



The PGS Internal Appeals Policy and Procedure (SS)

Contents

1. Purpose of the procedure	3
2. General Principles	3
3. Appeals procedure against internally assessed marks	4
4. Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice	6
5. Appeals procedure against centre decisions not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal.....	7
6. Appeals procedure following the outcome of a review of results.....	7
7. Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration	8
8. Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues	9
9. Associated documents*	10
10. Allocation of Tasks and Version Control	11

1. Purpose of the procedure

- 1.1. This procedure confirms compliance by The Portsmouth Grammar School (**the School**) with JCQ's [General Regulations for Approved Centres 2025-26](#) (section 5.3z,5.8) that the centre will have in place for inspection, which must be reviewed annually by a member of the senior management team and communicated within the centre, an internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, appeals against decisions to reject work on the grounds of malpractice, access to post-results services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration.

The centre will draw the attention of candidates and their parents/carers to their internal appeals procedure.

Links to documents cited or referenced in this Policy can be found in section 9 below (Associated Documents).

- 1.2. The following policy clarifies the process by which a pupil or parent:

- 1.2.1 Makes an appeal against the marks or procedures used in marking internally assessed work (section 3 below)
- 1.2.2 Makes an appeal against the Centre's decision to reject work on the grounds of malpractice (section 4 below)
- 1.2.3 Makes an appeal against the Centre's decision not to support a review of marking or a review of moderation (section 5 below)
- 1.2.4 Makes an appeal following the outcome of a review of results (section 6 below)

- 1.3. It also covers appeals relating to:

- 1.3.1 Centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration (section 7 below)
- 1.3.2 Centre decisions relating to other administrative issues (section 8 below)

2. General Principles

- 2.1. Certain qualifications contain components/units of non-examination assessment (or units of coursework) which are internally assessed (marked) by the School and internally standardised. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) which contribute to the final grade of the qualification are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderation.
- 2.2. In accordance with the Code of Practice for the conduct of external qualifications produced by the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ), the School is committed to ensuring that:

- 2.2.1 Internal assessments are conducted by staff who have the appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill who have been trained in this activity and do not have any potential conflict of interest. If AI tools have been used to assist in the marking of candidates' work they will not be the sole marker
- 2.2.2 Assessment evidence provided by candidates has been produced and authenticated according to the requirements of the relevant Specifications for each subject
- 2.2.3 The consistency of internal assessment is assured through internal standardisation as set out by the Awarding Bodies
- 2.2.4 Staff responsible for internal standardisation and/or assessment attend any compulsory training sessions
- 2.2.5 Pupils in Years 10 to 13 receive a copy of this document in the first term of the academic year and when they are given their examination timetables
- 2.2.6 The School follows the latest guidance provided by JCQ in submitting enquiries about results and following the correct appeals procedures.

3. Appeals procedure against internally assessed marks

- 3.1. JCQ requires that all schools have an appeals procedure for all work that is internally assessed as part of an external qualification which is governed by JCQ. It is expected that an appeal will be the last resort and should only be submitted once all other avenues have been explored. The School advises that any concerns about procedures around internal assessments should be communicated to the relevant Head of Department or, if more appropriate, the Deputy Head (Academic & Staff Welfare) as soon as possible so that any concerns or issues can be resolved. Thus, an appeal will be used only in exceptional circumstances. The procedure below follows JCQ guidance to centres:
 - 3.1.1 The School will ensure that pupils are informed of their centre assessed marks at least two calendar weeks prior to the deadline for submission to the awarding body so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted
 - 3.1.2 The School will inform pupils 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
 - 3.1.3 Pupils 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. Pupils should be aware that they will not be allowed access to original assessment material unless supervised.
 - 3.1.4 The School will provide pupils with sufficient time to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision. Accordingly, the timeframes below must be followed:
 - (a) Pupils should make requests for copies of materials within two working days of receiving their marks if they are considering an appeal

- (b) The School will, having received a request for copies of materials, make them available to the pupil within three working days of receiving the request. This will either be the originals viewed under supervised conditions or copies.
- 3.1.5 The School will 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. Accordingly, the timeframe below must be followed:
 - (a) Requests for reviews of marking **must** be made in writing to the Deputy Head (Academic & Staff Welfare) as soon as possible and within three working days of receiving copies of the requested materials or within five working days of receiving marks, whichever is sooner
 - (b) The written appeal should state the details of the request for a review and the reasons for it.
- 3.1.6 The School will 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 pupil for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review.
- 3.1.7 The School will instruct the reviewer to ensure that the pupil's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
- 3.1.8 The outcome of the review may be that the pupil's mark stays the same, increases or is lowered
- 3.1.9 The pupil will be informed in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking
- 3.1.10 The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the Head of Centre and will be logged as a complaint under the School's Complaints policy. The Head of Centre will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body. A written record will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request. Should the review of the centre's marking bring any irregularity in procedures to light, the awarding body will be informed immediately.
- 3.2. After candidates' work has been internally assessed, it is moderated by the awarding body to ensure consistency in marking between centres. The moderation process may lead to mark changes. This process is outside the control of the School and is not covered by this policy.

4. Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice

- 4.1. The **JCQ Information for Candidates** documents (Coursework, Non-examination assessments, Social media), 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.
- 4.2. The **JCQ Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** 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).
- 4.3. **The 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.
- 4.4. The Portsmouth Grammar School ensures that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing work for 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.
- 4.5. Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication does 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.
- 4.6. 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, The Portsmouth Grammar School will:
 - 4.6.1 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
 - 4.6.2 If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:
 - (a) the candidate should set out and submit as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal;
 - (b) the candidate should complete and submit an internal appeals form within 5 working days of the decision being made known to the appellant;
 - (c) the appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 10 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the School.

5. Appeals procedure against centre decisions not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal.

- 5.1. Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. Full details of these services, internal deadlines for requesting a service and fees charged are provided by the exams officer. Any fees charged must be paid by the candidate.
- 5.2. 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** the issue of results
- 5.3. The JCQ post-results services currently available are detailed below:

5.3.1 **Reviews of Results (RoRs):**

- (a) Service 1 (Clerical re-check) This is the only service that can be requested for objective tests (multiple choice tests)
- (b) 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
- (c) Service 3 (Review of moderation) This service is not available to an individual candidate

5.3.2 **Access to Scripts (ATS):**

- (a) Copies of scripts to support reviews of marking
 - (b) Copies of scripts to support teaching and learning
- 5.4. Reviews of results (RoRs) may be requested by centre staff with permission from candidates or by the candidates themselves. RoR service 3 – re-moderation of coursework - is not available to individual candidates. If a query is raised about a particular examination result, the Head of Examinations, Head of Department and Head of Centre will investigate the feasibility of requesting a review, which will be at the candidate's expense. A review request should only be submitted if this is supported by the Head of Department concerned.

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.

6. Appeals procedure following the outcome of a review of results

- 6.1. Where the Head of Centre remains dissatisfied after receiving the outcome of a RoR, an appeal will be made to the awarding body, following the guidance in the JCQ publications **Post-results services** and **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**.

- 6.2. Where the Head of Centre is satisfied after receiving the outcome of a RoR, but the internal candidate and/or their parent/carer is not satisfied, they may make a further representation to the Head of Centre. Following this, the Head of Centre's decision as to whether to proceed with an appeal will be based upon the centre's internal appeals arrangements. Candidates or parents/carers are not permitted by the awarding bodies to make direct representations to an awarding body.
- 6.3. An appeal must be made in writing and submitted to the centre within 10 calendar days of the notification of the outcome of the review. Subject to the Head of Centre's decision, this will allow the centre to process the appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required 30 calendar days. Awarding body fees which may be charged for the appeal must be paid by the candidate on submission of the written request. 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.

7. Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

- 7.1. This procedure confirms the School's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3z) that the centre will have in place for inspection a written internal appeals procedure which must cover appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration.
- 7.2. The School will:
 - 7.2.1 comply with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and special consideration as set out in the JCQ publications **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** and **A guide to the special consideration process**
 - 7.2.2 ensure that all staff who manage and implement access arrangements and special consideration are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced
- 7.3. Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments
 - 7.3.1 In accordance with the regulations, the School:
 - (a) recognises its duty to process access arrangements and submit applications for reasonable adjustments for disadvantaged candidates.
 - (b) complies with its responsibilities in identifying, determining and implementing appropriate access arrangements and reasonable adjustments.
 - 7.3.2 Failure to comply with the regulations has the potential to constitute malpractice which may impact on a candidate's result(s).
 - 7.3.3 Examples of failure to comply include:
 - (a) putting in place access arrangements/adjustments that are not approved
 - (b) failing to consider putting in place access arrangements (which may be a failure to comply with the duty to make reasonable adjustments)

- (c) permitting access arrangements/adjustments within the centre which are not supported by appropriate evidence
- (d) charging a fee for providing reasonable adjustments to disabled candidates AARA (Importance of these regulations).

7.4. **Special consideration**

Where the School can provide signed evidence to support an application, (JCQ publication - **A guide to the special consideration process – sections 1,2,6**) 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.

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

- 7.5.1 This may include the School's decision not to make/apply for a specific reasonable adjustment or to apply for special consideration, in circumstances where a candidate does not meet the criteria for, or there is no evidence/insufficient evidence to support the implementation of an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment or the application of special consideration.
- 7.5.2 Where the School decides 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 5 working days of the candidate being informed of the decision.
- 7.5.3 To determine the outcome of the appeal, the Head of Centre will consult the respective JCQ publication to check the centre has complied with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and/or special consideration and followed due procedures.
- 7.5.4 The appellant will be informed in writing of the outcome of the appeal once the investigation has been completed.
- 7.5.5 If the appeal is upheld, the School will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements/submit the necessary application.

8. **Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues**

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

8.2. Where the School may make a decision that affects a candidate or candidates:

- 8.2.1 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 within 5 working days of the candidate being made aware of the decision
- 8.2.2 The appellant will be informed in writing of the outcome of the appeal once the investigation has been completed.

9. Associated documents*

- 9.1. [The PGS Curriculum Policy](#)
- 9.2. The PGS More Able, Gifted and Talented Policy (available on request)
- 9.3. [JCQ Post-results services](#)
- 9.4. [JCQ Guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes](#)
- 9.5. [JCQ Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments](#)
- 9.6. [JCQ Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments](#)
- 9.7. [JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres 2025-26](#)
- 9.8. [JCQ A Guide to the Special Consideration Process](#)
- 9.9. [JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures](#)

(* JCQ hyperlinks provided above are correct at the time of publication of this Policy but the [JCQ website](#) should be used to check for/access any later versions (if relevant)

10. Allocation of Tasks and Version Control

Allocation of Tasks

Task	Allocated to	When / frequency of review
Keeping the policy up to date and compliant with the law and best practice	Deputy Head (Academic & Staff Welfare)	As required, and at least annually
Monitoring the implementation of the policy, relevant risk assessments and any action taken in response and evaluating effectiveness	Deputy Head (Academic & Staff Welfare)	As required, and at least termly
Maintaining up to date records of all information created in relation to the policy and its implementation as required by the GDPR	Heads of Department	As required, and at least termly
Receiving / reviewing input from interested groups (such as pupils, staff, parents) to consider improvements to the School's processes under the policy	Deputy Head (Academic & Staff Welfare)	As required, and at least annually
Formal annual review	Deputy Head (Academic & Staff Welfare)	Annually

Version Control

Date Approved	6 th October 2025 (SMT)
Date Reviewed	1 st October 2025 (ARM)
Next Review Date	Autumn Term 2026
Policy author (SMT)	Deputy Head (Academic & Staff Welfare)
Status	JCQ Requirement
Report	Academic and Educational Report

Ph4131025