



# The BRIT School

## Internal Appeals Policy (Exams)

2025-2026

### KEY STAFF INVOLVED

Role	Name(s)
Head of Centre	Stuart Worden
Senior Leaders	Louise Cooper Katie Findlater
Exams Officer	Charlotte Byrne
SENCo	Lakshmy Rajah

### Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms the BRIT School's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (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
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their internal appeals procedure

This procedure covers appeals relating to:

- Internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)
- Centre decisions not to support an application for 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

## Grounds for complaint

A student, parent or carer may make a complaint on the grounds below (this is not an exhaustive list).

### Teaching/ learning/ Grading

- Quality of teaching and learning, for example:
  - Non-subject specialist teacher without adequate training/subject matter expertise utilised on a long-term basis
  - Teacher lacking knowledge of new specification/incorrect core content studied/taught

- Core content not adequately covered
- Inadequate feedback for a candidate following assessment(s)
- Working at and expected MLG grading overgenerous/critical in comparison to qualification mark scheme when compared to candidate's work.
- Pre-release/advance material/set task issued by the awarding body not provided on time to an exam candidate.
- An assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not conducted according to the JCQ/awarding body instructions.
- The marking of an internal assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not undertaken according to the requirements of the awarding body. Please refer to the Non-Examination assessment policy.
- Centre fails to adhere to its Non Examination Assessment internal appeals procedure.
- Candidates not informed of their centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body.
- Candidates not informed of their centre assessed marks in sufficient time to request/appeal a review of marking prior to marks being submitted.
- Candidate marks not submitted correctly /accurately/ timely causing an error in grading achieved/ certification.

### **Access arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments**

- Candidate is identified to AEN before the Year 11 AEN deadline for exams access arrangements but is not assessed by the centre's appointed assessor
- Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding their access arrangements requirements
- Candidate did not consent to personal data being shared electronically (by the non-acquisition of a signed Data Protection Notice)
- Candidate not adequately informed of the arrangements in place and the subjects or components of subjects where the arrangements would not apply
- Exam information not appropriately adapted for a disabled candidate to access it with reasonable adjustments or access arrangements, please note if the awarding body has rejected an application for approval this is not something the centre can override the decision on.
- Adapted equipment put in place failed during exam / assessment
- Approved access arrangement(s) not in place at the time of an exam / assessment and special consideration is not then requested as a result.
- Where appropriate arrangements are not in place at the time of an exam/assessment due to a temporary injury or impairment, reasonable notice of 24–48 hours must be given before the exam session to allow the necessary adjustments to be made.

### **Entries**

- Failure to clearly explain a decision of early entry such as November exam seasons for a qualification to candidate/ parent/carer
- Candidate not entered/entered late (incurring a late entry fee to the student) for a required exam/assessment
- Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment
- Candidate entered for a wrong tier of entry

### **Conducting Examinations**

- Failure to adequately brief candidate on exam timetable/exam regulations prior to exam/assessment taking place
- Room in which exam held did not provide candidate with appropriate conditions for taking the exam
- Inadequate invigilation in exam room ratio (1:30 for written exams and 1:20 for practical External assessments and Non exam assessment practicals)
- Failure to conduct exam according to the regulations set by JCQ
- Online system failed during (online) exam/assessment
- Disruption during exam/assessment
- Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated/reported.
- Eligible application for special consideration for a candidate not submitted/not submitted to timescale.

### Results and Post-Results

- Candidates not made aware of the arrangements for post-results services after the publication of results.
- Candidate not having access to a member of department staff/ senior leader after the publication of results to discuss/make a decision on the submission of an enquiry.
- Candidate request for return of work after moderation and work not available/disposed of earlier than allowed in the regulations.
- Candidate unhappy with a centre decision not to support a clerical check, a review of marking, access to script or an appeal.
- Centre applied for the wrong post-results service/for the wrong exam paper.
- Centre missed awarding body deadline to apply for a post-results service.
- Centre applied for a post-results service without gaining candidate consent.

### Procedure for concerns, complaints or appeals

#### Submission stage:

The formal concern / complaint should be made using the internal appeals form at the end. The candidate / parent / guardian must submit the completed form clearly outlining the concern or complaint. The form should be completed in full before being submitted.

#### Stage 1:

The concern will be collated and directed to the appropriate HOD/Manager for the concern identified. Should a formal meeting take place involving the student at this stage it is recommended that the number of staff present be two staff members, to lessen the risk of a student feeling overawed or intimidated. It is also recommended that a nominated member of staff manages the process from start to finish ensuring continuity and fairness. Responses and outcomes should be provided within 20 working days of submission.

#### Stage 2:

If there is not a satisfactory resolution/ clear action taken, the parent/guardian should write to their relevant member of (SLT) senior leadership team or the BRIT school Principal, with a copy of the outcome of the stage 1 appeal and their concerns regarding the outcome. The Principle or nominated member of SLT will investigate the concern or complaint and will communicate with the parent/guardian.

#### Final Stage:

The parent/guardian may appeal to the Chair of Governors on procedural grounds only, within fourteen days of the receipt of the reply from stage 2. The Chair will consider the concern/complaint on procedural grounds only, and, only if s/he deems it necessary, meet with the parent/guardian. The Chair's response is final.

## **Appeal against internal marks / grades for portfolio work / non exam assessments**

### **Appeals relating to internal assessment decisions (centre assessed marks)**

Certain qualifications contain components or units of non-examination assessment, controlled assessment and/or coursework which are internally assessed 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 The BRIT School containing internally assessed components or units are:

- Art & Design Option (Eduqas/WJEC)
- Drama Option (Edexcel)
- English Language (AQA)
- Photography Option (Eduqas/WJEC)
- Textiles Option (AQA)
- Dance (UAL)
- Digital Arts (UAL)
- Film and Media Production (UAL)
- Graphic Design Option (UAL)
- Music (UAL)
- Music Technology (UAL / RSL)
- Musical Theatre (UAL)
- Theatre (UAL)
- Visual Art and Design (UAL)
- Applied Theatre (UAL)
- Digital Arts (UAL)
- Production Arts (UAL)
- English Literature A Level Pathway (AQA)
- History A Level Pathway (AQA)
- Film Studies AS Level Pathway (WJEC/Eduqas)

This procedure confirms The BRIT School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5.7) that the centre will:

- 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

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

The BRIT School ensures that all centre staff follow a robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework. This policy details the procedures relating to the qualifications above, including the marking and quality assurance/internal standardisation processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, 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.

The BRIT School 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 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.

The BRIT School will:

1. ensure that candidates are informed of their centre-assessed marks so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body.
2. inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of 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. having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate.
5. inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised.
6. provide candidates with sufficient time, normally at least five working days, to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision .
7. provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking. Please see further information in this policy below.
8. allow 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.
9. ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review.

10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre.
11. inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking.

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

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

The moderation process carried out by the awarding 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.

### **Appeals relating to internal marks / grades for portfolio work / non exam assessments**

The formal appeal should be made using the internal appeals form. Appeals for internal marks / grade for portfolio work and non-exam assessments must be made two weeks before the marks are submitted by the centre to the exam board, or two weeks from the submission of portfolio or non-exam assessment date once graded, whichever is sooner. A written record will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

The exams team will collate the evidence and identify it to the head of centre who will appoint a member of the senior leadership team (SLT) or Quality Nominee, who has no involvement in the allocation of internal assessment grades or process for that subject to conduct the investigation.

The purpose of the appeal will be to decide whether the process used for the internal assessment conformed to the published requirements as detailed in the awarding body specification (s) and/ or subject specific associated documents.

The nominated member of staff will inform the head of centre and the exam officer of the outcome of the appeal. If an error is found it will be identified to the teacher/head of department to be corrected and the exam officer informed of the correct grade/results to submit to the awarding bodies. If any irregularities in the procedure are found as suspected malpractice the awarding body will be informed.

The appellant will be advised in writing if the appeal is upheld/ a new mark/grade is awarded due to this investigation. Appellants must be awarded the marks that can go down as well as up. The appellant will be informed in writing of the outcome of the appeal, including any relevant correspondence with the awarding body and any changes made to the internal assessment procedures.

Once internally assessed, the candidate's work is moderated by the awarding body to ensure consistency in marking between centres. The moderation may lead to changes in marking if marking is considered generous or critical in comparison to the published requirements as detailed in the awarding body specification (s) and/ or subject specific associated documents. This is outside of the internal appeals procedure and is not covered by this internal appeals procedure. The awarding

body moderation can only be appealed by the centre in the Enquiry about results services, this is an appeal by the centre across all candidates in that cohort that were moderated for that subject/qualification. The centre will only appeal if there is significant evidence the moderation was not undertaken in accordance with the moderation policy set by the awarding body.

## **Appeals against externally marked written examinations**

When exam results are released in August / December / January for the previous exam series May-June / November, the exam boards allow a period for candidates to appeal the provisional results. This is a request the candidates make directly to the examination board and is processed on their behalf by the centre. The awarding bodies will not accept appeals directly from candidates.

Where the awarding body does not allow appeals by candidates directly, no appeals can be made by the candidate. They can appeal to the centre to review the data, only if data supplied for an internal unit is found to be incorrectly submitted will the centre appeal, the centre cannot directly appeal external units results.

### **Submission stage:**

Candidates may choose to appeal the awarding body's result, this must be requested before the EAR/ATS deadline. Please email the exam team at [dataandexams@BRIT.croydon.sch.uk](mailto:dataandexams@BRIT.croydon.sch.uk) for an EAR/ATS request form for the relevant series. Please see JCQ website for current EAR/ATS information and key dates, internal deadlines for applying must be met to allow time for application by external deadline.

Students must sign the candidate consent form. ATS/EAR service request must be completed in full on using the relevant forms provided in the results series. Without this being signed by the candidate by the internal deadline, even with payment the request cannot be processed in accordance with JCQ EAR/ ATS regulations.

The completed EAR/ATS must be paid for by the internal deadline. The responsibility, choice and cost to make a request is solely the responsibility of the candidate. Requests will not be made with the awarding body until payment has been taken.

Evidence of all requests received and evidence of requests being processed will be kept by the exams team at the centre for a period of three years minimum.

Outcomes from the awarding body will be emailed to students BRIT email address within 2- 5 working days of receipt of the outcome.

Where candidates are not happy with the outcome, they can complete an internal appeal form (Appendix 1 of this policy) and submit it within 7 days of the results of the EAR. The form should address the request for the centre to appeal to the awarding body, and the reasons for the appeal. The cost is advertised per awarding body on their website, and will be the responsibility of the candidate requesting the appeal.

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

The JCQ Information for candidates documents 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. The JCQ Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments) 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 BRIT 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.

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 BRIT 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 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. The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal.

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

This procedure confirms The BRIT School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations (section 5.13), that the centre will have 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. Full details of these services, internal deadlines for requesting a service and fees charged are provided by the exams officer. Candidates are made aware of the

arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results, and informed of the periods senior members of staff will be available 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:**

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. 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, and 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, the centre will:

1. Where a place a university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Review of Marking (where the qualification concerned is eligible)
2. In all other instances, consider accessing the script by requesting a priority copy of the candidate's script 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
3. Collect informed written consent/permission from the candidate to access their script
4. On access to the script, the centre/candidate should consider whether the mark scheme has been applied correctly in the original marking and if 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 is required before a request is submitted to the awarding body. Consent is required to confirm the candidate understands that the final subject grade and/or mark awarded following a clerical re-check or a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, may be lower than, higher than, or the same

as the result which was originally awarded. Candidate consent must only be collected after the publication of results.

For any moderated components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

- Confirm that a Review of Moderation cannot be undertaken for individual candidates 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 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

### **Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (dispute)**

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 Priority Review of Marking, advise the candidate they may request the Review by providing written consent (and the required fee) for this service to the centre by the deadline set by the centre.
- For a Non Priority Review of Marking, first advise the candidate to access a copy of their script by providing written permission for the centre to submit this request and access the scripts.
- After accessing the script, inform the candidate that any request for a Review of Marking must be submitted by the centre's deadline, together with written consent and the required fee for the service.
- Inform the candidate that a Review of Moderation cannot be requested for the work of an individual candidate or the work of a candidate not in the original sample.

Following the Review of Marking outcome, an external appeals process is available if the Head of Centre remains dissatisfied with the outcome and believes there are grounds for appeal. The JCQ publications Post-Results Services and JCQ Appeals Booklet (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes) will be consulted to determine the acceptable grounds for a preliminary appeal.

Where the Head of Centre is satisfied after receiving the Review of Marking outcome, but the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds for a preliminary appeal to the awarding body, an 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.

Awarding body fees which may be charged for the preliminary appeal must be paid to the centre by the appellant before the preliminary appeal is submitted to the awarding body (fees are available from the exams officer). If the appeal is upheld by the awarding body, this fee will be refunded by the awarding body and repaid to the appellant by the centre.

## INTERNAL APPEALS FORM

FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Reference No.	

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

- Appeal against an internal assessment decision and/or request for a review of marking
- Appeal against a decision to reject candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice
- 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

\*Where the nature of the appeal does not relate directly to an awarding body's specific qualification, indicate N/A in awarding body specific detail boxes



- 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>