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**Purpose of the Protocol**

This protocol confirms Hall Mead’s compliance with JCQ’s General Regulations for Approved Centres 2021-2022, section 5.8 e) 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 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;

* 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 – see NEA protocol
* Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals protocol
* 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 decide whether to request a review of centre assessed marks

For cardinalates with Access Arrangements or believing they should be entitled;

* 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
* 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
* Candidate not entered for a required exam/assessment
* Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment or 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 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 (online) 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 to timescale

**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 an enquiry
* Candidate request for return of work after moderation and work not available/disposed of earlier than allowed in the regulations
* 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 protocol

If a candidate or their parent/carer has a general concern or complaint about the centre’s delivery or administration of a qualification, we encourage them to seek to resolve this informally through conversation with the teacher, Head of subject or Head of Exams depending on the level of concern and history of previous interactions. If this does not solve th3 issue the concern or complaint should be made in person, by phone, email or in writing to the Exams Officer, Mrs Lee. If a complaint fails to be resolved informally the candidate or their parent/carer can then make a formal complaint via the Head of Exams.

Formal Complaints Process

To make a formal complaint the complainant should write to the Head of Exams outlining the reasons for their complaint, a proforma is available if desired (Appendix A)

Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 5 working days.

Investigation of a formal complaint

The Head of Centre will delegate the investigation to an appropriate senior colleague with no direct involvement in the complaint or an external appropriate senior colleague from an academy partner, if deemed necessary to ensure impartiality. The investigating officer will log all steps taken, keep any evidence and submit their findings to the Head of Centre for a final decision on the matter. The outcome will be provided to the complainant within 15 working days.

Appeals

Following the outcome, if the complainant remains dissatisfied and believes there are clear grounds, an appeal can be submitted to the Chair of the Local Governance Committee; if not resolved the complainant should then follow the ELAT complaints procedure and re-submit the original complaint plus any further evidence that comes to light through the initial investigations. At this stage the complainant will be notified of developments in the investigation on a weekly basis.

**Appendix A**

**Hall Mead – Exams Complaints and Appeals Form**

Complaint/appeal against the centre’s administration of a qualification

| **Name of complainant/appellant** | **name** different to complainant/appellant |
| --- | --- |
| **Candidate name** if different to complainant/appellant |  |
| Please state the grounds for your complaint/appeal below  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 protocols as set out in the relevant policy, and/or issues in teaching and learning which have impacted the candidate  *If necessary, continue on an additional page if this form is being completed electronically or overleaf if hard copy being completed* | |
| Detailany 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: | |

Please complete in full

**Appendix B**

**Complaints and Appeals Log**

On receipt each stage of all complaints/appeals are logged.

Outcome and outcome date is also recorded.
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