ST CUTHBERT'S
CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Complaints (Examinations)

for the Academic Year 2026 – 2027

Approved by:	Local Governing Committee	**Approved on:**	
Review date:		**Revision approved:**	
Version No:	1	**Originator(s):**	JCQ Policy

1. **Purpose of the policy**

This policy confirms St Cuthbert's Catholic High School 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 which covers general complaints regarding the centre's delivery or administration of a qualification.

2. Key Staff involved in this policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Daniel P. Murray
Exams officer line manager (Senior leader)	Karl Stuart
Exams manager/officer	Carol Wetherell
ALS lead/SENCo	Richard Collinson
Senior leader(s)	David Swindells, Juliana Blackie, Jenni Westwood, Matt Turner, Michael Donnelly and Paul Burrows

3. Grounds for complaint

A candidate (or their parent/carer) may make a complaint on the grounds below (this is not an exhaustive list).

3.1 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 decide whether to request a review of centre assessed marks.
- Candidate unhappy with internal assessment decision (complainant to refer via the Deputy Head (Curriculum) to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre fails to adhere to its *internal appeals procedure.*

3.2 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 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 the Deputy Head (Curriculum) to the centre's *internal appeals procedure*)
- Centre fails to adhere to its *internal appeals procedure.*

3.2 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.

3.3 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/assessmen.t
- 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.

3.4 Results and Post-results

- Prior to the issue of results, 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 manager/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 the Deputy Head (Curriculum) 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-result service
- Centre applied for a post-results service for candidate without gaining required candidate consent/permission.
-

4. 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 their are following, St Cuthbert's Catholic High School encourages the student/pupil to try to resolve this informally in the first instance.

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

4.1 How to make a formal complaint.

A formal complaint should be submitted in writing to the headmaster.

4.2 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 4 working weeks]

4.3 Internal appeals procedure

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 to the headmaster.
- The appeal will be referred to members of the Governing body as appropriate.
- The Chair of Governors or the Headmaster will inform the appellant of the conclusion in due course.