Internal Appeals Procedures
2024/25

Approved/reviewed by	
Senior Head teacher	
Date of next review	September 2026

These procedures are reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Key staff involved in the appeals procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	**Adam Palmer -Aylesbury Campus** **Rhi Morgans – High Wycombe**
SLT members	**Louise Baker, Adam Palmer, Rob Rooney, Simon Ralph, Rosin Still** **Andrea Darrie, Sam Edmondson, Niamh Ellison, Martin Fahey, Marco Feiteira, Liam Painter, John Treanor**
Exams Manager	**NA**
Exams and Data Officer	**Jocelyn Watson Aylesbury Campus** **Cindy Carvel High Wycombe Campus**
Additional Staff	**Heads of Department** **Other staff (internal and external) as required**

Appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

Certain GCSE, GCE and other qualifications (such as Cambridge National) contain components of non-examination assessment (or units of coursework) which are internally assessed (marked) by St Michael's Catholic School and internally 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.

This procedure confirms St Michael's Catholic School compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.7) that the centre will:

- have in place and be available for inspection purposes, a written internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions and to ensure that details of this procedure are communicated, made widely available and accessible to all candidates
- 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

Deadlines for the submission of marks (Summer 2025 exam series)

Date	Qualification	Details
24/3/2025	GCSE	Final date for submission of **marks and sample** for EDUQAS Drama component 1
15/03/2025	GCSE	Centre-assessed mark submission deadline for GCSE PE (J587/04, J587/05 & J587/06)
15/03/2025	GCE	Centre-assessed mark submission deadline for AS (H155/04, H155/05 and H155/06) and A Level PE (H555/05, H555/06 and H555/07)
05/05/2025	GCSE	Final date for submission of **marks and sample** for EDUQAS Music component 1 and 2
08/05/2025	GCSE	Final date for submission of **marks and sample** for EDUQAS Drama component 2
07/05/2025	GCSE	Final date for submission of all AQA GCSE Subjects except for Art and Design and MFL speaking tests (externally marked). This includes the English Language speaking endorsement
15/05/2025	GCSE	Final date for submission of NEA and coursework marks for other awarding bodies.
15/05/2025	GCE	Final date for submission of NEA and coursework marks to awarding bodies (except Art and Design). This includes the science practical endorsements
15/05/2025	Applied Certificate	Final date for submission of **marks and sample** for Criminology

15/05/2025	ELC and EPQ	Final Submission date to exam boards for Non-exam assessment submission deadline for Extended Project Qualification Schools and colleges may set their own internal deadlines.
15/05/2025	Cambridge Nationals	Centre-assessed mark submission deadline
22/05/2025	AQA GCSE MFL	Final date for submission of MFL speaking files
31/05/2025	GCSE and GCE	Final date for submission of Art and Design marks to moderator*

* As this is half term the final date for submission will be Friday 23rd May

St Michael's Catholic 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.

St Michael's Catholic 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 GCE, GCSE, Cambridge Nationals, Project qualifications, BTECs and entry level certificate, 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. St Michael's Catholic 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.

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 standards to his/her marking, then he/she may make use of this appeals procedure to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

Review of marking requests can only be accepted from the candidate and not a parent/carer.

St Michael's Catholic 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 as a review will only focus on the quality of their work in meeting the published assessment criteria

3. Inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (generally as a minimum, a copy their 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

4. 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 these will be shared under supervised conditions) within 5 working days.

5. Inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material unless supervised

6. Provide candidates with sufficient time in order 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

7. Provide a RoR 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 5 working days of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the **internal appeals form**. No requests will be accepted via email or verbally from a candidate.

8. Allow 10 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.
9. 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 and has no personal interest in the review.

10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre

11. St Michael's Catholic School will inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking.

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.

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

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

This procedure confirms St Michael's Catholic School 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 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. Details of the appeal process, detailing deadlines, fees etc is published on the school website. Information can also be provided by the Exams and Data Officer on request via email on exams@stmichaelscs.org.

Candidates are also made aware 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 Parentmail and on the school website.

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.

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 his/her 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 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 the centre to submit this request . This would be on the basis that the script is available and will be delivered before the deadline to submit a RoR to the board.
- 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 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 by the candidate on the agreed internals appeal form 10 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 his/her appeal 5 working days before the deadline to submit an RoR to the awarding body.

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 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.

The **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted to the centre within 3 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 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 and data manager). 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.

More information and the forms needed will be issued in the Post Results Appeals documentation – this is published each year as it is updated with fees etc

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

This procedure confirms SMCS compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3z) 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

SMCS 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, SMCS:

- 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 SMCS has appropriate evidence signed 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 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 SMCS 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 SMCS 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
- Please see form Appendix 1

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 10 working days.

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

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

Circumstances may arise that cause SMCS to make decisions on administrative issues that may affect a candidate's examinations/assessments.

Where SMCS may make a decision that affects 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 the regulations or followed due process, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted
- Please see form Appendix one

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 10 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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

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
- ☐ Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues
- ☐ Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

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

Internal Marks Appeals log

On receipt, all 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.

Ref No.	Date received	Type of Appeal	Outcome	Outcome date