



# Inspire Education Trust

Together we achieve, individually we grow

## Internal Appeals Procedure: Review of Results Appeals

Blue Coat CE Secondary School

---

**Policy Date:** September 2025

**Review Date:** September 2026

## Document History

Version	Status		Date	Author	Summary Changes
V1			September 2023	Kelly Jobson	Updated to Reflect JCQ changes 2023-2024
V2			September 2024	Kelly Jobson	Updated to Reflect centre agreed actions highlighted in yellow copied from GR 24-2025
V3			September 2025	Kelly Jobson	Updated to reflect JCQ Changes summary at the bottom of the Document

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that appeals against any decision at Blue Coat School not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation, or an appeal are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations. Reference in this procedure to GR refers to the JCQ publication **General Regulations for Approved Centres**.

## **1. Introduction**

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available (see below for details of how these are managed at Blue Coat School).

If teaching staff at Blue Coat School or a candidate (or his/her parent/carer) have a concern that a result may not be accurate, post-results services may be considered.

The JCQ post-results services currently available are detailed below.

## **2. Reviews of Results (RoRs): Services provided to Candidates**

This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCSE and A-level specifications. It is also available for Level 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications.

- **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 (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.

## **3. Access to Scripts (ATS)**

- Copies of scripts to support reviews of marking.
- Copies of scripts to support teaching and learning.

## **4. Purpose of the Procedure**

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm the arrangements at Blue Coat School for dealing with candidate appeals relating to any centre decision not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation, or an appeal.

This procedure ensures compliance with JCQ regulations (GR 5.13) which state that centres must 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 application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal.

## **5. Post-Results Service**

At Blue Coat School:

- Candidates are 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.
- Candidates are made aware/informed by email and by information posted on school website.
- Private candidates are made aware that all post-results service requests can be made directly through the relevant awarding body.
- Full details of the post-results services, internal deadline(s) for requesting a service and the fees charged (where applicable) are provided by Kelly Jobson, Exam Manager, on results day/following the issue of results.

## **6. Centre Actions in Response to a Concern about a Result**

**Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, Blue Coat School 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 concern may be justified.
- For written externally assessed components that contributed to the final grade, Blue Coat School will consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking where a place at university or college is at risk. In all other instances it will consider accessing the script via the Exam Board secure site.
- Written consent/permission from the candidate to access the script must be obtained prior to accessing the script.
- On accessing the script, staff will consider if it is felt that the agreed mark scheme has been applied correctly in the original marking and if the centre considers there are any errors in the marking.
- The school will support a request for the appropriate Review of Results service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified.
- The written consent of the candidate must be obtained before any request for a Review of Results is submitted.
- Where relevant, the school will 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.
- Exam office staff will ensure all communication from the Exam board is shared with the student via the school email account, i.e. the outcome of any Review of Results request.

**For moderated components that contributed to the final grade Blue Coat School 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 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.

#### Additional centre-specific actions:

- Head of Centre will advise all candidates by letter if a Review of Moderation is to take place (GR5.13).

### 7. Candidate Consent

Blue Coat School will:

- Acquire written candidate consent (accepting informed consent via candidate email) in all cases before a request for a Review of Results service 1 or 2 (including priority service 2) is submitted to the awarding body.
- Acquire informed candidate consent 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.
- Only collect candidate consent after the publication of results.

### 8. 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, Blue Coat School will:

- For a review of marking (Review of Results priority service 2), advise the candidate a review may be requested by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for this service to the centre by the deadline set by the centre.
- For a review of marking (Review of Results service 1 or 2), first advise the candidate to access a copy of their script to support a review of marking by providing written permission (and any required fee) for the centre to access the script from the awarding body.
- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (Review of Results service 1 or 2) is required, this must be submitted by the deadline set by the centre by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for the centre to request the service from the awarding body.
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (Review of Results service 3) cannot be requested for the work of an individual candidate or the work of a candidate not in the original sample.
- 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 completing an internal appeal form at least 7 working days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.
- The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal before the internal deadline for requesting a Review of Results.

### 9. Appeals

Following a Review of Results 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 Results outcome, but the candidate (or parent/carer) believes there are grounds for a preliminary appeal to the awarding body, an internal appeal may be made directly to the centre. Candidates or parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body. 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.

#### **To submit an internal appeal:**

- An internal appeals form should be completed and submitted to the centre within the time specified by the centre from the notification of the outcome of the review of the result.
- Subject to the Head of Centre's decision, the preliminary appeal will be processed and submitted 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.

### **10. JCQ Regulations Summary – 2025/2026 Updates**

This policy has been updated in line with the latest JCQ regulations and guidance for the 2025/2026 academic year. Key updates include:

#### **General Regulations (GR 5.13) Compliance**

- Centres must have a written internal appeals procedure available for inspection and communicated to candidates and their parents/carers.
- This procedure must cover disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, review of marking, review of moderation, or appeal.

#### **Post-Results Services**

- Access to Scripts (ATS): Available to support both reviews of marking and teaching/learning.
- Review of Results (RoR):
- Service 1: Clerical re-check (only for multiple choice tests).
- Service 2: Review of marking (available for externally assessed components).
- Priority Service 2: For urgent university/college placement concerns.
- Service 3: Review of moderation (not available for individual candidates).

#### **Appeals Process**

- Appeals must be submitted by the Head of Centre.
- Candidates or parents/carers cannot appeal directly to awarding bodies.
- Appeals must follow JCQ's **defined timelines and procedures**, including submission within 30 calendar days of the review outcome.

### Candidate Consent

- Written candidate consent (including via email) is required **after results are published** for:
  - Clerical re-checks
  - Reviews of marking
  - Access to scripts
  - Any subsequent appeal
- Consent must confirm understanding that grades may go **up, down, or remain the same**.
- Centres must retain consent records for **at least six months**.

### Submission and Communication

- Centres must submit requests electronically by JCQ deadlines.
- Candidates must be informed of outcomes **promptly**, typically via email.
- Disputes are managed through the centre's **internal appeals procedure**.

Reviewed by:

Kelly Jobson

September 2025

Next Review Date:

September 2026

Approved by Directors:

1 December 2025

Signed:



---

Lois Whitehouse  
CEO



---

Nicky Aston  
Chair of Standards