

# Complaints Policy (Exams)

## 2025-2026



This procedure is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

|                            |               |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Applicable to:</b>      | ATAM Academy  |
| <b>Approved By</b>         | UCH           |
| <b>Next Review Date</b>    | January 2027  |
| <b>Status</b>              | Non-Statutory |
| <b>Policy Lead/Author:</b> | ARO           |

## Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Key staff involved in the complaints and appeals procedure..... | 3 |
| Grounds for complaint.....                                      | 4 |
| Raising a concern/complaint .....                               | 6 |

## Key staff involved in the complaints and appeals procedure

| <b>Role</b>      | <b>Name(s)</b>   |
|------------------|--|
| Head of centre   | <b>Chris Steed</b>   |
| Exams officer    | <b>Aidan Rothnie</b>   |
| Senior leader(s) | <b>Julian Williams, Raj Sahota, Rupinder Sandhu, Mandy Virk, Ian Virk, Del Roudh, Usman Choudhury, Sunita Bhabra, Oliver Yates, Sam Williams</b> |
| SENCo            | <b>Sam Williams</b>  |

## Purpose of the policy

This policy confirms ATAM Academy 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 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.

### Teaching and learning

- a. Quality of teaching and learning, for example
  - a. Non-subject specialist teacher without adequate training/subject matter expertise utilised on a long-term basis
  - b. Teacher lacking knowledge of new specification/incorrect core content studied/taught
  - c. Core content not adequately covered
  - d. Inadequate feedback for a candidate following assessment(s)
- b. Pre-release/advance material/set task issued by the awarding body not provided on time to an exam candidate
- c. The taking of an assessment, which contributes to the final grade of the qualification, not conducted according to the JCQ/awarding body instructions
- d. Centre fails to adhere to its **internal appeals procedure**
- e. Candidate not informed of their centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body
- f. 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
- g. Candidate not given sufficient time to review materials to make a decision whether to request a review of centre assessed marks
- h. Candidate unhappy with internal assessment decision (complainant to refer via the Exams Officer to the centre's internal appeals procedure)
- i. Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals procedure

### Access arrangements

- a. Candidate not assessed by the centre's appointed assessor
- b. Candidate not involved in decisions made regarding their access arrangements
- c. 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*)
- d. Candidate not informed/adequately informed of the arrangements in place and the subjects or components of subjects where the arrangements would not apply
- e. Exam information not appropriately adapted for a disabled candidate to access it
- f. Adapted equipment put in place failed during exam/assessment
- g. Approved access arrangement(s) not put in place at the time of an exam/assessment
- h. Appropriate arrangements not put in place at the time of an exam/assessment as a consequence of a temporary injury or impairment
- i. Candidate unhappy with centre decision relating to access arrangements or special consideration (complainant to refer via the Exams Officer to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- j. Centre fails to adhere to its *internal appeals procedure*

### Entries

- a. Failure to clearly explain a decision of early entry for a qualification to candidate (or parent/carer)
- b. Candidate not entered/entered late (incurring a late entry fee) for a required exam/assessment
- c. Candidate entered for a wrong exam/assessment
- d. Candidate entered for a wrong tier of entry

### Conducting examinations

- a. Failure to adequately brief candidate on exam timetable/exam regulations prior to exam/assessment taking place
- b. Room in which exam held did not provide candidate with appropriate conditions for taking the exam
- c. Inadequate invigilation in exam room
- d. Failure to conduct exam according to the regulations
- e. Online system failed during (on-screen) exam/assessment
- f. Disruption during exam/assessment
- g. Alleged, suspected or actual malpractice incident not investigated/reported
- h. Eligible application for special consideration for a candidate not submitted/not submitted to timescale
- i. Failure to inform/update candidate on the outcome of a special consideration application if provided by awarding body

#### **Results and Post-results**

- a. 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
- b. 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
- c. Candidate request for return of work after moderation and work not available/disposed of earlier than allowed in the regulations
- d. Candidate (or parent/carer) unhappy with a result (complainant to refer via exams officer to awarding body **post-results services**)
- e. 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*)
- f. Centre fails to adhere to its internal appeals procedure
- g. Centre applied for the wrong post-results service/for the wrong script for a candidate
- h. Centre missed awarding body deadline to apply for a post-results service
- i. 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, ATAM Academy encourages the candidate to try to resolve this informally in the first instance. This can be undertaken by making contact with the centre and requesting a review of the complaint by the **Head of Centre**.

The Head of Centre may delegate responsibility for responding to the complaint to a member of the senior leadership team.

If a complaint fails to be resolved informally, the candidate (or his/her parent/carer) is then at liberty to make a formal complaint.

- ▶ All documentation relating to the submission of a formal complaint is available from the centre's **Concerns and Complaints Policy**.
- ▶ The centre will ensure that the current **Concerns and Complaints Policy** is published via the centre's website and printed copies are available on request.



