Code of Practice Governance Group

Date: Monday 23rd March 2020
Time: 11.30 – 12.30
Location: MS Teams
Attending: Fiona Robertson, Gill Stewart, Jean Blair, James Morgan, Alistair Wylie, Liz McGrath, Robert Quinn, Margot McKerrell

Agenda

Item	Topic	owner
13.1	**Notes of previous meeting** The notes were reviewed and all but one action closed regarding the record of our scenario planning to 18th March.	JB
13.2	**Review of EEM Paper** FR suggested a new working title be provided in due course – DFM using ACM (Alternative Certification Model) but tbc. JM updated the group wrt coursework and estimates, missing variables and impact of only coursework at N5, lots of assumptions and variability in reliability. Maths is an outlier as no coursework. Looks like Estimates will be the only common element across levels. FR: approach in RoUK will be interesting as their coursework has recently been removed so they are new to estimating and our position will be similar at H & AH. RQ: estimates should include a consideration of all component performance inc Coursework. FR: If we are relying more on estimates do we ask centres to estimate in a different way than normal – e.g. including rank ordering? But if we are breaking the link between previous practice and this year that will have to be considered. RQ: also, difficult to estimate at band, how do we account for variability? AW: also tied into the coursework situation - some candidates have been instructed to complete from home so this affects validity. FR: the appeals system will be key here and we need to scenario plan our actions based on our estimate of future judgements and capacity. If we do not have valid/full complement of coursework we may not be able to use at all for ACM but could use for appeals. External validation with the system remains important including with other regulators to retain congruence with them. External / peer review may be helpful – [redacted] has been in touch to offer assistance. We may need additional external resource on the statistics teams. **Action JM & FR to discuss.** FR: how do we introduce the qualitative aspect to certification? E.g. involve PA/PVs in a 'quasi grade boundary process' before certification using professional judgement, other evidence where appropriate to review the overall picture at national, centre, subject, level etc. Also how are we	JM&FR

	engaging with senior Appointees to retain their help with this process? **Action: JM to consider the overall model including quasi GB on grade distribution etc by centre, subject, level etc and bring back to CoPGG.** JM: is rank ordering still on the table? GS: yes, and Ofqual are doing this. FR: maybe, if we provide more guidance but this might break the relationship with previous year data. Once we decide on coursework we will provide guidance on estimation too. Previous estimation guidance may not apply. Need some messages about the statistical distribution and credibility. GS: Also, Standardisation needs to be robust to allow national and by centre distribution. Low uptake subjects may be anomalous. They might need a different or additional process – perhaps qualitative and previous years. RQ: Coursework can be a good yardstick for a cohort for ranking. FR: there is a continuum from Maths to Art – does it make the estimates more or less reliable? **Action: Coursework to be discussed and more data established and will return to CopGG later today. CoPGG agreed that N5 may be marked however usage and inclusion in our ACM based on more evidence and consideration of H & AH position with candidates not being able to access school is needed.** **Action: AW to link in with HC on H & AH Coursework communications to go out today/tomorrow based on previous GS email from yesterday.**	JM RQ/JB AW
13.3	**Review of Potential PRS Paper** AW talked through the paper and advised the model would likely be based on current EC process and that operationalisation of this needs underpinned by a project team. RQ: this can definitely be developed, will need focus on issues with validation and prioritisation. Time is of the essence although we have a little time to explore. The ACM needs to inform and influence this. FR: Biggest assumption will be around the uptake from the system and our operating capacity so we need to involve teachers as much as we can so they appreciate the how this will work. There will be magnification of input from parents and this will perhaps need mitigated by ordering, distribution balanced by symmetry and consistency and scope – e.g. guidance around the appeal of A grades etc. That would need buy in and acceptance. CoPGG agreed. RQ suggested the project was led by Operations. JB suggested potentially four strands/project arising Logistics – marking/coursework – RW/JMe ACM Model - JMo Data, reporting, certification and ops and APS - DF Post Results – perhaps MW FR: perhaps a joint SRO however in these circumstances should we engage a little before finalising/communicating - Advisory council to assist? ADES, Head Teachers, etc. RQ based on EC process so need the Operating Model to be robust. FR: PRS will be an important element for public confidence in overall ACM and process and we have sign off from SG.	

	Action: JB to share overarching governance description and that will help develop a project proposition by eop Wednesday including high level timelines.	JB
13.4	**Review of Scenarios/Contingencies** Now overtaken by events although carry through of assumptions made here to new governance and project will be good. We assume we will have staff and resources but need to know what would be the point that we would have to call foul given potential peak infection predictions.	JB
13.5	**NQ Quality Assurance** MMcK talked CoPGG through the paper – 70% of verification still outstanding so issues for pick up and distribution for verification. Only two options – delay everything o/s to session 2021 **or** do some verification in Sept/October (inc N4AVU) on a reduced/risk basis. RQ: we may need to deploy Option1 at a later stage and is there read across with HNVQ? JB: we have had good conversations with representatives from Colleges Scotland and feel quite positive about our e-ability, more to follow. FR - If we are running our appeals system in Sept/October will there be an overburden or contradiction in the system – when do we make that decision? MMcK: when will we certificate units – at the same time as courses? We need to decide that too. We have completed 30% verification so far. Should we focus on IACCAs? FR – revisit the assumptions as of now, option 1 but update and reflect and read across with HN. Do we have view about completion of units? Especially N4 and NPAs etc. How do/can we provide guidance about conditions? We need to reflect on evidence and QA we expect for N4, NPA etc in relation to our ACM for national courses to ensure we have equity where possible. **Action: MMcK/JB to reflect current situation and discussion in the paper and bring back to next meeting.**	JB/MMcK
13.6	**Coursework (at 4pm)** RQ/JB: We are concerned about N5 coursework that we have in the system and our ability to use it appropriately in our ACM. It is incomplete across centres and subjects and we now need to mark it and can see issues with completion of those processes. If this holds for N5 then it will apply to H & AH. FR: For H & AH - is there an Option 3 which is Option 1 amended to include – broader message to the system that whilst we are not collecting coursework to use in ACM we remind centres about alternative evidence. Appeals process is likely to rely or utilise alternative evidence. RQ: We must be open to how to deal with incomplete evidence in the event this is all that can be submitted and FR: we must remain open to allow us to future proof and validate this with stakeholders. **Action: RQ to amend paper to reflect.** JB went on to provide a further paper on N5 volumes and uplifts. The next part of the process is to release our materials to markers and the rest of our	RQ

	marking and distribution processes. Standardisation is the next part of the process and that is more difficult to do remotely when marking from paper. Planning is ongoing. JB: N5 deadline is passed, not all evidence is in and we need to decide go/stop soon. We have said that N5 marking will go ahead. The deadline has now passed and 50,000 of 176,000 items of entries have not been received. This leads us to a position of inequity across centres and subjects. We do not have technical solutions for all standardisation meetings. We cannot complete any central marking. At this stage, estimates are at 29,000 and we are expecting 500,000 plus by end of April so very early in this process. Technical issues with MI solutions ongoing. We can only plan to the best of our knowledge. CoPGG discussed estimate again, should we provide more or more rigorous guidance or rules on how to estimate effectively? JM: guidance is quite light touch but should we focus on how to rank instead? RQ: Add something around the value of including incomplete evidence/coursework. How would we accept the ranking evidence in an efficient way? Would this be part of the quasi grade boundary process involving senior appointees that we might employ? Previous action to develop this model applies. **Action: CoPGG agreed that CPG Planning for 2020 would need to begin in earnest to guide us. JB to initiate.** **Action: JB to raise questions on contamination of coursework being sent out and back for marking through SG contact**	JB JB
13.7	**Communications – AW & HC paper** The paper was discussed and slight amends agreed. Should we engage with any parts of the system prior to release? **Action: FR will arrange for [redacted] and [redacted] from ADES to get a pre release copy for discussion and perhaps review with some Principal Assessors also. These communications will be issued asap once signed off by FR today/tomorrow.**	FR
	Date of next meeting - tbc	

Please note – Coursework and Communications discussion took place at 4pm, GS was not available for 4pm meeting and MMcK was not in attendance.