



The Judd School

Internal appeals procedure

2025/26

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Mr Jonathan Wood
Assistant Headteacher (Assessment, Recording & Reporting)	Dr Joel Dunn
Data and Examinations Manager	Ms Lindsey MacAdam
Exams Officer	Mrs Jane Blunt
Exams Officer	Mrs Charlotte King
Exams Administrator	Mrs Michele McLennan

Contents

Key staff involved in the procedure	2
Contents	3
Purpose of the procedure	4
Appeals against 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 check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal	8
Introduction	8
Post-results services	8
Centre actions in response to a concern about a result	8
Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (dispute)	9
Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (dispute)	10
Appeals	10
Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and reasonable adjustments	11
Special consideration	11
Centre decisions relating to access arrangements, reasonable adjustments and special consideration	12
Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues	12
Further guidance to inform and implement appeals procedures	15

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms The Judd School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.3z, 5.8) that the centre will:

- have in place and available for inspection an internal appeals procedure which is reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team. The procedure, which will be communicated within the center by a member of the senior leadership team, must cover at least appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, post-result services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration.
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers its written internal appeals procedure

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 against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

This procedure confirms The Judd School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres, section 5.7 that the centre has in place "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" and that the centre must "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".

Certain GCSE and GCE subjects have non-examination assessment (NEA) components that contribute to the final grade of the qualification, which are internally assessed (marked) by The Judd School and internally standardised. The Extended Project Qualification is also internally assessed. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderation.

The Judd School is committed to ensuring that whenever its staff mark candidates' work this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.

The Judd School ensures that all centre staff follow a robust Non-examination Assessment Policy (for the management of GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments). This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments for GCE, GCSE, Project qualifications, 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. If AI tools have been used to assist in the marking of candidates' work, they will not be the sole marker. The Judd School is committed to ensuring

that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where a number of subject teachers are involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

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

1. The Judd School 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.
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. The Judd School will provide candidates with copies of materials or ensure candidates are able to access appropriate materials (for example, a copy of their 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.
4. Where it is not possible to provide copies of work (for example, art work and recordings) The Judd School will, having received a request for access, make them available to the candidate to review under supervision, within 10 working days of receipt of the request.
5. The Judd School will 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 the grounds for their request.
6. The Judd School will provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking (See table on next page). Requests will not be accepted after this deadline. Requests must be made in writing. A request for a review must be made by completing the form linked [here](#). Completed NEA and coursework appeal forms should be returned to the exams office for consideration by the Headteacher. Each marking review will be subject to a fee payable by the candidate.
7. The Judd School will allow a minimum of 10 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.
8. The Judd School will 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 for the component in question and has no personal interest in the review.
9. The Judd School will instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.
10. The Judd School will inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking.

Subject	Qualification	Deadline for Appeal
Art	A Level	22/05/26
Art & Design	GCSE	22/05/26
Biology (practical endorsement)	A-level	24/04/26
Chemistry (practical endorsement)	A-level	24/04/26
Computer Science	A-level	24/04/26
D&T Product Design	GCSE	24/04/26
D&T	A Level	24/04/26
Drama	GCSE	24/04/26
English Language	GCSE	24/04/26
English Literature	A Level	24/04/26
EPQ	A Level	24/04/26
Geography	A Level	24/04/26
History	A Level	24/04/26
Music	GCSE	24/04/26
Physics (practical endorsement)	A-level	24/04/26
PE	GCSE	27/02/26
	A-level	17/04/26

Table 1: Deadline dates for NEA and Coursework appeals 2026

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 centre's marking is in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should, therefore, be considered provisional.

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, AI) which are distributed to all candidates prior to relevant assessments taking place,

inform candidates of the things they must and must not do when they are completing their work.

The Judd 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 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 (where required) and malpractice is suspected, the following procedure will be followed:

1. The HoD/lead teacher for the subject and/or Assistant Head Teacher (AHT) will contact the student and their parents to inform them of the nature of the concerns.
2. The candidate will be given an opportunity to respond to the concerns.
3. If following the candidates initial response concerns remain about the authenticity of the work the candidate will be asked to redraft and resubmit the work before being asked to sign the candidate declaration form.
4. If the candidate refuses to redraft the work the candidate and their parents will be informed (by the AHT responsible for assessment) that the center remains unable to authenticate the work. They will be advised of the possible consequences of suspected malpractice being reported to the relevant awarding body. The candidate will be asked to sign the candidate declaration form and submit the original work again. The suspected malpractice will then be reported to the appropriate Awarding Body.
5. If the center is unable to authenticate the work and the candidate refuses to sign the candidate declaration form, the work will not be accepted or marked. The center will consider the work as missing and no mark will be submitted to the awarding body. The candidate and the parents will be advised of this outcome by the AHT responsible for assessment.

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 within 14 calendar days of the decision not to accept the candidates work being communicated in writing.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 14 working school days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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

Introduction

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available (see below for details of how these are managed at The Judd School)

If teaching staff at The Judd School or a candidate (or their parent/carer) have a concern that 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.
- 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

Post-results services

At The Judd School:

- 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 receive an email prior to results days detailing which services are available.

Centre actions in response to a concern about a result

Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, The Judd School 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, The Judd School 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 any **moderated components** that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

1. Confirm that a review of moderation cannot be undertaken on the work of an individual candidate or the candidate's work was not in the original sample submitted for moderation
2. Consult the moderator's report/feedback to identify any issues raised
3. 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
4. Determine if there are any grounds to submit a request for a review of moderation for the work of candidates in the original sample.

Candidate consent

- **Acquired written candidate 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 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, which must only be collected after the publication of results, is obtained by the candidate completing a google form, the link to which is emailed prior to results day and will be found on the Judd School Website under the exams section.

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, The Judd School 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. Cambridge International does not provide access to scripts to support a review of marking for iGCSE qualifications
- 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

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, The Judd School 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 the internal appeals form (see appendix 1) at least 10 calendar days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a review of results.

Appeals

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, an internal appeal may be made directly to 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:

- [The Judd School NEA, Coursework and Review of Results Appeals Form](#) should be completed and submitted to the centre within 10 calendar days from 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 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 reasonable adjustments

This procedure ensures compliance with JCQ regulations (GR 5.3z) which state that centres must have in place for inspection an internal appeals procedure that must be reviewed and annually updated by a member of the senior leadership team. This procedure must cover at least appeals regarding... centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration. The Judd School will

The Judd School will:

- comply with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and reasonable adjustments 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 reasonable adjustments are appropriately supported and resourced

In accordance with the regulations, The Judd School:

- recognises its duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, to submit applications for reasonable adjustments and make reasonable adjustments through the access arrangements process and make reasonable adjustments to the services 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

Special consideration is given to a candidate who is affected by adverse circumstances beyond their control at the time of the assessment. It is applied when the issue or event has had, or is reasonably likely to have had, a material effect on a candidate's ability to take an assessment or demonstrate their normal level of attainment in an assessment.

The Judd School will:

- comply with the requirements as set out in the JCQ publication **A guide to the special consideration process**
- ensure that all staff who manage and administer special consideration applications are aware of the requirements

Where The Judd 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 the affected candidate/candidates.

Centre decisions relating to access arrangements, reasonable adjustments and special consideration

This may include:

- a decision not to award/apply for a specific access arrangement/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 Judd 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 completed and submitted on **The Judd School Internal Appeals Form** (see Appendix 1)..
- The deadline for an appeal relating to access arrangements must be submitted no more than 2 school weeks after the notification of an access arrangement request decision. The Judd School will then investigate the appeal and respond to the appellant. This is to ensure that the JCQ deadline for applications of 21st March 2026 can be met and a body of evidence collated of a student's normal way of working.
- For appeals relating to The Judd School not applying for special consideration, **The Judd School Internal Appeals Form** (see appendix 1) must be received by The Judd School within 3 calendar days of the paper being sat and no later than Wednesday 24th June 2026. The Judd School will respond to the appellant by Monday 29th June 2026 in order to meet the exam board submission deadlines of Wednesday 01st July 2026. Should an appeal be received after Wednesday 24th June 2026 it will be reviewed on a case by case basis in conjunction with the exam boards?

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. A charge of £50 per appeal will be made by The Judd School.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal

If the appeal is upheld The Judd School will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements and submit the necessary applications - for access arrangements by 31st March 2025 and special consideration by Wednesday 2nd July 2025. The £50 will be refunded to the appellant.

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

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

Where The Judd 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 the regulations or followed due process, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted

The Judd School Internal Appeals Form (see appendix 1) should be completed and submitted to the centre within 10 calendar days that the appellant believes the centre took the decision. A charge of £50 per appeal will be made.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 20 calendar days of receiving such an appeal. If the appeal is upheld The Judd School will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements. The £50 will be refunded to the appellant.

Further guidance to inform and implement appeals procedures

JCQ publications

- https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Gen_regs_approved_centres_24-25_FINAL.pdf
- 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/exams-office/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/access-arrangements-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/gce-qualification-level-conditions-and-requirements>