

Exams Complaints & Appeals Procedure 2018/19

Shooters Hill Sixth Form College

Adopted and ratified by the Governing Body on:	Pending
Review Date:	Pending
Accountability:	Governing Body
Responsibility:	Governing Body

Head of Centre	Jan Atkinson
SLT members	Geoff Osborne, Stephen Greenman, Andrea Knight, Natalie Osborne Nathan Nagaiah, Sophie Farmer
Exams Officer	Laraine Nicholls
Review Date	Annually

Purpose of the procedure

The procedure confirms Shooters Hill 6th Form College compliance with JCQs General regulations for Approved Centres 2018/19, 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 of 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 a learning, for example
 - o The use of a non-specialist teacher without adequate training for a long period of time
 - o Teacher lacks knowledge of new specification and incorrect core content studied and taught
 - o Inadequate feedback for a candidate following assessment(s)
- Pre-release or advance material/set tasks issued by the awarding body, not provided on time to the exam candidate
- The taking of an assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not conducted according to the JCQ or awarding body regulations
- 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 internal appears 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 not informed/adequately of the access arrangements in place and the subjects or components of subject 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 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 why an early entry for a qualification to a candidate (or parent/carer) was made
- Candidate not entered/entered late (incurring late fees) for a requirement exam/assessment
- Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment

- Candidate entered for the wrong tier level

Conducting Exams

- Failure to adequately brief candidates on examination timetabling and regulations prior to the exam/assessment taking place
- Room in which exam held did not provide candidate with appropriate conditions for taking the exam
- Inadequate invigilation within the exam room
- Failure to conduct exam according to the regulation
- Online system failure during exam/assessment
- Disruption during exam/assessment
- Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated/reported appropriately
- Eligible application for special consideration for a candidate not submitted within the timeframe allowed
- 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 result services and the accessibility of senior members of centre staff after the publication of results
- Candidates not having access to a member of senior staff after the publication of results to discuss/make decision on the submission of an 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 check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal (complainant to refer via exams officer 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