

GUIDANCE

# Information for centres about making objective judgements

In relation to awarding qualifications in 2021

**ofqual**

# Contents

<b>Making objective judgements .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Objectivity in grading decisions .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Unconscious effects on objectivity .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Using previous data to check on the objectivity of judgements being made .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Reviewing judgements .....</b>	<b>5</b>

## Making objective judgements

In these unprecedented circumstances, schools and colleges are best placed to judge the performance of their students. Centres know their students well, and will have regularly assessed their performance throughout the course of study.

However, we recognise there are concerns about the potential for some students to be disadvantaged by this approach.

We are providing the following additional information on objectivity in grading 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 decisions

Each teacher assessed grade should be a professional judgement, balancing different sources of evidence and data. It is important that the centre's grading judgements are objective; they should take account of existing records and evidence, as well as new evidence generated in the coming months, to demonstrate a student's knowledge, skills and abilities in relation to the subject content that they have been taught.

This evidence should inform teachers' professional judgements about each student's performance. 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 where a particular view about an aspect of a student 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 that they have been taught
- contrast effects, for example over-estimating a student’s likely performance having first considered a large number of students who are all at a much lower standard
- outlier effects, for example, under-estimating a student’s performance if it is significantly out of line with (above or below) other students in that centre, for example some students may have performed less well during periods of remote learning

## Using previous data to check on the objectivity of judgements being made

The effects described above may not be consistent between either 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.

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 teacher assessed grades for this summer might have been influenced by preconceptions or irrelevant factors.

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.

In doing any such an 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 consider which data is relevant, which is not, and what conclusions may and may not be supported.

Data from previous years can provide a useful reference point by looking at overall grading patterns by student group to help centres make objective judgements. However, it is important that each student's grade is determined by the specific performance of that student in relation to the relevant qualification. On that basis, data from previous years should not be used in isolation as a basis upon which to determine individual grades.

## Reviewing judgements

Having considered possible unconscious effects on objectivity and any information from previous available data, centres should use this information to reflect carefully on their grading judgements. Dialogue between Heads of Departments, teachers and Heads of Centres 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.



© Crown Copyright 2021

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated.

To view this licence, visit

[www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/)

or write to

Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU

Published by:

**ofqual**

Earlsdon Park  
53-55 Butts Road  
Coventry  
CV1 3BH

0300 303 3344

[public.enquiries@ofqual.gov.uk](mailto:public.enquiries@ofqual.gov.uk)

[www.gov.uk/ofqual](http://www.gov.uk/ofqual)