



Kings Langley School

Unlocking Potential for Life

Internal Examinations Appeals Policy

Date Agreed – October 2024

Review Date – October 2025



Contents

1. Rationale	Page 3
2. Character Development: Commitment to Equality and Diversity	Page 3
3. Purpose of the procedure	Page 4
4. Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)	Page 4
5. Appeals relating to centre decisions not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal	Page 8
6. Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration	Page 12
7. Further guidance to inform and implement appeals procedures	Page 14
8. Internal Appeals Form	Page 15
9. Internal Appeals Log	Page 17
10. Review of Marking Template	Page 18

(See also separate *External Examinations Appeals Policy* and *External Examinations Policy*)



Rationale

This policy exists to provide a framework for supporting our stated aim of “ensuring the happiness of every individual in our community”, to promote a climate which enables all students to flourish, regardless of ability or special needs, and supports our desired outcomes of developing "strong character".

Character Development: Commitment to Equality and Diversity

This school is founded on a set of fundamental values designed to enable all students and adults connected with our community to flourish and succeed, regardless of background or circumstances. We are determined to be open to people, places, methods and ideas—and as such, equality and diversity are at the heart of everything we do. Our continued dedication to social justice and equality of opportunity is embodied in everything we do.

We are creating an inclusive school community where:

- People are treated with dignity and respect.
- Inequalities are challenged.
- We anticipate, and respond positively to, different needs and circumstances so that everyone can achieve their potential.
- We value diversity and we recognise that different people bring different perspectives, ideas, knowledge and culture, and that this difference brings great strength.
- We believe that discrimination or exclusion based on individual characteristics and circumstances, such as age; disability; caring or dependency responsibilities; gender or gender identity; marriage and civil partnership status; political opinion; pregnancy and maternity; race, colour, caste, nationality, ethnic or national origin; religion or belief; sexual orientation; socio-economic background; trade union membership status or other distinctions, represents a waste of talent and a denial of opportunity for self-fulfilment.
- We recognise that patterns of under achievement at any level and differences in outcomes can be challenged through positive intervention activities designed to bridge gaps.
- We respect the rights of individuals, including the right to hold different views and beliefs. We will not allow these differences to be manifested in a way that is hostile or degrading to others.
- We expect commitment and involvement from all our staff, students, partners and providers of goods and services in working towards the achievement of our vision.



Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms Kings Langley School compliance with the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) [General Regulations for Approved Centres](#) (section 5.3x) and that the centre will:

- have in place and available for inspection a written internal appeals procedure which must cover at least: appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, 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 a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal;
- centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration; and
- centre decisions relating to other administrative issues.

Appeals relating to 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 Kings Langley 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.

In relation to internal assessment decisions, this procedure confirms Kings Langley School compliance with the JCQ [General Regulations for Approved Centres](#) (section 5.7) and that the centre will:

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

Kings Langley 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.

Kings Langley 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 and GCSE, including the marking and quality assurance/internal standardisation processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow.

Candidates' work is marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. Kings Langley 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 is 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 their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the marking standards, then they may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

Kings Langley 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 terms of meeting the published assessment criteria;
3. inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (generally 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 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 artwork and recordings, inform the candidate that the originals will be shared under supervised conditions) within 1 calendar day;
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 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 3 calendar days of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the Internal Appeals Form.]
8. allow sufficient time 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;
10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre; and
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 in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.

This procedure is informed by the JCQ publications [Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments](#) (section 6.1), [Review of marking \(centre assessed marks\) suggested template for centres](#) and [Notice to Centres – Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks](#).

Table of GCE (A-level) Non-Examination Assessment (NEA) Deadlines

School deadlines are subject to change in extenuating circumstances.

A-level NEA Overview and Deadlines 2024-25

Subject	NEA Start Date	NEA Title	Percentage of Final Grade	NEA Deadline for Students	NEA Marks to Students	Deadline for Requests for Reviews of Marking from Students	NEA Exam Board Deadline	Exam Board	Staff	Spec	Unit	Level
PE	Spring Term Year 13	Practical Performances	15%	Fri 14th Feb	Fri 28th Feb	Fri 7th Mar	Sat 15th Mar	OCR	ANE	H555	H555/05	GCE
	Autumn Term Year 12	Evaluation and Analysis or Performance for Improvement (EAPI)	15%	Fri 14th Feb							H555/06	
History	Summer Term Year 12	Independent Research Enquiry	20%	Fri 14th Feb	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Thu 15th May	Pearson	HAD	9H10	9H10/04	GCE
Extended Project	Spring Term Year 12	Independent Research Project and Presentation	100%	Fri 31st Jan	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Thu 15th May	AQA	SCO	7993	7993	GCE
Drama	Spring Term Year 12	Creating Original Drama (Working Notebook and Devised Performance)	30%	Fri 14th Feb	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Thu 15th May	AQA	ABB	7262	7262/C	GCE
	Spring Term Year 12	Making Theatre (Practical Performance and Reflective Report)	30%	TBC by external examiner	NEAs marked by external assessor so no internal marking or review process.						7262/X	
English Literature A	Summer Term Year 12	Independent Critical Study - Texts Across Time	20%	Wed 18th Dec	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Thu 15th May	AQA	MCG	7712	7712/C	GCE
Biology A	Autumn Term Year 12	Practical Endorsement*	0%	Mon 10th Mar	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Thu 15th May	OCR	MCK	H420	H420/04	GCE
Chemistry A	Autumn Term Year 12	Practical Endorsement*	0%	Mon 10th Mar	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Thu 15th May	OCR	MCK	H432	H432/04	GCE
Physics A	Autumn Term Year 12	Practical Endorsement*	0%	Mon 10th Mar	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Thu 15th May	OCR	MCK	H556	H556/04	GCE
Geography	Summer Term Year 12	Independent Investigation	20%	Thurs 20th Mar	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Thu 15th May	Pearson	CHA	9GE0	9GE0/04	GCE
Product Design	Summer Term Year 12	Independent Design and Make Project	50%	Thu 4th April	Fri 2nd May	Fri 9th May	Thu 15th May	Pearson	HOU	90T0	90T0/02	GCE
Computer Science	TBC	Programming Project	20%	TBC	TBC	TBC	Thu 15th May	OCR	EWE	H446	H446/03	GCE
Art	Spring Term Year 12	Personal Investigation	60%	Wed 29th Jan	Fri 9th May	Fri 16th May	48hrs before moderator visit	Pearson	ARN	9FA0	9FA0/01	GCE
	Spring Term Year 13	Externally Set Assignment	40%	Wed 7th May	Wed 21st May	Wed 4th Jun						
Photography	Spring Term Year 12	Personal Investigation	60%	Wed 29th Jan	Fri 9th May	Fri 16th May	48hrs before moderator visit	Pearson	ARN	9PY0	9PY0/01	GCE
	Spring Term Year 13	Externally Set Assignment	40%	Wed 7th May	Wed 21st May	Wed 4th Jun						

* The practical endorsements in A level Biology, Chemistry and Physics are a compulsory part of the course which must be passed, but do not contribute to students' final grades.



Table of GCSE Non-Examination Assessment (NEA) Deadlines

School deadlines are subject to change in extenuating circumstances.

GCSE NEA Overview and Deadlines 2024-25

Subject	NEA Start Date	NEA Title	Percentage of Final Grade	NEA Deadline for Students	NEA Marks to Students	Deadline for Requests for Reviews of Marking from Students	NEA Exam Board Deadline	Exam Board	Staff	Spec	Unit	Level
English Language	Summer Term Year 10	Spoken Language	Endorsed Component	Completed In Y10	Fri 14th Mar	Fri 21st Mar	Mon 5th May	WJEC	MCG	C700QS	C700U30-1	GCSE
PE	Autumn Term Year 11	Written Task (Analysis and Evaluation of Performance)	10%	Wed 18th Dec	Fri 28th Feb	Fri 7th Mar	Sat 15th Mar	OCR	ANE	J587	J587/05	GCSE
	Autumn Term Year 10	Practical Performances	30%	Fri 14th Feb	Fri 28th Feb	Fri 7th Mar	Sat 15th Mar				J587/04	
Drama	Spring Term Year 10	Devising Drama (3 Essays and a Practical Performance)	40%	Mon 4th Nov	Friday 4th Apr	Fri 25th Apr	Wed 7th May	AQA	ABB	8261	8261/C	GCSE
	Autumn Term Year 11	Texts in Practice (Practical Performance)	20%	TBC by external examiner								
Music	Autumn Term Year 10	Performance	30%	Fri 7th March	Wednesday 23rd April	Wednesday 30th April	Mon 5th May	Eduqas	WAR	C660QS	C660U10-1	GCSE
	Autumn Term Year 10	Composition	30%	Fri 21st March							C660U20-1	
Design and Technology	Summer Term Year 10	Independent Design and Make Project	50%	Fri 21st Mar	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Wed 7th May	AQA	SCA	8552	8552/C	GCSE
Food Preparation & Nutrition	Autumn Term Year 11	Food Investigation Task	15%	Thu 3rd April	Fri 25th Apr	Fri 2nd May	Wed 7th May	AQA	SCA	8585	8585/CE	GCSE
	Autumn Term Year 11	Food Preparation Task	35%								8585/CE	
Art and Design	Autumn Term Year 10	Personal Portfolio	60%	Wed 8th Jan	Fri 2nd May	Fri 9th May	48hrs before moderator visit	Pearson	ARN	1ADG	1FAD 01	GCSE
	Spring Term Year 11	Externally Set Assignment	40%	Wed 30th Apr	Wed 21st May	Wed 4th Jun						

* The spoken language endorsement in GCSE English Language is a compulsory part of the course, but it does not contribute to a student's final grades.



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

This procedure confirms Kings Langley School compliance with the JCQ [General Regulations for Approved Centres](#) (section 5.13) and 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 online 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, including internal deadlines for requesting a service and the fees charged, are provided by the Exams Officer in the External Examinations Appeals Policy prior to the release of results.

Candidates are also made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results and informed of the periods during which senior members of centre staff will be available/accessible immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking. Candidates are made aware/informed by the External Examinations Appeals Policy prior to the release of results.

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 (Priority 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 2 (Non-priority review of marking)**
This service is available for all other components and 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 have 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 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; and/or
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 that 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 have 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; and
- 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.

Although written consent from candidates is not required in this instance, should the centre make the decision that there are grounds for a Review of Moderation request, all candidates will be made aware that, although their published subject grades will not be lowered in the exam series concerned, their



marks for the individual NEA component may be lowered which could affect future certification should they choose to carry their mark forward to a future exam series.

Summary of procedures and timescales:

Service 1: Clerical Re-Check

Date	Action
Thursday 15 th August 2024	Publication of GCE A-level results
Thursday 22 nd August 2024	Publication of GCSE results
Wednesday 25 th September 2024	Internal deadline for student to request a Clerical Re-Check and provide written consent to confirm that they understand that their reviewed mark could be lower than, higher than or the same as their original mark
Thursday 26 th September 2024	Deadline for Clerical Re-Check requests to be submitted to exam board
10 calendar days from date of request	Latest date for outcome of clerical re-check request to be received by the centre

Service 2: Priority Review of Marking

Date	Action
Thursday 15 th August 2024	Publication of GCE A-level results
Wednesday 21 st August 2024	Internal deadline for student to request that a Priority Review of Marking request is submitted and provide written consent to confirm that they understand that their reviewed mark could be lower than, higher than or the same as their original mark
Thursday 22 nd August 2024	Deadline for Priority Review of Marking requests to be submitted to the exam board
15 calendar days from date of request	Latest date for outcome of review of marking request to be received by the centre

Service 2: Non-Priority Review of Marking

Date	Action
Thursday 15 th August 2024	Publication of GCE A-level results
Thursday 22 nd August 2024	Publication of GCSE results
Wednesday 25 th September 2024	Internal deadline for student to request that a Review of Marking request is submitted and provide written consent to confirm that they understand that their reviewed mark could be lower than, higher than or the same as their original mark
Thursday 26 th September 2024	Deadline for Non-Priority Review of Marking requests to be submitted to the exam board
20 calendar days from date of request	Latest date for outcome of review of marking request to be received by the centre



Service 4: Review of Moderation

Date	Action
Thursday 15 th August 2024	Publication of GCE A-level results
Thursday 22 nd August 2024	Publication of GCSE results
Wednesday 25 th September 2024	Deadline for centre to have advised candidates that a review of moderation is being requested and that, although their subject grade in this exam series will not change, their mark may change and this might affect their grade in a future exam series should they wish to carry it forward
Thursday 26 th September 2024	Deadline for Review of Moderation requests to be submitted to exam board
35 calendar days from date of request	Latest date for outcome of review of moderation request to be received by the centre

In the event that a candidate wishes to request a RoR service, 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 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; and/or
- 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.

Where a candidate (or their parent/carer) disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking or a review of moderation, and believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support a review of results:

- an appeal should be submitted to the centre in writing using the Internal Appeals Form and providing details of the grounds for the appeal; and
- at least 3 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 deadline for submitting a review of results.

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.

To submit an internal appeal:

- The Internal Appeals Form should be completed and submitted to the centre within the time specified by the centre from the notification of the outcome of the review of the result.
- Subject to the Head of Centre's decision, the preliminary appeal will be processed and submitted 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 Kings Langley School compliance with the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (section 5.3x) and 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.

Kings Langley School 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*; and
- 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, Kings Langley School:

- 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; and
- 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; and
- charging a fee for providing reasonable adjustments to disabled candidates.

Special consideration

Where Kings Langley School can provide evidence 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 Kings Langley 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 a candidate who is the subject of a decision made by Kings Langley School in relation to the access arrangement(s), reasonable adjustment(s) or special consideration (or their 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; and
- the Internal Appeals Form should be completed and submitted within 3 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 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 5 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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

Where Kings Langley 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.

- The Internal Appeals Form should be completed and submitted within 3 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 publication [A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes](#) (section 7).

Further guidance to inform and implement appeals procedures

JCQ publications

- *General Regulations for Approved Centres*
https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Gen_reqs_approved_centres_24-25_FINAL.pdf
- *Post-Results Services*
https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Post-Results-Service_24_FINAL.pdf
- *JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes)*
https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Appeals_Booklet_2024_Revision_020924_FINAL.pdf
- *Notice to Centres – Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks*
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Notice-to-Centres-Review-of-centre-marks.pdf>
- *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*
https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Malpractice_Sep24_FINAL.pdf
- *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments*
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/JCQ-AARA-24-25-PRINT.pdf>
- *A guide to the special consideration process*
<https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/JCQ-AARA-24-25-PRINT.pdf>

Ofqual publications

- *GCSE (9 to 1) qualification-level conditions and requirements*
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/qcse-9-to-1-qualification-level-conditions>
- *GCE qualification-level conditions and requirements*
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/qce-qualification-level-conditions-and-requirements>



INTERNAL APPEALS FORM – Please tick the box to indicate the nature of your appeal.	FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
	Date received	
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal against the centre’s decision not to support a Review of Moderation. <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal against the centre’s decision not to support an appeal against a Review of Results.		

Candidate Name	Candidate Number
Level	Subject
NEA Component	
Please state the grounds for your appeal below.	
Candidate signature	
Date	

This form must be completed, signed, dated and returned to the Exams Officer within the deadlines indicated in the relevant appeals procedure.



Please state the grounds for your appeal below. (Continued from overleaf)



Internal Appeals Log

On receipt, all internal appeals are logged. The 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, in order that information can be easily made available to for JCQ inspection purposes and to an awarding body upon request.

Date received	Complaint or Appeal	Outcome	Outcome date



Review of Marking Template

Name of student: Click or tap here to enter text.

Qualification and component: Click or tap here to enter text.

Section(s) of NEA being reviewed: Click or tap here to enter text.

I confirm that I have reviewed the following:

- the candidate's work;
- the mark sheet completed by the teacher showing the breakdown of marks;
- any comments/annotation made by the teacher during the marking process; **AND**
- information regarding any internal standardisation to ascertain whether consistent standards were applied by the original marker to the candidate's work (where more than one teacher has been involved in marking); **OR**
- (where there was no internal standardisation carried out because there was only one teacher involved in marking the work) the work of other candidates in the cohort to ensure that judgements can be made on the consistency of standards; and

- I confirm that I understand that the purpose of my review is to check that the candidate's mark is consistent with the marking standard for the cohort and to identify correct any marking error.

I confirm that I have reviewed the work for the following types of marking error:

- administrative errors;
- a failure to apply the marking criteria to the evidence generated by the candidate where that failure did not involve the exercise of academic judgement; **AND**
- an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement.

Please complete either Section A or Section B below. **Section C must be completed for all reviews.**

Section A

My review has identified a marking error.

Please confirm the type of marking error that has been identified and provide details of where the marking error is not in line with the standard of other candidates at the academy, referring to the assessment objectives or NEA marking criteria, and any differences in the mark breakdown for the sections that have been reviewed.



Section B

My review has not identified a marking error.

Please provide details of the reasons for upholding the original mark below.

Section C

Original mark for this section of the NEA	Reviewed marked for this section of the NEA

I confirm that I have had no previous involvement in the assessment of this candidate for this component of the NEA and I have no personal interest in the outcome of the review.

Name and signature of reviewer:

Date: