

Pearson Edexcel A level History Spring term 2021 network events

21OLPH04 01 Paper 1

Delegate Booklet

Contents

Paper 1 Assessment Objectives	p.2
Sections A and B (AO1)	p.2
Criteria defined	p.2
Ideas and examples of criteria linked to the second-order concepts:	pp.3–4
• Change and Continuity	
• Causation	
• Consequence	
• Similarity and Difference	
• Significance	
Section C (AO3)	p.5
Section C Extracts	p.5
Examples of:	p.6
• Introduction	
• Integrating own knowledge	
• Conclusion	
Exemplar in full	pp.7–14
AO3 mark scheme and commentary	p.15
Guidance on advance information for the Summer 2022 series	p.16
Guidance on Summer 2022 grading outcomes	p.16
Guidance on Summer 2022 contingency arrangements	pp.17–18

Paper 1 Assessment Objectives

AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A level assessment overview

Paper 1 Study in breadth with historical interpretations Total marks: 60 Weighting: 30% Questions to answer: 3 Exam time: 2hrs 15	Section A: One essay from choice of two. AO1 – all concepts in scope (cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference, significance). Questions target analysis and evaluation. Questions normally cover at least a decade.
	Section B: One essay from choice of two. AO1 – all concepts in scope (as above). Questions target analysis and evaluation. Questions normally cover at least a third of chronology.
	Section C: One compulsory question, based on two extracts. AO3 Students analyse and evaluate historical interpretations, using two secondary extracts containing differing views.

Sections A and B (AO1)

Suggested essay planning

- Identify the concept
- Decide on the criteria that will be used
- Agree on 3 or 4 themes/factors
- Select 2 or 3 relevant examples for each, across the time period in the question.

Level 4/5 conclusions would include:

- a bringing together into a summary argument of the points raised in the essay
- the relative importance of each theme/factor compared to the others
- a well-supported judgement in answer to the question, which clearly uses the criteria identified in the introduction to justify the answer.

Criteria: ‘standards by which something may be judged or decided’.

Link to the [Edexcel A Level Guidance on the application of valid criteria in making a judgement](#)

AO1 Level 5: ‘Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.’

Criteria should not be mechanically imposed – they depend on and must reflect upon the question. But how can we facilitate and develop student thinking on criteria for the concepts of cause, consequence, change & continuity, similarity & difference, and significance?

Ideas and examples of criteria linked to the second-order concepts

Change and Continuity

Extent of change? Nature of Change? Rate of change?

*‘Across the period 1917–1980 the American people’s trust in the presidency increasingly declined’.
How far do you agree with this statement?*

[practice essay for Option 1F: In search of the American Dream: the USA, c1917–96]

Introduction example:

‘Across the period 1917–80 the American people’s trust in the presidency was affected by factors such as the media, scandal, and the increased role of the presidency. How much trust in the presidency declined will be determined by the rate by which trust declined across the period, and the nature of the change in the American people’s attitude towards the presidency. Overall, by 1980, trust was only partially destroyed.’

End of paragraph example:

‘...The extent of the change in the media’s portrayal of the president, from support of Roosevelt to investigation of Nixon, can therefore suggest that trust had declined significantly’

Conclusion example:

‘With reference to the criterion set of the degree of sustained change in the public attitude across 1917–1980, the fluctuations in support at first suggest that trust had not increasingly declined. Whilst there was a distrust of Hoover’s ability to guide them out of the Wall Street Crash, for instance, there was a return to trust for Roosevelt’s New Deal. However, the Vietnam War cast a shadow over four presidencies, which arguably suggests that by 1980 trust had been destroyed’

Causation

Long or short term? Pre-condition? Trigger? Catalyst? Hypothetical reasoning?

‘Why was I late for school? One reason was the invention of the mobile phone – if I hadn’t stayed up late texting on my phone, I would have had more sleep. Another reason was the snooze button on my alarm – without those extra minutes in bed I might have had a chance catching the earlier bus. The next bus was cancelled so I was in a real rush once I got to the school stop. And then I sprained my ankle as I attempted to run the last part of my journey, so I limped in way past the school bell... ‘

Consequence

How far do you agree that the main consequence of the failure of the Second Crusade was limited European support for the crusader states in the years 1149–92?

Conclusion example:

‘In conclusion, although both the limited support from Europe and the effect on Byzantine relations were a result of the Second Crusade’s failure, it could, instead, be supposed that the main consequence is more likely to have been the strengthening of Muslim opposition to the Franks. Arguably this had the greater impact given that it led to Saladin’s eventual recapture of Jerusalem (which had sustained the crusader states) and the reduction of Outremer to a few ports, such as Tyre.’

Similarity and Difference

The degree... was there more similarity than difference? On what basis are you counting?

The weight... was the difference more substantial than the similarity? Substantial in what way?

How far was the response to fears of communist influence in the period after the First World War different from the response in the period after the Second World War?

[Option 1F: In search of the American Dream: the USA, c1917–96]

Conclusion examples:

‘In judging the weight of the similarity and difference, the context of the Cold War and nuclear age of the second scare can be seen as more substantial than the fears of revolution in the first, therefore the differences between the two responses were to a great extent.’

‘When considering the impact of each response, there was a wider and longer-lasting reaction from the authorities (from Senate hearings to investigations) and a harsher federal response (FBI bugging homes and the creation of the CIA) in the second scare and therefore there was a large degree of difference between the two red scares.’

Significance

How significant was the problem of political extremism in challenging effective German government in the years 1919–30? (2018)

[Option 1G: Germany and West Germany, 1918–89]

Conclusion example:

‘Political extremism was so significant because its prevalence made it the more pivotal factor... the government was challenged extremely early on from both sides of the political spectrum...

‘However it is important to note that there were other flaws with the system of government that posed a large challenge to how effectively it ran, such as inherent flaws in the constitution. Proportional representation...

‘Considering which factor was arguably pivotal in effectively challenging the government, overall political extremism did pose the largest threat... and what is more significant is that they came from the left and right and that, especially for the right, seemed to have the support of higher up...’

Section C (AO3)

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that...

Students need to identify

- a) key themes running through both extracts
- b) The historical debate reflected in the two historians' arguments.

In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'?

[Option 1C: Britain, 1625–1701: conflict, revolution and settlement]

Section C extracts

Extract 1: From John Miller, The Stuarts, published 2006.

The refusal to grant William sufficient revenue for life was the key decision of the Revolution. Although William was voted the civil list for life in 1698, he still had to come to Parliament each year for money for the army and navy. His financial dependence on Parliament was much greater than that of Charles II. It transformed the relationship between King and Parliament. Parliament now met every year for several months. But 1689 also marked the start of a slow and subtle process whereby monarchs found it harder and harder to use their traditional powers. Those powers were to some extent reduced by legislation. The Triennial Act of 1694 forced the king to call a general election at least once every three years. The Act of Settlement of 1701, besides excluding Catholics from the throne and settling the succession, imposed restrictions on a future foreign king that showed the resentment of many MPs against their current Dutch king. He was not to appoint any foreigner to office, or engage England in a war involving any continental territory, or even leave the country, without Parliament's consent. But most constraints under which monarchs laboured owed less to legislation than to the practical difficulties of working with Parliament.

Extract 2: From Steven C A Pincus and James A Robinson, What really happened during the Glorious Revolution?, published 2011.

Contemporaries and subsequent commentators have all noted that from 1689 parliament met every year. The post-Revolution parliaments also had a much larger set of legislative achievements. The average parliamentary session in the years after 1689 passed over twice the number of statutes than had sessions before the accession of William and Mary. Nevertheless, it is difficult to argue that the changes contained within the 1688 Revolution constrained the Crown to call parliament more regularly, let alone annually. The Declaration of Rights, that document so central to the Revolution Settlement, merely stated that 'Parliaments ought to be held frequently and permitted to sit.' Even this was no new development, as many contemporary commentators were well aware. The Revolution Settlement was no more innovative with respect to financial accountability since financial oversight measures had been introduced previously in 1624, 1644 and 1667. After 1688 the government chose, but was not required, to provide the House of Commons with an annual estimate of its expenditure, though the Commons did create a statutory commission of accounts in 1691.

Introduction examples:

- 1) “Both the extracts have conflicting views about the extent to which the Glorious Revolution ‘transformed the relationship between King and Parliament’. Extract 1 by Miller argues that it was transformed, not just by the legislation passed in the years after, but also by the financial constraints held over him. However, extract 2 by Pincus and Robinson argue that the years 1688–89 provided little change in the way of governing.”
- 2) “Extract 1 is of the belief that the Glorious Revolution “transformed the relationship between king and parliament”, although in lines 12–15 makes it clear that legislation was not the significant factor in this transformation. Extract 2 differs, believing that [whilst] there was a significant change in the relationship, the Glorious Revolution was not responsible, to a large extent. Both make valid arguments but extract 1 is the more convincing, especially in its belief that the Civil Lists Act is what truly transformed the relationship between crown and parliament.”

Example of Integrating own knowledge with the extract

‘Miller, on the other hand, claims that the ‘financial dependence on Parliament’ of the king meant that their relationship was transformed, and that he was fully dependent due, in part, to the Civil List Act of 1698.

‘This was granted to William for life and contained £700,000, enough for the upkeep of his palace and to pay for the judges. This did create a parliamentary hold on William because it did not cover anything else. William was financially dependent due to his involvement of the country in the Nine Years War (1689-97), and the subsequent debt this produced (reaching £16 million). To pay for the wars William took multiple loans like through the Million Pound Loan Act, the 1693 lottery or the creation of the bank of England and all of these loans had to be paid back. Since he couldn’t create a new tax to pay off the loans without parliament’s approval, he was now held to whatever they wished. Therefore, Millar argues the Glorious Revolution did transform the relationship due to the financial legislation which came after it.’

Conclusion examples:

- 1) “In conclusion, while at face value both accept that a transformation of the Crown-Parliament relationship occurred, some of the reasoning behind it is flawed. Parliament truly asserted itself as a permanent and essential feature of English politics, after decades being dominated by the Crown, as a result of the Glorious Revolution. As Millar convincingly argues, the most essential part of this assertion was the tight and effective control of the monarch’s finances, as money is the most practical area to target – without money the king cannot operate. Parliament’s control was not total, as it did not truly topple the crown until later, but Parliament’s rise was so significant it should be described as a transformation of the Crown-Parliament relationship.”
- 2) “Overall, extract 1 is more convincing and therefore the Glorious Revolution did transform the relationship between parliament and king. Although the legislation (which fully clamped down on the king and created the transformation) wasn’t actually done until after the events of the actual ‘revolution’, all of them had a basis and a justification in the Bill of Rights, for example the Triennial Act. Although the Declaration and Bill of Rights were pretty insubstantial on their own, like Robinson and Pincus argue, the ideas cemented in it are what produces the necessary outcomes in the period leading up to 1701. Since all [] changes within the period 1688-1701 should be taken into account, it is clear it achieved its aim. Along with this, although financial settlements were achieved previously (as Robinson & Pincus pointed out) they were often unsuccessful in keeping a hold over the king, for example Charles II getting money from France. Therefore, it did transform the relationship between king and parliament.”

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'?
(Extract 1, line 5)

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

Both the extracts have conflicting views about the extent to which the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and parliament'. Extract 1 by Miller argues that it was transformed, not just by the legislation passed in the years after, but also by the financial constraints held over him. However extract 2 by Pincus and Robinson argues that the years of 1688-1689 provided little change in the way of governing.

Extract 2 shows that ~~Miller~~ between the first processes within the revolution were limited in terms of change. Robinson and Pincus say that although it may have held more parliaments it had no real obligation to, as the Declaration of Rights had said 'parliament ought to be called held frequently.' This

is a clear example of the vagueness of the article which also stated that laws could not be removed without consent of parliament and that no cruel or unusual punishment could be forced upon the people. This document simply outlined the grievances of parliament, essentially why they did not like the previous monarchy with no real enforcement involved. This meant that from 1689-1694 William could have held the same parliament to encourage patronage to his cause, which he did by using it to woo the Tories for the early years of reign. By having no enforcement Mr Robinson and Pincus argue that it allows the abuses of power and the use of patronage to encourage power to continue, therefore not transforming the relationship between King and parliament.

Robinson and Pincus also argue this through a financial perspective. They say that the measures imposed were 'no more innovative' than those of the past, as at all reigns parliament had

tried to control the monarchy through its money and that they only achieved what they did, like being able to 'view expenditure' or create a 'commission' due to the government choosing to. In this period William agreed to sharing his finances with the 'commission of accounts' created in '691, however this was all up to him. He also did not have to take their advice on board but did utilise them by way of exposing and removing corrupt ministers. William also worked to ensure that only one commission existed, blocking anymore from being created, and its duties as a commission ended by 1697. Therefore Robinson and Pincus argue that the king still had a large amount of control over parliament as he chose when, what, and how much to give to parliament.

Miller on the other hand claims that the 'financial dependence on parliament' of the king meant that their relationship was transformed, and that he was fully dependent due, in part

to the Civil List Act of 1698. This was granted to William for life and contained £700,000, enough for the upkeep of his palace and to pay for the judges. This did create a parliamentary hold on William because it did not cover anything else. William was financially dependent due to his involvement of the country in the Nine Year War (1689-97), and the subsequent debt this produced (reaching £16 million). To pay for the war William took multiple loans like through the Million Pound Loan Act, the 1693 lottery or the creation of the bank of England and all of these loans had to be paid back. Since he couldn't even create a new tax to pay off the loan without parliament's approval he was now held to whatever they wished. Therefore Miller argues the Glorious Revolution did transform the relationship due to the financial legislation which came after it.

Miller also argues a transformation due to the enforcement of the Declaration

of Rights through the Triennial Act of 1694, which 'forced the king to call a^{general} election at least once every three years'. This act led to a period labelled now as the 'Age of the Party' where elections were called extremely frequently with some being called in the same year as another. This not only means parliament exerted their power over William in enforcing the Declaration of Rights clause saying they ought to be called frequently, but it also broke ~~the~~ William's power in the parliaments. Due to them being called so frequently William could not get control over a faction or create support and it soon became obvious that parliament ruled over him, especially when his support - the Whig Junto - was removed in 1695 and the parliament even attempted impeachment proceedings against them, showing he truly had lost control. Therefore Miller suggests that the Glorious Revolution did transform the relationship between king and parliament as they had more control

due to the Act which followed.

Miller also says that the Glorious Revolution does transform the relationship between King and Parliament due to further restrictions and their general nature. In the Extract (1) Miller directly references the Act of Settlement and the fact that more of the issue was the 'practical difficulties of working with parliament'. The Act of Settlement imposed further restrictions on the King, many of which differed greatly from those agreed in the Bill of Rights, for example that the King may not leave the country without first ^{getting} ~~winning~~ consent from Parliament. Although these would have been annoying for the King and forced him to call parliament more often many referenced future foreign monarchs in a reaction to what he had done, meaning they were too late to stop him. Parliament themselves during this period were harder to work with due to being predominantly Whigs and believing wholeheartedly in their power.

expressed in the Bill of Rights. This meant that they believed they had control over the army, at one point limiting it down to 10,000 then 7,000 men despite William's protests. By having higher control and a majority the Whigs could make it very difficult for William especially when attempting to gain anymore funds, therefore Miller believes it was them, rather than necessarily all the legislation (like the Act of Settlement) that held control over William and transformed ^{the} parliament and King relationship.

Overall, I believe Extract 1 is more convincing and therefore that the Glorious Revolution did transform the relationship between parliament and King. Although the legislation (which fully clamped down on the King and created the transformation) wasn't actually done until after the events, of the actual 'Revolution', all of them had a basis and justification in the Bill of Rights, for example the Triennial Act. Although the Declaration and Bill of

Rights were pretty unsubstantial on their own, like Robinson and Pincus argue the ideas cemented in it are what produces the necessary outcomes in the period leading up to 1701. Since all ~~over~~ changes within the period 1688-1701 should be taken into account it is clear it achieved its aim. Along with this, although financial settlements were achieved previously (as Robinson and Pincus pointed out) they were often unsuccessful in keeping a hold over the king, for example Charles II getting money from France. Therefore it did transform the relationship between king and Parliament.

This essay satisfied 'each of the Bullet Points in the generic mark scheme at Level 5. A feature of this answer is its confident handling of the evidence in both extracts, and its sustained analysis of different aspects of the issues under debate. It clearly shows appreciation of the basis of the arguments offered by both authors.' (Exemplar Report)

Section C

Target: AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.• A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.• A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them.• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.• Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.• Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

Exemplar booklet commentary

Bullet Point 1 refers to the interpretation and analysis of extracts. Weaker answers are likely only to demonstrate comprehension of the extracts and limited analysis of them by describing points within them that are relevant to the debate. Stronger responses will demonstrate understanding of the issues of interpretation raised in both extracts and be able to compare them, while the best answers will show an understanding of the basis of the arguments offered by the authors of both extracts.

Bullet Point 2 refers to the deployment of knowledge of issues related to the debate. There is no mark awarded for AO1 in this mark scheme, therefore knowledge must be related directly to the debate raised in the extracts. While the strongest responses will demonstrate evidence of knowledge which is directly related to, and integrated with, the evidence and arguments raised in the extracts, it is likely that weaker responses will only add knowledge to the information in them in order to expand matters of detail.

Bullet Point 3 relates to a candidate's abilities to evaluate and reach a judgement about the interpretations in the extracts. Weaker responses will come to a judgement but one which is likely assertive, or which has little support. It is probable that such a judgement will relate more to the extracts overall than to the specific issues raised by them. Stronger responses however will clearly demonstrate the understanding that the points of view in the extracts are matters of interpretation and reach a supported overall judgement according to their merits. The best will also provide evidence that the candidate understands the nature of historical debate.

Guidance on advance information for the Summer 2022 series

- In Summer 2021 there were no adaptations in place for A level History.
- For Summer 2022 DfE/Ofqual decided to put in place Advance information.
- The government's intention is to release advance information by **7 February 2022** to help students focus their revision time.
- It is advised that teaching and learning should still cover the entire subject content in the specification.
- Should the impact of the pandemic worsen, advance information could be issued earlier to help teachers focus their remaining teaching time.
- Advance information will be available to download from the Edexcel website.
- Teachers will be able to share the information with learners to support their exam preparation.
- Advance information is to inform exam preparation and is not to be taken into the exam by students.
- Advance information should not be used to narrow teaching and learning.
- Purpose to make exams less daunting by telling students in advance major focus of content of the exam, helping to manage their exam preparation.
- Likely to be at a high level in terms of identifying specification content that will be assessed (e.g. identifying key topics/themes).
- Some questions may still be answerable using more than one area of specified content, including ones not listed.
- It will not always be possible to detail everything that is in the examination. In some cases it would simply be unhelpful to students in their exam preparation. We also need to consider fairness and comparability across options.
- Advance information will not be identical between different awarding organisations as qualification content and/or assessment is not identical.
- However, Awarding Organisations have worked together to ensure that it is comparable for each subject/qualification, and has the same level of impact on students in terms of their exam preparation.
- Additional information on advance information for A level History was released in December 2021 (link on slide 5).
- A level History advance information will be provided for the following papers/sections only:
 - Paper 1 Breadth study with interpretations– Sections A and B only
 - Paper 2 Depth study – all
 - Paper 3 Themes in breadth with aspects in depth – Sections A and B only

Guidance on Summer 2022 grading outcomes

- <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/ofquals-approach-to-grading-exams-and-assessments-in-summer-2022-and-autumn-2021>
- In Summer 2022 exam boards will set the grade boundaries based on a profile that reflects a midpoint between 2021 and pre-pandemic grading (Summer 2018/2019).
- This will provide a safety net for students, to reflect the disruption this cohort have experienced already in their course.
- Results overall will be higher than in 2019, and not as high as in 2020. The exact position may vary by subject and by grade.
- Alongside this, additional measures are being put in place such as advance information in A level Politics and History.
- In 2023 we aim to return to results that are in line with those before the pandemic began.

Guidance on Summer 2022 contingency arrangements

- Students should expect to take exams in Summer 2022.
- Contingency plans put in place in unlikely event that exams are cancelled.
- DfE and Ofqual ran consultancy on arrangements in October 2021 and outcomes published: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/contingency-arrangements-gcse-as-a-level-project-and-aea/outcome/decisions-on-contingency-arrangements-2022-gcse-as-a-level-project-and-aea>
- If exams cancelled in summer 2022, grades to be determined by teachers using a Teacher Assessed Grades approach similar to Summer 2021.
- Ofqual has published guidance for teachers on how they should collect evidence of student performance which could be used towards a TAG in the unlikely event that exams are cancelled next summer.
- Guidance being published now so that teachers know how to collect evidence from their students in advance of any decision to cancel exams.
- Teachers must not attempt to determine TAGs unless exams are cancelled.

Conditions under which students should be assessed

- Students should be assessed under exam-like conditions wherever possible – controls may be provided within a classroom rather than exam hall.
- For example, students:
 - should not know the questions beforehand
 - should work independently and without assistance
 - should not have access to books or revision notes
 - the assessment should be timed and supervised.
- Wherever possible, a centre must either assess all of its students who are taking a particular qualification using the same material at the same time or using different materials at different times.
- If not possible to assess whole cohort at same time, the assessment approach should be consistent within a centre, e.g. students assessed using the same style of assessment (but not the same questions).

When students should be assessed

- Centres should plan assessment opportunities to a timetable – approaches may vary based on what assessments have already taken place.
- A sensible approach for assessments:
 - second half of the autumn term 2021
 - spring term of 2022
 - first half of the summer term 2022.
- Many centres will already have assessments planned to support students' learning and some assessments may already have taken place – where possible these should be used to provide evidence to inform possible TAG.
- If assessments already taken place under different conditions centres should exercise judgement over whether it would be appropriate, and in interests of students, to contribute towards TAGs if needed.
- Explain the approach in centre policies for TAGs if necessary.

Time spent assessing students

- Total assessment time should not normally exceed the total time students would spend taking exams for the relevant qualification.

Content on which students should be assessed

- Students should be assessed on a wide range of content, similar to that which they will expect in the summer exams and across the assessment objectives for the qualification.
- Assessment opportunities should provide evidence from broadly the same proportion of the specification as would normally be covered in exams.
- If TAGs necessary, must only be on content students have been taught.

Assessment materials

- Assessments should be as useful as possible for students preparing to take summer exams – past papers could be used in full or part.
- If design own assessments must be in similar style to our exam papers.

Student awareness

- Where assessments are scheduled after publication of Ofqual guidance, students must be told before they take each assessment that their performance in it would be used as part of the evidence to determine a TAG if exams are cancelled.
- This information should be given sufficiently far in advance of the assessment to allow students time to revise and prepare.
- Students should be told which parts of the subject content will be covered by the assessment, but they should not be told the questions in advance or be able to predict the questions from information given to them.
- Teachers setting assessments after the advance information for the summer 2022 exams has been published, should take that advance information into account when deciding how to assess their students.

Students should not resit assessments

- Students should not be given the opportunity to repeat an assessment, e.g. to improve their mark in response to feedback.

Marking

- Teachers should mark the assessments in line with published exam board mark schemes and guidance.
- Students should be provided with feedback, which could include marks or comments.
- Teachers may tell the student the grade at which their performance in the assessment indicates they have performed – however make clear this is not a TAG – specific guidance on determining TAGs available if exams cancelled.
- Teachers should be clear that marking and grading have not been quality assured.

Retention of work

- The original student work must be retained by the centre. Students may be given copies if this would help support their learning.

Coursework

- If exams go ahead as expected, NEA will be marked and moderated as usual and combined with students' exam marks to generate their grades.
- If exams are cancelled, teachers will be expected to take a student's NEA into account when determining a TAG.

Further Support

- JCQ FAQs: <https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/JCQ-Summer-2022-FAQs.pdf>
- Pearson FAQs: <https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/campaigns/summer-2022-support/frequently-asked-questions.html>