

**How does a grading meeting work? Who does it involve, how are the people picked and what does it look at[u1] ?**

- Awarding meetings take place for each individual subject after the exam has been held, to ensure the standard and level of the demand of the assessment at each grade boundary is appropriate, fair, and consistent
- a panel of subject and assessment experts (Chair – CEO/Director; Advisor – HoS; Statistician; QM/QO; PA/DPA/PV/SIM)
  - review learner and assessment performance drawing on the professional judgement of subject experts (SQA appointees who are practising teachers and lecturers)
  - includes the reflections of markers and the senior exam team as they mark and review a wide range of candidate scripts, estimates provided by centres and information about the cohort, previous results
  - review how the course assessments functioned for this session (how have candidates performed in the exam and their coursework tasks and did the questions work as planned)

**What distinctions are there at subject level[u2] ?**

- Not sure what they are asking, however every course has subject specialists involved and consistency of standards is maintained through the Chair and Advisor

**What work will be done on grading in advance of receiving the results[u3] ?**

- **This has not been confirmed!**
  - Estimate analysis
  - Speculative effects of modifications and *Scenario 2 – Additional assistance*

**How can you guarantee that SQA assessors will be fair and consistent in approaching grading?**

- The structure of the meeting is set and consistent across all courses – this is outlined in a standard Awarding meeting agenda. [Comment added by ██████████ [SQA]: This is from the Handbook for Awarding: 'The number of staff tasked with particular roles within the awarding procedure is kept to a minimum. The roles of chair, advisor, and statistician are clearly defined (see Section 4) and are held by appropriately qualified members of SQA staff. The qualifications manager and principal assessor roles are subject-specific. All personnel are trained or have access to training programmes on an annual basis. In addition, any new staff taking on any of these roles undertakes training and will shadow existing staff where appropriate.']
- All personnel, including Principal Assessors, are trained or have access to training on an annual basis. Any new staff or appointees undertake training and will be able to shadow existing staff where appropriate.
- Review meetings are held daily to discuss any issues arising and procedural improvements that support consistency, fairness and parity across all decision making.
- The final decision of the awarding meeting is recorded on the Decision Making Record along with reasons for the decision and signed off by the Advisor and Principal Assessor. In the event that an agreement cannot be reached, an escalation process is in place.

**Is any historical data used in determining the grading[u4] ?**

- Previous attainment is broadly looked at, but does not determine grading
  - comparison of assessment analysis

- progression data
- Option 5 – this means that historical data will be looked at, however only to ensure grading is in line or above 2019