



Bluecoat Beechdale
Academy

Believe, Belong, Achieve

BLUECOAT BEECHDALE ACADEMY INTERNAL APPEALS (Centre assessed marks/NEA) 2025/26

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

Certain components of GCE GCSE and other qualifications contain components of non-examination assessments (or units of coursework) which are internally assessed (marked) by Bluecoat Beechdale Academy 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.

This procedure confirms Bluecoat Beechdale Academy's compliance with JCQ's *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2025-2026*, 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

Bluecoat Beechdale 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 subject-specific associated documents.

Bluecoat Beechdale Academy ensures that all centre staff follow a robust *Non-examination assessment policy* (for the management of GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments). This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments, including the marking and 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, and who have been trained in this activity. Bluecoat Beechdale 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 teachers are 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 his/her work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the marking standards to his/her marking, then he/she may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

Bluecoat Beechdale Academy 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 their work in meeting the published assessment criteria

3. inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (generally 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 (or for some marked assessment materials, such as art work and recordings, inform the candidate that the originals will be shared under supervised conditions within 5 calendar days.
5. inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material unless supervised
6. provide candidates with sufficient time in order 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
7. 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 to the Head of Centre within 5 calendar days of receiving copies of the requested materials.
8. allow 7 calendar 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.
9. ensure that the review of marking is carried out 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 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 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 the 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.

2. Appeals relating to centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

This procedure confirms Bluecoat Beechdale's 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 online 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 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 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 only available for externally assessed components of GCE A-level specifications (an individual awarding body may also offer this priority service for other qualifications)
- 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

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. If the centre supports the concern, collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the RoR service before the request is submitted. 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 publication of results.

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

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:

Apply 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 within 10 calendar days. 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.

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 requesting an internal appeals procedure (disputes) form prior to the internal deadline which is 10 calendar days. 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 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.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of his/her appeal within 10 days.

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** (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 RoR outcome, but the candidate (or his/her 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.