



# Internal Appeals Procedures

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy, as defined by JCQ, is to

- ▶ ensure that details of this procedure are communicated, made widely available and accessible to all candidates

Date of last review:	n/a	Author:	KBO
Date of next review:	Spring 2021	Owner:	KBO
Type of policy:	<input type="checkbox"/> Network-wide <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tailored by school	Approval:	Headteacher
School:	<b>Ark Greenwich Free School</b>	Key Contact Name:	
Key Contact Email:		Key Contact Phone:	

## POSITIONING WITHIN ARK OPERATIONAL MODEL

### 1. Ark's Mission

Component	Element
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Leadership & Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring, Reporting & Data <input type="checkbox"/> Governance & Accountabilities <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching & Learning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Curriculum & Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Culture, Ethos & Wellbeing <input type="checkbox"/> Pathways & Enrichment <input type="checkbox"/> Parents & Community <input type="checkbox"/> Finance, IT & Estates <input type="checkbox"/> Our People	Public Examinations – Internal Appeals

## Key staff involved in internal appeals procedures

<b>Role</b>	<b>Name(s)</b>
Head of centre	<b>Rhys Spiers</b>
Exams officer	<b>Kieren Boyer</b>
Exams Officer's Line Manager Assistant Headteacher	<b>Tehrim Valibhai</b>

## Appeals against internal assessment decisions (teacher assessed marks)

This procedure confirms Ark Greenwich Free School's compliance with JCQ's *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2020-2021, section 5.7* that the centre will:

- have in place and be available for inspection purposes, a written internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions and to ensure that details of this procedure are communicated, made widely available and accessible to all candidates
- before submitting marks to the awarding body inform candidates of their centre assessed marks and allow a candidate to request a review of the centre's marking

### Deadlines for the submission of marks (Summer 2021 exam series)

Date	Qualification	Details
18/6/2021	GCSE	Deadline for grades to be submitted to awarding organisations

Ark Greenwich Free 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.

Ark Greenwich Free School ensures that all centre staff follow a robust Coursework, Controlled Assessment and *Non-examination assessment policy*. This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments (including coursework and controlled assessments) for GCSEs, including the marking and quality assurance processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. Ark Greenwich Free School is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where a number of subject teachers are involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

On being informed of their centre assessed marks, if a candidate believes that the above procedures were not followed in relation to the marking of their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the mark scheme to their marking, then they may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

Ark Greenwich Free 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 may request copies of materials (for example, a copy of their marked work, the relevant specification, the mark scheme and any other associated subject-specific documents) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment.

3. having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate.
4. provide candidates with sufficient time in order to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision.
5. provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking. Requests will not be accepted after this deadline. Requests must be made in writing by completing the internal appeals form.
6. 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.
7. ensure that the review of marking is carried out by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate and has no personal interest in the review.
8. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.
9. 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 submitted to the awarding body. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

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.

### **Post Results Day appeals process**

The following processes act as a safety net for any genuine errors that were not identified prior to TAG submission.

If a scholar believes an error has been made in determining their grade, they will have a right to appeal. There are two stages to the appeals process:

#### **Stage 1: centre review**

If the scholar doesn't think they have been issued with the correct grade, they can appeal to AGFS, using the JCQ Appendix B – Optional Student Request Form for Centre Reviews and Appeals to Awarding Organisations (included in the appendix of this policy). AGFS will review whether they:

- Made an administrative error, eg. they submitted an incorrect grade; they used an incorrect assessment mark when determining the scholar's grade

- Did not apply a procedure correctly, eg. they did not follow the Centre Policy, did not undertake internal quality assurance, did not take account of access arrangements or mitigating circumstances, such as illness.

To help scholars decide whether to appeal they can request that AGFS shares the following information on results day if not before:

- AGFS centre policy
- The sources of evidence used to determine their grade along with any grades/marks associated with them
- Details of any special circumstances that have been taken into account in determining their grade, eg. access arrangements, mitigating circumstances such as illness

## **Stage 2: appeal to the exam board**

If the scholar does not think they have the correct grade after the centre review is complete, they can ask AGFS to appeal to the exam board by completing the JCQ Appendix B – Optional Student Request Form for Centre Reviews and Appeals to Awarding Organisations (included in the appendix of this policy) who will review whether:

- AGFS made an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement in the choice of evidence from which they determined the grade and/or in the determination of the grade from that evidence.
- AGFS did not apply a procedure correctly, eg. they did not follow their Centre Policy, did not undertake internal quality assurance, did not take account of access arrangements or mitigating circumstances, such as illness.
- The exam board made an administrative error, eg. they changed the grade during the processing of grades.

At both stages of the process the scholar must complete and submit the JCQ Appendix B – Optional Student Request Form for Centre Reviews and Appeals to Awarding Organisations (included in the appendix of this policy), ensuring all relevant sections of the form are complete, including a detailed explanation outlining the grounds for appeal within 5,000 characters. It is important to remember that the grade can go down, up or stay the same through either stage of the process.

If the scholar has post-16 offer that is dependent on an appeal, they should tell the placement they are hoping to go to so they can decide how to handle the offer. The timelines for priority and non-priority appeals are as follows:

**12 August to 7 September:** priority appeals window

**12 August to 16 August:** student requests centre review

**12 August to 20 August:** centre conducts centre review

**13 August to 23 August:** centre submits appeal to exam board

**12 August to end October:** majority of non-priority appeals to take place

**12 August to 3 September:** student requests centre review

**12 August to 10 September:** centre conducts centre review

### **13 August to 17 September: centre submits appeal to exam board**

Finally, if a scholar believes the exam board has made a procedural error in handling the appeal, the scholar can apply to Ofqual's Exam Procedures Review Service to review the process undertaken by the exam board.

Written candidate consent is required in all cases before a request for a stage 1 and stage 2 appeal is submitted to the awarding body as with these services candidates' marks and subject grades may be lowered, confirmed, or raised. Candidates will provide their consent for a stage 1 or stage 2 appeal by completing the JCQ Appendix B – Optional Student Request Form for Centre Reviews and Appeals to Awarding Organisations (included in the appendix of this policy).

Candidate consent can only be collected after the publication of results.



## Important information for students

### What may happen to your grade during the centre review and appeals process?

If you request a centre review or an awarding organisation appeal there are three possible outcomes:

- Your original grade is **lowered**, so your final grade will be lower than the original grade you received.
- Your original grade is **confirmed**, so there is no change to your grade.
- Your original grade is **raised**, so your final grade will be higher than the original grade you received.

Once a finding has been made you cannot withdraw your request for a centre review or appeal. If your grade has been lowered you will not be able to revert back to the original grade you received on results day.

### What will be checked during a centre review?

You can ask the centre to check whether it made a **procedural error**, an **administrative error**, or both. A procedural error means a failure to follow the process set out in the centre policy. An administrative error means an error in recording your grade or submitting your grade to the awarding organisation.

You must request a centre review before you can request an awarding organisation appeal. This is so the awarding organisation is certain that your grade is as the centre intended.

### What will be checked during an awarding organisation appeal?

You can ask the awarding organisation to check whether the centre made a **procedural error** - or whether the awarding organisation itself made an **administrative error**. You can also ask the awarding organisation to check whether the **academic judgement** of the centre was unreasonable, either in the selection of evidence or the determination of your grade.

### When do I need to submit my request?

You should submit a request for a centre review by **16 August 2021 for a priority appeal**, or by **3 September 2021 for non-priority appeals**.

Once you have received the outcome of your centre review, if you wish to request an awarding organisation appeal you should do so as soon as possible. Your school or college will submit this on your behalf. Requests for a priority appeal should be submitted by **23 August 2021** and requests for non-priority appeals should be submitted by **17 September 2021**. Priority appeals that aren't submitted to the awarding organisation by 23 August 2021 will still be treated as a priority but they may not be completed in time for those with a higher education place dependent on the outcome of the appeal.

### What is a priority appeal?

A priority appeal is only for students applying to higher education who did not attain their firm choice (i.e. the offer they accepted as their first choice) and wish to appeal an A level or other Level 3 qualification result. You should inform your intended higher education provider that you have requested a centre review or appeal.

### What is your UCAS personal ID and why is it needed?

Your UCAS personal ID is the 10 digit code included in all correspondence from UCAS. This is needed to confirm that a student's place is dependent on the outcome of the appeal.

## Stage one – centre review

### A. Student request

This section is to be completed by the student. A request for a centre review must be submitted to the centre, not the awarding organisation. A centre review must be conducted before an appeal to the awarding organisation. This is so the awarding organisation is certain that your grade is as the centre intended.

Centre Name		Centre Number	
-------------	--	---------------	--

Student Name		Candidate Number	
--------------	--	------------------	--

Qualification title e.g. AQA GCSE English Language			
Teacher Assessed Grade issued			
Is this a priority appeal? <small>A priority appeal is only for students applying to higher education who did not attain their firm choice and wish to appeal an A level or other Level 3 qualification result.</small>	Yes  No	If Yes provide your UCAS personal ID e.g. 123-456-7890	

### Grounds for centre review

Please tick one or both of the options if they apply to your request. If you don't think either apply, your centre will still conduct a review for administrative and procedural errors so the awarding organisation can be certain that your grade is as the centre intended.

Administrative Error by the centre e.g. the wrong grade/mark was recorded against an item of evidence		Procedural Error by the centre e.g. a reasonable adjustment / access arrangement was not provided for an eligible student	
--	--	--	--

### Supporting evidence

Please provide a short explanation of what you believe went wrong and how you think this has impacted your grade. There is a 5,000 character limit.

--

### Acknowledgement

I confirm that I am requesting a centre review for the qualification named above and that I have read and understood the information provided in the 'Important information for students' section above. In submitting this review, I am aware that:

- The outcome of the review may result in my grade remaining the **same**, being **lowered** or **raised**
- The next stage (Stage Two, the appeal to awarding organisation) may only be requested once the centre review (Stage One) has been requested and concluded.

Student Name

Student signature

Date



## Stage two – appeal to awarding organisation

This section is to be completed by the student. An awarding organisation appeal must be submitted to the centre and the centre will then submit it to the awarding organisation

### Grounds for appeal

Please tick the grounds upon which you wish to appeal

<b>1. Administrative error by the awarding organisation</b>	
<b>2. Procedural issue at the centre</b>	
a. Procedural Error	
b. Issues with access arrangements / reasonable adjustments and/or mitigating circumstances	
<b>3. Unreasonable exercise of academic judgement</b>	
a. Selection of evidence	
b. Determination of Teacher Assessed Grade	

### Evidence to support an appeal

Please provide a short explanation of what you believe went wrong and how you think this has impacted your grade where that relates to your chosen ground for appeal. In some cases you must provide a clear reason but it doesn't have to be lengthy.

#### 1. Administrative error by the awarding organisation

You **must** provide a clear explanation. There is a 5,000 character limit.

--

#### 2 (a) Procedural Error

This is when the centre made a procedural error that has not been corrected at Stage One or the centre did not conduct its review properly and consistently. If you can, please add a further explanation below or alternatively refer to the information that you have already provided above. There is a 5,000 character limit.

--

## 2 (b) Issues with access arrangements / reasonable adjustments and/or mitigating circumstances

You **must** provide a clear explanation of what you believe went wrong and how you think this has impacted on your grade. There is a 5,000 character limit.

## 3 (a) Selection of evidence

You **must** provide a clear explanation of what you believe went wrong and how you think this has impacted on your grade. There is a 5,000 character limit.

## 3 (b) Determination of the Teacher Assessed Grade

You can provide a short explanation of the reason for your appeal if you want to. There is a 5,000 character limit.

## Acknowledgement

I confirm that I am requesting an appeal for the qualification named above and that I have read and understood the information provided in the 'Important information for students' section above.

I am aware that:

- The outcome of the appeal may result in my grade remaining the same, being lowered or raised
- I understand that there is no further opportunity to appeal to the awarding organisation and that the next stage would be to contact the regulator. The awarding organisation will include the next appropriate steps, where applicable, in their appeal outcome letter which you will receive from your school/college.

**Student name**

**Student signature**

**Date**

# Optional Evidence Checklist for Student Appeals

This is a checklist of the evidence that schools and colleges will be required to submit to the Awarding Organisation in the event of a student appeal to the Awarding Organisation on either procedural or academic judgement grounds. Centres may also find this evidence useful when conducting centre reviews.

We recommend that subject teachers and Heads of Department are asked to review the checklist once teacher assessed grades have been submitted to ensure that all documentation is complete, accurate and easily accessible to staff who will be completing centre reviews and submitting appeals. It may be helpful to note the name and location of relevant documentation so that it can be easily retrieved if needed during the centre review and appeals processes.

We also recommend that you submit the completed checklist along with all required evidence, when submitting an appeal to the Awarding Organisation. This may reduce the need for the Awarding Organisation to contact centre staff with queries about the evidence submitted.

Qualification Level:

Subject:

	<b>The cohort assessment record (or equivalent centre documentation) including the following:</b>	<i>If this is not contained in the assessment record, please identify the appropriate document that has the information. This will need to be submitted to the Awarding Organisation in the event of an appeal.</i>	<i>Explanatory notes</i>
1	The roles of the two members of staff who checked and confirmed the grades for this subject.		
2	The evidence selected for the cohort and an explanation of how the evidence has been used to support the determination of grades.		<i>The explanation should be sufficient to enable the Awarding Organisation to understand the approach to the determination of grades at a cohort level. It should specify, for example, if greater weight has been given to one or more assessments and how coverage of the assessment objectives has been achieved.</i>
3	Details of individual variations in the evidence selected for students within the cohort and a rationale for each variation.		<i>This should detail all cases where the selection of evidence for an individual student varies from that selected for the cohort, including variations required as a result of access arrangements, mitigating circumstances, disruption to teaching and learning, concerns about authenticity or because the student is a private candidate.</i>
4	Confirmation of any mitigating circumstances which have been taken into account for individual students, and an explanation of the way in which they have been taken into account.		

5	Confirmation of any access arrangements or reasonable adjustments agreed for individual students, and an explanation of the way in which any failure to provide agreed access arrangements or reasonable adjustments has been taken into account.		
	<b>Additional documentation</b>	<i>Please indicate what documentation is available and its location.</i>	<i>When submitting an appeal to the awarding organisation, you need only upload this documentation for the student who has requested the appeal.</i>
6	Any available additional records relating to the evidence selection for private candidates included in the cohort.		<i>For example, any supporting documentation provided by a third party involved in the grading decision.</i>
7	Any available correspondence or records of discussions with students or parents about concerns related to the grading process.		<i>Teachers are not expected to document all conversations about student or parental concerns, but records that are available should be submitted to the Awarding Organisation in the event of an appeal.</i>
8	A copy of information shared with the student about the evidence selected, and marks or grades awarded for each item of evidence.		
9	Details of any procedural or administrative errors which have come to light since the original submission of teacher assessed grades, and confirmation of action taken to address these.		
	<b>Student performance evidence</b>	<i>Please indicate what documentation is available and its location.</i>	<i>When submitting an appeal to the awarding organisation, you need only upload this documentation for the student who has requested the appeal.</i>
10	All available student evidence which has been used in determining the grade.		
	<b>Centre review documentation</b>	<i>Please indicate what documentation is available and its location.</i>	<i>When submitting an appeal to the awarding organisation, you need only upload this documentation for the student who has requested the appeal.</i>
11	A copy of the student's request for a centre review and a copy of the centre's response.		<i>If any procedural or administrative errors were identified by the centre, the response to the student should make it clear what action has been taken as a result.</i>