



LIONHEART
EDUCATIONAL
TRUST

EXAMS INTERNAL APPEALS POLICY

**This policy applies to all secondary schools within
the Lionheart Educational Trust**

Approved by the Trust

September 2025 – September 2026



Contents

1. Introduction and aims.....	3
2. Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)	3
3. Appeals process (internal assessment decisions)	4
4. Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate’s work on the grounds of malpractice.....	5
5. Appeals against the centre’s decision not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal	6
6. Appeals process (centre decision not to support an awarding body appeal from a candidate)	8
7. Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements	8
7.1 Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments	8
7.2 Special consideration	9
7.3 Centre decisions relating to access arrangements, reasonable adjustments and special consideration	9
8. Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues.....	9
9. Staff with responsibility for exam procedures.....	11
Appendix 1 - Internal Appeals Form	15
Appendix 2 - Appeals log.....	16



1. Introduction and aims

The examinations process will use internal and external assessments to evaluate candidate performance; this may involve centre based marking and external examiner marking processes for some qualifications.

The purpose of these procedures is to outline how candidates can appeal against internal assessment decisions and a centre's decision not to support an external review.

The aim of these procedures are to:

- Ensure Lionheart exam centres complies with requirements and guidance set out by the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) and awarding bodies in regards to having in place a written internal appeals procedure reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre, relating to internal assessment decisions
- Outline the requirement to inform candidates of their centre assessed marks before these are submitted to the awarding body (as a candidate is allowed to request an internal review of the centre's marking)
- Outline the centre's appeal process in regards to disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

These procedures will be communicated to all relevant centre staff and students.

2. Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)

Certain components of GCSE, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, BTEC and GCE non-examination assessments (or units of coursework) that are internally assessed (marked) by the centre, and internally standardised, contribute to the final grade of the qualification. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) are then submitted (by the deadline set) to 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 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.

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

This procedure confirms our compliance with JCQs General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.7) that we 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

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. We are 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 take place to ensure consistency of marking.

On being informed of their centre assessed mark(s), if candidates 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 their marking, then they may make use of the internal appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking,

3. Appeals process (internal assessment decisions)

The following steps will be taken by centre staff:

- 1) Inform candidates 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) 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.
- 4) Upon receipt of a request for copies of materials, the centre will promptly make them available to the candidate within **7 calendar days**.
- 5) Inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised.
- 6) Sufficient time will be provided to candidates in order to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision, and should candidates wish to request a review must explain on what grounds they wish to request a review.
- 7) A clear ROR deadline will be provided 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 **7 calendar days** of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the internal appeals request form.
- 8) There will be **7 calendar days** allowed 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.
- 9) We 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 candidate and has no personal interest in the review.



- 10) The reviewer will be instructed to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.
- 11) We will inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking.
- 12) 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, and should the centre not accept the outcome of the review then the awarding body would be made aware.

Important Note:

- 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'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**.

4. 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), and our Trust student exam booklet, 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 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/authentication statement (where required) and malpractice is suspected the member of staff will raise concerns with the head of centre for appropriate action to be taken in line with the 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 the candidate disagrees with the decision then 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 and an internal appeals form should be completed and submitted within 7 calendar days of the decision being made known to the appellant.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 7 calendar days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

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

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. The Exams Officer within the centre will facilitate access to these services and communicate with candidates how to access the services and appropriate deadlines for making requests.

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 publication of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking. If the centre or a candidate (or their parent/carer) has a concern and believes a result may not be accurate, post results services may be considered.

Reviews of Results (RORs) offers three services:

- Service 1 – clerical re-check (this is the only service available 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. It is also available for Level 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications. (For NCFE this service only applies to T-levels)
- 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



Written candidate consent (informed consent via candidate email is acceptable) is required in all cases before a request for an ROR service 1 or 2 is submitted to the awarding body as with these services candidates' marks and subject grades may be lowered. Candidate consent can only be collected after the publication of results.

If a concern is raised about a particular examination result, the Exams Officer will work with teaching staff, heads of department and the Head of Centre to 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 centres will

- Where a place at university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 Review of marking

In all other instances consider accessing the script by: (Written consent/permissions from the candidate must be obtained)

- (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
- (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

Where the centre does not uphold a request from a candidate, the candidate may pay the appropriate ROR fee to the centre, and a request will be made to the awarding body on the candidate's behalf.

If the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support an enquiry, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre by completing the internal appeals form at least **7 calendar days** prior to the internal deadline for submitting an ROR.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of their appeal before the internal deadline for submitting an ROR.

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 will be consulted to determine the acceptable grounds for any 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 Appeals Booklet. Candidates or parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body.

For **moderated** components that contributed to the final grade centres 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 any moderator 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 Review of Results 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 all candidates in the original sample

6. Appeals process (centre decision not to support an awarding body appeal from a candidate)

The following steps will be taken:

- 1) The internal appeals form should be completed and submitted to the centre within **7 calendar 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 receiving the outcome of the enquiry about results process.

- 2) 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 upon request 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.

- 3) We will inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the appeal once received from the awarding body.

7. Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to access arrangements

The following steps will be taken:

- 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**
- ensure that all staff who manage and implement access arrangements and special consideration are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced

7.1 Access arrangements and reasonable adjustments

In accordance with the regulations, we:

- recognises our duty to explore and provide access to suitable courses, submit applications for reasonable adjustments through the access arrangements process and make reasonable adjustments to the service the centre provides to disabled candidates.
- complies with our 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 AARA (Importance of these regulations)

7.2 Special consideration

Where we hold signed evidence authorised by a member of the senior leadership team to support an application, we 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.

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

This may include Lionheart exam centres 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.

Where a decision is made 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

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

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.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 3 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

If the appeal is upheld, SENCo will proceed to implement the necessary arrangements/submit the necessary application.

8. Appeals regarding centre decisions relating to other administrative issues

Circumstances may arise that cause decisions to be made on administrative issues that may affect a candidate's examinations/assessments.



Where Lionheart exam centres 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 5 working days of the decision being made known to the appellant.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 3 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.



9. Staff with responsibility for exam procedures

Beauchamp City Sixth Form

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	Catherine Bartholomew
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Dan Burke
Exam Officer	Aziza Raidhan
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Catherine Bartholomew
SEND Coordinator	Ismahane Messahel
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Kathryn Judge

Beauchamp College

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	Kath Kelly
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Gary Mellor
Exam Officer	Sal Lail
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Jim Ardley
SEND Coordinator	Jim Ardley
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Shelley Bass, Alice King

Castle Rock School

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Roma Dhameja
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Phil Cooling
Exam Officer	Emma Knaggs
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Roma Dhameja
SEND Coordinator	Amy Bowles
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Roma Dhameja

**Cedars Academy**

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Laura Sanchez
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Hayley Pugh
Exam Officer	Susan Panczak
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	James Rolfe
SEND Coordinator	Kath Sedgley
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	James Rolfe, Zak Allard

Humphrey Perkins School

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	John Pye
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Rikki Khakhar
Exam Officer	Allison Poulton
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Matthew Rofe
SEND Coordinator	Karen Bradley
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Della Bartram

Judgemeadow Community College

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Alex Grainge
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Sally Howgate
Exam Officer	Rafia Mastoor
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Sally Howgate
SEND Coordinator	Jasdeep Singh
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Emma Andrews

**Newbridge School**

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	Michael Gamble
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Michael Gamble
Exam Officer	Leila Tillotson-Roberts
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Sophie Maine
SEND Coordinator	Sophie Marlow
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Thomas Barr, Mick Rowbottom, Rebecca Knaggs

Martin High School

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Laura Sanchez
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Timothy Hackett
Exam Officer	Chloe Hollis
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Kevin Seaward
SEND Coordinator	Emma Rudkin
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	

Mercia Academy

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Nick Holmes
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Nick Holmes
Exam Officer	Emily Endacott Jones
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Kelly Lundman
SEND Coordinator	Paul Galloway
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	

**Sir Jonathan North College**

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	James McKenna
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Carl Hartley
Exam Officer	Amrita Ali
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Claire Greaves
SEND Coordinator	Nic Coton
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Steve Reynard

Lionheart Educational Trust

Role	Staff
Chief Operating Officer	Ben Jackson
Director of Data & Exams	Richard Heppell



Appendix 1 - Internal Appeals Form



FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received:	
Reference No.	

Please tick **one** box below to indicate the nature of your appeal and complete all 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 check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal
- Appeal against the centre’s decision relating to Access Arrangements
- Appeal against the centre’s decision relating to other administrative issues

Name of appellant:		Candidate name: <i>(if different to</i>	
Awarding body:		Exam paper code:	
Subject:		Exam paper title:	
<i>Please state the grounds for your appeal below</i>			
Appellant signature:		Date of signature:	

This form must be signed, dated and returned to the Exams Officer on behalf of the Head of Centre within the timescale indicated in the Examinations internal appeals procedures.



Further guidance to inform and implement appeals

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 (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>