



Malden Oaks
School & Tuition service

Making the **MOST** of every day

Post results Services

EXAMS

Date reviewed: February 2026

Centre name	Malden Oaks School and Tuition Service
Centre number	14408
Date process first created	09/04/2024
Current process approved by	Headteacher
Current process reviewed by	Exams Manager
Date of next review	21/01/2027

Key staff involved in the process

Role	Name
Headteacher	Samantha Axbey
Senior leader(s)	Ayse Meliz, Nick Smith, Kelly Swaffield
Exams Manager	Stephen Shorey
Other staff (if applicable)	Heads of School

Contents

Purpose of the procedure.....	3
Post-exam results available to exam candidates.....	3
Access to Scripts (ATS):.....	3
Reviews of Results (RoRs):.....	4
Service 1 (Clerical re-check).....	4
Service 2 (Review of marking).....	4
Priority Service 2 (Review of marking).....	4
Service 3 (Review of moderation).....	4
Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (appeals).....	5

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms Malden Oaks School and Tuition Service's ("Malden Oaks") compliance with [JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres](#) (section 5.3z, 5.8) that the centre will:

- have in place for inspection, that must be reviewed and updated annually by a member of the senior leadership team and communicated within the centre, a written procedure which must cover access to post-exam result services and appeals
- draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers the school's internal appeals procedure

Post-exam results available to exam candidates

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 that 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 their tutor in individual exam meetings prior to the beginning of the exam season.

If the centre or a candidate (or their 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.

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.

For written components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

1. Where a place at 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)
2. In all other instances, consider accessing the script by:
 - a) (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
 - b) (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
3. Collect informed written consent/permission from the candidate to access their script
4. 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
5. Support a request for the appropriate **Review of Results (RoRs)** service (either a clerical re-check or a review of marking) if any error is identified
6. Collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the RoR service before the request is submitted

7. 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.

Reviews of Results (RoRs):

Service 1 (Clerical re-check)

This is the only service that can be requested for objective tests (multiple choice tests). This service includes the following checks:

- that all parts of the script have been marked
- the totalling of marks is correct
- the recording of marks is correct

Service 2 (Review of marking)

This is a post-results review of the original marking to ensure that the mark scheme has been applied correctly. A marking error can occur because of:

- an administrative error
- a failure to apply the mark scheme where a task has only a 'right' or 'wrong' answer
- an unreasonable exercise of academic judgement

The awarding body will train its reviewers to conduct reviews of marking accurately and consistently. Reviewers will not re-mark the script. They will only act to correct any errors identified in the original marking.

The service is available for externally assessed components of both unitised and linear GCE AS, A-level and GCSE specifications. It is also available for Level 1, 2 and 3 Vocational Technical Qualifications.

Priority Service 2 (Review of marking)

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

This is a priority review of the original marking to ensure that the mark scheme has been applied correctly. Requests for this service must be submitted by the centre no later than 20 August 2026 (seven days after the publication of GCE A-level and Level 3 VTQ results).

Service 3 (Review of moderation)

This service is not available to an individual candidate.

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 any moderator 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

Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (appeals)

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:

- For a review of marking (RoR priority service 2), advise the candidate they may request the review 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 (RoR 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 for the centre to access the script (and any required administration fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (RoR 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 this service) for the centre to submit this request
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (RoR 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 **internal appeals form** (Page 12 of the Internal Appeals Procedure) at least 3 calendar days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results. The appellant will be informed of the outcome of his/her appeal before the internal deadline for submitting a RoR.

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 the [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 their 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.

The **internal appeals form** (Page 12 of the Internal Appeals Procedure) should be completed and submitted to the centre within 3 calendar days of the notification of the outcome of the RoR. 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.

This procedure is informed by the JCQ documents [Post-Results Services](#) and [A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes](#)