

COMPLAINTS POLICY (Exams) 2023/24

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Date of next review	Autumn 2024

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	David Martin
Exams officer line manager (Senior leader)	Gareth Livesy-Jones
Exams officer	Michelle Phillips
SENCo	Abigail Grainger

Purpose of the Policy

This policy confirms Katherine Warington School's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (sections 5.3, 5.8) in drawing to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers its written complaints policy 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
- 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
- Candidate unhappy with internal assessment decision (complainant to refer via the Head of Centre to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre fails to adhere to its *internal appeals procedure*

Access arrangements and special consideration

- 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 record their personal data online (by the non-acquisition of a completed candidate personal data 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/assistive technology 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
- Candidate unhappy with centre decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration (complainant to refer via the Head of Centre to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre fails to adhere to its *internal appeals procedure*

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 accepted/rejected outcome of a special consideration application if provided by awarding body

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 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 Head of Centre to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre fails to adhere to its *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

Raising a concern/complaint

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, Katherine Warrington School encourages 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.

How to make a formal complaint

- A formal complaint should be submitted in writing by completing a **complaints form**
- Forms are available from the Exams Officer
- Completed forms should be returned to the Exams Officer
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 2 working days

How a formal complaint is investigated

- The Head of Centre will further investigate or appoint a member of the senior leadership team (who is not involved in the grounds for complaint and has no personal interest in the outcome) to investigate the complaint and report on the findings and conclusion
- The findings and conclusion will be provided to the complainant within 2 working weeks unless extenuating circumstances do not allow this timescale

Internal appeals procedure

Following the outcome, if the complainant remains dissatisfied and believes there are clear grounds, an appeal can be submitted.

- Any appeal must be submitted by following the centre's internal appeals procedure and completing an **internal appeals form**
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 2 working days
- The appeal will be referred to the Chair of Trustees (or a special Committee of the Trust Board) as detailed in the centre's internal appeals procedure
- The Chair of Trustees (or Trust Board), who as detailed in the centre's internal appeals procedure will inform the appellant of the final conclusion in accordance with the internal appeals procedure

Complaints log

On receipt, all complaints are assigned a reference number and logged. Outcome and outcome date is also recorded.

Ref No.	Date received	Complainant name	Outcome	Outcome date