Internal Appeals Procedure (Reviews of Results and Appeals) POLICY

Policy Control/Monitoring

Approved by: **(Position in Organisation)** **Date:**	**Governors** **04/12/2023**
Accountability: **(Position in Organisation)**	**Assistant Headteacher/** **Exams Quality Control Lead**
Revision Cycle:	Annually
Brief details of amendments made	V2 – expiry date amended

Equality Impact Assessment

This document forms part of Percy Hedley's commitment to create a positive culture of respect for all staff and service users. The intention is to identify, remove or minimise discriminatory practice in relation to the protected characteristics (race, disability, gender, sexual orientation, age, religious or other belief, marriage and civil partnership, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity), as well as to promote positive practice and value the diversity of all individuals and communities.
As part of its development this document and its impact on equality has been analysed and no detriment identified.

Key staff involved in the policy – Centre No 39301

- **Head of Centre**
- **SLT**
- **Examination Officer**

Version Control Tracker

Version Number	Date
V1	04/12/2023
V2	16/10/2024

1. Introduction

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

If teaching staff at Percy Hedley 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.

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 (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

2. Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm the arrangements at Percy Hedley 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.

3. Post-result services

At Percy Hedley 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 a letter from the examination officer in preparation to result day, detailing the post results services, fees included and that **candidate consent** for clerical re-checks and reviews of marking **must be obtained after the publication of results**
- Candidates must be informed that their marks and subject grades may be lowered and must provide their written consent before an application is submitted

4. Centre actions in response to a concern about a result

Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, Percy Hedley 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, Percy Hedley School will:

- Where a place at university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking

In all other instances:

Consider accessing the script by:

- (where the service is made available by the awarding body) 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 (form should be retained on the centre's files for at least six months)***
- 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 Percy Hedley 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

Percy Hedley 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

5. 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, Percy Hedley 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

6. 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. 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.

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