



House of Commons
Education Committee

Getting the grades they've earned

Covid-19: the cancellation of exams and 'calculated' grades

First Report of Session 2019–21

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 7 July 2020*

The Education Committee

The Education Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Education and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

[Rt Hon Robert Halfon MP](#) (*Conservative, Harlow*) (Chair)

[Apsana Begum MP](#) (*Labour, Poplar and Limehouse*)

[Dawn Butler MP](#) (*Labour, Brent Central*)

[Jonathan Gullis MP](#) (*Conservative, Stoke-on-Trent North*)

[Tom Hunt MP](#) (*Conservative, Ipswich*)

[Dr Caroline Johnson MP](#) (*Conservative, Sleaford and North Hykeham*)

[Kim Johnson MP](#) (*Labour, Liverpool, Riverside*)

[David Johnston MP](#) (*Conservative, Wantage*)

[Ian Mearns MP](#) (*Labour, Gateshead*)

[David Simmonds MP](#) (*Conservative, Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner*)

[Christian Wakeford MP](#) (*Conservative, Bury South*)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2020. This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/copyright.

Committee reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/education-committee and in print by Order of the House.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Kevin Candy (Second Clerk), Vanessa Donhowe (Committee Specialist), Dr Mike Everett (Clerk), Oliver Florence (Senior Media Officer), Rosemary Hill (Committee Specialist), Nelson Idama (Media Officer), Robert McQuade (Senior Committee Assistant), Rebecca Owen-Evans (Committee Specialist), Kandirose Payne-Messias (Committee Support Apprentice).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Education Committee, House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 2370; the Committee's email address is educom@parliament.uk.

You can follow the Committee on Twitter using [@CommonsEd](#).

Contents

Summary	3
1 Introduction	5
2 Is the system fair?	6
Overview	6
The calculated grade system	6
The potential for bias	7
The standardisation process	9
Who might be disadvantaged by standardisation?	10
Vocational and technical qualifications	11
3 The appeals process: a process for the well-heeled and sharp-elbowed?	13
Overview	13
Navigating the appeals process	14
Ensuring accessibility	14
4 Looking ahead	16
The autumn exam series	16
2021 exams	17
A question of fairness: post-16 catch-up funding	18
Conclusions and recommendations	19
Formal minutes	22
Witnesses	23
Published written evidence	24

Summary

This report examines the fairness, transparency and accessibility of this year's exam arrangements. As we took evidence and asked questions, these were the three guiding principles against which we scrutinised Ofqual's and the Department's decisions. Our report considers arrangements for GCSEs and A levels, as well as vocational and technical qualifications.

Pupils up and down the country have worked hard to prepare for their exams, and we understand their immense disappointment at the news that exams would be cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The Department and Ofqual acted swiftly to devise alternative arrangements so that pupils can be awarded grades and move on to the next step of their lives. Ofqual in particular should be commended for stepping up to the immense challenge of devising these exceptional arrangements.

Pupils will carry these qualifications with them for their entire lives. Their calculated grades must be accurate. But we have concerns that the system described by Ofqual as the "fairest possible in the circumstances" could be unfair for groups including disadvantaged pupils, BAME pupils, children looked after, and pupils with SEND.

We commend teachers for their hard work and professionalism in making difficult judgements about grades and ranking, and we note that they are working within the system designed by Ofqual. Exam boards will standardise grades using a model devised by Ofqual. Standardisation is a process applied to the calculated grades submitted by schools and colleges to ensure consistency. Standardisation draws on multiple evidence sources to determine whether calculated grades are more severe or generous than expected. As a result of standardisation, calculated grades may be adjusted, so that the grades pupils ultimately receive may be different to the centre-assessed grades submitted by schools and colleges.

Given the potential risks of bias, inaccuracy and grade inflation, it is clear that standardisation will play a crucial role in ensuring fairness. We call on Ofqual to make a transparency guarantee—a commitment to publishing details of its standardisation model immediately. Ofqual should not be afraid of scrutiny or open debate over whether its model offers the fairest outcome for every pupil and provider.

It is right that pupils should be able to appeal their grade if they believe bias or discrimination has occurred, but Ofqual has not given enough thought on how to make this route accessible to all pupils. Without support, proving bias or discrimination would be an almost impossible threshold for any pupil to evidence. Disadvantaged pupils, and those without family resources or wider support, risk being shut out of this route. Ofqual must urgently publish the evidence thresholds for proving bias and discrimination, clearly setting out what evidence will be required.

At our evidence session with Ofqual, we called for it to provide an advice and appeals helpline for pupils, and we welcome its commitment to do so. This must be free, and staffed by professionals trained to provide gold-standard, step-by-step assistance and advice to pupils about their options.

We strongly welcome the Government's announcement on funding catch-up tuition for the most disadvantaged pupils. However, the pandemic's impact on learning loss does

not stop when pupils turn 16. We call on the Government to extend this to disadvantaged post-16 pupils, to ensure this group is not left behind as they prepare for their exams. We call on the Department to set out expectations for provision of teaching support for pupils opting for an autumn exam.

Looking ahead to summer 2021, we remain mindful of the immense catch-up programme that will be needed to tackle learning loss. We do not support modifications to these exams, as we believe the 2021 cohort of exam-takers would be disadvantaged by a perception that their exams were not as rigorous as those taken by other cohorts. Instead, a short delay—weeks, not months—is the preferable option.

We set out our main recommendations for a fairer, more transparent, and more accessible system below:

Fairness

Ofqual must identify whether there is evidence that groups such as BAME pupils, pupils with SEND, children looked after, and FSM eligible pupils have been systematically disadvantaged by calculated grades. If this is the case, Ofqual's standardisation model must adjust the grades of the pupils affected upwards.

The Government must extend catch-up funding to include disadvantaged post-16 pupils to ensure this is not a lost generation. This should be done by doubling the disadvantage element in the 16–19 funding formula for pupils in Year 12, for at least the next year.

Transparency

Ofqual's evaluation must include comprehensive data on attainment, by characteristics including gender, ethnicity, SEND, children looked after, and FSM eligibility, providing full transparency on whether there are statistically significant differences between attainment this year compared with previous years.

Ofqual must be completely transparent about its standardisation model and publish the model immediately to allow time for scrutiny.

Ofqual must collect and publish anonymised data at the conclusion of the appeals process on where it received appeals from, including, as a minimum, type of school attended, region, gender, ethnicity, SEND status, children looked after (including children supported by virtual schools), and FSM eligibility.

Accessibility

Ofqual must urgently publish the evidence thresholds for proving bias or discrimination, clearly setting out what evidence will be required, including example case studies. This must be communicated to parents and pupils in advance of results day.

Ofqual must ensure gold-standard advice and support is easily accessible for all pupils unhappy with their grades. Both the helplines provided by Ofqual and the National Careers Service must be freephone lines. These must both be staffed by dedicated professionals with the training to provide sound and impartial step-by-step advice and support on options and appeals.

1 Introduction

1. In March 2020, as the Government responded to the threat of Covid-19, it was announced that schools and colleges would close for all but children of key workers and vulnerable children, and that national exams would be cancelled.¹ Shortly afterwards, on 25 March 2020, we launched our inquiry into the impact of Covid-19 on education and children's services. We knew that exam cancellations would be a source of great anxiety and concern for pupils, families and teachers. As part of our inquiry, we invited written evidence on the effect of cancelling formal exams, including the fairness of qualifications awarded and pupils' progression to the next stage of education or employment.

2. We were concerned about the fairness of this year's system for awarding grades. We held an oral evidence session on 10 June 2020 to hear views on which groups might lose out from calculated grades, and what needed to be done to level the playing field for all pupils. We also received over 100 written submissions on exams from pupils, parents, teachers and the wider education sector, detailing their concerns about exam cancellations and calculated grades. We are grateful to all those who took the time to submit evidence, during what is a particularly busy and uncertain time.

3. This report focuses specifically on the cancellation of national exams, including GCSEs, AS and A levels, and vocational and technical qualifications. We would like to put on record our gratitude to schools, parents and children across the country for dealing with all the unprecedented educational challenges created by the Covid-19 pandemic and lockdown. In particular, we thank the headteachers and teachers, and the support staff, cleaners and caretakers, who have kept schools open for children of critical workers and vulnerable children. We are also grateful for the work done to support children learning from home.

1 DfE, [Press release: Schools, colleges and early years settings to close](#), 18 March 2020

2 Is the system fair?

Overview

4. On 31 March 2020, following the announcement that exams were cancelled, the Secretary of State for Education issued a direction instructing Ofqual, the exams and qualifications regulator, to develop a process for calculating GCSE, AS and A level grades which would ensure that “qualification standards are maintained and the distribution of grades follows a similar profile to that in previous years.”² A further direction was issued on 9 April 2020, instructing Ofqual to develop suitable arrangements awarding for vocational and technical qualifications. We agree with the Department’s assessment that the complexity and diversity of these qualifications means that a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate.³

5. We consider exams to be the fairest form of assessment, and any alternative will inevitably be an imperfect replacement. Ofqual has stepped up to the immense challenge of devising these exceptional arrangements, and has engaged in numerous consultations with the sector.⁴ We note too that Ofqual has developed this year’s extraordinary regulatory frameworks within the parameters set out by Department’s directions.

The calculated grade system

6. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the majority of national exams have been cancelled and learners will instead receive a calculated result. Certain vocational and technical qualifications—such as those required for occupational competence—will be awarded through adapted or delayed assessments.

7. For cancelled exams, including AS, A levels and GCSEs, and eligible vocational and technical qualifications, Ofqual has instructed teachers to make a judgement of the grade their pupils would have been likely to be awarded in summer 2020 exams.⁵ To do this, teachers will draw on evidence such as school or college records, mock exams and non-examination assessment that a pupil has completed. Teachers have also been asked to rank each pupil relative to others who they judge would have been awarded the same grade. These grades, termed ‘centre-assessed grades’, and rankings, go through a multi-level sign off process, including sign off from the Head of Centre. To ensure that grading is fair nationally, exam boards then apply a standardisation model devised by Ofqual, which draws on evidence including:

historical outcomes for each centre; the prior attainment (Key Stage 2 or GCSE) of this year’s students and those in previous years within each centre; and the expected national grade distribution for the subject given the prior attainment of the national entry.⁶

2 DfE, [Direction to Ofqual on GCSEs, AS and A levels](#), 31 March 2020

3 DfE, [Direction to Ofqual on vocational and technical qualifications](#), 9 April 2020

4 See, for example: Ofqual, [Consultation Decisions: Specified general qualifications](#) 22 May 2020; Ofqual, [Consultation Decisions: Vocational, technical and other general qualifications](#) 22 May 2020

5 Ofqual, [Guidance for teachers, students, parents: Summer 2020 grades](#), 22 May 2020

6 Ofqual, [Guidance for teachers, students, parents: Summer 2020 grades](#), 22 May 2020, p9

The standardisation model is intended to account for under or over-predictions from teachers, and grades may be adjusted accordingly.⁷

8. Students will receive their exam results on the dates originally planned (13 August for A levels, and 20 August for GCSEs). The grades received will be indistinguishable from grades awarded in previous years, and students will be able to use them for progression to higher education, further education, and employment as normal.

The potential for bias

9. We asked Ofqual about the potential for bias in centre-assessed grades. Michelle Meadows, Ofqual's Deputy Chief Regulator and Executive Director for Strategy, Risk and Research, told us that:

There is some evidence of bias. For example, in A-level grades, there is evidence that bias with regard to ethnic minorities interacts with the ability of the students. For the most able students, there tends to be under-prediction of the grades that students go on to get. At lower levels of ability, you get the reverse effect where there is some over-prediction.⁸

10. Numerous written submissions we received highlighted the abundance of academic research evidence on bias in predicted grades. These submissions outlined how particular groups, including pupils from low-income backgrounds, black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) pupils, and pupils with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), could be adversely affected by this year's grade awarding process.⁹

11. Acknowledging the potential for bias in calculated grades is not a comment on teachers and their professional judgement. Teachers are some of the unsung heroes of the Covid-19 pandemic, and they are doing their very best in exceptional circumstances to provide fair grades for their pupils. Rather, as Lee Elliot Major, Professor of Social Mobility at the University of Exeter, told us, "There is lots of evidence around human bias in assessment. It is nothing to do with teachers [...] We are all prone to bias".¹⁰ As the 2020 extraordinary regulatory framework is an entirely new system, evidence on outcomes and fairness is not yet available. However, we believe it is reasonable to remain aware that the potential for human bias in predicted grades may be replicated in the calculated grade system.¹¹ We note that teachers and support staff themselves appear sceptical of the fairness of this year's system of awarding grades. A Tes survey from May 2020 of around 19,000 school staff found that just 39 per cent of school staff in England think the system will be fair to all.¹²

12. Research into grade prediction accuracy for university applicants has found that just 16% of applicants received the grades they were predicted.¹³ Pupils from low-income families are more likely to have their grades incorrectly predicted compared to their more

7 Ofqual, [Guidance for teachers, students, parents: Summer 2020 grades](#), 22 May 2020

8 [Q480](#)

9 See, for example: Teach First ([CIE0034](#)); Impetus ([CIE0086](#)); The Institute of Physics ([CIE0071](#)); The Traveller Movement ([CIE0137](#)); the Equality and Human Rights Commission ([CIE0139](#))

10 [Q453](#)

11 See: Ofqual, [Equality impact assessment: literature review](#), 15 April 2020, for a review of literature on the potential for bias in teachers' grade predictions.

12 Tes, [Only 39% teachers think 2020 grades fair for all](#), 13 May 2020

13 Wyness, G. (2016). [Predicted grades: accuracy and impact](#). University and College Union

affluent peers.¹⁴ In particular, high-attaining disadvantaged pupils are more likely to be underpredicted compared to those from more affluent backgrounds. Research by The Sutton Trust concluded that around 1,000 high-achieving disadvantaged students have their grades underpredicted per year.¹⁵ We asked witnesses which groups they thought would be negatively affected by centre-assessed grades. Kevin Courtney, joint General Secretary of the National Education Union, highlighted disadvantage and race as factors that can increase the likelihood of bias.¹⁶ Lee Elliot Major told us that “unintentionally, teachers will sometimes underestimate the academic potential of poorer pupils”,¹⁷ pointing out that disadvantage and race are often intersectional, and can “combine to make it even worse for those children.”¹⁸ Zubaida Haque, Interim Director of race equality thinktank the Runnymede Trust, further highlighted “higher attaining working-class students—but also particular ethnic minority students and specifically black Caribbean boys, as well as Gypsy Roma and Irish Traveller students.”¹⁹

We also asked witnesses for their views on Ofqual’s contention that the evidence on the likelihood of bias is “mixed”.²⁰ Zubaida Haque told us that mixed evidence:

[...] is not the issue here. The issue is there is a public sector equality duty that all public authorities are supposed to do to ensure that there is not bias. You are supposed to check for it regardless of the evidence.²¹

13. We put it to Ofqual that if the evidence is indeed mixed, it should be a priority to urgently undertake further research to establish the likelihood of bias and to identify which groups are most at risk.²² Sally Collier, Chief Regulator of Ofqual, insisted that the regulator takes its “public sector equalities duty incredibly seriously” and that they have put safeguards in place to minimise bias “as far as possible”.²³ These safeguards include issuing additional guidance, including “practical recommendations” to teachers to help protect against bias in judgements.²⁴ Nevertheless, we remain unconvinced that additional guidance is a sufficiently robust solution to the potential problem of unconscious bias, which could harm the life chances of thousands of already disadvantaged pupils. We note with particular concern that high attaining students from low-income families are more likely to have their grades underpredicted than their wealthier peers,²⁵ and we do not think enough has been done to ensure students from poorer backgrounds are not disadvantaged by this year’s process.

14. Pupils with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) might be disadvantaged by the evidence used to inform teachers’ judgements about grades and rankings. There is no guarantee that appropriate access arrangements—for example, modified papers for those with visual impairments—were provided for internal mock exams. VIEW’s written

14 Wyness, G. (2016). [Predicted grades: accuracy and impact](#). University and College Union. See also: Ofqual, [Equality impact assessment: literature review](#), 15 April 2020

15 Wyness, G. (2017). [Rules of the Game](#). Sutton Trust.

16 [Q454](#)

17 [Q458](#)

18 [Q453](#)

19 [Q454](#)

20 Ofqual, [Consultation on the assessment and grading of vocational, technical and other general qualifications](#), 22 May 2020

21 [Q456](#)

22 [Q491](#)

23 [Q491](#)

24 [Q490](#)

25 Wyness, G. (2017). [Rules of the Game](#). Sutton Trust.

evidence highlighted that while Ofqual has recommended that schools seek the advice of specialist advisory teachers to input into calculated grades, they are “not aware of a mechanism for ensuring that this happens”.²⁶ Similarly, the National Deaf Children’s Society’s submission agreed that there is “little accountability in place for the type of evidence used by schools and colleges”.²⁷

15. We raised our concerns about fairness for pupils with special educational needs to Ofqual, emphasising the importance of ensuring SEND specialists feed into calculated grades.²⁸ We are pleased that Ofqual produced guidance on considering evidence from SEND specialists during the calculated grade process.²⁹ We are concerned, however, that there was no accountability mechanism for ensuring this happened consistently. In our section on appeals, we give our recommendation on what action is needed in cases where pupils with SEND, or their families, believe inappropriate evidence was used in the grade calculating process.

16. We are unconvinced that safeguards—such as additional guidance and practical recommendations—put in place by Ofqual will be sufficient to protect against bias and inaccuracy in calculated grades. In particular, given research evidence on unconscious bias, we are concerned that groups including pupils from low-income families, BAME pupils, pupils with SEND, and children looked after could be disadvantaged by calculated grades.

17. Our recommendations on Ofqual’s standardisation model in the next section set out what we believe needs to happen now to identify and mitigate any bias in calculated grades.

18. Sally Collier told us that Ofqual will publish “a full programme of evaluation” in the autumn, and that this will examine how attainment gaps vary this year compared to those in previous examination years.³⁰ We agree with written evidence submitted by the Equality and Human Rights Commission that if this evaluation reveals disparities outside usual thresholds for variability for pupils with particular protected characteristics, and for Free School Meal (FSM) eligible pupils, they should be investigated urgently by Ofqual.³¹

19. We welcome Ofqual’s commitment to publish a full programme of evaluation in the autumn. Until it does so, we will not have answers about the fairness of the system.

20. Ofqual’s evaluation must include comprehensive data on attainment, by characteristics including gender, ethnicity, SEND, children looked after, and FSM eligibility, providing full transparency on whether there are statistically significant differences between attainment this year compared with previous years.

The standardisation process

21. The Department’s direction on GCSEs, AS and A levels instructed Ofqual to devise a standardisation process that would ensure “qualification standards are maintained and

26 VIEW ([CIE0183](#))

27 National Deaf Children’s Society ([CIE0101](#))

28 [Q514](#)

29 [Q514](#) [Sally Collier]; see also: Ofqual, [Guidance: Information for Heads of Centre on the submission of centre assessment grades](#), 22 May 2020

30 [Q491](#)

31 Equality and Human Rights Commission ([CIE0139](#)). See also, for example, Impetus ([CIE0086](#))

the distribution of grades follows a similar profile to that in previous years".³² Michelle Meadows told us that the standardisation process "will adjust outcomes for schools and colleges to set a fair standard, a level playing field."³³ Ofqual has confirmed its standardisation model will take into account a centre's historical outcomes, cohort prior attainment, and expected national grade distributions for subjects.³⁴ However, little detail has yet been published on Ofqual's model, and we agree with the Royal Statistical Society's conclusion that "more transparency" is needed urgently.³⁵

Who might be disadvantaged by standardisation?

22. A number of concerns with Ofqual's standardisation model were identified in the written submissions we received. Standardisation will operate at subject level, within which the model will consider each centre individually.³⁶ This may result in historic data derived from extremely small cohorts, making generalisation problematic. A submission from University College London's Centre for Education Policy and Equalising Opportunities warned that the use of historic performance data for standardisation could penalise "atypical" students such as high achievers in historically low-performing schools.³⁷ Written evidence from the New Schools Network expressed concern that newer institutions with little historic performance data would be disadvantaged. The association of national specialist colleges, Natspec, expressed reservations that use of historic data will not provide fair outcomes for small SEND specialist providers with highly variable year on year cohort attainment.³⁸ Another submission stated that the statistical model is a "significant concern" for Alternative Providers, for whom often "historical data shows no patterns of attainment".³⁹ The National Association of Hospital Education's submission expressed "huge concerns" that the model will "negatively impact on some of our learners in our cohorts this year who are gifted and talented, [...] their results will be out of step with our normal set of results".⁴⁰

23. Ofqual's decision not to include trajectory in their standardisation process was criticised in the Sutton Trust's written evidence, which suggested that the 'turnaround' schools disadvantaged by this decision "are likely to disproportionately serve poorer communities."⁴¹ However, Ofqual's consultation concluded that trajectory would be an "unacceptably unreliable" predictor of performance in 2020.⁴² We agree that the principles of statistical soundness and reliability must be followed, but remain concerned that schools on an upward trajectory may lose out. It is right that Ofqual has recognised that in exceptional cases there may be instances where there is "a substantive difference" between the 2020 cohort and historical cohorts, and we agree that in these cases schools and colleges should be able to make an appeal.⁴³

32 DfE, [Direction to Ofqual on GCSEs, AS and A levels](#), 31 March 2020

33 [Q482](#)

34 Ofqual, [Guidance for teachers, students, parents: Summer 2020 grades](#), 22 May 2020

35 Royal Statistical Society ([CIE0199](#))

36 Ofqual, [Blog: Making grades as fair as they can be](#), 15 May 2020

37 University College London, Centre for Education Policy and Equalising Opportunities ([CIE0075](#))

38 Natspec ([CIE0162](#))

39 MAT CEO network, PRUSAP & NAHE ([CIE0156](#))

40 The National Association for Hospital Education ([CIE0083](#))

41 The Sutton Trust ([CIE0194](#))

42 Ofqual, [Guidance for teachers, students, parents: Summer 2020 grades](#), 22 May 2020

43 Ofqual, [Consultation: Extraordinary regulatory framework, General Qualifications COVID-19, Guidance](#), 30 June 2020

24. We asked Ofqual what steps are being taken to ensure that the standardisation model is fair to all types of institution. Ofqual told us that they are testing the impact their model has on different school types to ensure standardisation does not have “an adverse consequence for a particular school type”.⁴⁴ Michelle Meadows further acknowledged that Ofqual is aware of concerns from schools “for whom this year would have been the year, but trying to evidence that, of course, is incredibly difficult.”⁴⁵

25. We asked Ofqual about concerns that the statistical model might result in results being driven down.⁴⁶ Michelle Meadows agreed that there is concern that some students “would have pulled it out of the bag on the day, while others would “would have had a bad day”, but argued that it is impossible reliably to identify students and schools for whom this would have been the case.⁴⁷ We agree with Ofqual that it would be impossible reliably to identify individual pupils who would have performed unexpectedly well in their exams, just as it would be impossible to identify those who would have had an unexpectedly bad result.

26. Given the potential risks of bias in calculated grades, it is clear that standardisation will be a crucial part of ensuring fairness. We are extremely concerned that Ofqual's standardisation model does not appear to include any mechanism to identify whether groups such as BAME pupils, FSM eligible pupils, children looked after, and pupils with SEND have been systematically disadvantaged by calculated grades.

27. Ofqual must identify whether there is evidence that groups such as BAME pupils, FSM eligible pupils, children looked after, and pupils with SEND have been systematically disadvantaged by calculated grades. If this is the case, Ofqual's standardisation model must adjust the grades of the pupils affected upwards.

28. Ofqual must be completely transparent about its standardisation model and publish the model immediately to allow time for scrutiny. In addition, Ofqual must publish an explanatory memorandum on decisions and assumptions made during the model's development. This should include clearly setting out how it has ensured fairness for schools without 3 years of historic data, and for settings with small, variable cohorts.

29. Ofqual must collect and publish anonymised data at the conclusion of the appeals process on where it received appeals from, including, as a minimum, type of school attended, region, gender, ethnicity, SEND status, children looked after (including children supported by virtual schools),⁴⁸ and FSM eligibility.

Vocational and technical qualifications

30. Calculating grades for vocational and technical qualifications is more complex than for academic qualifications due to the range and purpose of such qualifications. Unlike GCSE and A levels, there is no single approach to awarding that would work for all types of vocational and technical qualification. Ofqual, following the Secretary of State's

44 [Q507](#)

45 [Q509](#)

46 [Q509](#)

47 [Q509](#)

48 Under the Children and Families Act 2014, local authorities have a statutory obligation to establish a 'virtual school headteacher' (VSH) to champion the education of looked after children and care leavers. Virtual schools are a service to help these children to succeed in their education pathways. See, for example: DfE: [Promoting the education of looked after children and previously looked after children](#), February 2018

direction, divided vocational and technical categories into three categories, according to whether their purpose is progression to further study, gaining a qualification signifying occupational competence, or a combination of both.⁴⁹ Depending on what category qualifications fall into, the assessment method may be a calculated grade, or an adapted or delayed assessment.⁵⁰ Adapted assessments are those modified in such a way, for example a paper-based test being moved online, as to allow the assessment to be completed under current public health restrictions. Ofqual's consultation decision stated that delay should be a last resort option, but acknowledged that for a small group of qualifications—for example those with a health and safety critical element—delayed assessment would be the most appropriate option.⁵¹

31. We consider this to be a pragmatic approach, suitably adapted for the complexity of the landscape. However, we highlight that where adapted assessments are used to award vocational qualifications, these assessments must be fair and accessible for pupils with SEND.

32. We raised concerns from further education providers and schools about inconsistencies between awarding bodies around what work counts towards the centre-assessed grades.⁵² Tom Bewick, Chief Executive of the Federation of Awarding Bodies (FAB), told us that “10,000 or so [...] qualifications are within scope of this particular extraordinary regulatory framework”, which makes consistency difficult, but assured us that “it is an issue that has been addressed throughout this process.”⁵³ Tom Bewick emphasised that awarding bodies have been directed to “deliver a parallel regulatory regime alongside the existing regime”, which “will incur additional costs”.⁵⁴ He explained that the Department had requested an estimate of the additional costs of implementing the directions, and that the estimated cost provided by the Federation of Awarding Bodies is £16.3 million.⁵⁵ We agree that it is right the Department should provide grant funding for awarding organisations where there are additional costs of implementing the extraordinary regulatory framework for vocational and technical qualifications.

33. *As part of its evaluation Ofqual must publish comprehensive data on vocational and technical qualifications, by characteristics including gender, ethnicity, SEND, children looked after, and FSM eligibility, providing full transparency on whether there are statistically significant differences between attainment this year compared with previous years.*

34. *Where calculated grades are used to award vocational and technical qualifications this year, Ofqual must identify whether there is evidence that groups such as BAME pupils, FSM eligible pupils, children looked after, and pupils with SEND have been systematically disadvantaged by calculated grades. If this is the case, Ofqual's standardisation model must adjust the grades of the pupils affected upwards.*

49 DfE, [Direction to Ofqual on vocational and technical qualifications](#), 9 April 2020

50 Ofqual, [Guidance for centres: The awarding of vocational and technical qualifications](#), 22 May 2020

51 Ofqual, [Guidance for centres: The awarding of vocational and technical qualifications](#), 22 May 2020

52 [Q492](#); [Q516](#)

53 [Q492](#)

54 [Q517](#)

55 [Q517](#)

3 The appeals process: a process for the well-heeled and sharp-elbowed?

Overview

35. We took evidence on the system Ofqual has devised for appealing grades. Sally Collier assured us that Ofqual has “spent many hours with very many people trying to come up with the fairest possible appeal system in the circumstances”⁵⁶ Tom Bewick told us that given the circumstances, the 2020 system “is effectively the least worst option”.⁵⁷

36. We understand that Ofqual is working within parameters defined by the Secretary of State’s direction, which instructed Ofqual to develop an appeals policy “focused on whether the process used the right data and was correctly applied, rather than seeking to overturn teachers’ professional judgement on individual students’ ability”.⁵⁸ Accordingly, students will not be able to appeal teachers’ professional judgements that informed their grade, but will be entitled to

ask their centre to check whether they made an error when submitting a centre assessment grade and including them in the centre’s rank order. They will be able to raise a complaint to their centre if they have evidence of bias or that they were discriminated against.⁵⁹

37. We heard from Sally Collier that “If an appeal goes through the system and students do not feel it has been fair”, students can appeal to Ofqual as the regulatory arbiter.⁶⁰ She acknowledged the need to make sure that the process is “as accessible as possible.”⁶¹

38. We asked Ofqual about the fairness of the appeals system, highlighting that providing evidence of bias or discrimination is an unrealistic threshold, and one which will be “the preserve of the well-heeled, the most articulate”.⁶² We pressed Ofqual for details on how pupils, particularly disadvantaged pupils, would be supported in practice. Sally Collier told us that she does not “claim to have any easy answers” on these issues, but Ofqual will ensure that students who believe they have been subject to bias or discrimination “are supported, that they know the routes.”⁶³ We put it to Ofqual that more affluent families are more likely to have the tools to navigate the appeals system successfully, and are more likely to be able to draw on resources such as lobbying their MP or speaking to lawyers.⁶⁴ We remain unconvinced that the process for appealing against grades is fair and accessible.

56 [Q493](#)

57 [Q484](#)

58 DfE, [Direction to Ofqual on GCSEs, AS and A levels](#), 31 March 2020

59 Ofqual, [Guidance: Information for Heads of Centre on the submission of centre assessment grades](#), 22 May 2020, p16

60 [Q494](#)

61 [Q494](#)

62 [Q493](#)

63 [Q493](#)

64 [Q494](#)

Navigating the appeals process

39. We asked Ofqual about the mechanics of the appeals process, including who a young person should go to for advice and support. Sally Collier told us that the pupil should approach their school, but “we need to look at who else can help them.”⁶⁵ Michelle Meadows further told us that Ofqual has a public telephone helpline.⁶⁶ In a consultation launched by Ofqual on 30 June 2020, Ofqual confirmed that both they and the National Careers Service will be offering helplines “which will be able to provide information about the arrangements for appeals or malpractice or maladministration concerns”.⁶⁷ It is right that Ofqual is anticipating demand for advice and support on and after results day. However, the National Careers Service is, first and foremost, a careers advice portal, not a results or appeals specialist service. We are worried that Ofqual’s guidance on this states that the National Careers Service “can pass any complex enquiries to us if needed”.⁶⁸ This certainly does not fill us with confidence that the National Careers Service’s helpline will be capable of providing the expert professional advice needed by anxious pupils on results day.

40. When questioned on how pupils can challenge the calculated grade they are awarded, Sally Collier told us that “Each exam board has its own process for taking an appeal.”⁶⁹ We asked whether this meant that each exam board could design the process differently. Sally Collier assured us that exam boards “will want to make sure [...] that where they can, the look and feel of their systems is consistent.”⁷⁰ However, she was not able to provide details, telling us that “detail is being worked out as we speak”.⁷¹ It seems to us unnecessarily burdensome for every exam board to have a different process to navigate. We would not wish this to become an additional burden for those navigating the system.

Ensuring accessibility

41. **We are extremely concerned that pupils will require evidence of bias or discrimination to raise a complaint about their grades. It is unrealistic and unfair to put the onus on pupils to have, or to be able to gather, evidence of bias or discrimination. Such a system also favours more affluent pupils and families with resources and knowledge of the system.**

42. *Ofqual must urgently publish the evidence thresholds for proving bias or discrimination, clearly setting out what evidence will be required, including example case studies. This must be communicated to parents and pupils in advance of results day.*

43. *Where pupils with SEND, or their families, have concerns about their grade, they must be allowed to see the evidence, such as past work or mock exams, used by teachers to arrive at their calculated grade. If appropriate access arrangements were not in place*

65 [Q496](#)

66 [Q525](#)

67 Ofqual, [Consultation: Extraordinary regulatory framework, General Qualifications COVID-19](#), 30 June 2020

68 *Ibid.*

69 [Q501](#)

70 [Q504](#)

71 [Q503](#)

for the work used, or if their school did not use evidence from SEND specialists if this was appropriate, the pupil must be allowed to appeal on the basis of malpractice or maladministration.

44. Both Ofqual and the National Careers Service will be offering helplines to provide support and advice on and after results day. Two helplines must not mean a two-tier system. It is imperative that whichever number pupils ring, they will be provided with the same gold-standard, professional advice.

45. *Ofqual must ensure advice and support is easily accessible for all pupils unhappy with their grades. Both the helplines provided by Ofqual and the National Careers Service must be freephone lines. These must both be staffed by dedicated professionals with the training to provide sound and impartial step-by-step advice and support on appeals.*

46. *Ofqual must issue guidance to schools and colleges about the options available for pupils unhappy with their results. Letters to pupils should be sent out by schools and colleges, to ensure they are aware of their options, including the standard of evidence required to bring an appeal on the basis of bias or discrimination. Schools and colleges should clearly communicate to pupils and families which staff member will be their point of contact for discussions about next steps.*

4 Looking ahead

The autumn exam series

47. Some pupils will wish to sit exams in the autumn. Ofqual has concluded its consultation on proposed arrangements for an autumn exam series, with the outcome that exam boards will be required to offer a full series of exams in the autumn.⁷² We believe this is the right decision, as it will allow those who want to improve their grade to do so at the earliest opportunity. However, there are significant concerns about ensuring fairness for disadvantaged pupils given the extent of learning loss.

48. Much remains to be done if autumn exams are to be a level playing field for all pupils. Written submissions highlighted disparities in learning during school closures, with many disadvantaged children lacking an internet connection, a laptop, and a suitable home learning environment.⁷³ We asked Ofqual what could be done to mitigate this variability in learning. While Sally Collier told us that this is “obviously a big issue for any exam series that is going to take place in the autumn”,⁷⁴ we did not receive answers on how this would be tackled. Schools and colleges too will have their own concerns about the logistics of this exam series, particularly if social-distancing requirements are still in place. The Department is currently “exploring ways to minimise additional burdens on centres”,⁷⁵ and we expect the Department to provide concrete solutions, rather than vague guidance, on how this can be managed.

49. **Fairness and accessibility must be the guiding principles of an autumn exam series. Having directed Ofqual to provide pupils with “an opportunity to sit an exam at the earliest reasonable opportunity”,⁷⁶ the Department must not now wash its hands of further responsibility.**

50. ***The Department must provide guidance for schools and colleges, outlining minimum requirements for provision of teaching support for pupils opting for an autumn exam. The Department must support schools and colleges to manage the logistics of this series, providing concrete solutions on how the burden of an additional series can be minimised.***

51. Private candidates are a group for whom autumn exams could be particularly important. Private candidates include those who are home-schooled, are following distance-learning programmes, or who are studying independently for qualifications. Ofqual’s policy on private candidates allows for Heads of Centre to provide centre-assessed grades for private candidates, providing there is sufficient evidence of that pupil’s work.⁷⁷ However, not all private candidates have been able to find a centre to accept them. Written evidence we received on this issue—much of it from pupils and their families—highlighted the anxiety and frustration felt by this group, with submissions telling us they felt they

72 Ofqual, [Consultation decisions: An additional GCSE, AS and A level exam series in autumn 2020](#), 30 June 2020. See also, HC Deb, 2 July 2020, [col 538](#) [Commons oral ministerial statement]

73 See, for example: The Children’s Commissioner ([CIE0150](#)); Professor Mountford-Zimdars et al. ([CIE0172](#)); The Sutton Trust ([CIE0194](#)), Hackney Council ([CIE0235](#))

74 [Q510](#)

75 Ofqual, News story: [Ofqual publishes more details on appeals and confirms autumn exam arrangements](#), 30 June 2020

76 DfE, [Direction to Ofqual on GCSEs, AS and A levels](#), 31 March 2020

77 Ofqual, [Private candidate policy update](#), 30 April, 2020

had been overlooked by Ofqual.⁷⁸ We raised the difficulties that private candidates have had with Ofqual. Sally Collier told us that Ofqual has “worked very quickly with exam boards to get some additional centres, just specifically dealing with private candidates”, and that “figures have just started to come through”.⁷⁹ An autumn exam series will enable those private candidates who have not received a grade to progress to the next stage of their lives without further delay.

52. As at 30 June 2020, Ofqual has merely stated it will “confirm the exact timing of the exams in due course”.⁸⁰ We believe that given the potential disruption for schools and colleges, and the need for pupils and teachers to know, now, when their exams will take place, this is not good enough.

53. *Ofqual must urgently publish dates for the autumn exam series and end uncertainty for pupils, teachers, schools and colleges.*

2021 exams

54. We were concerned to hear reports that disruption could extend to exams next year.⁸¹ Sally Collier told us that the Government is currently considering “the impact of lost teaching and learning” on 2021 exams, while Ofqual is “looking at what that means for the exam system” and will launch a full consultation.⁸² We agree with Lee Elliot Major that “Clarity over exams for next year is key.”⁸³ We are aware that there is widespread public concern about the implications of learning loss for exams next year, with a petition to reduce examinable content reaching over 140,000 signatures.⁸⁴ The Secretary of State has asked Ofqual to investigate potential adaptations to assessments, such as “content sampling and increasing optionality”, and to explore the possibility of “moving some or all exams to later in the summer term”.⁸⁵ However, guidance published by the Department outlines expectations that pupils in examination years should continue with examined subjects as planned, and subjects should only be dropped in “exceptional circumstances”.⁸⁶

55. We believe that modifications to assessments will lead to erosion of standards, and that the 2021 cohort of exam-takers could be disadvantaged by a perception that their exams were not as rigorous as those taken by other cohorts.

56. *We support a short delay for exams in summer 2021 as preferable to modifications to exam content. Any delay must be a matter of weeks, not months. Ofqual must publish details of the 2021 exam series as soon as possible, and before the end of the summer term.*

78 See, for example: Mrs Katherine Norman ([CIE0019](#)); Mrs Rebecca Graham ([CIE0240](#))

79 [Q515](#)

80 Ofqual, News story: [Ofqual publishes more details on appeals and confirms autumn exam arrangements](#), 30 June 2020

81 As reported in: [When will all schools reopen? GCSEs and A-levels face further disruption as chaos set to stretch into 2021](#), The Sunday Times, 7 June 2020

82 [Q486](#)

83 [Q470](#)

84 Petition 320772: [Reduce curriculum content for year 10 & 12 students who will sit exams in 2021](#).

85 Letter from the Secretary of State to Ofqual. [Arrangements for examinations and assessments in 2020/21](#). 18 June 2020

86 DfE. [Guidance: Guidance for full opening: schools](#), 2 July 2020

A question of fairness: post-16 catch-up funding

57. The Government's recently announced billion pound tuition scheme is a vital initiative to ensure no disadvantaged pupil is left behind.⁸⁷ While there will be much catch-up work to be done, this additional funding will help level the playing field so that every pupil can climb the ladder of opportunity. Notably, however, the scheme does not include post-16 students, a group who will be sitting important final exams next summer. This is a significant omission. Evidence submitted by the Education Policy Institute's highlighted that 16–19 education funding been cut sharply over the last decade, and called for the disadvantage weighting⁸⁸ in the 16–19 funding formula “to be doubled for pupils in Year 12, for a minimum of a year”.⁸⁹ At our evidence session on 24 June 2020, we heard from Association of Colleges Chief Executive David Hughes that the decision not to include post-16 students in the support package is “indefensible”.⁹⁰ He further told us that the sector will need a “£200 million [...] pupil premium-type upgrade to funding for those students who need it most”, including catch-up support for disadvantaged students.⁹¹ We are further concerned about support for pupils who attend Alternative Provision or Pupil Referral Units in year 12 and 13. While this amounts to a very small number of pupils, they must not be forgotten.

58. The pandemic's impact on learning loss does not stop when pupils turn 16. Post-16 learners, whether they are resitting key English and Maths GCSEs, or preparing to sit final exams before entering higher education or the workplace, deserve proper catch-up support.

59. *The Government must extend catch-up funding to include disadvantaged post-16 pupils to ensure this is not a lost generation. This should be done by doubling the disadvantage element in the 16–19 funding formula for pupils in Year 12, for at least the next year.*

60. *Any post-16 pupils attending Alternative Provision and Pupil Referral Units, and those training for basic skills, must also be eligible for catch-up funding.*

87 DfE. Press release: [Billion pound Covid catch-up plan to tackle impact of lost teaching time](#), 19 June 2020

88 The disadvantage element in the 16–19 funding formula is comprised of two blocks: one using a postcode index to account for students' economic deprivation, and one to account for low prior attainment in English and maths. See also [ESFA Guidance: Funding rates and formula](#), May 2020

89 Education Policy Institute ([CIE0038](#))

90 [Q634](#)

91 [Q634](#)

Conclusions and recommendations

1. We welcome Ofqual's commitment to publish a full programme of evaluation in the autumn. Until it does so, we will not have answers about the fairness of the system. (Paragraph 19)
2. *Ofqual's evaluation must include comprehensive data on attainment, by characteristics including gender, ethnicity, SEND, children looked after, and FSM eligibility, providing full transparency on whether there are statistically significant differences between attainment this year compared with previous years.* (Paragraph 20)
3. Given the potential risks of bias in calculated grades, it is clear that standardisation will be a crucial part of ensuring fairness. We are extremely concerned that Ofqual's standardisation model does not appear to include any mechanism to identify whether groups such as BAME pupils, FSM eligible pupils, children looked after, and pupils with SEND have been systematically disadvantaged by calculated grades. (Paragraph 26)
4. *Ofqual must identify whether there is evidence that groups such as BAME pupils, FSM eligible pupils, children looked after, and pupils with SEND have been systematically disadvantaged by calculated grades. If this is the case, Ofqual's standardisation model must adjust the grades of the pupils affected upwards.* (Paragraph 27)
5. *Ofqual must be completely transparent about its standardisation model and publish the model immediately to allow time for scrutiny. In addition, Ofqual must publish an explanatory memorandum on decisions and assumptions made during the model's development. This should include clearly setting out how it has ensured fairness for schools without 3 years of historic data, and for settings with small, variable cohorts.* (Paragraph 28)
6. *Ofqual must collect and publish anonymised data at the conclusion of the appeals process on where it received appeals from, including, as a minimum, type of school attended, region, gender, ethnicity, SEND status, children looked after (including children supported by virtual schools), and FSM eligibility.* (Paragraph 29)
7. *As part of its evaluation Ofqual must publish comprehensive data on vocational and technical qualifications, by characteristics including gender, ethnicity, SEND, children looked after, and FSM eligibility, providing full transparency on whether there are statistically significant differences between attainment this year compared with previous years.* (Paragraph 33)
8. *Where calculated grades are used to award vocational and technical qualifications this year, Ofqual must identify whether there is evidence that groups such as BAME pupils, FSM eligible pupils, children looked after, and pupils with SEND have been systematically disadvantaged by calculated grades. If this is the case, Ofqual's standardisation model must adjust the grades of the pupils affected upwards.* (Paragraph 34)
9. We are extremely concerned that pupils will require evidence of bias or discrimination to raise a complaint about their grades. It is unrealistic and unfair to put the onus

on pupils to have, or to be able to gather, evidence of bias or discrimination. Such a system also favours more affluent pupils and families with resources and knowledge of the system. (Paragraph 41)

10. *Ofqual must urgently publish the evidence thresholds for proving bias or discrimination, clearly setting out what evidence will be required, including example case studies. This must be communicated to parents and pupils in advance of results day.* (Paragraph 42)
11. *Where pupils with SEND, or their families, have concerns about their grade, they must be allowed to see the evidence, such as past work or mock exams, used by teachers to arrive at their calculated grade. If appropriate access arrangements were not in place for the work used, or if their school did not use evidence from SEND specialists if this was appropriate, the pupil must be allowed to appeal on the basis of malpractice or maladministration.* (Paragraph 43)
12. Both Ofqual and the National Careers Service will be offering helplines to provide support and advice on and after results day. Two helplines must not mean a two-tier system. It is imperative that whichever number pupils ring, they will be provided with the same gold-standard, professional advice. (Paragraph 44)
13. *Ofqual must ensure advice and support is easily accessible for all pupils unhappy with their grades. Both the helplines provided by Ofqual and the National Careers Service must be freephone lines. These must both be staffed by dedicated professionals with the training to provide sound and impartial step-by-step advice and support on appeals.* (Paragraph 45)
14. *Ofqual must issue guidance to schools and colleges about the options available for pupils unhappy with their results. Letters to pupils should be sent out by schools and colleges, to ensure they are aware of their options, including the standard of evidence required to bring an appeal on the basis of bias or discrimination. Schools and colleges should clearly communicate to pupils and families which staff member will be their point of contact for discussions about next steps.* (Paragraph 46)
15. Fairness and accessibility must be the guiding principles of an autumn exam series. Having directed Ofqual to provide pupils with “an opportunity to sit an exam at the earliest reasonable opportunity”, the Department must not now wash its hands of further responsibility. (Paragraph 49)
16. *The Department must provide guidance for schools and colleges, outlining minimum requirements for provision of teaching support for pupils opting for an autumn exam. The Department must support schools and colleges to manage the logistics of this series, providing concrete solutions on how the burden of an additional series can be minimised.* (Paragraph 50)
17. As at 30 June 2020, Ofqual has merely stated it will “confirm the exact timing of the exams in due course”. We believe that given the potential disruption for schools and colleges, and the need for pupils and teachers to know, now, when their exams will take place, this is not good enough. (Paragraph 52)
18. *Ofqual must urgently publish dates for the autumn exam series and end uncertainty for pupils, teachers, schools and colleges.* (Paragraph 53)

19. We believe that modifications to assessments will lead to erosion of standards, and that the 2021 cohort of exam-takers could be disadvantaged by a perception that their exams were not as rigorous as those taken by other cohorts. (Paragraph 55)
20. *We support a short delay for exams in summer 2021 as preferable to modifications to exam content. Any delay must be a matter of weeks, not months. Ofqual must publish details of the 2021 exam series as soon as possible, and before the end of the summer term.* (Paragraph 56)
21. The pandemic's impact on learning loss does not stop when pupils turn 16. Post-16 learners, whether they are resitting key English and Maths GCSEs, or preparing to sit final exams before entering higher education or the workplace, deserve proper catch-up support. (Paragraph 58)
22. *The Government must extend catch-up funding to include disadvantaged post-16 pupils to ensure this is not a lost generation. This should be done by doubling the disadvantage element in the 16–19 funding formula for pupils in Year 12, for at least the next year.* (Paragraph 59)
23. *Any post-16 pupils attending Alternative Provision and Pupil Referral Units, and those training for basic skills, must also be eligible for catch-up funding.* (Paragraph 60)

Formal minutes

Tuesday 7 July 2020

Members present:

Robert Halfon, in the Chair

Apsana Begum	David Johnston
Tom Hunt	Ian Mearns
Dr Caroline Johnson	David Simmonds
Kim Johnson	Christian Wakeford

Draft Report (*Getting the grades they've earned: Covid-19: the cancellation of exams and 'calculated' grades*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chair's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 60 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the First Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available (Standing Order No. 134).

[Adjourned till 8 July 2020 at 9.30 am

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 10 June 2020

Dr Zubaida Haque, Interim Director, Runnymede Trust; **Kevin Courtney**, joint General Secretary, National Education Union; **Professor Lee Elliot Major**, Professor of Social Mobility, University of Exeter

[Q452–478](#)

Tom Bewick, Chief Executive, Federation of Awarding Bodies; **Sally Collier**, Chief Regulator, Ofqual; **Dr Michelle Meadows**, Executive Director for Strategy Risk and Research, Ofqual

[Q479–525](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

CIE numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Parent ([CIE0236](#))
- 2 Member of the public ([CIE0017](#))
- 3 Clough, Mr Ian ([CIE0055](#))
- 4 Abdullah, Dr Shamsul Kamariah ([CIE0057](#))
- 5 Ability 2 Access charity ([CIE0048](#))
- 6 Academy of Medical Royal Colleges ([CIE0205](#))
- 7 Achievement for All ([CIE0054](#))
- 8 Action Cerebral Palsy ([CIE0159](#))
- 9 Action for Children ([CIE0146](#))
- 10 Action Tutoring ([CIE0085](#))
- 11 Action Tutoring ([CIE0215](#))
- 12 Adoption UK ([CIE0165](#))
- 13 Akehurst, Mrs Heather ([CIE0033](#))
- 14 Alghrani, Dr Amel ([CIE0132](#))
- 15 Ali, Ms Zaneb ([CIE0020](#))
- 16 All-Party Parliamentary University Group ([CIE0277](#))
- 17 Allerdale and Copeland Youth Council ([CIE0032](#))
- 18 Ambition Institute ([CIE0023](#))
- 19 AP/SEND CEO Network ([CIE0180](#))
- 20 Article 39 ([CIE0290](#))
- 21 Asbury, Dr Kathryn ([CIE0089](#))
- 22 Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music ([CIE0087](#))
- 23 Association of Employment and Learning Providers (AELP) ([CIE0319](#))
- 24 The Association of Directors of Children's Services ([CIE0178](#))
- 25 Asylum Support & Immigration Resource Team (ASIRT) ([CIE0147](#))
- 26 Atkinson, Katherine ([CIE0254](#))
- 27 Ayadurai, Dr Charmele ([CIE0057](#))
- 28 Baars, Dr Sam ([CIE0172](#))
- 29 BAE Systems plc ([CIE0282](#))
- 30 Bagnall, Miss Charlotte ([CIE0029](#))
- 31 Bakes, Mrs ([CIE0245](#))
- 32 Bannister, Annie ([CIE0289](#))
- 33 Baxter, Kate ([CIE0246](#))

- 34 Become ([CIE0130](#))
- 35 The Bell Foundation ([CIE0144](#))
- 36 Bell, Mr Michael ([CIE0213](#))
- 37 Bell, Mr Michael ([CIE0158](#))
- 38 Black, Dr Michaela ([CIE0052](#))
- 39 Blackledge, Will ([CIE0053](#))
- 40 Boyle, Mr Anthony ([CIE0198](#))
- 41 Brighter Beginnings Day Nursery ([CIE0035](#))
- 42 The Brilliant Club ([CIE0069](#))
- 43 British Association for Early Childhood Education (Early Education) ([CIE0096](#))
- 44 British Association of Teachers of the Deaf ([CIE0267](#))
- 45 Burgess, Professor Simon ([CIE0214](#))
- 46 Business in the Community ([CIE0108](#))
- 47 Byrne, Mr Seamus ([CIE0132](#))
- 48 Caen Community Primary School ([CIE0272](#))
- 49 Cambridge Assessment ([CIE0129](#))
- 50 Career Development Institute ([CIE0116](#))
- 51 Careers England ([CIE0018](#))
- 52 Catch22 ([CIE0090](#))
- 53 Cathays High School ([CIE0098](#))
- 54 Catholic Education Service ([CIE0097](#))
- 55 Causeway Education ([CIE0266](#))
- 56 Centre for Education Policy and Equalising Opportunities, UCL Institute of Education ([CIE0075](#))
- 57 Challenge Partners ([CIE0080](#))
- 58 Chambers, Susannah ([CIE0227](#))
- 59 Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA) ([CIE0181](#))
- 60 Children and Families Across Borders (CFAB) ([CIE0124](#))
- 61 Children and Young People's Mental Health Coalition, and The Partnership for Mental Health and wellbeing in Schools ([CIE0251](#))
- 62 Office of the Children's Commissioner for England (Anne Longfield, Children's Commissioner) ([CIE0150](#))
- 63 Children's Food Campaign / Sustain ([CIE0221](#))
- 64 The Children's Literacy Charity ([CIE0037](#))
- 65 Children's Services Development Group (CSDG) ([CIE0182](#))
- 66 The Children's Society ([CIE0168](#))
- 67 City & Guilds Group ([CIE0151](#))
- 68 Clayton, R ([CIE0197](#))
- 69 Cole, Anna ([CIE0126](#))

- 70 Comprehensive Future ([CIE0091](#))
- 71 Confederation of School Trusts (CST) ([CIE0166](#))
- 72 Constantinides, Professor George ([CIE0073](#))
- 73 Coram Family and Childcare ([CIE0136](#))
- 74 Council of Deans of Health ([CIE0175](#))
- 75 The Country Trust ([CIE0106](#))
- 76 County Councils Network ([CIE0187](#))
- 77 Crafts Council ([CIE0021](#))
- 78 Cuthbert, Professor Rob ([CIE0193](#))
- 79 D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership ([CIE0278](#))
- 80 Defeyter, Professor Greta ([CIE0186](#))
- 81 Defeyter, Professor Greta ([CIE0042](#))
- 82 Denny, Associate Professor Kevin ([CIE0172](#))
- 83 Digital Learning Lab and NUSTEM, Northumbria University (Professor Rebecca Strachan ([CIE0161](#)))
- 84 Dimples Day Nursery ([CIE0011](#))
- 85 Dipper, Mr Daniel ([CIE0276](#))
- 86 Ditta, Mr Zahir ([CIE0287](#))
- 87 Dodd, Dr Alyson ([CIE0186](#))
- 88 Early Intervention Foundation ([CIE0220](#))
- 89 Edenred UK ([CIE0118](#))
- 90 Education and Employer Charity ([CIE0284](#))
- 91 Education Development Trust ([CIE0297](#))
- 92 Education Endowment Foundation ([CIE0217](#))
- 93 Education Endowment Foundation ([CIE0212](#))
- 94 Education Policy Institute ([CIE0218](#))
- 95 Education Policy Institute ([CIE0038](#))
- 96 Ellesmere Port Catholic High School ([CIE0208](#))
- 97 Elliot-Major, Professor Lee ([CIE0173](#))
- 98 Embracing Complexity ([CIE0207](#))
- 99 Equality and Human Rights Commission ([CIE0139](#))
- 100 European Children's Rights Unit, School of Law and Social Justice, University of Liverpool ([CIE0231](#))
- 101 Fair Education Alliance ([CIE0176](#))
- 102 Family Action ([CIE0131](#))
- 103 Feeding Britain ([CIE0061](#))
- 104 First 1001 Days Movement ([CIE0170](#))
- 105 FosterTalk Ltd ([CIE0135](#))
- 106 Fujita, Dr Taro ([CIE0172](#))

- 107 Furey, Dr Sinéad ([CIE0186](#))
- 108 Gatsby Charitable Foundation ([CIE0117](#))
- 109 Girlguiding ([CIE0078](#))
- 110 Graham, Mrs Rebecca ([CIE0240](#))
- 111 GTA England ([CIE0229](#))
- 112 Hackney Council ([CIE0235](#))
- 113 Hackney Migrant Centre ([CIE0081](#))
- 114 The Heathers Nursery ([CIE0031](#))
- 115 Helen Hamlyn Centre for Pedagogy, UCL Institute of Education ([CIE0192](#))
- 116 Helen's Place Educational Consultancy ([CIE0077](#))
- 117 Holdsworth, Mrs Marion ([CIE0206](#))
- 118 Home for Good ([CIE0119](#))
- 119 Hussain, Mr Qais ([CIE0006](#))
- 120 Hussey, Ms Josephine ([CIE0058](#))
- 121 ICT & Digital at RCCS ([CIE0271](#))
- 122 Impetus ([CIE0086](#))
- 123 Institute of Health Visiting ([CIE0294](#))
- 124 Institute of Physics ([CIE0071](#))
- 125 Institute of School Business Leadership ([CIE0265](#))
- 126 The Institution of Engineering and Technology ([CIE0120](#))
- 127 Jacobs, D ([CIE0250](#))
- 128 Joneidy, Dr Sina ([CIE0057](#))
- 129 Jones, Dylan ([CIE0167](#))
- 130 Just for Kids Law ([CIE0202](#))
- 131 Just for Kids Law ([CIE0232](#))
- 132 Kent, Dr Carmel ([CIE0143](#))
- 133 Kingsley Academy ([CIE0036](#))
- 134 Large, Sarah ([CIE0253](#))
- 135 Laura Russell ([CIE0043](#))
- 136 Law, Dr Jeremy ([CIE0068](#))
- 137 Leeds Trinity University ([CIE0197](#))
- 138 Local Government Association ([CIE0104](#))
- 139 London Councils ([CIE0164](#))
- 140 London Borough of Camden ([CIE0140](#))
- 141 Long, Dr Michael ([CIE0186](#))
- 142 Lowe, Mr Tim ([CIE0022](#))
- 143 Luckin, Professor Rose ([CIE0143](#))
- 144 Lundie, Dr David ([CIE0068](#))

- 145 Lupton, Professor Ruth ([CIE0190](#))
- 146 Magic Breakfast ([CIE0142](#))
- 147 Mann, Dr Emily ([CIE0186](#))
- 148 Marine Society and Sea Cadets (MSSC) ([CIE0225](#))
- 149 The Martin James Foundation ([CIE0262](#))
- 150 McDonagh, Siobhain ([CIE0154](#))
- 151 Middlesex University ([CIE0067](#))
- 152 Mind ([CIE0260](#))
- 153 Moment, Mr Gary ([CIE0184](#))
- 154 Morgan, Dr Michelle ([CIE0063](#))
- 155 Muslim Engagement and Development ([CIE0259](#))
- 156 Muthukrishnan, Mr Dayaan ([CIE0041](#))
- 157 NAHT ([CIE0191](#))
- 158 NASUWT ([CIE0163](#))
- 159 National Association for Hospital Education ([CIE0083](#))
- 160 National Association for Hospital Education, AP/SEND CEO National Network, and PRUs (Mrs Cath Kitchen) ([CIE0156](#))
- 161 National Autistic Society ([CIE0112](#))
- 162 National Deaf Children's Society ([CIE0101](#))
- 163 National Education Opportunities Network ([CIE0079](#))
- 164 National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) ([CIE0283](#))
- 165 National Literacy Trust ([CIE0138](#))
- 166 National Network of Parent Carer Forums ([CIE0113](#))
- 167 National Star ([CIE0134](#))
- 168 Nationwide Association of Fostering Providers, and Independent Children's Homes Association ([CIE0123](#))
- 169 Natspec ([CIE0162](#))
- 170 New Schools Network ([CIE0127](#))
- 171 No More Exclusions ([CIE0155](#))
- 172 Norman, Mrs Katherine ([CIE0019](#))
- 173 Northern Powerhouse Partnership ([CIE0024](#))
- 174 Nottingham Centre for Children, Young People and Families, Nottingham Trent University ([CIE0095](#))
- 175 NYAS (National Youth Advocacy Service) ([CIE0209](#))
- 176 Office of the Children's Commissioner for England (Anne Longfield, Children's Commissioner) ([CIE0216](#))
- 177 Open University ([CIE0066](#))
- 178 Open University Students Association ([CIE0046](#))
- 179 Out of School Alliance ([CIE0211](#))

- 180 Outwin Finders ([CIE0022](#))
- 181 Paediatric Continence Forum ([CIE0049](#))
- 182 PaJeS (Partnership for Jewish Schools) ([CIE0092](#))
- 183 Parentkind ([CIE0107](#))
- 184 Parentkind ([CIE0008](#))
- 185 Parsons, Mrs Jaki ([CIE0252](#))
- 186 Paul, Miss Niharika ([CIE0100](#))
- 187 Pearson ([CIE0026](#))
- 188 Phoenix Education Consultancy Ltd ([CIE0082](#))
- 189 Pimentel de Çetin, Dr Elizabeth ([CIE0111](#))
- 190 Porteous, Dr Debbie ([CIE0186](#))
- 191 Pothukuchi, Mr Srikrishna ([CIE0059](#))
- 192 Potter, M ([CIE0197](#))
- 193 Power to Connect ([CIE0196](#))
- 194 Prisoner Learning Alliance ([CIE0128](#))
- 195 Prisoners' Education Trust ([CIE0099](#))
- 196 Private sector IT company ([CIE0295](#))
- 197 Professional Association for Childcare and Early Years (PACEY) ([CIE0109](#))
- 198 Project 17 ([CIE0001](#))
- 199 Promote-ed ([CIE0223](#))
- 200 Prospect Union ([CIE0115](#))
- 201 Protection Approaches ([CIE0185](#))
- 202 The PSHE Association ([CIE0125](#))
- 203 Publishers Association ([CIE0030](#))
- 204 Publishers Association ([CIE0025](#))
- 205 Pupils 2 Parliament ([CIE0093](#))
- 206 Purchase, Ms Gill ([CIE0239](#))
- 207 Pyramid Project at the University of West London ([CIE0004](#))
- 208 The Quality in Careers Consortium ([CIE0264](#))
- 209 Rainbow Parents Carers Forum ([CIE0133](#))
- 210 Reaching Families ([CIE0056](#))
- 211 Reading Recovery Europe ([CIE0065](#))
- 212 Rescue Our Schools ([CIE0160](#))
- 213 Reynolds, Dr Christian ([CIE0186](#))
- 214 Ridderbeekx, Mr & Mrs Ron & Louise ([CIE0248](#))
- 215 Rivers Academy West London ([CIE0270](#))
- 216 Robinson, Professor Carol ([CIE0110](#))
- 217 Rose, Mr Tim ([CIE0039](#))

- 218 Rowe, Adam ([CIE0268](#))
- 219 Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health ([CIE0153](#))
- 220 Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists ([CIE0145](#))
- 221 Royal Society of Biology ([CIE0201](#))
- 222 Royal Statistical Society ([CIE0199](#))
- 223 Russell Group ([CIE0293](#))
- 224 Save the Children ([CIE0064](#))
- 225 The School and Nursery Milk Alliance ([CIE0088](#))
- 226 School Food Matters ([CIE0074](#))
- 227 The Seeds of Change UK Ltd ([CIE0045](#))
- 228 Sense ([CIE0169](#))
- 229 Sherwood, Dennis ([CIE0256](#))
- 230 Sherwood, Dennis ([CIE0007](#))
- 231 Shield, Dr Will ([CIE0172](#))
- 232 The Silver Bullet Machine Manufacturing Company Limited ([CIE0288](#))
- 233 Simon, Simple ([CIE0114](#))
- 234 The Skylark Partnership ([CIE0044](#))
- 235 Small Steps Big Changes ([CIE0122](#))
- 236 Social Finance, Gloucestershire County Council, and Cheshire West and Chester County Council ([CIE0188](#))
- 237 All-Party Parliamentary Group for Childcare and Early Education, Cache, The Early Years Alliance, The Foundation Stage Forum, The National Day Nurseries Association, and Tops Day Nurseries ([CIE0177](#))
- 238 St Christopher's Fellowship ([CIE0084](#))
- 239 The St Martin's Group ([CIE0152](#))
- 240 Stonewall ([CIE0149](#))
- 241 Stretesky, Mrs Christine ([CIE0186](#))
- 242 Stretesky, Professor Paul ([CIE0186](#))
- 243 The Sutton Trust ([CIE0219](#))
- 244 Sutton Trust ([CIE0194](#))
- 245 Swansea University, School of Education (Dr Cathryn Knight, Lecturer of Education) ([CIE0286](#))
- 246 Swansea University, School of Education (Dr Janet Goodall, Associate Professor of Education) ([CIE0286](#))
- 247 Swansea University, School of Education (Professor Tom Crick, Professor of Digital Education and Policy) ([CIE0286](#))
- 248 Teach First ([CIE0034](#))
- 249 TeachVac ([CIE0003](#))
- 250 Team Up ([CIE0148](#))
- 251 Thomas Pocklington Trust ([CIE0275](#))

- 252 Thomas Pocklington Trust, RNIB, RSBC, and Guide Dogs ([CIE0230](#))
- 253 Thomson, Dr Stephanie ([CIE0190](#))
- 254 Toseeb, Dr Umar ([CIE0089](#))
- 255 Townshend, Dr Cathy ([CIE0261](#))
- 256 The Traveller Movement ([CIE0137](#))
- 257 Triple P UK ([CIE0226](#))
- 258 Turner, Mrs Emma ([CIE0233](#))
- 259 UNICEF UK ([CIE0174](#))
- 260 Universities UK ([CIE0200](#))
- 261 University of Bristol (Professor Simon Burgess, Professor of Economics) ([CIE0195](#))
- 262 University of Bristol, School of Education (Professor Richard Watermeyer, Professor of Education) ([CIE0286](#))
- 263 University of Central Lancashire, Cumbria County Council, and Cumbria Youth Alliance, (Suzanne Wilson) ([CIE0121](#))
- 264 University of Exeter (Professor Anna Mountford-Zimdars, Centre for Social Mobility) ([CIE0172](#))
- 265 Unwin, Professor Lorna ([CIE0190](#))
- 266 Velthuis, Dr Sanne ([CIE0190](#))
- 267 VIEW (Rory Cobb, Chair) ([CIE0183](#))
- 268 Voice the Union ([CIE0076](#))
- 269 Walters ([CIE0189](#))
- 270 Walters ([CIE0015](#))
- 271 Whitehead-Ross Education ([CIE0028](#))
- 272 Women's Aid Federation of England ([CIE0102](#))
- 273 YMCA England & Wales ([CIE0141](#))
- 274 YoungMinds ([CIE0094](#))