



The  
Thomas Hardy School

# Internal appeals procedures 2020/21

These procedures are reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

<b>Approved/reviewed by</b>	
<b>Date of next review</b>	October 2021

## Key staff involved in internal appeals procedures

<b>Role</b>	<b>Name(s)</b>
Head of centre	<b>Mr M Foley</b>
SLT members	<b>To be appointed as required</b>
Exams officer	<b>Mrs C Boyles</b>

## 1. Appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

Certain GCSE, GCE and other qualifications contain components of non-examination assessment (or units of coursework) which are internally assessed (marked) by The Thomas Hardye 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 The Thomas Hardye School's compliance with JCQ's *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2020-2021*, 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.

The Thomas Hardye 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.

The Thomas Hardye 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, Project qualifications and any other assessment that is not '*externally set and taken by candidates at the same time under controlled conditions*' as defined by the JCQ), including the marking and quality assurance 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. The Thomas Hardye 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 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.

The Thomas Hardye 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 (for example, as a minimum, 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) 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 that 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 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 5 working days of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the **internal appeals form**
8. 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
9. 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
10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
11. 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 line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.

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

This procedure confirms The Thomas Hardy School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres 2020-2021, section 5.13 that the centre will:

***have available for inspection purposes and draw 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 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 exams officer and published on the school website.

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 (during tutor time) – details will be made available again on results days and via the school website and/or Exams Office.

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 marks 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 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 is required in all cases before a request for an RoR or ATS service 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.

After receiving results subject leaders can request a review of papers where they believe a clear error has been made. The permission of the student will be sought before the request for a review is submitted and the costs will be borne by the subject area.

Where the centre does not uphold a request from a candidate, they may wish to request a RoR service themselves. If a student wishes to initiate a review of papers they should collect and return the relevant forms from the exams office within the deadlines published by the centre (any forms received after this deadline will not be processed). The student will need to pay the fee demanded by the exam board, although this will be refunded if the remark results in an improved grade being awarded.

In the case where a student believes that a subject area should initiate a review but the school believes the grade to be correct then the student should make a written appeal to the deputy headteacher responsible for exams by 1st September. They will make a decision within 5 working days based on the student's performance across the time of their course, including the consistency of their work under exam conditions, and also their other results in the examination series.

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 5 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.

**FOR CENTRE USE ONLY**Date  
receivedReference  
No.**Internal appeals form**

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

<b>Name of appellant</b>		<b>Candidate name if different to appellant</b>	
<b>Awarding body</b>		<b>Exam paper code</b>	
<b>Qualification Subject</b>		<b>Exam paper title</b>	

**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, together with any fees payable.**