



# Whitby School

## Complaints Policy (Exams)

### School Governance Status

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations.

Review dates	By Whom	Approval date
February 2024	Staff and governors	7 May 2024
January 2025	Staff and governors	1 April 2025
January 2026	Staff and governors	23 March 2026

Signed by Chair:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rafina'.

## Complaints Policy (Exams)

Centre name	Whitby School
Centre number	48181
Date policy first created	17/04/2024
Current policy approved by	Governing Body
Current policy reviewed by	Exam Officer / Governing Body
Date of review	January 2026

## Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Susan Boyd
Senior leader(s)	Andrew Whelan
Data manager/Exams officer	Nick Tindall
Exam Officer	Gill Teasdale

This procedure is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that the complaints at Whitby School are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in this procedure to GR refers to the JCQ publication General Regulations for Approved Centres.

## Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm the arrangements for complaints at Whitby School and confirms 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 and appeals procedure which covers general complaints regarding the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification and our internal complaints procedure.

## Grounds for complaint

A candidate (or his/her/parent/carer) at Whitby School may make a complaint on the grounds below (This is not an exhaustive list).

## Teaching and Learning

- 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
- 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
- Candidate unhappy with internal assessment decision (complainant to refer 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 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 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/assistive technology 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
- Candidate unhappy with centre decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration (complainant to refer via 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 their 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 accepted/rejected outcome of a special consideration application if provided by awarding body

### **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 their 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 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 a candidate without gaining required candidate consent/permission

### **Raising a concern/complaint**

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, Whitby School encourages the candidate to try and resolve this informally. This can be undertaken by contacting the exams officer.

If a concern or 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**

All documentation relating to the submission of a formal complaint is available from, and should be returned to the Head of Centre. Formal complaints will be logged and acknowledged within 30 working days.

To make a formal complaint, candidates (or their parents/carers) must complete and return a complaints form, as supplied on the school website.

### **How a formal complaint is investigated**

The Head of Centre will further investigate, or appoint a member of senior management to.

The findings and conclusion of any investigation will be provided to the complainant within 4 working weeks.

## **Internal appeals procedure**

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 their parents/carers) must follow the centre's internal appeals procedure.

Appeals will be logged and acknowledged within 30 working days.

The appeal will be referred to the Head of Centre.

It will be the responsibility of the Head of centre to inform the appellant of the final conclusion in accordance with the internal appeals procedure.