



**ST IVO
ACADEMY**
Astrea Academy Trust
INSPIRING BEYOND MEASURE

Complaints and Appeals Policy (Exams)

Approved: April 2022 (Principal name updated January 2023)

Next review due: April 2023

Purpose of the Plan

This procedure confirms St Ivo Academy's compliance with the JCQs General Regulations for Approved Centres (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 or administration of a qualification.

Grounds for a Complaint

The candidates (or 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.
- Pre-release/advanced material/set task issued by the Awarding Body not provided on time to a candidate.
- The taking of an assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not conducted according to the JCQ/Awarding Body instructions.
- 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.
- Centre fails to adhere to its Internal Appeals 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 mark 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 data personal consent form).
- Candidate not informed/adequately informed of the arrangements in place and the subjects or components of subjects where 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 arrangements 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

- Failure to clearly explain a decision of early entry for a qualification to candidate (or parent/carer).
- Candidate not entered/entered late (incurring late fees) for a required exam/assessment.
- Candidate entered for the wrong exam/assessment.
- Candidate entered for the wrong tier of entry.

Conducting Examinations

- Failure to adequately brief candidate on exam timetable/exam regulations prior to the exam/assessment taking place.
- Room in which exam held did not provide the candidate with the appropriate conditions for taking the exam.
- Inadequate invigilation in the exam room.
- Failure to conduct exam in accordance with the regulations.
- Disruption during exam/assessment.
- Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated/reported.
- Eligible application for special consideration for a candidate not submitted/no submitted on time.
- 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 staff after the publication of results.
- Candidate not having access to a member of senior staff after the publication of results to discuss/make a 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 the centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal.
- Centre applied for the wrong post results service/for the wrong script for the candidate.
- Centre missed Awarding Body deadline to apply for post results service.
- Centre applied for a post results service for a candidate without gaining the required candidate consent/permission.

Complaints and Appeals Procedure

If a candidate (or parent/carer) has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification, St Ivo Academy encourages him/her to try to resolve this informally in the first instance. A concern should be made in writing to Mr Tim Blake, Trust Executive Principal.

If a complaint fails to be resolved informally, the candidate (or 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 to Mr Tim Blake, Trust Executive Principal.
- The complaint will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 5 working days.

How a formal complaint is investigated

- The Principal will appoint a member of SLT (who is not involved in the grounds for the 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 with 10 working days.

Appeals

Following the outcome, if the complainant remains dissatisfied and believes there are clear grounds, an appeal can be submitted, at stage 3 of the academy complaints policy.

- An appeal must be submitted in writing to Mr Tim Blake, Trust Executive Principal.
- The appeal will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 5 working days.
- The Principal will inform the complainant of the conclusion in due course.