Internal Appeals Procedure (Internal assessment decisions) 2025/2026

Queen Elizabeth II High School

Changed: Under heading Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpracticeInternal Appeals Procedure (Internal assessment decisions) 2025/2026

Centre name	Queen Elizabeth II High School
Centre number	45011
Date procedure first created	02/10/2025
Current procedure approved by	Mr Steven Slack
Current procedure reviewed by	Mrs Paula Venezia
Date of review	02/10/2025
Date of next review	02/10/2026

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	**Name**
Head of centre	Mrs Charlotte Clarke
Senior leader(s)	Mr Jason Coole (Deputy Head), Mrs Julie Ozer (Business Manager), Mrs Joanne Steriopulos (Assistant Head) Mr John Kinley (Assistant Head) Mr Steven Slack (Assistant Head)
Exams officer	Mrs Paula Venezia
Other staff (if applicable)	

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that appeals against internal assessment decisions (centre-assessed marks) at Queen Elizabeth II High School are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations in the following JCQ documents: **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (5.3, 5.7), **Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments** (4.6, 6.1, 9) and **Instructions for conducting coursework** (6, 7, 13.5). This procedure is also informed by the JCQ documents **Review of marking (centre assessed marks) suggested template for centres**, **Notice to Centres - Informing candidates of their centre assessed marks** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (3.3, 4.5, Form JCQ/M1).

Introduction

Certain qualifications contain components/units of non-examination assessment, controlled assessment, and/or coursework which are internally assessed (marked) by centres and internally reviewed/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 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 the 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.

The qualifications delivered at Queen Elizabeth II High School, containing internally assessed components or units are:

GCSE

Food Technology (unit 2),

Product Design(unit 2),

Art (unit 1),

Graphics (Unit 1),

Textiles (Unit 1),

English Language (component 3),

PE (unit 2), Drama (unit 1) and,

Music (unit 1 and unit 2),

Levels 1 & 2

Workskills (all units),

Jamie Oliver Home Cooking Skills (all units),

Entry Level Maths (all units),

Science/ Further Science (all units)

GCE

Art (component 1)

English Language(NEA Language in Action),

English Literature(independent critical study),

Computer Science (NEA the computing practical project),

Extended
Project Qualification (All),

Design & Technology (unit 2 and unit 4),

Biology (PAGS),

Chemistry (PAGS),

Physics (PAGS),

SQA qualifications

PC Passport,

Digital Media,

National 5 Practical
woodwork (unit

Asdan

CoPE

(all units for moderation)

AoPe (all units for moderation)

BTEC

National Diploma/Certificate in

Sport,

Performing Arts (Drama &
Dance),

Enterprise &
Entrepreneurship,

Tech awards in Dance (all various units)

Functional Skills

Level 1 & 2 English (Speaking unit)

Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm the arrangements at Queen Elizabeth II High School for dealing with appeals relating to internal assessment decisions.

This procedure ensures compliance with JCQ regulations, which state that centres must:

- have in place for inspection, that must be reviewed and updated annually, 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

Principles relating to centre-assessed marks

The Head of Centre/Senior Leader(s) at Queen Elizabeth II High School will ensure that the following principles are in place in relation to marking the work of candidates:

- A commitment to ensuring that whenever teaching staff mark candidates' work, that this is done fairly, consistently, and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents
- All centre staff follow a robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments, including controlled assessments and coursework, which details the procedures relating to relevant qualifications delivered in the centre, including the marking and quality assurance/internal standardisation processes that 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 and 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)
- A commitment 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 consistency of marking)
- On being informed of their centre-assessed marks, if a candidate believes that the above procedures were not followed in relation to the marking of their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the 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

Additional centre-specific principles:

On being informed of their centre-assessed mark(s),
in person and/or via the centres' Intouch messaging service (ARBOR) if candidates believe that the above procedures are not followed in relation to the marking of their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the marking standards to their marking, then they may make use of the internal appeals procedure, as below, to consider whether to request a review of the centres' marking.

Procedure for appealing internal assessment decisions (centre-assessed marks)

The Head of Centre/Senior Leader(s) at Queen Elizabeth II High 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
- 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 assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment
- Having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate (this will

either be the originals viewed under supervised conditions or copies) within the period of time as specified (see **Deadlines** below)

- Inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised
- 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 what they believe the issue to be
- Provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking and confirm understanding that requests must be made in writing and will not be accepted after this deadline (see **Deadlines** below)
- Require candidates to make requests for a review of centre marking by completing an internal appeals form within 5 working days of receiving their marks
- 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 (see **Deadlines** below)
- 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
- Ensure the outcome of the review of the centre's marking is 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
- Ensure a written record of the review is kept and made available to the awarding body upon request
- Ensure the awarding body is informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review

Additional centre-specific procedure:

Not applicable.

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

The JCQ **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre 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).

The centre 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 the candidate's 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/authentication statement (where required), and malpractice is suspected, Queen Elizabeth II High School 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 within 5 working days.

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 via an internal appeals form and should be completed and submitted within 5 working days of the decision being made known to the candidate.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal:

- within 5 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre

Deadlines and timescales

- Upon request, copies of materials will be made available to the candidate within 5 working days.
- The deadline to request a review of marking must be made within 10 working days of the candidate receiving copies of the requested material.
- The process for completing the review, making any changes to marks, and informing the candidate of the outcome will be completed in 5 working days, all before the awarding body's deadline for the submission of marks

Changes 2025/2026

(Changed/Added) Under heading **Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice** wording changed in bullet points and new bullet points added.

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in October 2025, no center-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.