

## Internal Appeals Policy

### **Purpose of the procedure**

This procedure confirms Rushden Academy's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3x) that the centre will:

- have in place and available for inspection a written internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, post-result services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

This procedure covers appeals relating to:

- Internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)
- Centre decisions not to support a 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

### **Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)**

All internal assessments will be undertaken by appropriately trained staff, using correct procedures. Students have a right to appeal if they feel that this is not the case.

**This policy cover non-examination assessment and controlled assessment for GCE, GCSE and Extended Project Qualification (EPQ). It also includes endorsements for GCSE English speaking and listening and A level science practical's.**

Rushden Academy is committed to ensuring that whenever their staff assess students' work for an external qualification this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the specification for the qualification concerned. Assessments should be conducted by teachers who have the appropriate knowledge and skills to undertake this task. The students' work should be produced and authenticated according to the requirements of the awarding body. Where assessments involve more than one teacher or teaching groups, consistency should be assured by internal moderation and standardisation. All students will be informed of the mark awarded for their assessment before it is submitted to the awarding body and informed that grades are only awarded by the awarding body following submission of marks as grades can change on moderation

If a student feels that this may not have happened in relation to their work they may appeal, using the guidelines below.

NB students can only appeal against the process that led to the assessment and not against the mark awarded.

- Students will be informed of their centre assessed marks before marks are submitted to the awarding body.
- Students will be informed 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 their work in meeting the published assessment criteria.
- Students will be informed that they may request copies of materials (for example, a copy of their marked assessment material (work), and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject. There may be a charge for this.
- On receiving a request for copies of materials, they will be made available to the student within 5 working days. (Some marked assessment materials, such as art work and recordings will be shared under supervised conditions). Original assessment materials can only be viewed under supervision.
- Once the student has reviewed the materials provided they can request an appeal if they still feel the correct procedures have not been followed. This should be done by completing the form (see Appendix 1) within 5 working days of receiving copies of the requested materials, clearly stating the reason for the appeal.
- The review of marking will be carried out by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that student and has no personal interest in the review. The reviewer will ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.
- The review will be completed within 5 working days. The student will be informed in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking. This will take place before the awarding body's deadline.
- The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

The moderation process carried out by the awarding bodies 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.

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

This procedure confirms Rushden Academy's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres 2022-2023 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 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 available from the exams officer.

Candidates are also informed of the arrangements for post-results services and the availability of senior members of centre staff immediately after the publication of results, before they sit any exams by information in the Student Exam Handbook.

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 2 (Review of marking)  
This service is only available for externally assessed components of GCE A-level specifications (an individual awarding body may also offer this priority service for other 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
2. In all other instances, consider accessing the script by:
  - a) (where the service is made available by the awarding body) 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 the moderator's 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

**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 he/she 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 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 (see Appendix 1) at least 7 calendar days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of their 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 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 receiving 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 Rushden Academy's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3x) that the centre will have in place and available for inspection a written internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding... centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

Rushden Academy will:

- comply with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and special consideration as set out in the JCQ publications **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, Rushden Academy:

- recognises its duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, through the access arrangements process submit applications for reasonable adjustments and make reasonable adjustments to the service 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 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 AARA (Importance of these regulations)

## **Special Consideration**

Where Rushden Academy can provide signed evidence to support an application, it will apply for special consideration at the time of the assessment for a candidate who has temporarily experienced illness, injury or some other event outside of 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 his or her normal level of attainment in an assessment.

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

This may include Rushden Academy'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 Rushden Academy 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 calendar days of the decision being made known to the appellant

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.

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.

If the appeal is upheld, Rushden Academy will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements/submit the necessary application.

**Appendix 1**  
**Internal appeals form**

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| FOR CENTRE USE ONLY |  |
| Date received       |  |
| Reference No.       |  |

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 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

\*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<br>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 please continue overleaf

Appellant signature:

Date of signature:

This form must be signed, dated and returned to the exams officer on behalf of the head of centre to the timescale indicated in the relevant appeals procedure



## **Further guidance to inform and implement appeals procedures**

### **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>

**This policy will be publicised to students in the college via the Principal and the college website.**