

External Examinations Internal Appeals Policy

This policy relates to appeals against decisions taken by the College with regard to the Review of Results (ROR) process for Public Examinations.

It should be read in conjunction with JCQ Post-Results Services: Information and guidance to centres <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services> and JCQ Appeals booklet <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals>.

In all cases Methodist College is committed to acting in a fair, consistent and timely manner and in accordance with any guidelines published by relevant bodies/organisations.

Awarding Bodies will only accept applications for Reviews of Results from centres and not from candidates or their parents.

Candidates wishing to apply for any of the services open to individuals should do so by completing the Review of Results application form available in school after the publication of results. Forms must be submitted by the deadline given and accompanied by the appropriate fee. Candidates must understand that marks and subject grades may be lowered following any Review of Results and therefore they must sign the application form giving written consent to the College applying for such a review on their behalf. Candidates are strongly advised to consult with their Subject teachers and/or the relevant Head of Department before applying for a Review of Results. The College will support such applications.

The Awarding Bodies offer the following Review of Results services for individual candidates:

Service 1 (Clerical re-check)

This is a re-check of all clerical procedures leading to the issue of a result.

This service will include the following checks:

- that all parts of the script have been marked;
- the totalling of marks;
- the recording of marks.

The outcome of the clerical re-check will be reported along with a statement of the total marks awarded for each unit, or component, included in the enquiry.

Service 2 (Review of marking)

This is a post-results review of the original marking to ensure that the agreed mark scheme has been applied correctly. **It is not a re-marking of the candidate's script.**

The awarding body will have trained its reviewers to conduct reviews of marking accurately and consistently. **Reviewers will not re-mark the script.**

This service will include:

- the clerical re-checks detailed in Service 1;

- a review of marking as described above.

Priority Service 2 (Review of marking)

This is a priority post-results review of the original marking to ensure that the agreed mark scheme has been applied correctly. **It is not a re-marking of the candidate's script.**

The awarding body will have trained its reviewers to conduct reviews of marking accurately and consistently. **Reviewers will not re-mark the script.**

The service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE specifications. It is only available if a GCE A-level candidate's place in higher education is dependent on the outcome. Universities and colleges will endeavour to be flexible in keeping places open. However, they can only do so if they are informed of priority reviews of marking that may affect an offer. It is therefore vitally important that candidates inform the relevant universities and colleges as soon as a priority review of marking has been requested.

Outcome of enquiries

The outcome of each enquiry will be confirmed by the respective awarding body.

The awarding body will provide a reason for the decision of a review of marking. If the mark has changed the reason will either be that an administrative error has occurred or there was a marking error. A marking error would occur where an examiner has not correctly applied the mark scheme or any other relevant procedure, i.e.

- if the 'right' mark was not given in a task where there is a 'right' or 'wrong' mark;
- if there has been an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement[†].

[†]An academic judgement is what is involved when marking and grading assessments. It is possible for different examiners reasonably to reach different judgements.

Unreasonableness in academic judgement occurs where the mark given is one that no reasonable examiner could properly have awarded.

If there is a disparity of two qualification grades or more between the original marker and the reviewer, the awarding body will automatically provide the centre with specific details.

Where there has been a reduction in marks or a downgrade, the request cannot be revoked and the original mark or grade cannot be reinstated.

Appeals

If a candidate is not satisfied with the outcome of a Review of Results, he/she can ask the College to submit an Appeal within 30 days of receiving the outcome.

Please note that candidates and/or their parents/carers are not entitled to appeal directly to the awarding body.

The College will only submit an appeal if it **genuinely believes that the awarding body has not followed due procedures.** Appeals must focus on whether an awarding body:

- a) has used procedures that were consistent with regulatory requirements;

- b) has applied its procedures properly and fairly in arriving at judgements;
- c) †for AS, A-level and Project qualifications only, has not properly applied the mark scheme.

†For AS and A-level qualifications only, the mark could not have been given by a trained and standardised marker who had appropriate subject knowledge and who had exercised his/her academic judgement in a reasonable way.

The College's decision as to whether to proceed with an appeal is subject to the following Examinations Appeals Procedures.

Candidates who wish the College to consider appealing the outcome of a Review of Results must consult with and get the approval of the relevant Head of Department. The Head of Department must be satisfied that he/she is able to indicate precisely where the Awarding Body has not followed due procedures. If the Head of Department is thus satisfied, he/she will ask the Vice-Principal responsible for Examinations to approve the submission of an appeal by the College. If the Vice-Principal (Examinations) is satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for appeal, that approval will be given and the College will proceed with an appeal. If the Vice Principal (Examinations) is not satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for appeal, then the College will not proceed and that decision will be communicated to the candidate. If the Head of Department is not satisfied that he/she is able to indicate precisely where the Awarding Body has not followed due procedures, then he/she will refuse to proceed with an application for appeal and will inform the Vice Principal and the candidate of that decision.

If candidates and/or their parents/ guardians wish to appeal the decision by either the Head of Department or the Vice-Principal(Examinations) not to proceed, they must apply in writing to the Principal within no more than 3 days of that decision being communicated (dependent on the Awarding Body's closing date for the application for appeal) indicating precisely where they believe the Awarding Body has not followed due procedures. The Principal together with another Vice-Principal will consider the grounds for appeal and communicate their decision to the candidate and/or their parents/guardians.

May 2018