# RGS Dodderhill
# Internal Appeals Procedure 2026-27

This procedure is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations and to reflect centre practice

## Key staff involved in the procedure

| Role | Name(s) |
|---|---|
| Head of centre | Amy Page AMP |
| Senior leader -<br>Deputy Head Academic (RGSD)<br>Deputy Head Academic (RGSW) | <br>Amelia Cartwright ACC<br>Hannah Talbot HMT |
| Exams officer | Amelia Cartwright ACC |
| SENCo | Jane Ferguson JRF |

## Contents


Key staff involved in the procedure 2

Purpose of the procedure 3

Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre-assessed marks) 3

Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice 6

Appeals relating to centre decisions not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal 7

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration 9

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues 10

Further guidance to inform and implement appeals 14

## Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms RGS Dodderhill's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.3, 5.8) that the centre will:

- have in place for inspection a written internal appeals procedure that is 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 internal assessment decisions, access to post-result services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration (with reference to the JCQ document *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*)
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their written internal appeals procedure which will cover appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, access to 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 an application for 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)

Certain qualifications contain components/units of non-examination assessment, controlled assessment/coursework which are internally assessed (marked) by RGS Dodderhill 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.

The qualifications delivered at RGS Dodderhill containing internally assessed components/units are:

- GCSE Music
- GCSE PE
- GCSE Food Preparation and Nutrition
- GCSE Art - Fine Art and Graphic Design
- GCSE Textiles
- GCSE English Language (Spoken Word)

This procedure confirms RGS Dodderhill's 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

## Table 1 - Deadlines for the submission of marks

| GCSE Subject & exam board | Teaching staff deadline for internal marking & marks given to pupils | Deadline for pupils to appeal by | Deadline for informing pupils of the outcome | Actual Exam board deadline |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| GCSE PE (OCR) J587 | 19th February | 26th February | 8th March | 15th March |
| English language Spoken Word (AQA) | 16th April | 23rd April | 30th April | 7th May |
| Drama (AQA) 8261 | 16th April | 23rd April | 30th April | 7th May |
| Food (AQA) 8585 | 16th April | 23rd April | 30th April | 7th May |
| Art & Design: Fine Art (OCR) J171 | 23rd April | 30th April | 7th May | 15th May |
| Textiles (OCR) J174 | 23rd April | 30th April | 7th May | 15th May |
| Music (OCR) J536 | 23rd April | 30th April | 7th May | 15th May |

RGS Dodderhill 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 associated subject-specific documents.

RGS Dodderhill ensures that all centre staff follow a robust *Non-examination Assessment Policy* for the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessment and coursework. This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments for GCSE Music, PE, English Language Spoken Word, Drama, Art, Textiles and Food Preparation and Nutrition, 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 skills, 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. RGS Dodderhill 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/tutor is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistent 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 their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the marking standards to the marking, then candidate may make use of this appeals procedure to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

1. RGS Dodderhill will ensure that candidates are informed of their centre-assessed marks so that they can request a review of the centre's marking before final marks are submitted to the awarding body.

2. RGS Dodderhill will inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of work submitted.

3. RGS Dodderhill will inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (a minimum, a copy of the marked assessment material (work) and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject) to help them decide whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment.

4. RGS Dodderhill will, having received a request for materials, promptly make them available to the candidate within 2 working days. (This will either be the originals, viewed under supervised conditions, or copies).

5. RGS Dodderhill will inform candidates that they will not be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised.

6. RGS Dodderhill will provide candidates with sufficient time, normally at least five working days, to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision.

7. RGS Dodderhill will 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 by the deadline in Table 1 - **Deadlines for the submission of marks,** by completing the **internal appeals form**. Candidates must explain on what grounds they wish to request a review.

8. RGS Dodderhill will allow 5 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. **See Table 1 Deadlines for the submission of marks.**

   **NB mark changes can be either upwards or downwards**.

9. The school will make a charge of £45 for the review of marking. Requesting an appeal constitutes an acceptance of the charge. No charge will be made in the event that the appeal is successful.

10. RGS Dodderhill will ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review.

11. RGS Dodderhill will instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.

12. RGS Dodderhill 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 body may result in a mark change, either upwards or downwards, even after an internal review. The internal review process is in place to ensure consistency of marking within the centre, whereas moderation by the awarding body ensures that 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.

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

The JCQ Information for candidates documents (AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments), coursework, non-examination assessments and social media) which are distributed to all candidates prior to relevant assessments taking place (and prior to a candidate signing the declaration of authentication which relates to their work), inform candidates of the things they must and must not do when they are completing their work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 5 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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

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

This procedure confirms RGS Dodderhill's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.13) that the centre will:

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

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. Full details of these services, internal deadlines for requesting a service and fees charged are provided by the Head of Centre or exams officer.

Candidates are also made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results. Candidates are also informed of the periods during which senior members of staff will be available immediately after the publication of results so that the results may be discussed, and decisions made on submission of reviews of marking. Candidates are made aware/informed by a letter sent home by the Head of Centre and exams officer and also details are explained during an exams presentation to candidates.

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 available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE A-level and some GCSE specifications
- Service 3 (Review of moderation)
  This service is not available upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample

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

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

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

- Confirm that a review of moderation cannot be undertaken on the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample submitted for moderation
- Consult any moderator'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

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

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

- For a review of marking (RoR priority service 2), advise the candidate they may request the review by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for this service to the centre by the deadline set by the centre
- For a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2), first advise the candidate to access a copy of their script to support a review of marking by providing written permission for the centre to access the script (and any required administrative fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request

- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2) is required, this must be submitted by the deadline set by the centre by providing informed written consent (and the required fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (RoR service 3) cannot be requested for the work of an individual candidate or the work of a candidate not in the original sample

If the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support a review of results, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre by completing the internal appeals form at least 2 working days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.

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

Following the RoR outcome, an external appeals process is available if the Head of Centre remains dissatisfied with the outcome and believes there are grounds for appeal. The JCQ documents **Post-Results Services** and **A guide to the awarding organisations' 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 document *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*. 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 **25 calendar days** of the notification of the outcome of the RoR. Subject to the Head of Centre's decision, this will allow the centre to process the preliminary appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required **30 calendar days** of the awarding body issuing the outcome of the review of results process. Awarding body fees which may be charged for the preliminary appeal must be paid to the centre by the appellant before the preliminary appeal is submitted to the awarding body (fees are available from the exams officer). If the appeal is upheld by the awarding body, this fee will be refunded by the awarding body and repaid to the appellant by the centre.

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

This procedure confirms RGS Dodderhill's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3z) that the centre will:

- have in place for inspection that is 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 to centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

RGS Dodderhill will:

- comply with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and special consideration as set out in the JCQ documents **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** and **A guide to the special consideration process**

- ensure that all staff who manage and implement access arrangements and special consideration are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced

**Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments**

In accordance with the regulations, RGS Dodderhill:

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

Failure to comply with the regulations 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

**Special consideration**

Where RGS Dodderhill has appropriate evidence authorised by a member of the senior leadership team to support an application, it will apply for special consideration at the time of the assessment for a candidate who is affected by adverse circumstances beyond their control, when the issue or event has had, or is reasonably likely to have had, a material effect on the candidate's ability to take an assessment or demonstrate their normal level of attainment in an assessment.

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

This may include RGS Dodderhill'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 RGS Dodderhill 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 7 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 document 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 5 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

If the appeal is upheld, RGS Dodderhill 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 RGS Dodderhill to make decisions on administrative issues that may affect a candidate's examinations/assessments.

Where RGS Dodderhill 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 with the regulations or followed due process, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted
- An **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted 5 working days of the decision being made known to the appellant.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 5 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name of appellant | | Candidate name<br>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, 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

## 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 | Appellant name | Outcome | Outcome date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

## Further guidance to inform and implement appeals

These include, but are not limited to:

**JCQ documents**

- General Regulations for Approved Centres https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/
- Post-Results Services https://www.jcq.org.uk/exam-results-data/post-results/
- A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes https://www.jcq.org.uk/exam-results-data/appeals/
- Notice to Centres – Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework-nea/
- 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-reasonable-adjustments/
- A guide to the special consideration process https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-reasonable-adjustments/

**Ofqual regulations**

- 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