Exams Internal Appeals Policy 2026/27

The Crypt School

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Deputy Head Academic/ Exams Officer	
Date of next review	01/11/2027

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Nicholas Dyer
Senior leader(s)	Senior Deputy Head, Deputy Head (Academic)
Exams officer	Louise Coughlin
SENCo	Natasha Prout

Contents

Key staff involved in the procedure 2
Purpose of the procedure 3
Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks) 4
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 recheck, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal 7
Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements or special consideration 9
Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues 11
Further guidance to inform and implement appeals 16

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms The Crypt School's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (5.3, 5.8) 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 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 or 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) 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 Crypt School'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

Board Deadlines for the submission of marks

Date	Qualification	Details	Exam series
05/11/26	EPQ (AQA)	Internal deadline 23/10/26	November 2026
15/03/27	A Level PE	Internal deadline 11th March	Summer-2027
24/03/27	GCSE Drama	Component 1. Internal deadline 19th March	Summer-2027
TBC – 2 weeks prior to moderation visit	GCSE PE	Marks to candidates no later than 3 weeks prior to board deadline (TBC)	Summer-2027
07/05/27	GCSE Food & GCSE English Language (AQA)	Internal deadline 29/04/27	Summer-2027
15/05/27	A level Drama (Eduqas), Geography, History, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Music (OCR), DT, English Literature (Pearson)	Drama – process and evaluation reports must be submitted to visiting examiner with the recording within a week of the final performance date. Internal deadline 10/05/27	Summer-2027
15/05/27	GCSE Music (OCR), DT (Pearson)	Internal deadline 10/05/27	Summer-2027

15/05/27	Entry Level Computing (OCR)	Internal deadline 10/05/27	Summer-2027
24/05/27	GCSE MFL (AQA)	Internal deadline 04/04/27	Summer-2027
31/05/27	A level & GCSE Art (AQA)	Internal deadline 26/05/27	Summer-2027
01/06/27	A level MFL (AQA)	Internal deadline 04/05/27	Summer-2027
Various	GCSE & A level MFL (Pearson)	All speaking recordings should be uploaded via LWT within 2 working days of completing the oral assessments for each language (assessment window is 15/04 – 20/05)	Summer-2027

The Crypt 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 associated subject-specific documents.

The Crypt School ensures that all centre staff follow a robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework. This policy details the procedures relating to non-examination assessments, 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.

The Crypt School 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 the candidate may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

The Crypt School will:

1. 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. 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. inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (as 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. These materials must be requested from the appropriate HoD within **THREE WORKING DAYS** of the candidate receiving their internally assessed mark.

4. having received a request for materials, promptly make them available to the candidate within **TWO WORKING DAYS** (This will either be the originals, viewed under supervised conditions, or copies). The HoD will inform the Exams Officer of the request.

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

6. provide candidates with sufficient time to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision, informing candidates that if their decision is to request a review that point 7 must be followed.

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 **THREE WORKING DAYS** of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the internal appeals form – this must be submitted to the Exams Officer. Candidates must explain on what grounds they wish to request a review

8. allow **FOUR 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 for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review. The candidate's work may be shared outside of the centre for the review of marking to be conducted. HoDs who are unable to find an appropriate assessor will consult their line manager or, if they are not available, another member of SLT.

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 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. <u>The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should, therefore, be considered provisional.</u>

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.

The Crypt 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.

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, The Crypt School will:

- 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:

- an internal appeals form should be completed and submitted within 2 working days of the decision being made know to the appellant. The appeals form should set out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 3 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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), 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)

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

This procedure confirms The Crypt 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 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, school deadlines for requesting a service and the fees charged are provided by the exams office staff and are made available on the school's website.

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 centre staff will be available immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking.

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 specifications. It is also available for Level 3 Vocational and Technical Qualifications. For NCFE this service only applies to T-levels.
- 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.

The Crypt School will support reviews of results provided the candidate has given written consent (this may be electronic), the candidate pays all costs associated with the enquiry and the request is received in the exams office by the school published deadline for post results services.

Consent is required in all cases to confirm that the candidate understands that the final subject grade and/ or mark awarded following a clerical recheck, or review of marking and any subsequent appeal may be lower than, higher than or the same as the original result that was awarded. Candidate consent will only be collected after the publication of results.

Candidates will be told that they must contact their chosen university to inform them of any review of marking.
https://www.ucas.com/undergraduate/clearing-and-results-day/results-day/thinking-appealing-your-grades

A Review of Moderation (Service 3) is not available to an individual candidate as it involves all candidates. If a request is made for a service 3 enquiry the Exams Officer, teaching staff and Head of Centre will investigate the

feasibility of requesting an enquiry at the centre's expense by consulting any moderator report/ feedback to identify any issues raised and determining if the centre's internally assessed marks have been accepted without change by the awarding body. If the centre's marks have been accepted by an awarding body then no appeal can be made.

Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (dispute)

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 for service 3, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre by completing the **internal appeals form** at least 2 weeks 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.

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 **7 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 office). 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.

This procedure is informed by the JCQ documents Post-Results Services and A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

This procedure confirms The Crypt School's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3) 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

The Crypt 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

In accordance with the regulations The Crypt School:

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

This may include The Crypt 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.

Where The Crypt School 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
- The **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted within 5 working 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 in writing within 5 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.
If the appeal is upheld, The Crypt School will, whenever possible, proceed to implement the necessary arrangements/submit the necessary application.

This procedure is informed by the JCQ documents A guide to the awarding organisations' 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)

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

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

Where The Crypt School 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 within 3 calendar 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 document A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes (7)

Marks and Post Review Internal appeals form

This form should be completed in all cases to lodge an appeal.

Please tick to indicate what the appeal is against:

- ☐ **internally assessed marks and/ or request for a review of marking**
- ☐ **centre decision to reject work on the grounds of malpractice**
- ☐ **centre decision not to support a review of results**
- ☐ **centre decision relating to an administrative issue**
- ☐ **the outcome of a review of results**

Name of appellant		Candidate name *if different to appellant*	
Awarding body		Exam paper code	
Qualification Subject		Exam paper title	

Please state the grounds for your appeal below:

Continue overleaf if necessary

Appellant declaration

By signing here, I am confirming I understand that any appeal may result in marks going up, down or staying the same.

I understand I must comply with the deadlines within the internal appeals procedure.

I also confirm that I will pay in advance any fees which may be charged by the awarding body for an appeal following the outcome of a review of results. I understand this fee will be refunded if the appeal is upheld.

Signature: **Date of signature:**

The appellant declaration against the relevant appeal must be signed, dated and returned to the exams officer on behalf of the head of centre to the timescale indicated in the internal appeals procedure.

Candidate name		Level and Subject	
Awarding body		NEA Paper Code	
☐ Work has been marked in accordance with the mark scheme, no changes to mark awarded to the candidate ☐ Work not marked fully in accordance with the mark scheme, changes to mark awarded to the candidate			
Old Mark		New Mark	
Reviewees Signature		Date	

Work will now be moderated by the awarding body to ensure consistency in marking between centres. Please be aware the moderation process may lead to mark changes. This process is outside the control of Crypt School.

FOR EXAM OFFICE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Date to candidate	

FOR EXAM OFFICE ONLY	
Date received	

Special Consideration and Access Arrangements Appeal.

Please tick to indicate what the appeal is against:

- ☐ **Access Arrangements Decision**
- ☐ **Special Consideration Decision**

Name of appellant		Candidate name *if different to appellant*	

Please state the grounds for your appeal below

Continue overleaf if necessary

The information I have provided is correct. I understand providing misleading or false information is a serious matter and can result in a sanction from the exam board. I give permission for this information to be shared with exam boards.

Signature: **Date of signature:**

The appellant declaration against the relevant appeal must be signed, dated and returned to the exams officer on behalf of the head of centre to the timescale indicated in the internal appeals procedure.

Appeals log

On receipt, all appeals are 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.

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/
- ~~JCQ Appeals Booklet~~ 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