



400 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

## Internal Appeals Procedure

<b>Policy approval date</b>	<b>October 2025</b>
<b>Policy review date</b>	<b>October 2026</b>
<b>Policy Leads</b>	<b>David Sykes Lucy Gallagher Liz Bradbury</b>
<b>Governor or SLT approval</b>	<b>SLT</b>
<b>Governor committee responsible for policy</b>	<b>N/A</b>

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks) at Richard Hale School are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations in the JCQ publications General Regulations for Approved Centres (GR 5.7), Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (ICNEA 6.1). This procedure is also informed by the JCQ publications Reviews of marking (centre assessed marks) suggested template for centres and Notice to Centres - Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks.

TEO Guidance September 2025.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PURPOSE OF THE PROCEDURE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>PRINCIPLES RELATING TO CENTRE ASSESSED MARKS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>DEADLINES AND TIMESCALES FOR SUMMER 2026.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>APPEALS AGAINST DECISIONS TO REJECT A CANDIDATE’S WORK ON THE GROUNDS OF MALPRACTICE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>APPEALS RELATING TO CENTRE DECISIONS NOT TO SUPPORT AN APPLICATION FOR A CLERICAL RE-CHECK, A REVIEW OF MARKING, A REVIEW OF MODERATION OR AN APPEAL .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>CENTRE ACTIONS IN THE EVENT OF A DISAGREEMENT (DISPUTE).....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>APPEALS REGARDING CENTRE DECISIONS RELATING TO ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AND SPECIAL CONSIDERATION .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AND REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>SPECIAL CONSIDERATION .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>APPEALS REGARDING CENTRE DECISIONS RELATING TO OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>INTERNAL APPEALS FORM .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>APPEALS LOG .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## Introduction

Certain qualifications contain components of non-examination assessment (or units of coursework) which are internally assessed (marked) by Richard Hale School and internally reviewed/standardised. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) which contribute to the final grade of the qualification are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderation.

The moderation process carried out by the Awarding Body may result in a mark change, either upwards or downwards, even after an internal review. The internal review process is in place to ensure consistency of marking within the centre, whereas moderation by the Awarding Body ensures that centre marking is in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the Awarding Body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.

The qualifications delivered at Richard Hale School containing components of non-examination assessment/units of coursework are:

### GCE A Level

AQA	7262	Drama
AQA	7552	D&T Product Design
AQA	7037	Geography
OCR	H505	History
OCR	H601	Art & Design: Fine Art
OCR	H472	English Literature
OCR	H555	PE
OCR	H446	Computer Science
WJEC	A680QS	Media Studies
WJEC	A660QS	Music

### GCSE

AQA	8552	D&T
AQA	8261	Drama
AQA	8852	Engineering
AQA	8585	Food Prep & Nutrition
AQA	8035	Geography
OCR	J171	Art & Design: Fine Art
OCR	J536	Music
OCR	J587	PE

### BTEC

BTEC Business	DLBV4	National Level 3 Extended Diploma in Business
BTEC Applied Science	TRX99	National Level 3 Extended Diploma in Applied Science
BTEC Sport	ZXH38	National Level 3 Extended Diploma in Sport

### **Purpose of the procedure**

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm Richard Hale School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (5.3z, 5.8) that the centre will:

- have in place for inspection purposes, and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre, an internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, access to post results services, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration
- before submitting marks to the awarding body inform candidates of their centre assessed marks and allow a candidate to request a review of the centre's marking
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their internal appeals procedure

This procedure covers appeals relating to:

- Internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)
- Centre decisions not to support an application for clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal
- Centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration
- Centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

### **Principles relating to centre assessed marks**

The Head of Centre/Senior Leader(s) at Richard Hale School will ensure that the following principles are in place in relation to marking the work of candidates:

- A commitment to ensuring that whenever teaching staff mark candidates' work, that this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the Awarding Body's specification and subject-specific associated documents
- All centre staff follow a robust Non-examination Assessment Policy (for the management of non-examination assessments). This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments for relevant qualifications delivered in the centre, including the marking and quality assurance/internal standardisation processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow
- Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity
- A commitment to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the Awarding Body. Where more than one subject teacher/tutor is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking
- On being informed of their centre-assessed marks, if candidates believes that the above procedures were not followed in relation to the marking of their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the marking standards to their marking, then they may make use of the internal appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking

### Additional centre-specific principles

The Head of Centre/Senior Leader(s) at Richard Hale School will:

- Ensure that candidates are informed of their centre assessed marks so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body
- Inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of work submitted
- Inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (as a minimum, a copy of the marked assessment material (work) and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment
- Having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate (for some marked assessment materials, such as artwork and recordings, inform the candidate that the originals will be shared under supervised conditions) within the period of time as specified (see Deadlines below)
- Inform candidates they will not be allowed access to view original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised
- Provide candidates with sufficient time to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision, informing candidates that if their decision is to request a review, they will need to explain what they believe the issue to be
- Provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking and confirm understanding that requests must be made in writing and will not be accepted after this deadline (see Deadlines below)
- Require candidates to make requests for a review of centre marking by completing the Internal Appeals form by the dates stated in the table below

### Deadlines and timescales for Summer 2026

#### GCE

Board	Subject	Date of Appeal to Exams Officer by	Outcome to students by	Marks to be submitted to Awarding Bodies by
AQA	Drama	5 May	12 May	15 May
AQA	D&T Product Design	5 May	12 May	15 May
AQA	Geography	5 May	12 May	15 May
OCR	History	5 May	12 May	15 May
OCR	Art & Design: Fine Art	15 May	27 May	31 May
OCR	English Literature	5 May	12 May	15 May
OCR	PE	3 March	11 March	13 March
OCR	Computer Science	4 May	12 May	15 May
WJEC	Media Studies	5 May	12 May	15 May
WJEC	Music	18 April	28 April	2 May

## GCSE

Board	Subject	Date of Appeal to Exams Officer by	Outcome to students by	Marks to be submitted to Awarding Bodies by
AQA	D&T	22 April	6 May	15 May
AQA	Drama	22 April	6 May	15 May
AQA	Engineering	22 April	6 May	15 May
AQA	Food Prep & Nutrition	22 April	6 May	15 May
AQA	Geography	22 April	6 May	15 May
OCR	Art & Design: Fine Art	1 May	11 May	15 May
OCR	Music	22 April	6 May	15 May
OCR	PE	3 March	11 March	13 March

- Allow sufficient time for the review to be carried out, to make any necessary changes to marks and to inform the candidate of the outcome, all before the Awarding Body's deadline for the submission of marks (see Deadlines below)
- Ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review
- Instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
- Inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking
- Ensure the outcome of the review of the centre's marking is made known to the Head of Centre/Senior Leader who will make the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body
- Ensure a written record of the review is kept and made available to the Awarding Body upon request
- Ensure the Awarding Body is informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review

### Additional centre-specific procedure

#### Deadlines and timescales

- Upon request, copies of materials will be made available to the candidate within 3 working days
- The deadline to request a review of marking must be made within 3 working days of the candidate receiving copies of the requested materials
- The process for completing the review, making any changes to marks, and informing the candidate of the outcome will be completed within 3 working days, all before the Awarding Body's deadline for the submission of marks

Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice

The JCQ Information for candidates documents (Coursework, Non-examination assessments, Social media) which are distributed to all candidates prior to relevant assessments taking place, inform candidates of the things they **must** and **must not** do when they are completing their work.

The JCQ Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments) or similar centre document is issued to candidates prior to assessments taking place (and prior to a candidate signing the declaration of authentication which relates to their work).

Richard Hale School ensures that staff delivering/assessing coursework, internal assessments and/or non-examination assessments are aware of centre procedures relating to the authentication of learner work and have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism (including AI misuse) and other potential candidate malpractice.

Candidate malpractice offences relating to the content of work (i.e. inappropriate/offensive content, copying/collusion, plagiarism (including AI misuse) and/or false declaration of authentication) which are discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication do not need to be reported to the awarding body but will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment where the offence does not relate to the content of candidates' work (e.g. possession of unauthorised materials, breach of assessment conditions) or where a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, must be reported to the awarding body.

If there are doubts about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or irregularities are identified in a candidate's work before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication/authentication statement (where required) and malpractice is suspected, Richard Hale School will:

- follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document (Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments/Instructions for conducting coursework) and any supplementary guidance that may be provided by the awarding body. Where this may lead to the decision to not accept the candidate's work for assessment or to reject a candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice, the affected candidate will be informed of the decision.]

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:

- a written request, setting out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal, should be submitted
- an **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted within 5 calendar days of the decision being made known to the appellant

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 3 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

---

*This procedure is informed by the JCQ documents Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (4.6, 6.1, 9), Instructions for conducting coursework (6, 7, 13.5), Review of marking (centre assessed marks) suggested template for centres, Notice to Centres - Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks and Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (3.3, 4.5 including reference to Form JCQ/M1)*

Appeals relating to centre decisions not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

This procedure confirms Richard Hale School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.13) that the centre will:

- have available for inspection purposes and draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers, a written internal appeals procedure to manage disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. Full details of these services, internal deadlines for requesting a service and fees charged are provided by the exams officer and are posted on the school web site.

Candidates are also made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results. Candidates are also informed of the periods during which senior members of centre staff will be available immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking. Candidates are made aware/informed during assemblies before the exam series. Parents are informed via letter towards the end of the Summer term.

If the centre or a candidate (or their parent/carer) has a concern and believes a result may not be accurate, post-results services may be considered.

The JCQ post-results services currently available are detailed below.

#### **Reviews of Results (RoRs):**

- Service 1 (Clerical re-check)  
This is the only service that can be requested for objective tests (multiple choice tests)
- Service 2 (Review of marking)
- Priority Service 2a (Priority Review of marking where a university place is dependant)  
This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE A-level specifications. It is also available for Level 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications.
- Service 3 (Review of moderation)  
This service is not available to an individual candidate

#### **Access to Scripts (ATS):**

- Copies of scripts to support reviews of marking
- Copies of scripts to support teaching and learning

Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, the centre will look at the marks awarded for each component part of the qualification alongside any mark schemes, relevant result reports, grade boundary information, etc. when made available by the awarding body to determine if the centre supports any concerns.

For written components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

1. Where a place a university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking (where the qualification concerned is eligible for this service)
2. In all other instances, consider accessing the script by:
  - a) requesting a priority copy of the candidate's script to support a review of marking by the awarding body deadline, or
  - b) (where the option is made available by the awarding body) viewing the candidate's marked script online to consider if requesting a review of marking is appropriate
3. Collect informed written consent/permission from the candidate to access their script
4. On access to the script, consider if it is felt that the agreed mark scheme has been applied correctly in the original marking and if the centre considers there are any errors in the marking
5. Support a request for the appropriate RoR service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified
6. Collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the RoR service before the request is submitted
7. Where relevant, advise an affected candidate to inform any third party (such as a university or college) that a review of marking has been submitted to an awarding body.

Written candidate consent (informed consent via candidate email is acceptable) is required in all cases before a request for a RoR service 1 or 2 (including priority service 2) is submitted to the awarding body. Consent is required to confirm the candidate understands that the final subject grade and/or mark awarded following a clerical re-check or a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, may be lower than, higher than, or the same as the result which was originally awarded. Candidate consent must only be collected after the publication of results.

For any moderated components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

- Confirm that a review of moderation cannot be undertaken on the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample submitted for moderation
- Consult any moderator report/feedback to identify any issues raised
- Determine if the centre's internally assessed marks have been accepted without change by the awarding body – if this is the case, a RoR service 3 (Review of moderation) will not be available
- Determine if there are any grounds to submit a request for a review of moderation for the work of all candidates in the original sample

## Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (dispute)

Where a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking or a review of moderation, the centre will:

- For a review of marking (RoR priority service 2), advise the candidate they may request the review by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for this service to the centre by the deadline set by the centre
- For a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2), first advise the candidate to access a copy of their script to support a review of marking by providing written permission for the centre to access the script (and any required administration fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2) is required, this must be submitted by the deadline set by the centre by providing informed written consent (and the required fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (RoR service 3) cannot be requested for the work of an individual candidate or the work of a candidate not in the original sample]

If the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support a review of results, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre by completing the internal appeals form at least 3 working days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal before the internal deadline for submitting a RoR.

Following the RoR outcome, an external appeals process is available if the head of centre remains dissatisfied with the outcome and believes there are grounds for appeal. The JCQ publications Post-Results Services and JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes) will be consulted to determine the acceptable grounds for a preliminary appeal.

Where the head of centre/senior leader is satisfied after receiving the RoR outcome, but the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds for a preliminary appeal to the awarding body, a further internal appeal may be made to the head of centre. Following this, the head of centre's decision as to whether to proceed with a preliminary appeal will be based upon the acceptable grounds as detailed in the JCQ Appeals Booklet. Candidates or parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body.

The internal appeals form should be completed and submitted to the centre within 5 calendar days of the notification of the outcome of the RoR. Subject to the head of centre's decision, this will allow the centre to process the preliminary appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required 30 calendar days of the awarding body issuing the outcome of the review of results process. Awarding body fees which may be charged for the preliminary appeal must be paid to the centre by the appellant before the preliminary appeal is submitted to the awarding body (fees are available from the exams officer). If the appeal is upheld by the

awarding body, this fee will be refunded by the awarding body and repaid to the appellant by the centre.

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

This procedure confirms Richard Hale School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.3z) that the centre will:

- have in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre, an written internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

Richard Hale School will:

- comply with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and special consideration as set out in the JCQ documents **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** and **A guide to the special consideration process**
- ensure that all staff who manage and implement access arrangements and special consideration are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced

Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

In accordance with the regulations, Richard Hale School:

- recognises its duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, through the access arrangements process to submit applications for reasonable adjustments through the access arrangements process and make reasonable adjustments to the services the centre provides to disabled candidates
- complies with its responsibilities in identifying, determining and implementing appropriate access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

Failure to comply with the regulations has the potential to constitute malpractice which may impact on a candidate's result(s).

Examples of failure to comply include:

- putting in place access arrangements/adjustments that are not approved
- failing to consider putting in place access arrangements (which may be a failure to comply with the duty to make reasonable adjustments)
- permitting access arrangements/adjustments within the centre which are not supported by appropriate evidence
- charging a fee for providing reasonable adjustments to disabled candidates

### **Special consideration**

Where Richard Hale School has appropriate evidence authorised by a member of the senior leadership team to support an application, it will apply for special consideration at the time

of the assessment for a candidate who is affected by adverse circumstances beyond their control when the issue or event has had, or is reasonably likely to have had, a material effect on the candidate's ability to take an assessment or demonstrate their normal level of attainment in an assessment.

### **Centre decisions relating to access arrangements, reasonable adjustments and special consideration**

This may include Richard Hale School's decision not to make/apply for a specific reasonable adjustment or to apply for special consideration, in circumstances where a candidate does not meet the criteria for, or there is no evidence/insufficient evidence to support the implementation of an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment or the application of special consideration.

Where Richard Hale School makes a decision in relation to the access arrangement(s), reasonable adjustment(s) or special consideration that apply for a candidate or candidates:

- If a candidate who is the subject of the relevant decision (or the candidate's parent/carer) disagrees with the decision made and reasonably believes that the centre has not complied with its responsibilities or followed due procedures, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted
- An internal appeals form should be completed and submitted within 5 working days of the decision being made known to the appellant

To determine the outcome of the appeal, the head of centre/senior leader will consult the respective JCQ publication to confirm the centre has complied with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and/or special consideration and followed due procedures.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 7 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

If the appeal is upheld, Richard Hale School will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements/submit the necessary application.

---

*This procedure is informed by the JCQ documents A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes (3), Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (3.3), General Regulations for Approved Centres (5.4), Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments (Importance of these regulations) and A guide to the special consideration process (1, 2, 6)*

## Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

### INTERNAL APPEALS FORM

Please tick box to indicate the nature of your appeal and complete all white boxes\* on the form below

- Appeal against an internal assessment decision and/or request for a review of marking
- Appeal against a decision to reject candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice
- Appeal against the centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal
- Appeal against the centre's decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration
- Appeal against the centre's decision relating to an administrative issue

FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Reference No.	

\* Where the nature of the appeal does not relate directly to an awarding body's specific qualification, indicate N/A in awarding body specific detail boxes

Name of appellant		Candidate name (if different to appellant)	
Awarding body		Exam paper code	
Qualification type Subject		Exam paper title	

Please state the grounds for your appeal below:

(If applicable, tick below)

- Where my appeal is against an internal assessment decision, I wish to request a review of the centre's marking

If necessary, continue on an additional page if this form is being completed electronically or overleaf if hard copy being completed

Appellant signature:

Date of signature:



--	--	--	--	--

## Further guidance to inform and implement appeals

### JCQ publications

- General Regulations for Approved Centres  
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations>
- Post-Results Services  
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services>
- JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes)  
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals>
- Notice to Centres – Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks  
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/non-examination-assessments>
- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures  
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments  
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance/>
- A guide to the special consideration process  
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance/>

### Ofqual publications

- GCSE (9 to 1) qualification-level conditions and requirements  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gcse-9-to-1-qualification-level-conditions>
- GCE qualification-level conditions and requirements  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gce-qualification-level-conditions-and-requirements>