



COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS PROCEDURE Centre 17632

Grounds for Complaint

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

- Teaching and learning
 - The quality of teaching and learning
 - Pre-release material/set task not provided on time
 - Assessments not conducted according to JCQ/awarding body instructions
 - Marking of an internal assessment not undertaken according to the requirements of the awarding body (please refer to Internal Appeal Procedure below)
 - We fail to adhere to our Appeals Procedure
 - Candidate not informed on his/her centre assessed mark in sufficient time to request a review or appeal

- Access arrangements
 - Candidate not assessed by our appointed assessor
 - Candidate not involved in decisions about his/her access arrangements
 - Candidate did not consent to personal data being shared electronically
 - 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
 - Approved access arrangement(s) not put in place at the time of an 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
 - Candidate not entered/entered late (incurring a late entry fee) for a required exam/assessment
 - Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment

- 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, candidate not made aware of the arrangements for post-results services and the accessibility of senior members of 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 centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal (complainant to refer via Deputy Head (Academic) to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
 - Centre applied for the wrong post-results service/for the wrong script 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

If a candidate (or his/her parent/carer) has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification he/she is following, we encourage him/her to try to resolve this informally in the first instance. A concern or complaint should be made in person, by telephone or in writing to the Head of Centre.

If a complaint fails to be resolved informally, the candidate (or his/her parent/carer) is then at liberty to make a formal complaint.

Internal Appeals Procedure

Merchant Taylors' School is committed to ensuring that whenever its staff mark candidates' work this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.

Merchant Taylors' School ensures that all centre staff follow a robust *Non-Examination Assessment Policy* (for the management of GCE and GCSE non-examination assessments). This policy details all procedures relating to non-examination assessments for GCE, Pre-U, GCSE, Project qualifications including the marking and quality assurance/internal standardisation processes which relevant teaching staff are required to follow.

All access arrangements will be put into place by the SENCO using their department policy document.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, and who have been trained in this activity. Merchant Taylors' School is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where a number of subject teachers are involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardisation will ensure consistency of marking.

On being informed of their centre assessed marks, if a candidate believes that the above procedures were not followed in relation to the marking of his/her work, or that the assessor has not properly

applied the mark scheme to his/her marking, then he/she may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

Merchant Taylors' School will

1. ensure that candidates are informed of their centre assessed marks so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body
2. inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of their work in meeting the published assessment criteria
3. inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (as a minimum, a copy their marked assessment material (work) and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment
4. having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate (or for some marked assessment materials, such as art work and recordings, inform the candidate that these will be shared under supervised conditions) within 10 school days
5. inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material unless supervised
6. provide candidates with sufficient time in order to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision, informing candidates that if their decision is to request a review they will need to explain what they believe the issue to be
7. provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for a review of the centre's marking. Requests will not be accepted after this deadline. Requests must be made in writing within 7 calendar days of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the **internal appeals form** on the school website
8. allow 5 school days for the review to be carried out, to make any necessary changes to marks and to inform the candidate of the outcome, all before the awarding body's deadline for the submission of marks
9. ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate and has no personal interest in the review
10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
11. inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking

The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre who will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding

body. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review.

The moderation process carried out by the awarding bodies may result in a mark change, either upwards or downwards, even after an internal review. The internal review process is in place to ensure consistency of marking within the centre, whereas moderation by the awarding body ensures that centre marking is in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.

If a parent/guardian wish to complain about any non-exam related matter, they should follow the Complaints procedure for Parents/Guardians policy.

External Appeals Procedure for External Remarks

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. Candidates are informed of the arrangements for post-results services and the availability of senior members of centre staff immediately after the publication of results, **before** they sit any exams. This information is within the Examination Pack sent home by post and then provided again in an email from the Head of Exams just before results are issued.

If the centre or a candidate (or his/her parent/carer) has a concern and believes a result may not be accurate, post-results services may be considered.

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 a university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking
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 his/her 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 if any error is identified
6. Collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the 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 is required in all cases before a post result service can be 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.

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 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 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

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 he/she 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 his/her script to support a review of marking by providing written permission for the centre to access the script (and any required 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 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 the internal appeals form at least 14 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 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 RoR outcome, but the candidate (or his/her 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** should be completed and submitted to the centre within 5 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.

Head of Examinations
September 2021
To be reviewed September 2022