

BASIC CRITERIA MET:

- ✓ Head of Centre approval.
- ✓ Submitted within 30 days of review outcome.
- ✓ Candidate consent obtained.

A Level Religious Studies

The candidate has received a result approximately 30 marks lower in the Developments in Religious Thought paper than her average for the Philosophy of Religion and Ethics papers.

In their Developments in Religious Thought paper, their script demonstrates:

Question 1 on Augustine – candidate shows **excellent** synoptic links with a wide **range of scholarly views** and **detailed understanding** of Augustine and his Pauline influences **skilfully** weaved in. It is a holistic and skilful essay, and it answers the set questions precisely. L4 & L3 suggests the examiner hasn't rewarded the references to Paul and skilful application of Augustine's understanding of grace.

Question 2 on Anonymous Christians – candidate showcases an **extensive scholarly understanding** of inclusivism, exclusivism, Barth and anonymous Christians, **skilfully** interweaving an array of scholars. The candidate fully understands the demands of the question, is in control and has produced a highly skilful answer. This is a clear L6 answer.

Question 3 on Gender – **excellent focus** on the gender roles and good exploration of Catholic view vs Simone De Beauvoir. There is some confusing numbering here which can be confusing and affects flow, but this is another **skilful** essay. It should also achieve a L6, perhaps the numbering has confused the examiner.

ACCEPTABLE GROUNDS BECAUSE:

- ✓ Clear – explains the reason for the concern.
- ✓ Concise – focuses on the key issues for us to review.
- ✓ Specific – levels, command words and expectations all covered.

Additional

Some centres find it useful to include screen clips or quotes from the mark scheme / marking criteria and candidate's script to illustrate their concerns.

Please don't provide remarked and/ or annotated copies of scripts as your grounds for appeal.

BASIC CRITERIA MET:

- ✓ Head of Centre approval.
- ✓ Submitted within 30 days of review outcome.
- ✓ Candidate consent obtained.

GCSE English Language

We believe the marks awarded for questions 3, 4, and 5 of Paper 1 are too low, and could not have been given by any examiner exercising reasonable academic judgment and a reasonable interpretation of the mark scheme. Our Head of English has reviewed the candidate's script and provided comments below, which show where the mark scheme has not been properly applied.

Question 3 – 5/8 marks, a low Level 3. Their answer is consistently clear and relevant, exploring the different foci of the extract, shifts in focus and the effects of these – for example, how the focus on the hyena's 'violent nature' at the beginning 'quickly establishes the danger that the animal poses' as 'an important theme', or the effect of the transition from the hyena as 'an object of terror, to quite amusing'. Indeed, the effect of this 'transition from terror to farce' is analysed perceptively, with sensitive inference and synthesis. The answer is supported by judicious examples throughout. We believe there is at least some achievement in level 4 in this answer, but the response is currently a low Level 3.

Question 4 - 11/20 marks, borderline Level 3. The answer is clear and relevant throughout, suggesting a secure Level 3 mark is appropriate. Furthermore, there are moments where discussion becomes more detailed and perceptive, particularly on p. 10 of the candidate's script, in the paragraph where the candidate develops a counterargument to the suggestion that 'the hyena is no threat to Pi'. Here, the focused discussion of 'the connotations of "beating"' and the 'underlying predatory instinct beneath the humorous surface' suggested by 'crouched' are convincing, detailed critical comments and contribute to the candidate's increasingly perceptive evaluation, and this is further developed by the consideration of the hyena's whimsicality that follows. These moments suggest at least a hint of Level 4 achievement, and a mark of 16.

Question 5 (AO5 & AO6) - 17/24 marks for AO5 (in the middle of Upper Level 3) and 12/16 (high Level 3) for AO6. A comparison with creative writing exemplar material suggests that a mark in Level 4 for both AO5 would be reasonable. The candidate describes the scene with imagination and flair. Details such as describing the lion 'gaz[ing] coolly [sic] down on pilgrims frantically waving cameras or smaller softer versions of himself' are highly effective, particularly in play of 'coolly' against 'frantically', the choice of the aptly metaphorical 'pilgrims' or the imaginative detail of the tourists' soft toys. The response is highly coherent and very well controlled throughout, with varied and always apt sentencing: the final short sentences of the antepenultimate paragraph and the judicious minor sentences which make up the penultimate paragraph are particularly striking and successful. In the final paragraph, by inventively reusing some of the phrases from the first paragraph but altering them, the candidate cleverly makes the piece cohere around a cyclical structure. Paragraphs are fluently linked, and discourse markers are seamlessly integrated. For AO6, there are some minor spelling errors, but the writing is generally accurate. Sentence demarcation is 'consistently' rather than 'mostly' secure, a wide range of punctuation and sentence forms are used with a high level of accuracy (including speech marks, and dashes for parenthesis), and the candidate's grammatical control is 'securely' rather than 'mostly' in evidence. Marks securely in the top level for AO5 and at least on the borderline for AO6 would recognise this.

ACCEPTABLE GROUNDS BECAUSE:

- ✓ Clear – tells us where and what the concern is.
- ✓ Concise – there is a detailed explanation, but it stays to key issues.
- ✓ Specific – question, command words, levels all referenced.

The examples provided are not the only acceptable way to present valid grounds.

BASIC CRITERIA MET:

- ✓ Head of Centre approval.
- ✓ Submitted within 30 days of review outcome.
- ✓ Candidate consent obtained.

GCSE Mathematics (Foundation tier)

We believe that the candidate should be awarded the M1 mark for their working at the beginning of Q20 on the paper 3.

The mark scheme states that M1 should be awarded for "17000 x 15/100"

The candidate has written "17000 x 0.15 = 2550".

This has been checked by several members of our Maths department, all of whom have current or past experience with examining.

ACCEPTABLE GROUNDS BECAUSE:

- ✓ Clear – tells us where and what the concern is.
- ✓ Concise – we immediately know what to address.
- ✓ Specific – question, answer and mark scheme all referenced.

Additional

Try to focus on what is unreasonable in the marking of the script, rather than what else could be reasonable marking. In many cases, and particularly with more subjective content, it is possible for more than one mark to be reasonably awarded, and exam boards won't change from one reasonable mark to another similarly reasonable mark.

Here are some examples of the unacceptable grounds for appeal that are often put forward in appeal applications. If your appeal application is based on one or more of these grounds and does not also contain any valid grounds, it will not be accepted as an appeal by the awarding body.

Unacceptable grounds for appeal:

- The marking seems harsh.
- The candidate is one mark below the grade boundary.
- The candidate will miss out on a HEI / FEI place.
- I would have given benefit of the doubt for...
- We would like someone to undertake another review / remark the paper.
- The mark is out of line with performance in other papers / qualifications / mocks.
- The review found errors, so we have lost confidence in the marking.
- The candidate was disadvantaged for / before the exam, please review the marking taking that into account.
- Grade boundaries were lower in previous exam series.
- Examiner annotations on marked scripts are not grounds for appeal on their own.

The examples provided are not the only acceptable way to present valid grounds.

The list of unacceptable grounds is not exhaustive and there may be other reasons why the grounds you present are not valid.