

Complaints and Appeals Procedure

2021/2022

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that the complaints and appeals in relation to examinations at The Newbridge School is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in this procedure to GR refers to the [JCQ publication General Regulations for Approved Centres](#).

Approved/reviewed by

Leila Tillotson- Roberts – Examinations Officer
Julia Patrick – CEO

Date of next review

January 2023

Centre Name	The Newbridge School
Centre Number	25182
Date Policy Created	25/01/2022
Current Policy Reviewed by	Leila Tillotson-Roberts
Current Policy approved by	Julia Patrick
Date of Next Review	January 2023

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name (s)
Exams Officer	Leila Tillotson-Roberts
Senior Leaders	Ms. Natalie Fox, Mr Nick Schober, Ms Laura Drakeley, Mr Danny Birt, Ms Kirste Thompson
Head of Centre	Ms Julia Patrick (CEO), Mr Michael Gamble, Mr Michael Rowbottom
Exams & Data Admin	Jodie Williamson

Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of this procedure is to confirm the arrangements for complaints and appeals in relation to examinations at The Newbridge School and confirms compliance with [JCQ's General Regulations for Approved Centres](#) (section 5.8) in drawing to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers their written complaints and appeals procedure which covers general complaints regarding the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification.

Grounds for complaint

A candidate (or his/her/parent/carer) at The Newbridge School may make a complaint on the grounds below.

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 examination 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 (complainant should refer to the centre's internal appeals procedure)
- Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals procedure
- Candidate not informed of their centre assessed mark prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body
- Candidate not informed of their 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 the centre assessed mark

Access arrangements

- Candidate not assessed by the centre's appointed assessor
- Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding their 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 arrangement(s) in place and the subjects or components of subjects where the arrangement(s) would not apply
- Examination information not appropriately adapted for a disabled candidate to access it
- Adapted equipment put in place failed during examination/assessment
- Approved access arrangement(s) not put in place at the time of an examination/assessment
- Appropriate arrangement(s) not put in place at the time of an examination/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 a late entry fee) for a required examination/assessment

- Candidate entered for a wrong examination/assessment
- Candidate entered for a wrong tier of entry

Conducting examinations

- Failure to adequately brief candidate on examination timetable/regulations prior to examination/assessment taking place
- Room in which assessment held did not provide candidate with appropriate conditions for taking the examination
- Inadequate invigilation in examination room
- Failure to conduct the examination according to the regulations
- Online system failed during (on-screen) examination/assessment
- Disruption during the examination/assessment
- Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated/reported
- Failure to inform/update candidate on the outcome of a special consideration application

Results and Post-Results

- Before examinations, candidate not made aware of the arrangements for post-results services and the availability 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 a decision on the submission of a results 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 to the centre's internal appeals procedure)
- (updated 2021/22) 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 a candidate without gaining 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, The Newbridge School encourages an informal resolution in the first instance. This can be undertaken by the candidate (or parent/carer) contacting the relevant member of staff who will be happy to talk to the complainant and seek to establish a solution.

If a concern or 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

All documentation relating to the submission of a formal complaint is available from, and should be returned to Mr Michael Gamble - Head of Centre.

Formal complaints will be logged and acknowledged within 5 working days.

To make a formal complaint, candidates (or parents/carers) must complete and return the complaint and appeals form.

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 of any investigation will be provided to the complainant within 5 working days.

Appeals

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

To submit an appeal, candidates (or parents/carers) must complete and return a complaints and appeals form to the Head of Centre.

Appeals will be logged and acknowledged within 5 working days.

The appeal will be referred to The Chair of Governors (or a special committee if the Governing Body) for consideration.

It will be the responsibility of The Chair of Governors (or committee) to inform the appellant of the final conclusion.