



HARROGATE  
GRAMMAR SCHOOL  
EXCELLENCE FOR ALL

# Complaints Policy (Exams) 2025-26

**Member of Staff Responsible**

**Alison Meacher**

**Approved on:**

**14 May 2026**

**Review date:**

**March 2027**

**Signed off by:**

**Kirstie Moat**

## Purpose of the policy

This policy confirms Harrogate Grammar School's 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 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, 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 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 decision (complainant to refer via Faculty Leader 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 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 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 manager 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 Manager 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, Harrogate Grammar School encourages the candidate to try to resolve this informally in the first instance. A concern or complaint should be made in person, by telephone, by email or in writing to the Exams Manager or 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.

## Complaints/Appeals Procedure Flowchart

### Informal

- Concern raised informally with Exams Manager/Head of Centre by email, phone or in person
- Quick response and resolution (usually within 3 working school days) or meeting scheduled to discuss

### Stage 1

- Complainant contacts the Headteacher/Principal for formal investigation if they feel the issue has not been addressed or warrants further investigation.
- Complaint will be acknowledged within 2 working days
- Investigation and response by Headteacher/Principal
- Within 10 working days the Headteacher/Principal will investigate and respond in writing

### Stage 2

- Complainant submits a formal complaint via email or post to the Red Kite Learning Trust if they remain dissatisfied with the previous outcome
- Complaint will be acknowledged within 2 working days
- The CEO/Chair of the Trust (or their nominated representative) will consider all the relevant evidence to the complaint.
- The outcome will be confirmed in writing within 20 working days of confirmation that the investigation will be undertaken.

### Stage 3

- Complainant writes to Trust CEO or Chair, within 20 working days of receiving Stage 2 Outcome, to request that their complaint is referred to the Trust Complaints Appeal Panel if they still remain dissatisfied.
- Receipt of the request will be confirmed with 5 working days
- The appeal panel will review Stage 1 and Stage 2 investigations and make a final decision to uphold/reject all or part of the complaint.
- The panel's findings and recommendations will be provided to the complainant within 30 working days of confirmation of the request

### Stage 4

Complainant may refer their complaint to the Department for Education if they remain dissatisfied



