Appendix 5 – Complaints and Appeals Procedure (Exams)

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Purpose of the Policy

This policy confirms Sir Christopher Hatton Academy'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 their 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
    a) Non-subject specialist teacher without adequate training/subject matter expertise utilised on a long-term basis
    b) Teacher lacking knowledge of new specification/incorrect core content studied/taught
    c) Core content not adequately covered
    d) 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 their centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body
- Candidate not informed of their 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 the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre fails to adhere to its *internal appeals procedure*

Access arrangements

- Candidate not assessed by the centre's appointed assessor
- Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding their access arrangements
- Candidate was not informed that an application for access arrangements was to be processed using *Access arrangements online*, complying with the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018

- 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 to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre fails to adhere to its own *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 the awarding body

Results and Post-results

- Prior to the issue of results, 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 the exams team to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre fails to adhere to it 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/complain

If a candidate (or their parent/carer) has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification they are following, Sir Christopher Hatton Academy encourages the candidate to try to resolve this informally in the first instance.

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

How to make a formal complaint

Details on how to make a complaint can be found in the Hatton Academies Trust Complaints Policy which is available on their website. Complaints or disputes relating to internal assessment decisions, access arrangements, special consideration, reviews of results or examination appeals should instead be dealt with through the Academy's Internal Appeals Procedure (Appendix 6).