Examination Procedures - Internal Appeals

Applicable to:	✓	Seaton Valley High School
		Seaton Sluice Middle School
		Whytrig Middle School
Approval body:	Executive Headteacher	

Status:

Statutory policy or document	No
Review frequency	School to determine
Approval by	School to determine

Publication:

Statutory requirement to publish on school website	No
Agreed to publish on school website	Yes

Review:

Frequency	**Next Review Due**
Annually	Autumn 2026

Version Control:

Author	Creation Date	Version	Status
Data and Curriculum Services Manager (AD)	28 January 2019	0.1	Initial draft
Changed by	**Revision Date**		
Business Manager (BW)	13 May 2019	1.0	Final approved version for publication, following formatting changes and minor amendments
Data and Curriculum Services Manager (AD)	22 January 2020	1.1	Updated in line with The Exams Office template (October 2019)
Data and Curriculum Services Manager (AD)	15 October 2020	1.2	Updated in line with The Exams Office template (September 2020)
Business Manager (BW)	18 December 2020	2.0	Final approved version for publication
Data and Examinations Officer (JL)	22 February 2022	2.1	Updated in line with The Exams Office template (September 2021)
Business Manager (BW)	25 February 2022	3.0	Final approved version for publication
Data and Examinations Officer (JL)	2 March 2023	3.1	Updated in line with The Exams Office template (September 2022)
Business Director (BW)	17 March 2023	4.0	Final approved version for publication
Business Manager - Data and Curriculum Support (GT)	8 January 2024	4.1	Updated in line with The Exams Office template (September 2023)
Business Director (BW)	15 January 2024	5.0	Final approved version for publication
Business Manager - Data and Curriculum Support (GT)	1 November 2024	5.1	Updated in line with The Exams Office template (September 2024)
Business Director (BW)	25 November 2024	6.0	Final approved version for publication
Business Manager - Data and Curriculum Support (GT)	31 October 2025	6.1	Updated in line with The Exams Office template (September 2025); replaced references to ACHS with SVHS
Business Director (BW)	5 November 2025	7.0	Final approved version for publication

1 Appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

1.1 Certain qualifications contain components/units of non-examination assessment, controlled assessment and/or coursework which are internally assessed (marked) by centres and internally standardised. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderation.

1.2 This procedure confirms Seaton Valley High School's compliance with the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) current General Regulations for Approved Centres Sections 5.3z and 5.8, which state 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 internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions, access to post-result 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

1.3 The qualifications delivered at Seaton Valley High School containing internally assessed components/units can be found in the SVHS Curriculum and Assessment Information document which is updated annually.

1.4 Deadlines for the submission of marks (Summer 2026 exam series) are as follows:

Date	Qualification	Details	Exam Series
05.11.25	GCSE	English Speaking Centre Assessed Mark	November 2025
07.05.26	GCSE English & GCSE Music	English Speaking Centre Assessed Marks & Music Controlled Assessment Marks	Summer 2026
15.05.26	OCR GCSE PE	Centre Assessed Marks	Summer 2026
15.05.26	Cambridge National in Health & Social Care	Centre Assessed Marks	Summer 2026
15.05.26	GCSE & GCE	AQA/OCR/Edexel Centre Assessed Marks	Summer 2026
15.05.26	AQA Entry Level	Entry Level Awards in Maths and Science	Summer 2026
18.05.26	Pearson Russian GCSE	Russian Speaking Centre Assessed Marks	Summer 2026
18.05.26	GCSE French	French Speaking Centre Assessed Marks	Summer 2026
31.05.26	GCSE/GCE Art & Design	Centre Assessed Marks	Summer 2026

1.5 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

1.6 The school is committed to ensuring that whenever its staff mark candidates' work this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.

1.7 The school ensures that all centre staff follow a robust Non-examination assessment policy (for the management of GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments). This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments for all externally awarded qualifications including, but not limited to, GCE, GCSE, BTEC, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals; including the marking and quality assurance processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow.

1.8 Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. Seaton Valley High School is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where a number of subject teachers are involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

1.9 On being informed of their centre-assessed marks, if a candidate believes that the above procedures were not followed in relation to the marking of his/her work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the mark scheme to his/her marking, then he/she may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

1.10 The 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 their work in meeting the published assessment criteria
- inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (as a minimum, a copy of their marked assessed 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 (or for some marked assessment materials, such as art work and recordings, inform the candidate that the originals will be shared under supervised conditions) within five working days
- inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment materials, including artefacts, unless supervised
- provide candidates with sufficient time, normally at least five working days, to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision
- provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking. Requests will not be accepted after this deadline. Requests must be made in writing within five working days of receiving copies of the requested materials and candidates must explain on what grounds they wish to request a review
- allow five working days 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

- 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 and has no personal interest in 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

1.11 The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the Head of Centre, who will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

1.12 The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review.

1.13 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 the 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.

1.14 The above procedure is informed by the JCQ publications Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (6.1), Reviews of marking (centre assessed marks) suggested template for centres, and Notice to Centres - Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks.

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

2.1 The JCQ Information for candidates documents (Coursework, Non-examination assessments, and 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.

2.2 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).

2.3 The 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.

2.4 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.

2.5 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.

2.6 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, Seaton Valley High School will follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document (Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments or 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.

2.7 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 five working days of the decision being made known to the appellant

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

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

3.1 This procedure confirms the school's compliance with the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) current General Regulations for Approved Centres Section 5.13, which requires that the centre has in place, available for inspection purposes and communicates with 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 online application for a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal..."

3.2 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.

3.3 Candidates are also informed **before** they sit any exams of the arrangements for post-results services and the availability of senior members of centre staff immediately after the publication of results, and the accessibility of senior members of centre staff immediately **after** the publication of results through an information booklet distributed with an accompanying letter and on the federation's website.

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

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

Review of Results (RoR) services

- 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 (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

3.6 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.

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

- where a place a university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking
- in all other instances, consider accessing the script by:
    - (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
    - (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
- collect informed written consent/permission from the candidate to access his/her script
- 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
- support a request for the appropriate RoR service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified
- collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the RoR service before the request is submitted
- 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

3.8 Written candidate consent (via completion of a Google Form) 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.

3.9 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

3.10 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 his/her 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 this service to 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 to 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

3.11 If the candidate (or his/her 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 completing the internal appeals form at least five working days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a RoR request.

3.12 The appellant will be informed of the outcome of his/her appeal before the internal deadline for submitting a RoR request.

3.13 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.

3.14 Where the Head of Centre is satisfied after receiving the RoR outcome, but the candidate (or his/her 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.

3.15 The internal appeals form should be completed and submitted to the centre within three working 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.

4 Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

4.1 This procedure confirms the school's compliance with JCQ's current General Regulations for Approved Centres Section 5.3, which requires 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 internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

4.2 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

Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments

4.3 In accordance with the regulations, the school:

- recognises its duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, 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

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

4.5 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

4.6 Where the 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

4.7 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.

4.8 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:

4.9 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

4.10 An internal appeals form should be completed and submitted within five working days of the decision being made known to the appellant.

4.11 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.

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

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

4.14 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).

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 **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:

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

Appendix 2: Complaints and appeals log

On receipt, all complaints/appeals are assigned a reference number and logged.

Outcome and outcome date is also recorded.

The outcome of any 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 logged as an appeal, so information can be easily made available to an awarding body upon request. The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review – this will be noted on this log.

This log will be retained for inspection for 6 months after the publication of results or six months after the closure of the appeal case, whichever is longer. After this date all paperwork pertaining to the appeal will be securely destroyed.

Ref No.	Date received	Complaint or Appeal	Outcome	Outcome date

Appendix 3: Further guidance to inform and implement appeals procedures

JCQ Publications

- General Regulations
- Post-Results Services
- Appeals
- Coursework
- Non-Examination Assessments
- Suspected Malpractice
- Access Arrangements, Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration

Ofqual Publications

- GCSE (9 to 1) qualification-level conditions and requirements
- GCE qualification-level conditions and requirements