



Fir Vale Academy

The best in everyone™

Part of United Learning

Internal Appeals Procedure

Internal Assessment Decisions

April 2026

1. Policy details

Centre name	Fir Vale Academy
Centre number	36568
Date policy first created	13/11/2023
Current policy approved by	Danny Bullock
Current policy reviewed by	Lewis Baxter
Date of review	21/04/2026
Date of next review	02/11/2026

Role	Name / responsibility
Head of centre	Danny Bullock
Senior leader(s)	Lewis Baxter
Exams officer	Jared Oxley
Other staff	Responsible for marking, internal standardisation and candidate communication within their subject areas.

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually so that appeals against internal assessment decisions, including centre-assessed marks, are managed in line with JCQ requirements and awarding body regulations.

2. Overview and scope

Some qualifications include non-examination assessment, controlled assessment or coursework which is marked by the centre and then submitted to an awarding body for moderation or verification. This procedure explains how candidates can request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body.

Important

Centre-assessed marks are provisional until the awarding body has completed moderation, verification or any other required quality assurance. The final mark or grade may change as a result of the awarding body's processes, even after an internal review has taken place.

3. Qualifications covered

This procedure applies to all qualifications delivered by Fir Vale Academy which include internally assessed components or units. This may include, but is not limited to:

- OCR Nationals and Cambridge Nationals
- BTEC Level 1 and Level 2 qualifications
- NCFE/CACHE qualifications
- VTCT qualifications
- WJEC qualifications
- Edexcel Entry Level qualifications
- GCSE, GCE or Project qualifications with internally assessed components where applicable

4. Core principles

- Work is marked fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body specification, mark scheme and subject-specific guidance.
- Teachers and assessors involved in marking have appropriate knowledge, understanding, skill and training.
- Potential conflicts of interest are declared and managed before marking or review takes place.
- Where more than one teacher or assessor is involved, internal moderation or standardisation is used to secure consistency.
- Candidate work is authenticated in line with awarding body and JCQ requirements.
- AI tools must not be used as the sole marker of candidate work. Any permitted use of AI to support administration or checking must not replace professional judgement and must comply with awarding body guidance.
- Candidates are informed of their centre-assessed marks before those marks are submitted to the awarding body and are given a meaningful opportunity to request a review of the centre's marking.

5. Informing candidates of centre-assessed marks

Subject staff will inform candidates of their centre-assessed marks before submission to the awarding body. Candidates will also be told that the mark is provisional and may change following moderation, verification or other awarding body processes.

Candidates will be informed of how to request copies of relevant materials and how to submit a written request for a review of the centre's marking. The academy will set internal deadlines that allow sufficient time for the review to be completed and for any necessary changes to be made before the awarding body submission deadline.

6. Materials available to candidates

A candidate considering whether to request a review may ask for access to relevant materials. These will normally include, as a minimum, the marked assessment material and the mark scheme or assessment criteria. Depending on the qualification and awarding body rules, this may be provided as supervised access to the original work, copies of the work, or other appropriate materials.

Materials will be made available promptly and within 30 calendar days of request, or sooner where required to meet the awarding body deadline.

7. Requesting a review of centre marking

If the complainant remains dissatisfied and believes there are clear grounds for appeal, they may submit a written appeal to the head of centre. The appeal should explain why the complaint has not been resolved satisfactorily and should include any supporting evidence.

Stage	Timescale / action
Candidate receives centre-assessed mark	Candidate is informed of the provisional mark and the deadline for requesting materials and/or review.
Request for materials	Relevant materials are made available promptly and within 30 calendar days, or sooner where the awarding body deadline requires it.

Stage	Timescale / action
Request for review	The candidate submits the review form within five calendar days of receiving the requested materials, unless an earlier deadline has been published to meet the awarding body deadline.
Review conducted	The review is carried out by an assessor with appropriate competence, no previous involvement in marking that candidate's work for the component, and no personal interest in the outcome.
Outcome	The candidate is informed in writing of the outcome. The mark may stay the same, increase or decrease. The outcome is reported to the Head of Centre, who has final responsibility for the mark submitted where disagreement remains.
Records	A written record of the review is retained securely and made available to the awarding body on request.

8. Malpractice and authenticity concerns

If there are doubts about the authenticity of a candidate's work, or irregularities are identified before the candidate has signed any required declaration of authentication, Fir Vale Academy will investigate in line with JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures and the relevant awarding body requirements.

The candidate will be informed in writing of the suspected malpractice and the evidence on which the concern is based. The candidate will be given an opportunity to respond before a final decision is reached. The matter will be referred to the Head of Centre, who will consider the evidence before deciding whether to proceed with a malpractice allegation and/or reject the work.

If the candidate disagrees with a decision to reject work on the grounds of malpractice, they may submit a written appeal to the Head of Centre within five calendar days of being informed of the decision. The appeal should set out the grounds and include any supporting evidence. The appeal will be reviewed by a senior member of staff who has had no prior involvement in the original decision, and the candidate will be informed of the outcome in writing within ten calendar days.

9. Data protection and records

Records of marks, requests for materials, review forms, review outcomes, internal standardisation evidence and malpractice decisions will be stored securely. Information will be processed in line with UK GDPR, the Data Protection Act 2018, JCQ requirements and the academy's data protection policy.



Appendix A – Request for Review of Centre Marking

Candidate and assessment details

Candidate name	
Candidate number	
Qualification / subject / component	
Awarding body	
Centre-assessed marks received	
Date marks received	
Date materials received, if applicable	

Complaint details

Reason for requesting a review <i>Explain why you believe the centre's marking procedures were not followed or the marking standards were not properly applied.</i>	
Evidence attached <i>List any supporting evidence.</i>	
Candidate declaration <i>I understand that the review will consider the marking of the work submitted and that the mark may stay the same, increase or decrease.</i>	
Candidate signature	
Date	
Parent signature	
Date	