

Internal Appeals Procedure 2025-26

Contents

1. [Key staff](#)
2. [Purpose of the procedure](#)
3. [Appeals against internal assessment decisions \(centre assessed marks\) - Reviews of marking of GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments, controlled assessments and coursework](#)
4. [Appeals against the centre's decision to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice](#)
5. [Appeals against the centre's decision not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal](#)
6. [Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration](#)
7. [Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues](#)
8. [Review](#)

1. Key staff

Staff involved in the Internal Appeals Procedure:

Role	Personnel
Head of Centre	Stephen Ward
Deputy Head for Assessment & Exams	Gill Dambaza
Exams Office personnel	Kim Smalley, Louise Preston, Gemma Eungblut
SENCO	Lynsey Gogin
Heads of Department/Teachers (NEA and coursework)	Aisling Brown, Helene Barrell, Claudia Freeman, Tim Pegler, Alex van Dijk, Tim Lovewell, Susan Passmore, Helen Kedie, Natalie Stanley, Charlotte Wells, Matthew Rudd, Rachel Bloomfield-Proud, Kerry Watkins-Marks
Senior Leaders/Senior Deputy Head /Governors (Complaints)	Abbey Jones, James Gazet

2. Purpose of the procedure

2.1. The Stephen Perse Foundation (the **School**) complies with the JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (Sections 5.3.z, 5.8) and confirms 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, a written internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, access to post-results services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration;
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their internal appeals procedure.

2.2. This procedure covers appeals relating to the following situations:

- 1) Internal Assessment decisions - Non-examination assessments (NEA), controlled assessment (where applicable) and coursework, when a student is not satisfied with their centre-assessed mark and wishes to request a review of the centre's marking before the mark is submitted to the awarding body;
- 2) Malpractice decisions - When the centre decides to reject a student's coursework or NEA on the grounds of malpractice;
- 3) Centre decisions relating to post-results services - Clerical checks, reviews of marking, reviews of moderation and any subsequent appeal when a student is not satisfied with their final examination grade and the centre does not support their request for a clerical check, for a review or for a subsequent appeal;
- 4) Centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration - When there is disagreement between the centre and a student or parent/carer concerning access arrangements or a request for Special Consideration;
- 5) Centre decisions relating to other administrative issues.

3. Appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks) - Reviews of marking of GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments, controlled

assessments and coursework

- 3.1. The School is committed to ensuring that whenever staff mark candidates' work this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification, regulations and subject-specific associated documents.
- 3.2. The School ensures that all centre staff follow a robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework.
- 3.3. Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, who have been trained in this activity and who do not have any potential conflicts of interest. If AI tools have been used to assist in the marking of candidates' work, they will not be the sole marker. The School is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where more than one subject teacher—is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will be undertaken to ensure consistency of marking.
- 3.4. The School will:
 - 1) 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.
 - 2) Inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark. Candidates are advised to explain where they believe credit for their work has not been awarded and are advised to relate this to one or more assessment objectives in the marking criteria. The review will focus on the points raised by the candidate.
 - 3) Inform candidates that they may request copies of materials to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment. As a minimum, the materials available should be a copy of the marked assessment material or work, the mark scheme or assessment criteria, plus any additional materials which may vary from subject to subject.
 - 4) Having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate. This will either be copies or the originals viewed under supervised conditions (e.g. Art & Design work).
 - 5) Inform candidates they will not be allowed to access original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised.
 - 6) Provide candidates with sufficient time, normally at least four working days, in order to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision.
 - 7) Provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking. Candidates will have a maximum of four working days from receipt of their mark to the deadline for submitting a request for a review of marking. The Head of Department or subject teacher with overall responsibility for the non-examination assessments will send all candidates a link to the centre's Internal Appeals Google form to complete. Candidates **must** either confirm they are happy with their mark or that they are not happy and if not happy, **must** explain the grounds on which they wish to request a review. Requests will not be accepted after the agreed deadline to 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. A maximum of four working days will normally be allowed.
 - 8) Ensure that the review of marking is carried out 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 review.
 - 9) Instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.

- 10) Inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking by completing the relevant section of the Google form.
 - 11) Make the outcome of the review of the centre's marking known to the Head of Centre / Deputy Head for Assessment & Exams. A written electronic record of the review will be kept by the Exams Office and made available to the awarding body upon request.
- 3.5. The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of the review.
- 3.6. The moderation process carried out by the awarding bodies may result in a mark change, either upwards or downwards, even after an internal review is carried out by the centre. The internal review process is in place to ensure consistency of marking within the centre, whereas moderation by the awarding body ensures that centre's marking is in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.
- 4. Appeals against the centre's decision to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice**
- 4.1. The JCQ's 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 completing their work.
- 4.2. 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).
- 4.3. The School ensures that staff delivering and assessing coursework, internal assessments and/or non-examination assessments are aware of the centre's 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.
- 4.4. Suspected malpractice before the candidate authentication form is signed**
- 4.4.1. When a subject teacher becomes aware of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice relating to a student's NEA, controlled assessment or coursework **prior to the student having signed the authentication form**, the teacher must raise the issue immediately with their Head of Department and the Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams. The matter will be investigated and if malpractice is deemed to have taken place, the student will have to re-do their work under supervised conditions or if there is no time for work to be re-done, any work which is not the student's own must be recorded on the candidate record form.
- 4.5. Suspected malpractice after the candidate authentication form has been signed**
- 4.5.1. When a subject teacher becomes aware of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice relating to a student's NEA, controlled assessment or coursework **after the student has signed the authentication form and submitted the work for marking**, the teacher must immediately inform their Head of Department, the Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams and the Head of Centre. The teacher must record a mark of zero for the work and the Head of Centre must notify the relevant awarding body immediately using Form JCQ/M1. The matter will be investigated and if malpractice is deemed to have taken place, a mark of zero will be upheld and the student informed that this mark will be submitted to the awarding body.

4.5.2. The student will have the right to appeal the decision to award a mark of zero and to explain the circumstances under which the NEA, or coursework was produced. If the Head of Centre is satisfied with the explanation, the NEA, controlled assessment or coursework will be marked, the mark submitted to the awarding body and the candidate informed. If the Head of Centre does not accept the explanation, there is no further right of appeal within the centre.

5. Appeals against the centre's decision not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

5.1. This procedure confirms the School's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** that the centre will:

5.2. Post-results Services

5.2.1. Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. Full details of these services, the internal deadlines for requesting a service and the fees charged are provided by the Deputy Head for Assessment & Exams.

5.2.2. Candidates are informed **before** results are issued of the arrangements for requesting post-results services, and of the accessibility of senior members of centre staff immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking. Candidates are sent this information by email, and parents are informed by email via the Parent Portal. 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.

5.2.3. *Reviews of Results (RoRs)* offers three services.

- Service 1 – clerical re-check
- Service 2 – review of marking
- Service 2P - a priority review of marking. This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE A Level specifications.
- Service 3 – review of moderation (this service is not available to an individual candidate)

5.2.4. Where concern is expressed about a particular result, the centre will look at the marks awarded for each component part of the qualification alongside any mark schemes, relevant results reports, grade boundary information, etc. to determine if the centre supports the concern.

5.3. Service 1 or 2

5.3.1. A candidate is required to provide written consent in all cases before a request for a RoR service 1 or 2 is submitted to the awarding body as candidates' marks and subject grades may be lowered, raised or remain the same as a result. Candidate consent will only be collected after the publication of results and not beforehand. Candidates are asked to complete a form to collect the relevant script details and their signed consent.

5.3.2. At the centre a candidate who requests either Service 1 or 2 will be asked to pay the appropriate fee to the centre in advance of their request being submitted to the awarding body. The Exams Office personnel will then submit the request to the awarding body on its secure extranet site.

5.3.3. It is highly unlikely the centre will reject a Service 1 or Service 2 request. The centre will usually only advise against an RoR if the candidate's mark is on or just above a grade

boundary. The Exams Officer and/or the Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams will inform a candidate and their parent/carer, who are dissatisfied with how the centre deals with a request for a Service 1 or Service 2, that they should follow the School Complaints Policy and Procedures, available on its website.

5.3.4. Candidates and their parent/carer are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body.

5.3.5. The Exams Officer and/or the Deputy Head for Assessment & Exams will also indicate the timescales necessary for a complaint to be submitted, such that, if the complaint is upheld, there remains sufficient time to submit the review of results before the awarding body deadline.

5.4. **Service 3 - review of moderation**

5.4.1. A Service 3 request is a review of the original moderation to ensure the assessment criteria were fairly, reliably and consistently applied. It is not a re-moderation of the original sample of work. It cannot be provided for an individual candidate and in any case it cannot be provided when the centre's internally assessed marks have been accepted without change by an awarding body.

5.4.2. If there is a change to the centre's internally assessed marks, the appropriate Head of Department and Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams will consider whether there is a case for a review of moderation. No candidate consent is required. All students will be made aware of their marks for their JCQ NEA and coursework components and have the opportunity to request a review of marking before the marks are submitted to the moderator (see the centre's NEA, Controlled Assessment and Coursework Policy).

5.5. **Service OS - Access to scripts**

5.5.1. The centre processes all requests for access to scripts once the results have been published. AQA, CIE, OCR and Pearson provide the centre's exam staff access to download the scripts free of charge, provided candidates have given their consent to the centre to access their scripts. Consent is provided after the publication of results. Candidates complete and sign the consent form. Where scripts may be used to support teaching and learning, candidates must provide signed consent and may opt to have their candidate details removed from their script.

5.6. **Appeals against the outcome of a review**

Following the outcome of a Review of Results Service 1 or 2, if the candidate and their parent/carer remain concerned, they may request a preliminary appeal be submitted to the awarding body. The JCQ publications *Post-Results Services and JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes)* will be consulted to determine whether the acceptable grounds for a preliminary appeal have been met.

5.7. **Request for appeal accepted**

5.7.1. If the Head of Centre and/or Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams believe there are grounds for appeal, a request will be submitted on behalf of the candidate.

5.7.2. The centre will process the preliminary appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required **30 calendar days** (28 days for Cambridge International) of receiving the outcome of the review of results process.

5.7.3. The candidate and parent/carer (appellant) will be required to pay the awarding body fee

to the centre before the preliminary appeal is submitted to the awarding body. The Exams Officer or Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams will inform the appellant of the fee. If the appeal is upheld by the awarding body, this fee will be refunded by the awarding body and subsequently repaid to the appellant by the centre.

5.8. **Request for appeal declined**

- 5.8.1. If the Head of Centre and/or the Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams do not believe there are grounds for a preliminary appeal, they will communicate this decision and the reasons to the candidate and their parent/carer in writing in a timely manner and reject the request.
- 5.8.2. The Head of Centre and/or the Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams will also inform the candidate and their parent/carer that if they are dissatisfied with the decision to reject the request for a preliminary appeal, they may ask for a review of the Head of Centre's decision, setting out their reasons for requesting a review. Candidates and their parent/carer are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body.
- 5.8.3. The Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams will also indicate the timescales necessary for a complaint to be submitted, such that should the decision to reject the request be overturned, there remains sufficient time to submit the preliminary appeal before the awarding body deadline.

6. **Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration**

- 6.1. This procedure confirms the School's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3 z) 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, a written internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration
- 6.2. The 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
- 6.3. **Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments**
- 6.3.1. In accordance with the regulations, the School:
- recognises its duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, 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
- 6.3.2. Failure to comply with the regulations have 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

6.4. **Special consideration**

Where the School can provide signed evidence or 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.

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

- 6.5.1. This may include the 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.
- 6.5.2. Where the School makes a decision in relation to the access arrangement(s), reasonable adjustment(s) or special consideration that apply for a candidate or candidates:
- The SENCO and/or Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams should inform the candidate of their right to appeal, and relevant deadlines, when they give the candidate the initial decision concerning access arrangement(s), reasonable adjustment(s) or special consideration
 - 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.
 - The candidate (or the candidate's parent/carer) should send the request by email to the Head of Centre within five working days of receiving the decision, and sooner than this if necessary to meet external deadlines
- 6.5.3. To determine the outcome of the appeal, the Head of Centre 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.
- 6.5.4. The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal usually within five working days, and in any case in time for the necessary steps to be taken if the appeal is upheld.
- 6.5.5. If the appeal is upheld, The School will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements/submit the necessary application.

7. **Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues**

Circumstances may arise that cause The School to make decisions on administrative issues that may affect a candidate's examinations/assessments. 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 the regulations or followed due process, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted following The School Complaints Policy and Procedures, which are available on its website.

8. Review: this procedure is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Version Control

Date of adoption of this policy	7 November 2025
Date of last review of this policy	October 2025
Date for next review of this policy	October 2026
Policy owner	Exams Officer
Authorised by	Deputy Head for Assessments & Exams