

Last Review	December 2020
Next Review	December 2021
Frequency	Annually
Governors	

Formal complaints and appeals procedures (Exams) 2020/2021

Key staff involved in the complaints and appeals procedures

Role	Name(s)
Principal	Amanda Costello
Exams Officer	Helena Fallon
Senior Leaders	Carol Leighton Nicola Preece
SENCo	Shaun Redfern

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms Milton School's compliance with JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres 2020-2021 (section 5.8) that the centre will draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their written complaints and appeals procedure which will cover general complaints regarding the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification.

Grounds for complaint

A candidate (or his/her/parent/carer) may make a complaint on the grounds below (this is not an exhaustive list).

Teaching and learning

Quality of teaching and learning, for example

- Non-subject specialist teacher without adequate training/subject matter expertise utilised on a long-term basis.
- Teacher lacking knowledge of new specification/incorrect core content studied/taught.
- Core content not adequately covered
- Inadequate feedback for a candidate following assessment(s)

Pre-release/advance material/set task issued by the awarding body not provided on time to an exam candidate.

The taking of an assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not conducted according to the JCQ/awarding body instructions.

The marking of an internal assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not undertaken according to the requirements of the awarding body (complainant should refer to the centre's appeals procedure).

Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals procedure.

Candidate not informed of his/her centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body.

Candidate not informed of his/her centre assessed marks in sufficient time to request/appeal a review of marking prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body.

Candidate not given sufficient time to review materials to make a decision whether to request a review of centre assessed marks.

Access arrangements

Candidate not assessed by the centre's appointed assessor.

Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding his/her access arrangements.

Candidate did not consent to personal data being shared electronically (by the non-acquisition of a signed data protection notice/candidate data personal consent form

Candidate not informed/adequately informed of the arrangements in place and the subjects or components of subjects where the arrangements would not apply.

Exam information not appropriately adapted for a disabled candidate to access it.

Adapted equipment put in place failed during exam/assessment

Appropriate arrangements not put in place at the time of an exam/assessment as a consequence of a temporary injury or impairment.

Entries

Failure to clearly explain a decision of early entry for a qualification to candidate (or parent/carer)

Candidate not entered/entered late (incurring a late entry fee) for a required exam/assessment

Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment

Candidate entered for a wrong tier of entry

Conducting examinations

- Failure to adequately brief candidate on exam timetable/exam regulations prior to exam/assessment taking place.
- Room in which exam held did not provide candidate with appropriate conditions for taking the exam.
- Inadequate invigilation in exam room
- Failure to conduct exam according to the regulations
- Online system failed during (on-screen) exam/assessment
- Disruption during exam/assessment
- Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated/reported.
- Eligible application for special consideration for a candidate not submitted/not submitted to timescale
- Failure to inform/update candidate on the outcome of a special consideration application.

Results and Post-results

- Before exams, candidates not made aware of the arrangements for post-results services and the accessibility of senior members of a centre staff after the publication of results.
- Candidate not having access to a member of senior staff after the publication of results to discuss/make decision on the submission of a review/enquiry
- Candidate request for return of work after moderation and work not available/disposed of earlier than allowed in the regulations.
- Candidate (or parent/carer) unhappy with a result (complainant to refer via exams officer to awarding body post-results services).
- Candidate (or parent/carer) unhappy with a centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal (complainant to refer via Principal to the centre's internal appeals procedure).
- Centre applied for the wrong post-results service/for the wrong exam paper for a candidate
- Centre missed awarding body deadline to apply for a post-results service
- Centre applied for a post-results service for candidate without gaining required candidate consent/permission.

Complaints and appeals procedure – Please see complaints policy