



## Royal Wootton Bassett Academy

# Exams Complaints and Appeals Procedures

Written by: Mrs D Bevis / Mrs S Mills  
Date ratified: December 2024  
Next Review Date: December 2025  
Version Number: 4  
Reviewed by: LGB

### Key Staff Involved in the Exams Complaints and Appeals Procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Mrs Anita Ellis
Exams officer line manager (Senior Leader)	Mrs Demelza Bevis
Exams officer	Mrs Sharon Mills
Admin / Data Manager	Mrs Shelly Davies
SENCO	Mrs Susan McMullin

### Contents

<b>Royal Wootton Bassett Academy</b> .....	1
Purpose of the procedure.....	2
Grounds for complaint.....	2
Teaching and learning.....	2
Access arrangements and special consideration.....	2
Entries.....	3
Conducting examinations.....	3
Results and Post-results.....	3
Raising a concern/complaint.....	3
How to make a formal complaint.....	4
How a formal complaint is investigated.....	4
Appealing a complaint.....	4
Internal appeals procedure.....	4
Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice.....	6

Appeals relating to centre decisions not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal .....	7
Complaints and Appeals form.....	10
Complainant/appellant signature: .....	Date of signature:..... 10
Complaints and Appeals log .....	12

## Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms Royal Wootton Bassett Academy compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.3, 5.8) that the centre will draw 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/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 / NEA, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not conducted according to the JCQ/awarding body instructions
- The marking of an internal assessment (centre assessed work), which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not undertaken according to the requirements of the awarding body
- 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 make a decision whether to request a review of centre assessed marks
- Candidate unhappy with internal assessment / NEA decision (complainant to refer via Exams Officer 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 did not consent to record their personal data online (by the non-acquisition of a completed candidate personal data 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/assistive technology 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
- Candidate unhappy with centre decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration (complainant to refer via exams officer 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 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 accepted/rejected outcome of a special consideration application if provided by awarding body

### 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 exams officer 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 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, Royal Wootton Bassett Academy encourages the candidate to try to resolve this informally in the first instance. A complaint should be made in writing to the head of centre.

If a 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

Please see the Royal Wootton Bassett Complaints policy for full details.

- A concern or complaint can be made in person, in writing or by telephone. They may also be made by a third party acting on behalf on a complainant, as long as they have appropriate consent to do so.
- Complaints against school staff (except the Headteacher) should be made in the first instance, to the Headteacher via the school office. Please mark them as Private and Confidential.
- Complaints that involve or are about the Headteacher should be addressed to Mrs Julie Dickson (the Chair of Governors), via the school office. Please mark them as Private and Confidential.
- Completed complaints and appeals forms should be returned to exams officer
- Forms received will be logged by the centre and acknowledged within 2 working 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 20 working days of the complaint being received and logged by the centre.

### Appealing a complaint

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 2 working days
- The appeal will be referred to Mrs Julie Dickson (the Chair of Governors), via the school office. Please mark them as Private and Confidential. (or a special Committee of the Governing body) for consideration
- The Chair of Governors (or Committee) will inform the appellant of the final conclusion in due course

### Internal appeals procedure

Certain qualifications contain components/units of non-examination assessment, controlled assessment and/or coursework which are internally assessed (marked) by centres and internally standardized. The marks awarded (the internal assessment decisions) which contribute to the final grade of the qualification are then submitted by the deadline set by the awarding body for external moderation.

This procedure confirms Royal Wootton Bassett Academy's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.7) that the centre will:

- have in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions and to ensure that details of this procedure are communicated, made widely available and accessible to all candidates
- before submitting marks to the awarding body inform candidates of their centre assessed marks and allow a candidate to request a review of the centre's marking

Royal Wootton Bassett Academy is committed to ensuring that whenever it's staff mark candidates work this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents.

Royal Wootton Bassett Academy ensures that all centre staff follow a robust policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework.

Candidates' work will be marked by staff who have appropriate knowledge, understanding and skill, who have been trained in this activity and do not have any potential conflicts of interest. If AI tools have been used to assist in the marking of candidates' work, they will not be the sole marker. Royal Wootton Bassett Academy is committed to ensuring that work produced by candidates is authenticated in line with the requirements of the awarding body. Where more than one subject teacher/tutor is involved in marking candidates' work, internal moderation and standardization will ensure consistency of marking.

On being informed of their centre assessed marks, if a candidate believes that the above procedures were not followed in relation to the marking of their work, or that the assessor has not properly applied the marking standards to the marking, then the candidate may make use of the appeals procedure below to consider whether to request a review of the centre's marking.

Royal Wootton Bassett Academy will:

1. ensure that candidates are informed of their centre assessed marks so that they may request a review of the centre's marking before marks are submitted to the awarding body
2. inform candidates that they will need to explain on what grounds they wish to request a review of an internally assessed mark as a review will only focus on the quality of work submitted
3. inform candidates that they may request copies of materials (generally as a minimum, a copy of the marked assessment material (work) and the mark scheme or assessment criteria plus additional materials which may vary from subject to subject) to assist them in considering whether to request a review of the centre's marking of the assessment
4. having received a request for copies of materials, promptly make them available to the candidate within 3 calendar days. This will either be the originals viewed under supervised conditions or copies
5. inform candidates they will not be allowed access to original assessment material, including artefacts, unless supervised
6. provide candidates with sufficient time, normally at least five working days, to allow them to review copies of materials and reach a decision
7. provide a clear deadline for candidates to submit a request for review of the centre's marking. Requests will not be accepted after the deadline. Requests must be made in writing within 3 calendar days of receiving copies of the requested materials by completing the internal appeals form and candidates must explain on what grounds they wish to request a review
8. allow 20 calendar days for the review to be carried out, to make any necessary changes to marks and to inform the candidate of the outcome, all before the awarding body's deadline for the submission of marks
9. ensure that the review of marking is conducted by an assessor who has appropriate

- competence, has had no previous involvement in the assessment of that candidate for the component in question and has no personal interest in the outcome of the review
10. instruct the reviewer to ensure that the candidate's mark is consistent with the standard set by the centre
  11. inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review of the centre's marking

The outcome of the review of the centre's marking will be made known to the head of centre who will have the final decision if there is any disagreement on the mark to be submitted to the awarding body. A written record of the review will be kept and made available to the awarding body upon request.

The awarding body will be informed if the centre does not accept the outcome of a review.

The moderation process carried out by the awarding body may result in a mark change, either upwards or downwards, even after an internal review. The internal review process is in place to ensure consistency of marking within the centre, whereas moderation by the awarding body ensures that centre marking is in line with national standards. The mark submitted to the awarding body is subject to change and should therefore be considered provisional.

### Appeals against decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice

The JCQ Information for candidates documents (Coursework, Non-examinations assessments, Social Media) which are distributed to all candidates prior to relevant assessments taking place, inform candidates of the things they must and must not do when they are completing their work.

Royal Wootton Bassett Academy ensures that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing work for assessments are aware of the potential for malpractice.

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication does not need to be reported to the awarding body but will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures. The only exception to this is where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has potentially been breached. The breach will be reported to the awarding body immediately.

If there are doubts about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or irregularities are identified in a candidate's work before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication/authentication statement (where required) and malpractice is suspected, Royal Wootton Bassett Academy will:

- follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document (Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments/ Instructions for conducting coursework) and any supplementary guidance that may be provided by the awarding body. Where this may lead to the decision to **not** accept the candidate's work for assessment or to reject the candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice, the affected candidate will be informed of the decision.

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:

- a written request, setting out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal, should be submitted
- an internal appeals form should be completed and submitted within 5 working days of the decision being made known to the appellant

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 20 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.

## Appeals relating to centre decisions not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

This procedure confirms Royal Wootton Bassett Academy's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.13) that the centre will:

- have available for inspection purposes and draw to the attention of candidates and their parents/carers, a written internal appeals procedure to manage disputes when a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support an application for a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal

Following the issue of results, awarding bodies make post-results services available. Full details of these services can be found on our school website and forms to request the service with details of fees are provided by the exams officer.

Candidates are made aware of the arrangements for post-results services prior to the issue of results. Candidates are also informed of the periods during which senior members of centre staff will be available immediately after the publication of results so that results may be discussed, and decisions made on the submission of reviews of marking. Candidates are made aware/informed by letter which is usually sent by email.

If the centre or a candidate (or their parent/carer) has a concern and believes a result may not be accurate, post-results services may be considered.

The JCQ post-results services currently available are detailed below.

### Reviews of Results (RoRs):

- Service 1 (Clerical re-check)  
This is the only service that can be requested for objective tests (multiple choice tests)
- Service 2 (Review of marking)
- Priority Service 2 (Review of marking)  
This service is available for externally assessed components of both unitized and linear GCE A-level specifications. It is also available for Level 3 Vocational and Technical qualifications
- Service 3 (Review of moderation)  
This service is not available to an individual candidate

### Access to Scripts (ATS):

- Copies of scripts to support reviews of marking
- Copies of scripts to support teaching and learning

Where a concern is expressed that a particular result may not be accurate, the centre will look at the marks awarded for each component part of the qualification alongside any mark schemes, relevant result reports, grade boundary information, etc. when made available by the awarding body to determine if the centre supports any concerns.

For written components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

1. Where a place a university or college is at risk, consider supporting a request for a Priority Service 2 review of marking (where the qualification concerned is eligible for this service)
2. In all other instances, consider accessing the script by:
  - a) requesting a priority copy of the candidate's script to support a review of marking by the awarding body deadline, or
  - b) (where the option is made available by the awarding body) viewing the candidate's marked script online to consider if requesting a review of marking is appropriate
3. Collect informed written consent/permission from the candidate to access their script
4. On access to the script, consider if it is felt that the agreed mark scheme has been applied correctly in the original marking and if the centre considers there are any errors in the

- marking
5. Support a request for the appropriate RoR service (clerical re-check or review of marking) if any error is identified
  6. Collect informed written consent from the candidate to request the RoR service before the request is submitted
  7. Where relevant, advise an affected candidate to inform any third party (such as a university or college) that a review of marking has been submitted to an awarding body

Written candidate consent (informed consent via candidate email is acceptable) is required in all cases before a request for a RoR service 1 or 2 (including priority service 2) is submitted to the awarding body. Consent is required to confirm the candidate understands that the final subject grade and/or mark awarded following a clerical re-check or a review of marking, and any subsequent appeal, may be lower than, higher than, or the same as the result which was originally awarded. Candidate consent must only be collected after the publication of results.

For any moderated components that contributed to the final result, the centre will:

- Confirm that a review of moderation cannot be undertaken on the work of an individual candidate or the work of candidates not in the original sample submitted for moderation
- Consult any moderator report/feedback to identify any issues raised
- Determine if the centre's internally assessed marks have been accepted without change by the awarding body – if this is the case, a RoR service 3 (Review of moderation) will not be available
- Determine if there are any grounds to submit a request for a review of moderation for the work of all candidates in the original sample

### Centre actions in the event of a disagreement (dispute)

Where a candidate disagrees with a centre decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking or a review of moderation, the centre will:

- For a review of marking (RoR priority service 2), advise the candidate they may request the review by providing informed written consent (and the required fee) for this service to the centre by the deadline set by the centre
- For a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2), first advise the candidate to access a copy of their script to support a review of marking by providing written permission for the centre to access the script (and any required administration fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- After accessing the script to consider the marking, inform the candidate that if a request for a review of marking (RoR service 1 or 2) is required, this must be submitted by the deadline set by the centre by providing informed written consent (and the required fee for this service) for the centre to submit this request
- Inform the candidate that a review of moderation (RoR service 3) cannot be requested for the work of an individual candidate or the work of a candidate not in the original sample

If the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds to appeal against the centre's decision not to support a review of results, an internal appeal can be submitted to the centre by completing the internal appeals form at least 20 calendar days prior to the internal deadline for submitting a request for a review of results.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal before the internal deadline for submitting a RoR.

Following the RoR outcome, an external appeals process is available if the head of centre remains dissatisfied with the outcome and believes that there are grounds for appeal. The JCQ publications **Post-Results Services** and **JCQ Appeals Booklet** (A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes) will be consulted to determine the grounds for a preliminary appeal.



Where the head of centre is satisfied after receiving the RoR outcome, but the candidate (or their parent/carer) believes there are grounds for a preliminary appeal to the awarding body, a further internal appeal may be made to the head of centre. Following this, the head of centre's decision as to whether to proceed with a preliminary appeal will be based upon the acceptable grounds as detailed in the **JCQ Appeals Booklet**. Candidates or parents/carers are not permitted to make direct representations to an awarding body.

The internal appeals form should be completed and submitted to the centre within 5 calendar days of the notification of the outcome of the RoR. Subject to the head of centre's decision, this will allow the centre to process the preliminary appeal and submit to the awarding body within the required 30 calendar days of the awarding body issuing the outcome of the review of results process. Awarding body fees which may be charged for the preliminary appeal must be paid to the centre by the appellant before the preliminary appeal is submitted to the awarding body (fees are available from the exams officer). If the appeal is upheld by the awarding body, this fee will be refunded by the awarding body and repaid to the appellant by the centre.

## Complaints and Appeals form

FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Reference No.	

Please tick box to indicate the nature of your complaint/appeal

- 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:	
<p>If your grounds are 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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>If necessary, continue on an additional page if this form is being completed electronically or overleaf if hard copy being completed</p>	
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

### Internal Appeals form

FOR CENTRE USE ONLY	
Date received	
Reference No.	

Please tick box to indicate the nature of your appeal and complete all white boxes\* on the form below

- Appeal against an internal assessment decision and/or request for a review of marking
- Appeal against the centre's decision not to support a clerical re-check, a review of marking, a review of moderation or an appeal
- Appeal against the centre's decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration
- Appeal against the centre's decision relating to an administrative issue

\*Where the nature of the appeal does not relate directly to an awarding body's specific qualification, indicate N/A in awarding body specific detail boxes

Name of appellant		Candidate name (if different to appellant)	
Awarding body		Exam paper code	
Qualification type Subject		Exam paper title	

Please state the grounds for your appeal below:

(If applicable, tick below)

- Where my appeal is against an internal assessment decision, I wish to request a review of the centre's marking

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

Appellant signature:

Date of signature:

This form must be signed, dated and returned to the exams officer on behalf of the head of centre to the timescale indicated in the relevant appeals procedure

Complaints and Appeals log

On receipt, all complaints/appeals are assigned a reference number and logged. Outcome and outcome date is also recorded.

Ref No.	Date received	Complaint or Appeal	Outcome	Outcome date