

David Nieper Education Trust



Complaints and Appeals Procedures 2022-2023

**This policy is reviewed annually and approved by
Dr Kathryn Hobbs, Headteacher, Head of Centre
Date of next review – September 2023**

Key staff involved in internal appeals procedures

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Dr K Hobbs
SLT members	Mr R White, Mr C Endacott, Mr C Ruddy, Mrs E Merchant, Mrs W Bennett
Exams officer	Mr C Bradder
ALS lead/SENCO	Mrs A West

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms David Nieper Academy's compliance with JCQ's *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2022-23*, section 5.8 that the centre has in place "...a written complaints and appeals procedure 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
- 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 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

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 the 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 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

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 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 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 Head of Centre to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre applied for the wrong post-results service/for the wrong exam paper 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

Complaints and appeals procedure

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, David Nieper Academy encourages them 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 and appeals form**
- Forms are available from the Examinations Officer
- Completed forms should be returned to the Head of Centre
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 7 calendar 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

Appeals

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

- Any appeal must be submitted in writing by again completing a **complaints and appeals form**
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 7 calendar days
- The appeal will be referred to Chair of Governors for consideration
- The Chair of Governors will inform the appellant of the conclusion in due course

Complaints and appeals form	FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
	Date received	
Please tick box to indicate the nature of your complaint/appeal	Reference No.	

- Complaint/appeal against the centre's delivery of a qualification
- Complaint/appeal against the centre's administration of a qualification

Name of complainant/appellant	
Candidate name if different to complainant/appellant	

Please state the grounds for your complaint/appeal below

If your complaint is lengthy, please write as bullet points; please keep to the point and include relevant detail such as dates, names etc. and provide any evidence you may have to support what you say

Your appeal should identify the centre's failure to follow procedures as set out in the relevant policy, and/or issues in teaching and learning which have impacted the candidate

If necessary, continue an additional page if this form is being completed electronically or overleaf if hard copy being completed

Detail any steps you have already taken to resolve the issue(s) and what you would consider to be a good resolution to the issue(s)

Complainant/appellant signature:

Date of signature:

This form must be completed in full; an incomplete form will be returned to the complainant/appellant

