This document outlines how Ballakermeen teachers went about formulating the centre assessed grades that were submitted to the examinations board. The process followed was extremely robust and no grade was determined without judicious consideration.

**Expectations provided to staff:**

* This should be **a holistic professional judgement,** balancing the different sources of evidence.
* This should be a realistic judgement of the grade each student would have been most likely to getif they had taken their exam(s) in a subject and completed any non-exam assessment this summer. This could include U grades.
* Centre assessed grades are not the same as ‘target’ or ‘current’ grades.
* Previous outcomes must be carefully considered.

|  |
| --- |
| **Evidence taken into consideration (not exhaustive)** |

* Mock examination results
* In-class assessments
* Forecast Grades
* Non examined assessments
* Attitude to Learning
* Prior attainment (early entry examination results)
* Cohort ability
* Transition matrices – national performance conversions
* Last 3 years of results

|  |
| --- |
| **Abbreviated Outline of Process** |

The school’s leadership team provided detailed guidance on how to approach the CAG process

Evidence outlined above collated by subject leaders and teachers and judiciously considered

Subject leaders met with their staff teams on a number of occasions to discuss individual students and determine grades and rankings. All relevant staff contribute to this process. Range of evidence considered

Subject leaders met with a member of the senior leadership team to discuss grades and rankings

Final grades reviewed and signed off by the Head Teacher before submission to the examination boards