Loreto Grammar School Internal Appeals Procedure (reviews of results and appeals)

2026/2027

This procedure is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Mrs Stokes	
Date of next review	October 2027

Key staff involved in internal appeals procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	**Mrs Beever**
Deputy Headteacher	**Mrs Walker**
Assistant Headteacher	**Mrs Stokes**
Examinations officer	**Mrs Caulkin**

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that appeals against any decision at Loreto Grammar 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 document **General Regulations for Approved Centres**.

Introduction

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

If teaching staff at Loreto Grammar School or a candidate (or their 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.

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 available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE A-level specifications
- Service 3 (Review of moderation) - This service is not available to an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample

Access to Scripts (ATS):

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

Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm the arrangements at Loreto Grammar 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 in place for inspection, that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written internal appeals procedure relating to post-results services and appeals (with reference to the JCQ document *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*)
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their written internal appeals procedure which will cover appeals regarding internal assessment decisions,

access to post-results services and appeals, and centre decisions relating to access arrangements and special consideration
- 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.

Post-results services

At Loreto Grammar 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 immediately after the document of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking
- Candidates are made aware by information shared by Mrs Stokes via email prior to the examination results being published
- Full details of the post-results services, internal deadline(s) for requesting a service and the fees charged (where applicable) are provided by Mrs Stokes via email prior to results being published.

Centre actions in response to a concern about a result

Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, Loreto Grammar 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** components that contributed to the final grade, Loreto Grammar School will:

- Where a place a university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking (where the qualification concerned is eligible for this service).

In all other instances, Loreto Grammar School will:

Consider accessing the script by:

- 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.
- Collect written consent/permission from the candidate to access the script.

- On access to the script, 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.
- Support a request for the appropriate Review of Results service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified.
- Collect written consent from the candidate to request the Review of Results 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.

For **moderated** components that contributed to the final grade Loreto Grammar 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.

Candidate consent

Loreto Grammar 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 document of results.

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, Loreto Grammar 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 administration 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 their 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 the review and appeals form at least 5 working days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.

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 documents **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. Following this, the head of centre's (or their delegated representative's) decision as to whether to proceed with a preliminary appeal will be based upon the acceptable grounds as detailed in *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*.

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.