



Complaints Policy (Exams)

Archbishop Beck Catholic College

Complaints Policy (Exams)

Centre name	Archbishop Beck Catholic College
Centre number	34214
Date policy first created	28/11/2024
Current policy approved by	Paul Stirling
Current policy reviewed by	Peter Phillips
Date of review	17/10/2025
Date of next review	17/10/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Paul Stirling
Senior leader(s)	Colin Flynn Collette Stirling Dawn Bond Emma Griffiths Ian Daly Kate Verdin Sue Daniels Peter Phillips
Exams officer	Peter Phillips
Other staff (if applicable)	Vicky Lundon

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any complaints at Archbishop Beck Catholic College are managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm the arrangements for complaints at Archbishop Beck Catholic College and confirms compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (5.3, 5.8) in drawing to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers our written complaints policy which covers general complaints regarding the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification and our internal appeals procedure.

Grounds for complaint

A candidate (or their/parent/carers) at Archbishop Beck Catholic College 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

Additional grounds for complaint relating to teaching and learning:

Not Applicable

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 to the centre's **internal appeals procedure**)
- Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals procedure

Additional grounds for complaint relating to access arrangements:

Not Applicable

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

Additional grounds for complaint relating to examination entries:

Not Applicable

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

Additional grounds for complaint relating to the conducting of examinations:

Not Applicable

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**)
- 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

Additional grounds for complaint relating to results and post-results:

Not Applicable

Raising a concern/complaint

If a candidate (or parent/carer) has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification, Archbishop Beck Catholic College encourages an informal resolution in the first instance.

This can be undertaken by:

- Complaints should be made by candidate or parent/carer, to the exams officer verbally with the aim of resolving any issues quickly and effectively.

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:

- A formal complaint should be received within seven working days of the event by completing the complaints form which will be provided by and returned to the exams officer.

Formal complaints will be logged and acknowledged within:

- The complaint will be acknowledged within five days of receipt, and a response provided within two working weeks. The process will be monitored and the complainant advised if there is likely to be a delay in response and the expected duration of the delay.

To make a formal complaint, candidates (or parents/carers) must:

- Complete and return a complaints form.

How a formal complaint is investigated

The exams officer will undertake a full investigation of the complaint and report to the Head of Centre.

Where an issue is identified, a mistake has been made or it is deemed that the college has fallen short of reasonable expectations, an apology will be made, the mistake rectified where appropriate, and/or action taken to prevent the same mistake happening again.

If the complainant is dissatisfied with the outcome of the complaints process then an appeal can be made.

The findings and conclusion of any investigation will be provided to the complainant within:

- Two 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 parents/carers) must:

- Appeals should be made in writing, to the Head of Centre, within seven days of the complaint decision, and no later than three weeks before the deadline for exam board remarks.

Appeals **must** be made in writing by the candidate or parent/carer, to the Head of Centre.

Appeals will be logged and acknowledged within:

- The appeal will be acknowledged within five days of receipt, and a response provided within two working weeks.

The appeal will be referred to:

- The Head of Centre will appoint a senior member of staff, i.e. an Assistant Headteacher or a Deputy Headteacher, to conduct an investigation.

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

Additional details on the internal appeals process:

The appellant will be informed, in writing, of the outcome of the appeal, including any relevant correspondence with the awarding body, and any changes made to internal examination procedures and/or training.

The outcome of the appeal will be made known to the Head of Centre and will be logged as a complaint. A written record will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request. Should the appeal bring any irregularity in procedures to light, the awarding body will be informed.

Changes 2025/2026

(update 01/10/2025)

(Removed/replaced) Under heading **Access arrangements and special consideration** removed reference to **candidate personal data consent form**/replaced with reference to complying with the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in September 2025 no Centre-Specific changes were needed.