Diet 2020 Appeals Options

There is a set of assumptions surrounding the Minimal Viable Product which would be used to certificate candidates.

There are various options that could be considered post certification:

If candidates do not need to accept their result this would then lead to a variety of possible options.

1. Sit examinations in Diet 2021.
2. Sit examinations in a wash-up diet later in 2020.
3. Appeal the result(s).

Sit examinations in Diet 2021

Pros:

- Allows candidates to be certificated according to actual evidence–based achievement

Cons:

- Impacts leavers - might not apply to S6 candidates
- Potential impact on future plans
- Impact on other subject choices
- Implications for numbers in centres and for SQA in delivering and processing Diet 2021

Sit examinations in a wash-up diet later in 2020

Pros:

- Earlier opportunity for candidates to be certificated according to actual evidence–based achievement
- Potentially no loss of progression opportunities
- Reduces impact on teaching and learning moving forwards

Cons:

- Difficult for SQA to deliver
- Impact on centres
- Potential impact on attainment
- Creates continuing uncertainty

Appeal the result(s)

Pros:

- Clear validation criteria which would potentially make it more manageable
- Timing is better with this option for candidates

Cons:

- Dependent on a variety of important assumptions

Assumptions surrounding appeals process:

- Clarity is required around the MVP model to be able to work up a viable appeals process
- No charge for this service
- Validation criteria would need to be established and enforced – currently no such criteria exist
- Success of delivery is most likely dependent on being back to normal business
- Based around the provision of alternative evidence – this may include coursework not previously submitted/marked

CONFIDENTIAL

- Would need to work in a similar way to Exceptional Circumstances service and be requested by a centre after consideration by Head of Centre
- Consideration should be given to taking a priority-based approach e.g. UCAS candidates, H/AH, N5 (only identified components or for leavers)
- Consideration of a review of a centre sample to address volume of submissions
- There is an overarching assumption that the consideration of alternative evidence (in many different formats) will require a significant amount of training, collaboration and discussion in order to achieve a fair and consistent outcome across all subjects. It is anticipated that the default position for this would most likely be face to face.

CONFIDENTIAL