



Compass Learning Centre

Exams Internal Appeals Procedures 2021-22

Statutory Policy: NO	Governor Action: NO			
Governors' Committee Responsible:	Teaching & Learning Committee			
Link Governor:	Chair of Committee			
Link SLT:	School Business Leader			
Person Responsible:	Exams Officer			
Date Reviewed:	November 2021			
Next Review Date:	October 2022			
Key Link Policies / Documents: <i>This list is not exhaustive and further policies / documents may also need to be consulted in addition to these dependent on circumstances</i>	Exams Access Arrangements Policy Exams Data Protection Policy Exams Emergency Evacuation Policy Exams Lockdown Policy Exams Non Examination Assessment Policy Exams Policy Exams Special Consideration Policy Exams Word Processor Policy Exams Candidate Handbook Exams Complaints & Appeals Procedure Exams Contingency Plan			
Policy Suite:				
HR	Curriculum	Student Behaviour & Welfare	Finance	Premises & Health & Safety
	✓			

Our aim is to help all our learners unlock their potential in life and work

Signed: *Alison Glazier* Headteacher Date: 18/11/2021

Signed: *[Signature]* Link Governor Date: 25/11/2021

Equality Impact Assessment – initial screening record

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What area of work is being considered? Upon whom will this impact? 	Exams Internal Appeals Procedures																																				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would the work impact upon groups, are they included and considered? <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>The Equality Strands</th> <th>Negative Impact</th> <th>Positive Impact</th> <th>No impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Minority ethnic groups</td> <td></td> <td>√</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gender</td> <td></td> <td>√</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disability</td> <td></td> <td>√</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Religion, Faith or Belief</td> <td></td> <td>√</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sexual Orientation</td> <td></td> <td>√</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transgender</td> <td></td> <td>√</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Age</td> <td></td> <td>√</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rurality</td> <td></td> <td>√</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		The Equality Strands	Negative Impact	Positive Impact	No impact	Minority ethnic groups		√		Gender		√		Disability		√		Religion, Faith or Belief		√		Sexual Orientation		√		Transgender		√		Age		√		Rurality		√	
The Equality Strands	Negative Impact	Positive Impact	No impact																																		
Minority ethnic groups		√																																			
Gender		√																																			
Disability		√																																			
Religion, Faith or Belief		√																																			
Sexual Orientation		√																																			
Transgender		√																																			
Age		√																																			
Rurality		√																																			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does data inform this work, research and/or consultation. And has it been broken down by the equality strands? <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>The Equality Strands</th> <th>No</th> <th>Yes</th> <th>Uncertain</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Minority ethnic groups</td> <td>√</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gender</td> <td>√</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disability</td> <td>√</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Religion, Faith or Belief</td> <td>√</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sexual Orientation</td> <td>√</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transgender</td> <td>√</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Age</td> <td>√</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rurality</td> <td>√</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		The Equality Strands	No	Yes	Uncertain	Minority ethnic groups	√			Gender	√			Disability	√			Religion, Faith or Belief	√			Sexual Orientation	√			Transgender	√			Age	√			Rurality	√		
The Equality Strands	No	Yes	Uncertain																																		
Minority ethnic groups	√																																				
Gender	√																																				
Disability	√																																				
Religion, Faith or Belief	√																																				
Sexual Orientation	√																																				
Transgender	√																																				
Age	√																																				
Rurality	√																																				
<p>Does the initial screening highlight potential issues that may be illegal? No Further comments:- Aware of and awaiting guidance on new GDPR</p>																																					
<p>Do you consider that a full Equality Impact Assessment is required? NO</p>																																					
<p>Initial screening carried out by Personnel Administrator Signed: <i>Herry Taylor</i> Dated</p>																																					
<p>Comment by Headteacher No changes to this policy at this time awaiting DCC guidance for GDPR Signed: <i>Alison Glazier</i> Dated Headteacher</p>																																					

Internal Appeals Procedures

2021/22

These procedures are reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Date of next review	OCT2022

Key staff involved in internal appeals procedures

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Alison Glazier
Senior leader(s)	Alison Glazier, Mark Fisher, Rebecca Hubbard, Kerry Taylor, Paul Knight
Exams officer	Helen Lancaster

Contents

Key staff involved in internal appeals procedures.....	3
1. Appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)	5
2. Appeals against the centre’s decision not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal	8
Further guidance to inform and implement appeals procedures	12

1. Appeals against 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 The Compass Learning Centre and internally standardised. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) which contribute to the final grade of the qualification are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderation.

This procedure confirms The Compass Learning Centre compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.7) that the centre will:

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

Deadlines for the submission of marks

Date	Qualification	Details	Exam series
1 st May	GCSE	Any subject	Summer-2022
1 st May	FS	If applicable	
2 weeks before each module submitted	BTEC	Modules on going	

The Compass Learning Centre 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 Compass Centre 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 [(insert as applicable for your centre) for GCE, GCSE, Project qualifications (include any other qualifications delivered in your centre to which these procedures apply) **Note** that the JCQ publication **General Regulations for Approved Centres** states *that centres **must** have a written internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions in **all** qualifications. Details of this procedure **must** be communicated, made widely available and accessible to all candidates.*], 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. Compass Centre 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 marking standards 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.

The Compass Learning Centre 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 meeting the published assessment criteria
3. inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (generally as a minimum, a copy their 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 art work and recordings, inform the candidate that these will be shared under supervised conditions) within 5 days
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 2 days of receiving copies of the requested– by completing the **internal appeals form**
8. allow 3 days for the review to be carried out, to make any necessary changes to marks and to inform the candidate of the outcome, all before the awarding body's deadline for the submission of marks
9. ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate and has no personal interest in the review
10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
11. inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking

The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre who will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review.

The moderation process carried out by the awarding 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.

The 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](#)

2. Appeals against the centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

This procedure confirms The Compass Learning Centre's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.13) that the centre will:

- have available for inspection purposes and draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers, a written internal appeals procedure to manage disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

Candidates are also made aware of the arrangements for post-results services and the availability of senior members of centre staff immediately after the publication of results, **before** they sit any exams by teachers in Tutor Time and letters home

If the centre or a candidate (or his/her parent/carer) has a concern and believes a result may not be accurate, post-results services may be considered.

The JCQ post-results services currently available are detailed below.

Reviews of Results (RoRs):

- Service 1 (Clerical re-check)
This is the only service that can be requested for objective tests (multiple choice tests)
- Service 2 (Review of marking)
- Priority Service 2 (Review of marking)
This service is 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 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 contributed to the final result, the centre will:

1. Where a place a 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 his/her 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
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 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 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
- 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]

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 centre will:

- For a review of marking (RoR priority service 2), advise the candidate he/she 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 his/her 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
- 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]

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.

The **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted to the centre within 3 days of the notification of the outcome of the RoR. Subject to the head of centre's decision, this will allow the centre to process the preliminary appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required **30 calendar days** of the awarding body issuing the outcome of the review of results process. Awarding body fees which may be charged for the preliminary appeal must be paid to the centre by the appellant before the preliminary appeal is submitted to the awarding body (fees are available from the exams 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.]

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 the centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

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 procedures

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
<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>

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>