Internal Appeals Procedure

2026/27

This procedure is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations and to reflect centre practice.

Effective from 1 September 2026

Approved/reviewed by	C. Walker
Date of next review	September 2027

Key staff involved in the exams policy/procedure

Role	Name(s)
Governors	
Head of centre	**Gary Kynaston**
Exams officer line manager (Senior Leader)	**Connie Walkers / Tim Bridle**
Exams officer (EO)	**Lucie Hrabankova**
ALS lead/SENCo	**Paulina Wajler**
SLT member(s)	**Chris Wilson, Hodo Isse, Jessica Adolphus, Shaun Flitton**
IT Staff	**Bekim Kastrati, D'mello Anthony**
Site Staff	**Anthony Raftery, Julio Pena Vera, Kamel Meziane**

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms Hammersmith Academy compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (sections 5.3, 5.8) that the centre will:

- have in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre, an internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, access to post-result services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration (with reference to the JCQ document *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*)
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their written internal appeals procedure which will cover appeals regarding internal assessment decisions, access to post-result services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

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 relating to internal assessment decisions (centre-assessed marks)

Certain qualifications contain components/units of non-examination assessment, controlled assessment and/or coursework which are internally assessed (marked) by centres 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.
The qualifications delivered at Hammersmith Academy containing internally assessed components/units are shared with parents and students via email, and are published on the HA website.

This procedure confirms Hammersmith Academy 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

The deadlines are shared with parents and students via email, and are published on the HA website.

Date	Qualification	Details	Exam series
	GCSE		Summer-2027
	GCE	Final date for submission of centre assessed marks (AQA, OCR, Pearson and WJEC)	Summer-2027

Hammersmith Academy 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 associated subject-specific documents.

Hammersmith Academy ensures that all centre staff follow robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework. This policy details the procedures relating to non-examination assessments 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 skills, and who have been trained in this activity and who do not have any potential conflicts of interest. If AI tools have been used to assist in the marking of candidates' work, they will not be the sole marker. Hammersmith Academy is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where more than one subject teacher/tutor is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistent of marking.

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

- ensure that candidates are informed of their centre assessed marks so that they can request a review of the centre's marking before final marks are submitted to the awarding body

- inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of work submitted

- inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (as a minimum, a copy of the marked assessment material (work) and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject) to them decide whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment

- having received a request for materials, promptly make them available to the candidate within (10 working days). This will either be the originals, viewed under supervised conditions or copies.

- inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised

- provide candidates with sufficient, normally at least five working days, to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision

- 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 (10 working days) of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the **internal appeals form** and candidates must explain on what grounds they wish to request a review.

- allow (21 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 for the submission of marks

- ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review

- instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre

- inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking

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 (AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments), coursework, non-examination assessments and social media) which are distributed to all candidates prior to relevant assessments taking place (and prior to a candidate signing the declaration of authentication which relates to their work), inform candidates of the things they must and must not do when they are completing their work.

Hammersmith Academy 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. Instead, they must 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 relevant awarding body.

If there are doubts about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or irregularities are identified in a candidate's work before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication/authentication statement (where required) and malpractice is suspected, Hammersmith Academy will:

- follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document (*Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments*/*Instructions for conducting coursework*) and any supplementary guidance that may be provided by the awarding body. Where this may lead to the decision to **not** accept the candidate's work for assessment or to reject a candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice, the affected candidate will be informed of the decision.

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:

- a written request, setting out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal, should be submitted
- an **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted

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

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

This procedure confirms Hammersmith Academy 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 an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available.

Candidates are also 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/accessible immediately after the document of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking. Candidates are made aware/informed by

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 available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE A-level specifications (an individual awarding body may also offer this priority service for other qualifications. For NCFE this service only applies to T-levels.
- Service 3 (Review of moderation)
- This service is not available upon the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample

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 at 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)
2. In all other instances, consider accessing the script by:
    a) 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 their 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 document 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]
- If the candidate (or his/her 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) at least (10 working days) prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.
- The appellant will be informed of the outcome of his/her appeal

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 documents **Post-Results Services** and **A guide to the awarding organisations' 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 their 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 document *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*. 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 (10 working 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 working 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 special consideration

This procedure confirms Hammersmith Academy compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3z) that the centre will:
have in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre, an internal appeals procedure which must cover at least appeals regarding... centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration

Hammersmith Academy will:

- comply with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and special consideration as set out in the JCQ documents **Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments** and **A guide to the special consideration process**
- ensure that all staff who manage and implement access arrangements and special consideration are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced

Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

In accordance with the regulations, Hammersmith Academy

- recognises its duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, submit applications for reasonable adjustments through the access arrangements process and to make reasonable adjustments to the services the centre provides to disabled candidates.
- complies with its responsibilities in identifying, determining and implementing appropriate access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

Failure to comply with the regulations have the potential to constitute malpractice which may impact on a candidate's result(s).
Examples of failure to comply include:

- putting in place access arrangements/adjustments that are not approved
- failing to consider putting in place access arrangements (which may be a failure to comply with the duty to make reasonable adjustments)
- permitting access arrangements/adjustments within the centre which are not supported by appropriate evidence
- charging a fee for providing reasonable adjustments to disabled candidates

Special consideration

Where Hammersmith Academy has appropriate evidence authorised by a member of the senior leadership team to support an application, it will apply for special consideration at the time of the assessment for a candidate who has temporarily experienced illness, injury or some other event outside of 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 his or her normal level of attainment in an assessment.

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

This may include Hammersmith Academy not to make/apply for a specific reasonable adjustment or to apply for special consideration, in circumstances where a candidate does not meet the criteria for, or there is no evidence/insufficient evidence to support the implementation of an access arrangement/reasonable adjustment or the application of special consideration.

Where Hammersmith Academy makes a decision in relation to the access arrangement(s), reasonable adjustment(s) or special consideration that apply for a candidate or candidates:

- If a candidate who is the subject of the relevant decision (or the candidate's parent/carer) disagrees with the decision made and reasonably believes that the centre has not complied with its responsibilities or followed due procedures, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted

To determine the outcome of the appeal, the head of centre will consult the respective JCQ document to confirm the centre has complied with the principles and regulations governing access arrangements and/or special consideration and followed due procedures.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal [within 21 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre].

Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

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

Where Hammersmith Academy 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 with the regulations or followed due process, a written request setting out the grounds for appeal should be submitted
- An **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted (within 10 working days of the decision being made known to the appellant).

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 21 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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

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

Hammersmith Academy ensures that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing work for assessments are aware of the potential for malpractice. 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. The only exception to this is where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has potentially been breached. The breach will be reported to the awarding body immediately.
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, Hammersmith Academy will:

- Follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document (*Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments*/*Instructions for conducting coursework*) and any supplementary guidance that may be provided by the awarding body. Where this may lead to the decision to **not** accept the candidate's work for assessment or to reject a candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice, the affected candidate will be informed of the decision.

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:

- A written request, setting out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal, should be submitted
- An **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted 10 working days of the decision being made know to the appellant

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 10 working/working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

Hammersmith Academy Internal Appeals Form

Please tick box to indicate the nature of your appeal and complete all white boxes* on the form

- ☐ 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
- ☐ Appeal against the centre's decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration
- ☐ Appeal against the centre's decision relating to an administrative issue

Name of appellant		**Candidate name** *if different to complainant/appellant*	
Awarding Body		**Subject**	
Exam Paper Code		**Exam Paper Title**	
Please state the grounds for your appeal below *d*			
Appeal against internally assessed marks **Appellant declaration** By signing here, I am confirming I understand the purpose of the appeal will be to decide whether the process used for the internal assessment conformed to the published requirements of the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents. I also understand the appeal may only be made against the assessment process not against the mark to be submitted by the centre for moderation by the awarding body. **Signature:** **Date of signature:**			
Appeal against the centre decision not to support an enquiry about results **Appellant declaration** By signing here, I am confirming I feel there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision. **Signature:** **Date of signature:**			
Appeal against the outcome of an enquiry about results **Appellant declaration** By signing here, I am confirming I understand that the grounds for my appeal must relate to the awarding body's procedures or the application of the post-result service procedures. I also understand that appeals do not generally involve further reviews of marking candidates' work. I also confirm that I will pay in advance any fees which may be charged by the awarding body for the appeal. I understand this fee will be refunded if the appeal is upheld. **Signature:** **Date of signature:**			

The appellant declaration against the relevant appeal must be signed, dated and returned to the EO, on behalf of the head of centre, to the timescale indicated in the internal appeals procedure.

For centre use only	
Date received	**Received by**

Appeals log

The outcome of any review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre. A written record of the review will be kept and logged as an appeal, so information can be easily made available to an awarding body upon request. The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review – this will be noted on this log.

Ref No.	Date received	Appellant name	Outcome	Outcome date

Further guidance to inform and implement appeals

JCQ documents

- *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 - Reviews of marking (centre assessed marks)*
  - https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework
  - https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/non-examination-assessments
- *Notice to Centres – informing candidates of their centre assessed marks*
  https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/non-examination-assessments

Ofqual documents

- *GCSE (9 to 1) qualification-level conditions and requirements*
  https://www.gov.uk/government/documents/gcse-9-to-1-qualification-level-conditions

- *GCSE (A* to G) qualification-level conditions and requirements*
    - https://www.gov.uk/government/documents/gcse-a-to-g-qualification-level-conditions-and-requirements
- *GCE qualification-level conditions and requirements*
  https://www.gov.uk/government/documents/gce-qualification-level-conditions-and-requirements
- *Pre-reform GCE qualification-level conditions and requirements*
  https://www.gov.uk/government/documents/gce-qualification-level-conditions-for-pre-reform-qualifications