements were in place for mock exams as a result of a specific need, identified by our SENDCO.

**Can we know the grade submitted?**

No. We are legally obliged not to let students or parents know their submitted grade before results day.

Whilst students do not have an automatic right to know their grades or marks for assessments, we have shared the marks of each individual assessment as they have been completed. This has allowed teachers and students to engage in diagnostic feedback that would hopefully lead to improvements in later assessments.

**The assessments you're doing are different from another school or college. How is this fair?**

Schools and colleges have been given a lot of flexibility in how they decide on a holistic teacher assessed grade this summer. This means that it's likely the assessment programmes will look different in other schools and colleges, even ones in the same area.

Because students should only be assessed on what they have been taught, to account for variations in lost learning due to the pandemic, the range and type of evidence will differ between schools and colleges, and even between students within a school.

Our approach has been approved by the exam boards; but many different approaches have also been approved. This does not mean one approach is better than the other.

### **I don't think my child's teacher will judge them fairly.**

All staff have undergone objectivity and bias training. This is detailed in our Centre Policy, which has been approved by the exam boards.

We have also used, what we call, 'blind marking'. This is where the name of the candidate has been removed from the assessment and a teacher, other than the class teacher, has marked that assessment.

All of the grades will be signed off by two members of staff, including the Head of Department. All grades will be signed off by the head of centre.

We will also have to send a sample of work into the exam boards, ensuring that grades are fair and accurate.

### **My child needs a particular grade for university / college; what can I do to make sure they get it?**

It is important that neither students nor the parents or carers put any pressure on classroom teachers or heads of department to submit a certain grade. If a member of staff feels that pressure is being applied, this will be reported to senior members of staff, who have been instructed to report this (whether from parents or students) to the exam boards as potential malpractice.

If you want to raise genuine mitigating circumstances with us, **and have not already done so by the original 14<sup>th</sup> May deadline**, then please do so to: [hallamc@christletonhigh.co.uk](mailto:hallamc@christletonhigh.co.uk) by **12 noon on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> June**. Medical or mental health applications must have medical evidence included for them to be processed.

### **What is exam malpractice?**

Exam malpractice this year includes:

- students fabricating evidence (e.g. claiming plagiarised work is their own),
- they or their parents placing undue pressure on teachers to submit a certain grade,
- teachers fabricating evidence.

If malpractice is proven, the exam boards may decide to withhold the qualification altogether.

Our Malpractice policy for 2021 can be found at this link:

<https://www.christletonhigh.co.uk/uploads/files/exams-malpractice-policy-202-1721.pdf>

### **How can I appeal?**

If your child is unhappy with their grade this summer, they will have the opportunity to resit all GCSEs and A/AS-levels in the autumn. Students should speak to Miss Hallam about entering the autumn series.

There is also the option to appeal a grade on the following grounds:

- Administrative error – you think the school or college has submitted the wrong grade for you
- Procedural error - you think the school or college did not follow our process correctly
- Error of academic judgement – you do not think the grade submitted reflects a reasonable judgement on either the evidence that was used, or the grade arrived at.

All appeals will first be processed as a **centre review**. Following the outcome of a centre review, students can choose to take forward an appeal to the exam board(s), which we will do on their behalf.

Details of how to request a centre review and exam board review are included in **Appendix A**.

**Please note that at any stage of the appeals process a student's grade(s) could go up, down or stay the same. If the appeal process decides that the submitted grade was too high, students will not be able to keep the higher grade. We will require students to sign a declaration saying that they understand this before they submit an appeal.**

### **My child has work at a higher grade than the work used as evidence. Can they appeal?**

Students have already been told what evidence is being used.

Year 11: <https://www.christletonhigh.co.uk/uploads/files/final-tags-2021-parent-and-stu-1727.pdf>

Year 12/13: <https://www.christletonhigh.co.uk/uploads/files/-1728.pdf>

When it comes to appeals, exam boards will be considering whether any teacher acting reasonably could have used the same evidence and reached the same judgement. This is different to whether other alternatives would have been equally as valid.

### **How should a teacher balance the evidence when a student scores exceptionally highly on some assessments/questions, and less well on others?**

While there is no one type of evidence that takes precedence, evidence gathered in conditions that enable confidence about the authenticity of the students' work will give more confidence in the overall holistic judgement. If a teacher identifies a difference in performance between different types of assessment evidence, their grading decision should reflect the evidence they consider, in their professional judgement, to more authentically represent a student's level of attainment.

Teachers should not place too much reliance on a source of evidence for which students had the opportunity to prepare /rehearse the answers, if that evidence is out of line with other evidence across the course.

### **Can a student receive a grade only on the basis of Non-Examination Assessment (NEA otherwise known as coursework), work completed, if this is the only evidence available?**

It is not necessary for every aspect of the specification to be assessed to arrive at a grade. The aim is to include evidence that assesses the student's ability across a reasonable range of subject content reflecting, where possible, all assessment objectives, as set out in qualification specifications.

Teachers are advised to consider whether the evidence available is sufficient to support the judgement that is being made. Unless there is no time available to do so the teacher is advised to set additional assessments, where needed.

On submission of grades to the awarding organisation, Heads of Centre/The Headteacher will declare they are satisfied that each student's grade is based on an appropriately broad range of evidence and that each student has been taught an appropriate amount of content to provide the basis for a grade. The most appropriate grade to award will depend in practice upon the extent to which the student has met the assessment objectives overall. Shortcomings in some aspects of the student's performances may be balanced by better performances in other aspects.

If a student's specific circumstances prevent additional assessment evidence being generated, the grade descriptors could be used to underpin a centre's holistic grading judgements in assigning an appropriate grade to the student. The significance of the NEA in the specific qualification, and the standard of the students' evidence are relevant factors in that determination.

### **When making grading judgements is it essential that the most recent evidence takes precedence over evidence that was completed earlier in the course, even if the student has performed less well in the later assessments?**

Flexible arrangements have been put in place this summer and centres will ensure that students have the opportunity to show the full breadth of their knowledge and understanding in each subject based on what they have been taught. It is important that grades represent a holistic, objective judgement based on evidence of each student's performance in a specific subject.

Usually a student's most recent evidence is likely to be more representative of their performance. However, there may be specific, individual circumstances where that is not the case.

The teacher should consider the coverage of the assessment objectives, the content being assessed in the earlier and later assessment tasks, as well as the conditions under which the evidence was completed. When assigning the grade, the teacher should consider the quality of the work in relation to the assessment materials used as well as the grade descriptors and grading exemplification available to assist them in making their grading judgement.

## Appendix A – Joint Council for Qualifications Appeals process, (issued by JCQ on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2021)

If, on results day, you are not happy with the grade awarded, you have the right to appeal that grade.

There are two stages to appeal.

### Stage One – Centre Review

This stage covers the centre's role in handling requests from students who wish to correct a perceived error.

#### **Who can request a review and when?**

Any student, including a Private Candidate, may submit a request for a centre review on the grounds that the centre has:

- failed to follow its procedures properly or consistently in arriving at that result or
- made an administrative error in relation to the result.

Requests for appeals on the grounds of academic judgement (unreasonableness) will only be considered by awarding organisations (at Stage Two) and not by centres. In these cases, an initial centre review must still be completed to ensure that the centre has not made any procedural or administrative errors. The centre should **not** review its academic judgements during the centre review stage.

A centre review must be completed and an outcome reported to the student before an appeal can be submitted to the awarding organisation. Any appeals submitted where this has not happened, will be rejected by the awarding organisation and a new application will need to be submitted once the centre review has been completed.

All requests for a centre review, including those from Private Candidates, must be made directly to the centre which submitted the grade(s). Requests for centre reviews should be made by the candidate to the centre by:

- **16 August 2021** (priority appeals - for students applying to higher education who did not attain their firm choice, i.e. the offer they accepted as their first choice, and wish to appeal an A level or other Level 3 qualification result)
- **3 September 2021** (in all other cases).

This will enable centres to meet the deadlines to submit appeals to awarding organisations.

Centre reviews which are not submitted by these dates may lead to appeals not being completed in time for those with a higher education place dependent on the outcome of the appeal.

For reviews where a higher education place is dependent on the outcome of an appeal, students must include their UCAS personal ID. The student should also notify their preferred higher education provider that a review has been requested at the earliest possible opportunity so they can decide how to handle their offer.

Centres must accept and process/investigate any request for a review from a student. Failure to do so could constitute malpractice and awarding organisations are required to follow up on such cases.

To assist centres and students to promptly request and handle reviews, a request and consent form is included in **Appendix B**. Students must complete the form outlining the reason for the review, this does not need to be explained in detail but should allow the student to outline in their view:

- how the centre failed to follow its procedures properly and consistently and why that failure was important to determining the grade; and/or
- the administrative error the centre made and what difference it made to the determination of the grade.

A student may submit a request for a review but subsequently decide they wish to withdraw it. They should be allowed to do so **as long as no finding has been made**. A centre review application cannot be withdrawn once a finding has been made.

### Determining a review outcome

An example of a centre administrative error is the transposing of grades for students with similar names. Such factual errors should be easy to identify and determine.

The appropriateness of the centre's procedure will already have been checked by the awarding organisation as part of its external quality assurance process. The focus of a review on procedural grounds will therefore be **whether the centre followed its procedure properly and consistently in arriving at the grade being challenged**.

The types of procedural failure a student may raise and a centre will need to check may include:

- the existence and consideration of mitigating circumstances at the time of an assessment
- the provision of agreed access arrangements/reasonable adjustments for an assessment
- the process for determining and quality assuring grades (for example internal standardisation, authentication of student work).

In cases where the centre considers that there has been a procedural failure or administrative error, the centre needs to decide whether this affected the grade submitted to the awarding organisation.

The resulting outcome may be that the grade is raised, stays the same or is lowered, depending on the impact of the error or failure.

### Examples

- A student requested a review as they did not believe that the marks/grades attributed to their selection of evidence were accurately recorded. The centre reviewed the student's evidence and confirmed that the correct marks/grades were included when determining the student's grade. Therefore, no change was required to the student's grade.
- A student has requested a review as they believe that the school did not take account of the fact that their approved access arrangements/reasonable adjustments were not in place for some of the assessments used in the selection of evidence. The centre finds that the student's concerns were correct, having checked that the student was entitled to access arrangements/reasonable adjustments and finding no record that these were in place for two of the three assessments used in the student's evidence. There was therefore a **failure in procedure**. The centre reviews the grade for the student considering this finding, to determine whether their final judgement would have changed as a result. The centre considers that the lack of access arrangements/reasonable adjustments would have had an impact on the student's performance in those assessments and would have meant they would likely have achieved a higher grade on both. They therefore advise that, in their professional opinion and in line with the approach set out in the centre policy, the grade should be a B rather than a C.
- A student has requested a centre review believing that the school has transposed some of their marks that make up the range of evidence. The centre finds that the student's concerns are correct: there was an **administrative error**. The centre reviews the grade for the student considering this finding, to determine whether their final judgement would have changed as a result.

It is possible for a procedural failure or an administrative error to be identified but for this not to have had any impact on the grade awarded. In this case the outcome of the review would be that the grade stays the same.

### Examples

- The centre finds that the marks of one piece of evidence have been transposed to another piece of evidence, but the differences are small and the weighting of each piece of evidence is similar so the overall impact of correcting the errors is that the grade already reported was accurate and therefore stays the same.
- The centre finds that the grade for the student was not checked and confirmed by a second staff member but, after completing this step it is found that the grade reported remains accurate. The grade in this case

was found to be aligned with the evidence of student performance from which it was determined, so did not require amendment.

It is also possible for a procedural failure or an administrative error to be identified at the review which, when rectified, leads to a lowering of the grade. Taking the procedural failure example above, a failure in the grade checking and confirmation process, when resolved as a result of the centre review, could find that the grade should in fact have been lowered as a result of that process as the centre found the grade to be too generous in relation to the evidence of student performance from which the grade was determined.

As with the administrative error example above, a mistransposed lower mark could impact a piece of work that is weighted more heavily than the other piece of evidence. When resolved as a result of the centre review, it could be that the grade should have been lower.

**In such cases, the student who has submitted the review will already have consented to their grade being lowered as a possible outcome and the centre should therefore submit a request to lower the grade to the relevant awarding organisation.**

Once the centre has considered the review and determined if a grade change is necessary due to a procedural failure or administrative error, it must report the outcome either to the student who submitted the review (if the grade has not changed) or to the awarding organisation to request a change to the grade.

Awarding organisation staff will then consider the outcome and reasons and make the final decision about changing the grade.

Amended grades will be reported to the centre, to be shared with the student along with the centre's review decision. In cases where the awarding organisation disagrees with the centre's decision to amend a grade as the result of a review and considers it inappropriate to do so, or considers a different grade to be appropriate, the awarding organisation will clearly communicate its reasons to the centre.

**Whether or not a procedural or administrative failure was found, and whether or not the grade changed as a result, all students have the right to submit an appeal to the awarding organisation as the next stage in the process.**

Any appeal to the awarding organisation must be submitted on the student's behalf by the centre that carried out the relevant review, with the consent of the student. A refusal to submit an appeal for the student could be considered malpractice and investigated by the awarding organisation as such.

## Stage Two – Appeals to the awarding organisation (the exam boards)

### **Who can request an appeal and when?**

Any student, including a Private Candidate, who considers that there has been a procedural error, an administrative error or that their grade reflects an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement (either because of the way that the grade has been determined and/or the selection of the evidence), may submit a request for an awarding organisation appeal **after they have received the outcome of their centre review and after the publication of results.**

An appeal can only be made against a result issued. Any student who believes that the centre's decision to withdraw an entry due to insufficient evidence on which to determine a Teacher Assessed Grade, or not to make an entry in the first place, must raise such concerns through the centre's complaints process. Any continuing concerns following completion of the centre's complaints process may subsequently be raised through the awarding organisation's complaints process.

All requests for an appeal must be made directly to the centre which submitted the grade and must be received by the awarding organisation by:

- **23 August 2021** for priority appeals (for students applying to higher education who did not attain their firm choice, i.e. the offer they accepted as their first choice, and wish to appeal an A level or other Level 3 qualification result), or by
- **17 September 2021** for non-priority appeals.

All requests for appeals, from internal or Private Candidates, must be made to the centre which determined and submitted the grade and the centre must submit the appeal request to the awarding organisation.

Awarding organisations will not accept appeals directly from students or parents. Appeals submitted by students or parents directly to an awarding organisation will not be processed and will need to be re-submitted via the centre.

Any student who requests a priority appeal must include their UCAS personal ID with the appeal application for it to be processed as such. They should also notify their higher education provider that they have requested an appeal at the earliest possible opportunity so they can decide how to handle their offer.

Centres must accept and submit a request for an appeal from a student. A failure to do so could constitute malpractice and awarding organisations are required to follow up on such cases. The appeal submission should include the outcome of the initial centre review showing the centre's own findings when considering the student's concerns.

Appeals cannot be made to an awarding organisation until the centre review has been completed. Any submitted where this is not the case will be rejected by the awarding organisation and a new application will need to be submitted after the centre review has concluded.

A centre must submit an appeal to the awarding organisation if the student considers that:

- the centre did not follow its procedure properly or consistently in arriving at the result, or during the centre review
- the awarding organisation made an administrative error in relation to the result
- the centre made an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement in the choice of evidence from which to determine the grade and/or the determination of that grade from the evidence.

The information the awarding organisation will require from a student when they submit their appeal includes:

- what they consider the centre failed to do, why that was a failure to follow the centre's procedures, and why that failure was important to the determination of the Teacher Assessed Grade
- in what way they consider the awarding organisation made an administrative error, and what difference it made to the determination of the Teacher Assessed Grade
- in what way they consider there was an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement:
  - in the selection of evidence used to determine the Teacher Assessed Grade
  - in the determination of a Teacher Assessed Grade from the selected evidence.

When an application for an appeal is received, the awarding organisation will decide whether it will be accepted for evaluation or not.

The decision whether to accept the application for an appeal is based on:

- whether the grounds of appeal are within the remit of the appeals process (where a rationale is required)
- whether a centre review has been completed
- the timing of the application in relation to the published deadlines for submitting appeals
- whether the student has confirmed that they consent to their grade being raised, lowered or staying the same.

If an application for an appeal is not accepted, the reason(s) for this will be given.

A student may submit a request for an appeal but subsequently decide they wish to withdraw it.

Awarding organisations will accept requests for appeals to be withdrawn as long as no finding has been made. An application for an awarding organisation appeal cannot be withdrawn once a finding has been made.

When considering an appeal, the awarding organisation will consider the factors raised by the appeal and attach such weight to them as it considers appropriate.

For example, the Ofqual Guidance explains that *‘whether a Learner raised any objection to the inclusion or exclusion of particular evidence before the determination of the TAG is a factor which an awarding organisation may take into account, but it should not be determinative. Similarly, a failure by a Centre, prior to the determination of the TAG, to disclose to the Learner what evidence they would rely on might or might not be a relevant factor’*.

The guidance explains that a procedural appeal requires the awarding organisation to *‘consider whether there is sufficiently persuasive evidence that the Centre deviated from its own procedures in the way(s) identified by the Learner in the grounds of appeal. The determination of such an appeal does not require a comprehensive or step-by-step evaluation of the merits of the procedure set by the Centre. The appropriateness of the Centre’s procedure will have been checked by the awarding organisation as part of its external quality assurance. The question on appeal is whether the Centre followed that procedure properly and consistently in arriving at the Learner’s TAG’*.

Where an appeal is made on the grounds of an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement (either in the choice of evidence from which to determine the grade and/ or the determination of that grade from the evidence), the awarding organisation will take into account Ofqual’s guidance which sets out that the starting point is the Teacher Assessed Grade itself and not any alternative grade put forward as part of the appeal.

Therefore, the focus of any appeal will be on whether the Teacher Assessed Grade was unreasonable and not that any other grade or mark would have been reasonable.

As the Teacher Assessed Grade is holistic in nature, the awarding organisation’s independent reviewer will take a similarly holistic approach to their decision-making. **The purpose of the independent review is not to review the marking of individual assessments.**

The independent reviewer will consider whether the original Teacher Assessed Grade decision was reasonable. **The independent reviewer will not consider whether they would have given an alternative grade or whether an alternative grade could also reasonably have been given.**

The independent reviewer will consider whether the original Teacher Assessed Grade decision was reasonable on its own terms, not if any alternative proposition for the Teacher Assessed Grade or evidence put forward by the student, would be a more appropriate exercise of academic judgement. **There may be a difference of opinion as to the assessed grade without there being an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement. The reviewer will only conclude that there has been an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement if the Teacher Assessed Grade was clearly wrong – i.e. there was no basis upon which the grade could properly have been given.**

As a result of the appeal, the case will either be rejected (disallowed) or upheld (allowed) in whole or in part.

**The fact that an appeal has been upheld (allowed) will not necessarily result in a grade change for the student.**

Where the awarding organisation:

- identifies a procedural error or
- finds alternative evidence should have been included in the range of evidence

and that this may have impacted the Teacher Assessed Grade, they will report these findings to the centre and direct them to review the Teacher Assessed Grade.

The centre must then inform the awarding organisation if it believes there should be a change to the grade. An awarding organisation may impose a change to the grade.

Following final quality assurance checks, where it considers it appropriate to do so, the awarding organisation will make the grade amendment and report the outcome of the appeal, with reasons for its decision, to the centre.

Where an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement is identified by the awarding organisation, the independent reviewer will determine the alternative grade. The awarding organisation will then report the revised grade and outcome of the appeal, with reasons, to the centre.

Following the conclusion of the awarding organisation's appeal process, a student who remains concerned their grade was incorrect may be able to apply for a procedural review to the Exam Procedures Review Service (EPRS)

from the relevant regulator. There are EPRS processes for Ofqual (England) and Qualification Wales. The regulators will provide further details about the EPRS processes for summer 2021 before results days this summer.

## Key Dates – post publication of results

### Key Dates for priority appeals\*

10 August to 16 August 2021	Window for students to request a centre review
10 August to 20 August 2021	Centres conduct centre reviews
10 August to 23 August 2021	Centres submit appeals to awarding organisations

*A priority appeal is only for students applying to higher education who did not attain their firm choice (i.e. the offer they accepted as their first choice) and wish to appeal an A level or other Level 3 qualification result.*

### Key dates for non-priority appeals

From result day to 3 September 2021	Window for students to request a centre review
From result day to 10 September 2021	Centres conduct centre reviews
From result day to 17 September 2021	Centres submit appeals to awarding organisations

Publication of GCE AS and A-level results – 10 August 2021

Publication of GCSE results – 12 August 2021

## Important information for students

### What may happen to your grade during the centre review and appeals process?

If you request a centre review or an awarding organisation appeal there are three possible outcomes:

- Your original grade is **lowered**, so your final grade will be lower than the original grade you received.
- Your original grade is **confirmed**, so there is no change to your grade.
- Your original grade is **raised**, so your final grade will be higher than the original grade you received.

Once a finding has been made you cannot withdraw your request for a centre review or appeal. If your grade has been lowered you will not be able to revert back to the original grade you received on results day.

### What will be checked during a centre review?

You can ask the centre to check whether it made a **procedural error**, an **administrative error**, or both. A procedural error means a failure to follow the process set out in the centre policy. An administrative error means an error in recording your grade or submitting your grade to the awarding organisation.

You must request a centre review before you can request an awarding organisation appeal. This is so the awarding organisation is certain that your grade is as the centre intended.

### What will be checked during an awarding organisation appeal?

You can ask the awarding organisation to check whether the centre made a **procedural** or **administrative error** - or whether the awarding organisation itself made an **administrative error**. You can also ask the awarding organisation to check whether the **academic judgement** of the centre was unreasonable, either in the selection of evidence or the determination of your grade.

### When do I need to submit my request?

You should submit a request for a centre review by **16 August 2021 for a priority appeal**, or by **3 September 2021 for non-priority appeals**.

Once you have received the outcome of your centre review, if you wish to request an awarding organisation appeal you should do so as soon as possible. Your school or college will submit this on your behalf. Requests for a priority appeal should be submitted by **23 August 2021** and requests for non-priority appeals should be submitted by **17 September 2021**. Priority appeals that aren't submitted to the awarding organisation by 23 August 2021 will still be treated as a priority but they may not be completed in time for those with a higher education place dependent on the outcome of the appeal.

### What is a priority appeal?

A priority appeal is only for students applying to higher education who did not attain their firm choice (i.e. the offer they accepted as their first choice) and wish to appeal an A level or other Level 3 qualification result. You should inform your intended higher education provider that you have requested a centre review or appeal.

### What is your UCAS personal ID and why is it needed?

Your UCAS personal ID is the 10 digit code included in all correspondence from UCAS. This is needed to confirm that a student's place is dependent on the outcome of the appeal.

## Stage one – centre review

### A. Student request

This section is to be completed by the student. A request for a centre review must be submitted to the centre, not the awarding organisation. A centre review must be conducted before an appeal to the awarding organisation. This is so the awarding organisation is certain that your grade is as the centre intended.

Centre Name		Centre Number	
-------------	--	---------------	--

Student Name		Candidate Number	
--------------	--	------------------	--

Qualification title e.g. AQA GCSE English Language			
Teacher Assessed Grade issued			
Is this a priority appeal? <small>A priority appeal is only for students applying to higher education who did not attain their firm choice and wish to appeal an A level or other Level 3 qualification result.</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If Yes provide your UCAS personal ID e.g. 123-456-7890	

#### Grounds for centre review

Please tick one or both of the options if they apply to your request. If you don't think either apply, your centre will still conduct a review for administrative and procedural errors so the awarding organisation can be certain that your grade is as the centre intended.

Administrative Error by the centre e.g. the wrong grade/mark was recorded against an item of evidence	<input type="checkbox"/>	Procedural Error by the centre e.g. a reasonable adjustment / access arrangement was not provided for an eligible student	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--	--------------------------

#### Supporting evidence

Please provide a short explanation of what you believe went wrong and how you think this has impacted your grade. There is a 5,000 character limit.

--

#### Acknowledgement

I confirm that I am requesting a centre review for the qualification named above and that I have read and understood the information provided in the 'Important information for students' section above. In submitting this review, I am aware that:

- The outcome of the review may result in my grade remaining the **same**, being **lowered** or **raised**
- The next stage (Stage Two, the appeal to awarding organisation) may only be requested once the centre review (Stage One) has been requested and concluded.

<b>Student Name</b>
<input type="text"/>

<b>Student signature</b>
<input type="text"/>

<b>Date</b>
<input type="text"/>

## Stage two – appeal to awarding organisation

This section is to be completed by the student. An awarding organisation appeal must be submitted to the centre and the centre will then submit it to the awarding organisation

Grounds for appeal	
Please tick the grounds upon which you wish to appeal	
<b>1. Administrative error by the awarding organisation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. Procedural issue at the centre</b>	
a. Procedural Error	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Issues with access arrangements / reasonable adjustments and/or mitigating circumstances	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3. Unreasonable exercise of academic judgement</b>	
a. Selection of evidence	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Determination of Teacher Assessed Grade	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evidence to support an appeal
Please provide a short explanation of what you believe went wrong and how you think this has impacted your grade where that relates to your chosen ground for appeal. In some cases you must provide a clear reason but it doesn't have to be lengthy.
<b>1. Administrative error by the awarding organisation</b> You <b>must</b> provide a clear explanation. There is a 5,000 character limit.
<b>2 (a) Procedural Error</b> This is when the centre made a procedural error that has not been corrected at Stage One or the centre did not conduct its review properly and consistently. If you can, please add a further explanation below or alternatively refer to the information that you have already provided above. There is a 5,000 character limit.

**2 (b) Issues with access arrangements / reasonable adjustments and/or mitigating circumstances**

You **must** provide a clear explanation of what you believe went wrong and how you think this has impacted on your grade. There is a 5,000 character limit.

**3 (a) Selection of evidence**

You **must** provide a clear explanation of what you believe went wrong and how you think this has impacted on your grade. There is a 5,000 character limit.

**3 (b) Determination of the Teacher Assessed Grade**

You can provide a short explanation of the reason for your appeal if you want to. There is a 5,000 character limit.

**Acknowledgement**

I confirm that I am requesting an appeal for the qualification named above and that I have read and understood the information provided in the 'Important information for students' section above.

I am aware that:

- The outcome of the appeal may result in my grade remaining the same, being lowered or raised
- I understand that there is no further opportunity to appeal to the awarding organisation and that the next stage would be to contact the regulator. The awarding organisation will include the next appropriate steps, where applicable, in their appeal outcome letter which you will receive from your school/college.

**Student name**

**Student signature**

**Date**

## Reviewing academic judgements at the appeals stage

Independent reviewers at the appeals stage will be asked to review whether there has been an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement in the selection of evidence on which the student's Teacher Assessed Grade has been based and/or the determination of the Teacher Assessed Grade on the basis of the selected evidence.

The independent reviewer will consider the judgement exercised by the teacher in applying the centre policy to the individual student who has submitted the appeal. They will not consider the reasonableness of the centre policy itself, which will be reviewed as part of the awarding organisation quality assurance process. The independent reviewer will expect to see that the teacher has had due regard to the guidance issued for the summer 2021 series by Ofqual and JCQ, and the subject specific grading support materials provided by awarding organisations.

Reasonable in this context allows for normal variation in academic judgement between two professionals with appropriate subject knowledge and understanding of the Ofqual and JCQ requirements. **The teacher's exercise of judgement will not be considered unreasonable simply because an alternative exercise of judgement would have resulted in a more or less favourable result for the individual student.** The teacher's judgement will be considered unreasonable only if it is such that no teacher acting reasonably could have reached the same judgement.

### Reviewing the selection of evidence

The independent reviewer will first review the centre policy, to gain an understanding of the centre's overall approach, and then consider the explanations provided by the teacher on the assessment record (or equivalent centre documentation) for the selection of evidence at a cohort level and any variation in the evidence selected for individual students. They will also consider the student's grounds of appeal, in order to understand why they believe the selection of evidence was unreasonable in their case.

The independent reviewer will consider whether the teacher's academic judgement has been exercised in a way which is contrary to the guidance issued by Ofqual and JCQ to such an extent that no teacher acting reasonably, and being mindful of that guidance, could have reached the same judgement. The following example is intended to illustrate this approach.

The Ofqual guidance states that teachers should assess students on as broad a range of specification content as they can. **A selection of evidence will not be unreasonable simply because it does not cover every area of content that has been taught,** since students are not assessed on every area of content in a normal exam year. **Nor will a selection of evidence be unreasonable because it does not cover all assessment objectives for the specification,** if this has been necessary because of disruption to teaching and learning. However, a selection of evidence which completely excluded one or more assessment objectives may be unreasonable if no appropriate justification has been provided.

### Reviewing the Teacher Assessed Grade

The independent reviewer will review the section on determining grades in the centre policy, to gain an understanding of the centre's overall approach, and the assessment record for the subject (or equivalent centre documentation), to gain an understanding of any mitigating circumstances or other relevant factors relating to the individual student. The reviewer will also review all available items of performance evidence on which the Teacher Assessed Grade has been based, and the student's grounds of appeal.

The independent reviewer will consider whether the Teacher Assessed Grade awarded to the student is contrary to the grading descriptors and exemplification issued by the awarding organisation for the specification in question to such an extent that no teacher acting reasonably, and being mindful of that guidance, could have reached the same judgement. A grade will only be considered unreasonable if the reviewer considers that the student's performance evidence is clearly and unequivocally indicative of a higher or lower grade.