



Reviews of Results and Appeals Policy (Exams)

September 2022

(To be reviewed August 2023)

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Becca Walker
Exams officer	Natalie Rose Woods
Education Manager	Helen Thompson
Senior leader(s)	Kass Court
ALS lead/SENCo	Dan Board

Safeguarding Statement

SupaJam is a post-16 specialist provider, specialising in Music, Maths, English and Life Skills. All staff, volunteers and partners are committed to safeguarding the welfare of every person within SupaJam. Our mission is to help young people to engage and achieve within a safe and inclusive environment.

Purpose of the procedure

This procedure confirms SupaJam Education In Music and Media's compliance with JCQ's **General Regulations for Approved Centres** (section 5.8) 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 his/her/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 (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 his/her centre assessed marks prior to marks being submitted to the awarding body
- Candidate not informed of his/her 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 Head of Centre Becca Walker 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 his/her 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 Head of Centre Becca Walker 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 Head of Centre 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

Complaints and Appeals Procedure

If a candidate (or his/her parent/carer) has a general concern or complaint about the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification he/she is following, SupaJam Education In Music and Media encourages him/her to try to resolve this informally in the first instance. To do this the candidate should speak to Becca Walker Head of Centre, by telephone or in writing.

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

How to make a formal complaint

The process:

- 1) The Education Manager will arrange a time to discuss the issue with the student.
- 2) They will review the issue carefully, and may need to talk to any members of staff involved.
- 3) When they have completed their review of the issue, they will arrange a further meeting with the student to discuss the outcome. This may involve action in support of the complaint, or it may involve the Education Manager detailing to the student why the action that they are unhappy with was in fact appropriate. They will follow this decision in writing.
- 4) If the student would like to appeal this decision, they must then email the Head of Centre, becca.walker@supajam-education.org.
- 5) The Head of Centre will follow the same process and may come to the same conclusion or a different conclusion, depending on their findings.
- 6) If the student is still unhappy with the outcome, they should contact the Awarding Body directly to follow the Awarding Body's complaints process.

Appeals

Following the outcome, if the complainant remains dissatisfied and believes there are clear grounds, an appeal can be submitted.

The process:

- 1) The student should email their teacher outlining that they wish to appeal the grade given.
- 2) The teacher will send their work to our Internal Verifier (IQA) who will second mark the work and review the teachers comments and feedback.
- 3) The Internal Verifier will contact the teacher to let them know if they agree or disagree with their decision, advising on the mark that should be awarded to the student. We may also involve the awarding body EQA (External Quality Assurer) to make sure they also agree with the decision, which will be given in writing.
- 4) The teacher will communicate with the student to let them know if their mark has changed or has stayed the same.
- 5) If the student is still unhappy with the outcome, they should follow the above complaints procedure.

If the student does not feel that the staff of SupaJam have appropriately dealt with their grading concerns, they can go to the awarding body directly and follow their appeals process.

Within SupaJam, our portfolio based qualification is delivered by NCFE. Our GCSE's are delivered by Pearson Edexcel.

Please see below examples of our complaints procedure forms.

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

