



CHURCH OF ENGLAND
ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL
EDUCATION DIVISION



The **Methodist Church** 

SIAMS APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

The procedure for appeals by schools against SIAMS findings and/or complaints about the conduct of inspections/inspectors is as follows:

Step One

The School must raise the issue directly with the SIAMS inspector. This may involve re-consideration of evidence or consideration of evidence not already taken into account.

Step Two

If Step One fails to resolve the issue to the satisfaction of the school the governing body may ask the diocese to review the report and/or the inspection. The diocese will seek to determine whether the report is fair and judgements are supported by secure evidence. The diocese may also review the performance or conduct of the inspector. The diocese may, with the agreement of the inspector, amend the report (not necessarily in the school's favour).

Step Three

If the school remains dissatisfied with the findings the diocese may refer the case to the National Society. The Society will review the inspection and will either support the inspector's findings and/or conduct of the inspection or, after consultation with the diocese, arrange for a re-inspection to take place; The Society's decision will be final.

The National Society appeals process does not apply to inspectors who are not accredited to the Society or inspectors appointed by a governing body against the expressed advice of the diocese concerned.

Please note: we cannot address an appeal that is not submitted by the end of the school term following the term in which the Section 48 inspection took place.

Appeals against SIAMS outcomes

There are three possible outcomes to an appeal:

1. The original findings of the inspection are upheld.
2. The original findings of the inspection are over-ruled and changed.
3. The National Society deems that the school needs to be re-inspected.

The main issues emerging over inspection appeals are:

- Writing, which is not evaluative and does not make it clear why the particular grade has been given.
- Over reliance on framework criteria at the expense of sensible judgements based on evidence.

- Inclusion of terms such as 'with outstanding features' in headline judgements, which are good and grading-related terms (e.g. good or satisfactory) being liberally included in judgements which state otherwise.
- Most cases of appeal have been the result of inspectors grading schools as Good when the school considered themselves to be Outstanding. A common link is unrealistic self-evaluation by the school.

Nicola Sylvester
Head of School Effectiveness
The National Society