



## Examinations: Internal Appeals Procedure

### Millfield Science & Performing Arts College

Centre name	Millfield Science & Performing Arts College
Centre number	46231
Current policy approved by	Tim Grayston
Current policy reviewed by	Susan Draper
Date of review	24/09/2025
Date of next review	24/09/2026

### Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Nicola Regan
Senior leader(s)	Tim Grayston
Exams officer	Susan Draper
Other staff (if applicable)	

#### 1. Purpose

This procedure sets out how Millfield School manages appeals relating to examinations, ensuring compliance with Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) requirements.

It provides a process for handling appeals concerning:

- Internal assessment decisions
- Post-results services (e.g. reviews of results)
- Malpractice decisions
- Access arrangements and special consideration

#### 2. Publication and Accessibility

This procedure:

- Is published on the school website
- Is available to candidates and parents/carers upon request
- Forms part of the centre's compliance with JCQ regulations

### 3. Key Principles

- The candidate cannot appeal directly to awarding organisations
- Appeals to awarding bodies are made by the Head of Centre
- The “appellant” in awarding body processes is the centre, not the candidate
- All appeals must follow defined grounds and timelines

### 4. Grounds for Appeal

Appeals must be based on valid grounds. These include:

#### Acceptable grounds may include:

- Procedural error or failure to follow JCQ/awarding body regulations
- New evidence not previously available
- Administrative or clerical error
- Evidence that the decision was unreasonable based on available facts

#### Not acceptable grounds:

- Disagreement without supporting evidence
- Simply denying malpractice without new or relevant evidence
- General dissatisfaction with a result (without procedural basis)

### 5. Appeals Process Overview

#### Stage 1 – Raising a Concern

- The candidate (or parent/carer) submits an appeal in writing to the school
- This must clearly state:
  - The nature of the appeal
  - The grounds for appeal
  - Any supporting evidence

#### Stage 2 – Centre Review

- The centre will:
  - Investigate the appeal
  - Review all relevant documentation
- A written response will be issued within 7 school days

Outcome:

- **Appeal upheld** → action taken (e.g. remark requested, appeal submitted)
- **Appeal rejected** → reasons provided in writing

#### Stage 3 – Appeal to Awarding Body (if applicable)

If the centre upholds the appeal and escalation is appropriate:

- The Head of Centre submits the appeal to the awarding body

- Timescales must be strictly adhered to (see Section 8)

## **6. Principles relating to centre assessed marks**

The head of centre/senior leader(s) at Millfield Science & Performing Arts College will ensure that the following principles are in place in relation to marking the work of candidates:

- A commitment to ensuring that whenever teaching staff mark candidates' work, that this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents
- All centre staff follow a robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework which details the procedures relating to relevant qualifications delivered in the centre, including the marking and quality assurance/internal standardisation processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow
- Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity and 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)
- A commitment 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 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 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

### **Procedure for appealing internal assessment decisions (centre-assessed marks)**

The head of centre/senior leader(s) at Millfield Science & Performing Arts College will:

- 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
- 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
- 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 assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment
- Having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate (this will either be the originals viewed under supervised conditions or copies) within the period of time as specified (see Deadlines below)
- Inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised
- 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 they will need to explain what they believe the issue to be
- Provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking and confirm understanding that requests must be made in writing and will not be accepted after this deadline (see Deadlines below)
- Require candidates to make requests for a review of centre marking by completing an internal appeals form
- 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 (see Deadlines below)

- 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
- Instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
- Inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking
- Ensure the outcome of the review of the centre's marking is 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
- Ensure a written record of the review is kept and made available to the awarding body upon request
- Ensure the awarding body is informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review

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

The JCQ Information for candidates' documents (Coursework, Non-examination assessments, Social media) which are distributed to all candidates prior to assessments taking place, inform candidates of the things they must and must not do when they are completing their work.

The JCQ Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments) or similar centre document is issued to candidates prior to assessments taking place (and prior to a candidate signing the declaration of authentication which relates to their work).

The centre 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 but will 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 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, Millfield Science & Performing Arts College 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:

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.

### **The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal:**

- within 3 calendar/working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre

### **Deadlines and timescales**

- Upon request, copies of materials will be made available to the candidate within 2 calendar/working days
- The deadline to request a review of marking must be made within 2 calendar/working days of the candidate receiving copies of the requested materials

- The process for completing the review, making any changes to marks, and informing the candidate of the outcome will be completed within 5 calendar/working days, all before the awarding body's deadline for the submission of marks

## **7. Post-Results Services Appeals**

### **Purpose of the procedure**

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm the arrangements at Millfield Science & Performing Arts College for dealing with candidate appeals relating to any centre decision not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation, or an appeal.

This procedure ensures compliance with JCQ regulations (GR 5.13) which state that centres must have available for inspection 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.

### **Post-results services**

At Millfield Science & Performing Arts College:

- Candidates are 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

Candidates are made aware/informed by:

- The issue of the candidate examination booklet and an assembly in March alerts students to Post Results services. An email is sent out before results day making parents/carers aware. All students, parents/carers are informed that post results information can be found on the school website. A post results information sheet is placed with the student's statement of results which is given to student on results day.

Full details of the post-results services, internal deadline(s) for requesting a service and the fees charged (where applicable) are provided by:

- The Exams Officer

### **Centre actions in response to a concern about a result**

Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, Millfield Science & Performing Arts College 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 concern may be justified

For **written components** that contributed to the final grade, Millfield Science & Performing Arts College will:

- Where a place a university or 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)

In all other instances:

Consider accessing the script by:

- requesting a priority copy of the candidate's script to support a review of marking by the awarding body deadline, or
- (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
- Collect written consent/permission from the candidate to access their script

- 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
- Support a request for the appropriate Review of Results service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified
- Collect written consent from the candidate to request the Review of Results service before the request is submitted
- 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

For moderated components that contributed to the final grade Millfield Science & Performing Arts College 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 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 Review of Results 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 all candidates in the original sample

#### **Candidate consent**

Millfield Science & Performing Arts College will:

- Acquire written candidate consent (accepting informed consent via candidate email) in all cases before a request for a Review of Results service 1 or 2 (including priority service 2) is submitted to the awarding body
- Acquire informed candidate consent 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
- Only collect candidate consent after the publication of results

#### **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, Millfield Science & Performing Arts College will:

- For a review of marking (Review of Results priority service 2), advise the candidate a review may be requested 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 (Review of Results 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 (and any required administration fee) for the centre to access the script from the awarding body
- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (Review of Results 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 the centre to request the service from the awarding body
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (Review of Results 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 an internal appeals form at least 5 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 review of results.

## **Appeals**

Following a Review of Results 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 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 Review of Results outcome, but the candidate (or parent/carer) believes there are grounds for a preliminary appeal to the awarding body, an internal appeal may be made directly to the centre. Candidates or parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body. 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**. To submit an internal appeal:

- An 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

## **8. Malpractice Appeals**

### **8.1 Centre Responsibilities**

The procedure must clearly outline:

- Grounds for appeal
- The process and timelines

### ***Grounds for Appeal***

*Appeals must be based on reasonable grounds which relate to the incident in question. The following are accepted as reasonable grounds:*

- *the incident was not dealt with in accordance with the published procedures as detailed in the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice – Policies and Procedures*
- *the decision was unreasonable in light of the evidence presented to the Malpractice Committee*
- *further evidence (including medical evidence) has come to light which may change the awarding organisation's decision*
- *the sanction imposed is disproportionate to the seriousness of the malpractice.*

*The following do not, within themselves, constitute grounds for an appeal:*

- *the individual did not intend to cheat*
- *the individual has an unblemished academic record*
- *the individual could lose a FEI or HEI place or employment*
- *the individual regrets their actions*

### **Process and Timelines**

- A concern is submitted to the school in writing using the appeals form in the Appendix

- The centre investigates and responds within **7 school days**

### **Escalation to Awarding Body**

Where the centre supports an appeal:

- The **Head of Centre** submits the appeal directly to the awarding body

### **Timescale Requirement (JCQ)**

- To submit an appeal against a malpractice decision, **the application must be initiated by the Head of Centre** (or a private candidate/affected staff member) and sent directly to the relevant awarding body within **14 calendar days** of receiving the malpractice decision.

### **8.2. If the Centre Does Not Support an Appeal**

If the Head of Centre determines:

- There are no valid grounds for appeal

Then:

- The decision is confirmed in writing
- The candidate is advised to follow the school complaints procedure, if they remain dissatisfied (these can be found on the school website)

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

This procedure confirms Millfield Science and Performing Arts College compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.3z) 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.

#### **Millfield Science and Performing Arts College 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, Millfield Science and Performing Arts College:

- recognises its duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, submit applications for reasonable adjustments and 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 Millfield Science and Performing Arts College 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 Millfield Science and Performing Arts College 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 Millfield Science and Performing Arts College 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 within 7 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 7 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

If the appeal is upheld, Millfield Science and Performing Arts College will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements/submit the necessary application.

### **Appendices**

- **Appendix A:** Appeals Form
- **Appendix B:** JCQ Guidance References (latest versions)

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 detail boxes

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

Please state the grounds for your appeal below:

(If applicable, tick below)

- Where my appeal is against an internal assessment decision, I wish to request a review of the centre’s marking  
If necessary, continue on an additional page if this form is being completed electronically or overleaf if hard copy being completed

Appellant signature:

Date of signature:

This form must be signed, dated and returned to the exams officer on behalf of the head of centre to the timescale indicated in the relevant appeals procedure

## Further guidance to inform and implement appeals

### JCQ publications

- General Regulations for Approved Centres <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations>
- Post-Results Services <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/post-results-services>
- JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes) <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals>
- Notice to Centres – Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks <https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/non-examination-assessments>
- 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/accessarrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance/>
- A guide to the special consideration process <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance/>

### Ofqual publications

- 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/gcequalification-level-conditions-and-requirements>