

## Consolidated Student Appeals Procedure

1. This Consolidated Appeals procedure describes whether and how students can appeal against various decisions made by the College about them. It also describes what happens when an appeal is upheld or rejected.
2. Part A of the procedure deals with appeals against:
  - a. The outcome of a Disciplinary hearing;
  - b. The outcome of a Fitness to Practise Panel;
  - c. The outcome of a Fitness to Study Panel.
3. Part B of the procedure applies to appeals against the outcome of an Academic Misconduct hearing.
4. Part C of the procedure deals with appeals against a decision of an Assessment Board.
5. Part D of the procedure deals with appeals against a refusal by the College to grant a suspension of studies.
6. Part E of the procedure deals with appeals against the rejection of an application for Mitigating Circumstances.
7. Part F deals with appeals against suspension or withdrawal of a UK student by the College owing to the student's non-engagement with their studies.
8. Part G deals with appeals against the outcome of a formal investigation of a student complaint.
9. Part H deals with appeals against withdrawal of an international student owing to the student's non-engagement with their studies.

### Intended audiences

10. The primary audiences for this procedure are:
  - Students considering, or engaged in, making an appeal;
  - College staff responsible for teaching and supporting students;
  - College staff involved in considering appeals, as described below.

### **Who may use this procedure?**

11. Further information about who may use the different parts of this procedure appears at the beginning of each part.

### **Appeals panels**

12. Each part of this procedure has two stages. Second stages involve an Appeals Panel. Appeals Panels will comprise at least two senior members of College staff with no prior involvement in the case, and the members will be identified to the appellant before the Panel considers the appeal so that the appellant may object to a Panel member, for example on the grounds of bias. If an objection is made, a nominee of Academic Quality team will consider whether the student's objection is valid. If the objection is found to be valid, that member of the Panel will be substituted and the new member identified to the appellant.

### **How to access advice and support**

13. Students needing further advice about, or support with, making an appeal of any kind should contact their Customer Service Officer.

### **Confidentiality**

14. Information about student appeals will be shared only with those College staff who play a specific role in the procedure as described below, and only to the extent that these staff require to discharge their roles properly.

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) runs an independent scheme to review student complaints and the outcomes of other appeals processes. Regent College is a member of this scheme. If you are unhappy with the outcome, you may be able to ask the OIA to review your case. You can find more information about making a complaint to the OIA, what it can and can't look at and what it can do to put things right if something has gone wrong here: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/students>.

You normally need to have completed this appeals procedure before you complain to the OIA. Regent College will send you a letter called a "Completion of Procedures Letter" when you have reached the end of our processes and there are no further steps you can take internally. If your appeal is not upheld or rejected, we will issue you with a Completion of Procedures Letter automatically. If your appeal is upheld or partly upheld, you can ask for a Completion of Procedures Letter if you want one. You can find more information about Completion of Procedures Letters and when you should expect to receive one here: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/providers/completion-of-procedures-letters>

**Part A: appeals against the outcome of a Disciplinary hearing, Fitness to Practise Panel or Fitness to Study Panel**

**Who may use Part A?**

<b>If you are...</b>	<b>Then...</b>
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Pearson</b>	You may use Part A.
On a programme leading to an award from the <b>University of Bolton</b>	Part A does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Buckinghamshire New University</b>	Part A does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>St. Mary's University</b>	This procedure does not apply to you. You should refer to the <a href="#">University's procedures</a> .
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Regent College</b>	You may use Part A.

15. A student may appeal in writing within 10 working days of receiving the outcome of the hearing or panel. The appeal should be made to Academic Quality and include detail of the grounds on which the appeal is being made. An appeal submission form is provided [here](#).

16. Students can appeal on one or more of the following grounds:

- That the relevant procedure was not followed properly such that the legitimacy of the decision or decisions reached is called into question;
- That the outcome is not permitted under the relevant procedure;
- That the student has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process.

17. If the student's appeal submission is not wholly based on one or more of the grounds set out above, or is submitted late without good reason, Academic Quality may refer some or all of it to a different procedure or reject it entirely. If it is rejected, the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter explaining the rejection and details of how the student may apply to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review.

18. In the first instance, an eligibility check will be undertaken of the academic appeal submission. If it is agreed that the academic appeal submission falls under the scope of the grounds for appeal (as identified above) and is submitted on time or late with good reason, then the appeals will be referred for consideration.

## **Stage one**

19. Once received, the Academic Quality nominee will consider whether the appeal falls within an issue excluded from review or whether the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit. Where it is determined the appeal is excluded from review or vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit the academic quality nominee shall have the authority to reject it summarily and inform the appellant of the decision in writing within 10 working days.

20. If the appeal submission is held to be admissible, it will be scrutinised by the Academic Quality nominee, together with the supporting documentation, and an investigation undertaken if necessary. The Academic Quality nominee, will then determine whether to:

- a. Uphold the appeal, in which case the student will be informed of the decision within 10 working days of receipt. Where the student does not accept the Stage One decision, the matter will be referred to Stage Two;
- b. Reject the appeal, in which case the student will be notified within 10 working days that the appeal submission has not demonstrated that there are sufficient grounds to uphold the appeal, and advised of the options available to them;
- c. Refer the appeal. Where the Academic Quality nominee believes the appeal is complex; raises a new point and/or requires a determination on policy, they will have the discretion to refer the appeal to an Appeals Panel.

## **Stage two**

21. Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage One decision or the Academic Quality nominee has referred the appeal, the matter will proceed to consideration by an Appeals Panel. Where an appeal is referred by the Academic Quality nominee, no further action will be required from the student.

22. Where the student is seeking a Stage Two review, they should submit a Stage Two Appeal Form within 10 working days of the date of notification of the decision at Stage One.

23. The grounds on which a request for review of a Stage One may be granted are as follows:

- a. There is new evidence that could not be provided earlier in the procedure; or
- b. There is evidence that the correct process was not followed at Stage One of the process; or,
- c. The outcome at Stage One is not reasonable given the evidence.

24. Dissatisfaction with the outcome of Stage One alone is not grounds for a Stage Two review.

25. The Appeals Panel will be provided with the Stage One decision, the evidence submitted by the student at Stage One and at Stage Two; and any further evidence used or collected by the Academic Quality nominee at Stage One. Decisions will be made based on the evidence submitted and students will have no right to attend the Panel meeting or to give oral evidence.

26. Following consideration by the Panel, they may either:
- a. Reject the appeal and advise the student accordingly that their appeal is not upheld;
  - b. Overturn the decision and substitute their own decision for that of the original decision-maker;
  - c. Refer the decision by requesting the original decision-maker consider the new evidence or a new decision-maker review all the evidence and make a new determination (For the avoidance of doubt, where a matter is referred the subsequent decision can be appealed under the appeals process).
27. The student will be provided with a written statement of the outcome and reasons for it, including any relevant recommendations, normally within 10 working days of the panel making its decision. This statement will also include a Completion of Procedures notification and details of how the student may apply to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review of the outcome.

**Part B: appeals against the outcome of an Academic Misconduct hearing**

**Who may use Part B?**

If you are...	Then...
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Pearson</b>	You may use Part B.
On a programme leading to an award from the <b>University of Bolton</b>	Part B does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Buckinghamshire New University</b>	Part B does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>St. Mary's University</b>	You may use Part B. If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of this procedure, you should make a further appeal to the University before a Completion of Procedures notification will be given to you.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Regent College</b>	You may use Part B.

28. A student may appeal in writing within 10 working days of receiving the outcome of the hearing or panel. The appeal should be made to Academic Quality and include detail of the grounds on which the appeal is being made. An appeal submission form is provided [here](#).

29. Students can appeal on one or more of the following grounds:

- That the relevant procedure was not followed properly such that the legitimacy of the decision or decisions reached is called into question;
- That the outcome is not permitted under the relevant procedure;
- That the student has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process.

30. If the student's appeal submission is not wholly based on one or more of the grounds set out above, or is submitted late without good reason, Academic Quality may refer some or all of it to a different procedure or reject it entirely. If it is rejected, the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter explaining the rejection and details of how the student may apply to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review.

31. In the first instance, an eligibility check will be undertaken of the academic appeal submission. If it is agreed that the academic appeal submission falls under the scope of the grounds for appeal (as identified above) and is submitted on time or late with good reason, then the appeals will be referred for consideration.

## **Stage one**

32. Once received, the Academic Quality nominee will consider whether the appeal falls within an issue excluded from review or whether the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit. Where it is determined the appeal is excluded from review or vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit the academic quality nominee shall have the authority to reject it summarily and inform the appellant of the decision in writing within 10 working days.

33. If the appeal submission is held to be admissible, it will be scrutinised by the Academic Quality nominee, together with the supporting documentation, and an investigation undertaken if necessary. The Academic Quality nominee, will then determine whether to:

- a. Uphold the appeal, in which case the student will be informed of the decision within 10 working days of receipt. Where the student does not accept the Stage One decision, the matter will be referred to Stage Two;
- b. Reject the appeal, in which case the student will be notified within 10 working days that the appeal submission has not demonstrated that there are sufficient grounds to uphold the appeal, and advised of the options available to them;
- c. Refer the appeal. Where the Academic Quality nominee believes the appeal is complex; raises a new point and/or requires a determination on policy, they will have the discretion to refer the appeal to the Appeals Panel.

## **Stage two**

34. Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage One decision or the Academic Quality nominee has referred the appeal, the matter will proceed to consideration by an Appeals Panel. Where an appeal is referred by the Academic Quality nominee, no further action will be required from the student.

35. Where the student is seeking a Stage Two review, they should submit a Stage Two Appeal Form within 10 working days of the date of notification of the decision at Stage One.

36. The grounds on which a request for review of a Stage One may be granted are as follows:

- a. There is new evidence that could not be provided earlier in the procedure; or
- b. There is evidence that the correct process was not followed at Stage One of the process; or
- c. The outcome at Stage One is not reasonable given the evidence.

37. Dissatisfaction with the outcome of Stage One alone is not grounds for review.

38. The Appeals Panel will be provided with the Stage One decision, the evidence submitted by the student at Stage One and at Stage Two; and any further evidence used or collected by the Academic Quality nominee at Stage One. Decisions will be made based on the evidence submitted and students will have no right to attend the Panel meeting or to give oral evidence.

39. Following consideration by the Panel, they may either:
- a. Reject the appeal and advise the student accordingly that their appeal is not upheld.
  - b. Overturn the decision and substitute their own decision for that of the original decision-maker.
  - c. Refer the decision by requesting the original decision-maker consider the new evidence or a new decision-maker review all the evidence and make a new determination. (For the avoidance of doubt, where a matter is referred the subsequent decision can be appealed under the appeals process).
40. The student will be provided with a written statement of the outcome and reasons for it, including any relevant recommendations, normally within 10 working days of the panel making its decision. This statement will also include a Completion of Procedures notification and details of how the student may apply to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review of the outcome.



## Part C: appeals against the decision of an Assessment Board

### Who may use Part C?

If you are...	Then...
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Pearson</b>	You may use Part C.
On a programme leading to an award from the <b>University of Bolton</b>	Part C does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Buckinghamshire New University</b>	Paragraph 41 applies to you. If you remain dissatisfied after informal discussions, or wish to proceed directly to a formal appeal, you should refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>St. Mary's University</b>	This procedure applies up to the middle of paragraph 55. Students may appeal the College's decision to the University (and then to OIA).
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Regent College</b>	You may use Part C.

41. Students who are concerned about the decision of an Assessment Board are encouraged to speak to a member of academic staff (such as their module tutor) or CSO informally in the first instance as it may be that the concern can be resolved by a member of staff explaining or clarifying the decision. The student will be provided with an outcome to any informal discussions in writing.

42. Where a student (or recent student) remains dissatisfied after an informal discussion, or wishes to proceed directly to a formal appeal, they may lodge a formal appeal with Academic Quality in writing using the appeal submission form [here](#).

43. A formal appeal must be made within 10 working days of receiving the outcome of an informal discussion or, where an informal discussion has not taken place, within 10 working days of receiving the outcome of the Assessment Board. The outcome of the Assessment Board may be in the form of published or confirmed marks or grades, notification of progression (or non-progression) from one stage to another, and/or notification of a final award.

44. Students can appeal on one or more of the following grounds:

- That there has been an administrative error or some other material irregularity affecting the Assessment Board's decision;
- That the relevant assessment regulations and/or procedures were not followed properly such that the legitimacy of the outcome of those procedures is called into question. These

procedures include the conduct of the Assessment Board itself.

- College staff who took part in the assessment procedures demonstrated bias in the way they made their decisions;
- For a student with a disability or additional needs, the assessment was not correctly carried out, or the support identified was not provided, or the agreed assessment procedures for that student were not properly implemented.

45. The College will not consider an appeal against the decision of an Assessment Board where:

- The decision is yet to be confirmed or published;
- The student did not understand, or was not aware of, the relevant assessment regulations and procedures;
- The student was not aware of the published procedures for applying for Mitigating Circumstances;
- The appeal is made on the grounds of Mitigating Circumstances without there being any relevant written medical or other evidence to show why it should be considered (e.g. medical or death certificates, counsellor's letter, crime report);
- The appeal is based on evidence that relates to alleged ill-health or other Mitigating Circumstances that could have been reported to the College at the time they occurred, but were not, and the student is unable to provide a valid reason for not having provided the evidence at the time;
- The appeal represents a disagreement with the academic judgement of an Assessment Board in assessing the merits of academic work, or in reaching a decision on progression, or on the final classification for an award, which has been reached in accordance with the published regulations and procedures;
- The appeal is on the grounds that the quality of teaching or support affected academic performance. In such circumstances a student should consider submitting a complaint according to the Student Complaints Procedure;
- The appeal is received after the deadline without good cause.
- The appeal is vexatious or frivolous.

46. In the first instance, an eligibility check will be undertaken of the academic appeal submission. If it is agreed that the academic appeal submission falls under the scope of the grounds for appeal (as identified above) and is submitted on time or late with good reason, then the appeals will be referred for consideration.

### **Stage one**

47. Once received, the Academic Quality nominee will consider whether the appeal falls within an issue excluded from review or whether the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit. Where it is determined the appeal is excluded from review or vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit the academic quality nominee shall have the authority to reject it summarily and inform the appellant of the decision in writing within 10 working days.

48. If the appeal submission is held to be admissible, it will be scrutinised by the Academic Quality nominee, together with the supporting documentation, and an investigation undertaken if

necessary. The Academic Quality nominee, will then determine whether to:

- a. Uphold the appeal, in which case the student will be informed of the decision within 10 working days of receipt. Where the student does not accept the Stage One decision, the matter will be referred to Stage Two;
- b. Reject the appeal, in which case the student will be notified within 10 working days that the appeal submission has not demonstrated that there are sufficient grounds to uphold the appeal, and advised of the options available to them;
- c. Refer the appeal. Where the Academic Quality nominee believes the appeal is complex; raises a new point and/or requires a determination on policy, they will have the discretion to refer the appeal to the Appeals Panel

## **Stage two**

49. Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage One decision or the Academic Quality nominee has referred the appeal, the matter will proceed to consideration by an Appeals Panel. Where an appeal is referred by the Academic Quality nominee, no further action will be required from the student.

50. Where the student is seeking a Stage Two review, they should submit a Stage Two Appeal Form within 10 working days of the date of notification of the decision at Stage One.

51. The grounds on which a request for review of a Stage One may be granted are as follows:

- a. There is new evidence that could not be provided earlier in the procedure; or
- b. There is evidence that the correct process was not followed at Stage One of the process; or
- c. The outcome at Stage One is not reasonable given the evidence.

52. Dissatisfaction with the outcome of Stage One alone is not grounds for review.

53. The Appeals Panel will be provided with the Stage One decision, the evidence submitted by the student at Stage One and at Stage Two; and any further evidence used or collected by the Academic Quality nominee at Stage One. Decisions will be made based on the evidence submitted and students will have no right to attend the Panel meeting or to give oral evidence.

54. Following consideration by the Panel, they may either:

- a. Reject the appeal and advise the student accordingly that their appeal is not upheld;
- b. Require that the assessment in question be annulled and the student be permitted to retake the assessment;
- c. Refer the decision back to Assessment Board for reconsideration in the light of their findings through the appeal.

55. The student will be provided with a written statement of the outcome and reasons for it,

including any relevant recommendations, normally within 10 working days of the panel making its decision. This statement will also include a Completion of Procedures notification and details of how the student may apply to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review of the outcome, and, for HND students only, to Pearson for a final appeal.

## Part D: appeals against a refusal by the College to grant a suspension of studies

### Who may use Part D?

If you are...	Then...
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Pearson</b>	You may use Part D.
On a programme leading to an award from the <b>University of Bolton</b>	Part D does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Buckinghamshire New University</b>	Part D does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>St. Mary's University</b>	Part D does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Regent College</b>	You may use Part D.

56. A student may appeal in writing within 10 working days of receiving a rejection of their request to suspend their studies. The appeal should be made to Academic Quality and include detail of the grounds on which the appeal is being made. An appeal submission form is provided [here](#).

57. Students can appeal on one of the following grounds:

- That the procedure described in the College's Student Transfer and Change of Status Policy was not followed properly such that the legitimacy of the decision reached is called into question;
- That the student has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process.

58. If the student's appeal submission is not wholly based on one or more of the grounds set out above, or is submitted late without good reason, Academic Quality may refer some or all of it to a different procedure or reject it entirely. If it is rejected, the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter explaining the rejection and details of how the student may apply to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review.

59. In the first instance, an eligibility check will be undertaken of the academic appeal submission. If it is agreed that the academic appeal submission falls under the scope of the grounds for appeal (as identified above) and is submitted on time or late with good reason, then the appeals

will be referred for consideration.

### Stage one

60. Once received, the Academic Quality nominee will consider whether the appeal falls within an issue excluded from review or whether the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit. Where it is determined the appeal is excluded from review or vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit the academic quality nominee shall have the authority to reject it summarily and inform the appellant of the decision in writing within 10 working days.

61. If the appeal submission is held to be admissible, it will be scrutinised by the Academic Quality nominee, together with the supporting documentation, and an investigation undertaken if necessary. The Academic Quality nominee, will then determine whether to:

- a. Uphold the appeal, in which case the student will be informed of the decision within 10 working days of receipt. Where the student does not accept the Stage One decision, the matter will be referred to Stage Two;
- b. Reject the appeal, in which case the student will be notified within 10 working days that the appeal submission has not demonstrated that there are sufficient grounds to uphold the appeal, and advised of the options available to them;
- c. Refer the appeal. Where the Academic Quality nominee believes the appeal is complex; raises a new point and/or requires a determination on policy, they will have the discretion to refer the appeal to the Appeals Panel.

### Stage two

62. Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage One decision or the Academic Quality nominee has referred the appeal, the matter will proceed to consideration by an Appeals Panel. Where an appeal is referred by the Academic Quality nominee, no further action will be required from the student.

63. Where the student is seeking a Stage Two review, they should submit a Stage Two Appeal Form within 10 working days of the date of notification of the decision at Stage One.

64. The grounds on which a request for review of a Stage One may be granted are as follows:

- a. There is new evidence that could not be provided earlier in the procedure; or
- b. There is evidence that the correct process was not followed at Stage One of the process; or
- c. The outcome at Stage One is not reasonable given the evidence.

65. Dissatisfaction with the outcome of Stage One alone is not grounds for review.

66. The Appeals Panel will be provided with the Stage One decision, the evidence submitted by the student at Stage One and at Stage Two; and any further evidence used or collected by the Academic Quality nominee at Stage One. Decisions will be made based on the evidence submitted

and students will have no right to attend the Panel meeting or to give oral evidence.

67. Following consideration by the Panel, they may either:

- a. Reject the appeal and advise the student accordingly that their appeal is not upheld;
- b. Overturn the decision and substitute their own decision for that of the original decision-maker;
- c. Refer the decision by requesting the original decision-maker consider the new evidence or a new decision-maker review all the evidence and make a new determination. (For the avoidance of doubt, where a matter is referred the subsequent decision can be appealed under the appeals process).

68. The student will be provided with a written statement of the outcome and reasons for it, including any relevant recommendations, normally within 10 working days of the panel making its decision. This statement will also include a Completion of Procedures notification and details of how the student may apply to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review of the outcome.

## Part E: appeals against a rejection of an application for Mitigating Circumstances

### Who may use Part E?

If you are...	Then...
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Pearson</b>	You may use Part E.
On a programme leading to an award from the <b>University of Bolton</b>	Part E does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Buckinghamshire New University</b>	Part E does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>St. Mary's University</b>	Part E does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Regent College</b>	You may use Part E.

69. A student may appeal in writing within 10 working days of receiving confirmation that the College has rejected an application for Mitigating Circumstances. The appeal should be made to Academic Quality and include details of the grounds on which the appeal is being made. An appeal submission form is provided [here](#).

70. Students can appeal on one or more of the following grounds:

- That the College's Mitigating Circumstances procedure was not followed properly such that the legitimacy of the outcome is called into question;
- That the student has new supporting evidence for their application that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process;
- That the decision to reject the application was not reasonable.

71. If the student's appeal submission is not wholly based on one or more of the grounds set out above, or is submitted late without good reason, some or all of it may be referred to a different procedure or it may be rejected entirely. If it is rejected, the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter explaining the rejection and details of how the student may apply to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review.

72. In the first instance, an eligibility check will be undertaken of the academic appeal submission. If it is agreed that the academic appeal submission falls under the scope of the grounds for appeal (as identified above) and is submitted on time or late with good reason, then the appeals will be referred for consideration.



## Stage one

73. Once received, the Academic Quality nominee will consider whether the appeal falls within an issue excluded from review or whether the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit. Where it is determined the appeal is excluded from review or vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit the academic quality nominee shall have the authority to reject it summarily and inform the appellant of the decision in writing within 10 working days.

74. If the appeal submission is held to be admissible, it will be scrutinised by the Academic Quality nominee, together with the supporting documentation, and an investigation undertaken if necessary. The Academic Quality nominee, will then determine whether to:

- a. Uphold the appeal, in which case the student will be informed of the decision within 10 working days of receipt. Where the student does not accept the Stage One decision, the matter will be referred to Stage Two;
- b. Reject the appeal, in which case the student will be notified within 10 working days that the appeal submission has not demonstrated that there are sufficient grounds to uphold the appeal, and advised of the options available to them;
- c. Refer the appeal. Where the Academic Quality nominee believes the appeal is complex; raises a new point and/or requires a determination on policy, they will have the discretion to refer the appeal to the Appeals Panel

## Stage two

75. Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage One decision or the Academic Quality nominee has referred the appeal, the matter will proceed to consideration by an Appeals Panel. Where an appeal is referred by the Academic Quality nominee, no further action will be required from the student.

76. Where the student is seeking a Stage Two review, they should submit a Stage Two Appeal Form within 10 working days of the date of notification of the decision at Stage One.

77. The grounds on which a request for review of a Stage One may be granted are as follows:

- a. There is new evidence that could not be provided earlier in the procedure; or
- b. There is evidence that the correct process was not followed at Stage One of the process; or
- c. The outcome at Stage One is not reasonable given the evidence.

78. Dissatisfaction with the outcome of Stage One alone is not grounds for review.

79. The Appeals Panel will be provided with the Stage One decision, the evidence submitted by the student at Stage One and at Stage Two; and any further evidence used or collected by the Academic Quality nominee at Stage One. Decisions will be made based on the evidence submitted and students will have no right to attend the Panel meeting or to give oral evidence.

80. Following consideration by the Panel, they may either:
- a. Reject the appeal and advise the student accordingly that their appeal is not upheld.
  - b. Overturn the decision: and substitute their own decision for that of the original decision-maker.
  - c. Refer the decision by requesting the original decision-maker consider the new evidence or a new decision-maker review all the evidence and make a new determination. (For the avoidance of doubt, where a matter is referred the subsequent decision can be appealed under the appeals process).

81. The student will be provided with a written statement of the outcome and reasons for it, including any relevant recommendations, normally within 10 working days of the panel making its decision. This statement will also include a Completion of Procedures notification and details of how the student may apply to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review of the outcome.

**Part F: appeals against suspension or withdrawal of a UK student by the College owing to the student’s non-engagement with their studies**

**Who may use Part F?**

<b>If you are...</b>	<b>Then...</b>
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Pearson</b>	You may use Part F.
On a programme leading to an award from the <b>University of Bolton</b>	You may use Part F.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Buckinghamshire New University</b>	You may use Part F.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>St. Mary’s University</b>	You may use Part F.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Regent College</b>	You may use Part F.

82. A student (or recent student) may appeal in writing within 10 working days of receiving confirmation that they are being suspended or withdrawn from their studies according to the College’s UK Student Engagement procedure. The appeal should be made to Academic Quality and include detail of the grounds on which the appeal is being made. An appeal submission form is provided [here](#).

83. The College will not accept an appeal against withdrawal due to non-payment of fees.

84. Students can appeal on one of the following grounds:

- That the procedure described in the College’s UK Student Engagement procedure was not followed properly such that the legitimacy of the decision reached is called into question;
- The student’s engagement with their studies was affected by Mitigating Circumstances that the student could not report at the time for valid reasons, and which have not been considered by the College.

85. The College will not consider an appeal based on evidence that relates to alleged ill-health or other Mitigating Circumstances that could have been reported to the College at the time they occurred, but were not, and the student is unable to provide a valid reason for not having disclosed the information at the time.

86. If the student’s appeal submission is not wholly based on one or more of the grounds set out above, or is submitted late without good reason, some or all of it may be referred to a different procedure or it may be rejected entirely. If it is rejected, the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter explaining the rejection and details of how the student may apply

to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review.

87. In the first instance, an eligibility check will be undertaken of the academic appeal submission. If it is agreed that the academic appeal submission falls under the scope of the grounds for appeal (as identified above) and is submitted on time or late with good reason, then the appeals will be referred for consideration.

### **Stage one**

88. Once received, the Academic Quality nominee will consider whether the appeal falls within an issue excluded from review or whether the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit. Where it is determined the appeal is excluded from review or vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit the academic quality nominee shall have the authority to reject it summarily and inform the appellant of the decision in writing within 10 working days.

89. If the appeal submission is held to be admissible, it will be scrutinised by the Academic Quality nominee, together with the supporting documentation, and an investigation undertaken if necessary. The Academic Quality nominee, will then determine whether to:

- a. Uphold the appeal, in which case the student will be informed of the decision within 10 working days of receipt. Where the student does not accept the Stage One decision, the matter will be referred to Stage Two;
- b. Reject the appeal, in which case the student will be notified within 10 working days that the appeal submission has not demonstrated that there are sufficient grounds to uphold the appeal, and advised of the options available to them;
- c. Refer the appeal. Where the Academic Quality nominee believes the appeal is complex; raises a new point and/or requires a determination on policy, they will have the discretion to refer the appeal to the Appeals Panel.

### **Stage two**

90. Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage One decision or the Academic Quality nominee has referred the appeal, the matter will proceed to consideration by an Appeals Panel. Where an appeal is referred by the Academic Quality nominee, no further action will be required from the student.

91. Where the student is seeking a Stage Two review, they should submit a Stage Two Appeal Form within 10 working days of the date of notification of the decision at Stage One.

92. The grounds on which a request for review of a Stage One may be granted are as follows:

- a. There is new evidence that could not be provided earlier in the procedure (providing objective and authoritative evidence of why it could not be provided earlier); or
- b. There is evidence that the correct process was not followed at Stage One of the process; or

- c. The outcome at Stage One is not reasonable given the evidence.
93. Dissatisfaction with the outcome of Stage One alone is not grounds for review.
94. The Appeals Panel will be provided with the Stage One decision, the evidence submitted by the student at Stage One and at Stage Two; and any further evidence used or collected by the Academic Quality nominee at Stage One. Decisions will be made based on the evidence submitted and students will have no right to attend the Panel meeting or to give oral evidence.
95. Following consideration by the Panel, they may either:
- a. Reject the appeal and advise the student accordingly that their appeal is not upheld;
  - b. Refer the decision back to the Provost (or his or her nominee) for reconsideration in the light of their findings through the appeal.
96. The student will be provided with a written statement of the outcome and reasons for it, including any relevant recommendations, normally within 10 working days of the panel making its decision. This statement will also include a Completion of Procedures notification and details of how the student may apply to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review of the outcome.

## Part G: appeals against the outcome of a formal investigation of a student complaint

### Who may use Part G?

If you are...	Then...
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Pearson</b>	You may use Part G.
On a programme leading to an award from the <b>University of Bolton</b>	Part G only applies to you if your complaint is not about academic quality and/or standards. If your complaint is about academic quality and/or standards, you should refer to the University's stage 3 procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Buckinghamshire New University</b>	Part G does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>St. Mary's University</b>	Part G does not apply to you. You should speak to your Customer Service Officer and/or refer to the University's procedures.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Regent College</b>	You may use Part G.

97. A prospective student, current student or recent student may appeal against the outcome of a formal investigation of a complaint within 10 working days of receiving the outcome. The appeal should be made to Academic Quality and include detail of the grounds on which the appeal is being made. An appeal submission form is provided [here](#).

98. An appeal must be lodged on one of the following grounds:

- That the student complaints procedure was not followed properly such that the legitimacy of the outcome reached is called into question;
- That the outcome is not permitted under that procedure;
- That the complainant has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process.

99. If the student's appeal submission is not wholly based on one or more of the grounds set out above, or is submitted late without good reason, some or all of it may be referred to a different procedure or it may be rejected entirely. If it is rejected, the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter explaining the rejection and details of how the student may apply to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review.

100. In the first instance, an eligibility check will be undertaken of the academic appeal submission. If it is agreed that the academic appeal submission falls under the scope of the grounds

for appeal (as identified above) and is submitted on time or late with good reason, then the appeals will be referred for consideration.

### **Stage one**

101. Once received, the Academic Quality nominee will consider whether the appeal falls within an issue excluded from review or whether the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit. Where it is determined the appeal is excluded from review or vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit the academic quality nominee shall have the authority to reject it summarily and inform the appellant of the decision in writing within 10 working days.

102. If the appeal submission is held to be admissible, it will be scrutinised by the Academic Quality nominee, together with the supporting documentation, and an investigation undertaken if necessary. The Academic Quality nominee, will then determine whether to:

- a. Uphold the appeal, in which case the student will be informed of the decision within 10 working days of receipt. Where the student does not accept the Stage One decision, the matter will be referred to Stage Two;
- b. Reject the appeal, in which case the student will be notified within 10 working days that the appeal submission has not demonstrated that there are sufficient grounds to uphold the appeal, and advised of the options available to them;
- c. Refer the appeal. Where the Academic Quality nominee believes the appeal is complex; raises a new point and/or requires a determination on policy, they will have the discretion to refer the appeal to the Appeals Panel.

### **Stage two**

103. Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage One decision or the Academic Quality nominee has referred the appeal, the matter will proceed to consideration by an Appeals Panel. Where an appeal is referred by the Academic Quality nominee, no further action will be required from the student.

104. Where the student is seeking a Stage Two review, they should submit a Stage Two Appeal Form within 10 working days of the date of notification of the decision at Stage One.

105. The grounds on which a request for review of a Stage One may be granted are as follows:

- a. There is new evidence that could not be provided earlier in the procedure (providing objective and authoritative evidence of why it could not be provided earlier); or
- b. There is evidence that the correct process was not followed at Stage One of the process; or
- c. The outcome at Stage One is not reasonable given the evidence.

106. Dissatisfaction with the outcome of Stage One alone is not grounds for review.

107. The Appeals Panel will be provided with the Stage One decision, the evidence submitted by the student at Stage One and at Stage Two; and any further evidence used or collected by the Academic Quality nominee at Stage One. Decisions will be made based on the evidence submitted and students will have no right to attend the Panel meeting or to give oral evidence.

108. Following consideration by the Panel, they may either:

- a. Uphold the original outcome, or;
- b. Refer the outcome back to the Director of Academic Quality for reconsideration in the light of their findings through the appeal, or;
- c. Require that a new investigation into the complaint is conducted to consider the case in the light of their findings through the appeal.

109. The student will be provided with a written statement of the outcome and reasons for it, including any relevant recommendations, normally within 10 working days of the panel making its decision. This statement will also include a Completion of Procedures notification and details of how the student may apply to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review of the outcome.

110. The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education will not review complaints from applicants.



**Part H: appeals against withdrawal of an international student by the College owing to the student’s non-engagement with their studies**

**Who may use Part H?**

<b>If you are...</b>	<b>Then...</b>
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Pearson</b>	You may use Part H.
On a programme leading to an award from the <b>University of Bolton</b>	You may use Part H.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Buckinghamshire New University</b>	You may use Part H.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>St. Mary’s University</b>	You may use Part H.
On a programme leading to an award from <b>Regent College</b>	You may use Part H.

111. An international student (or recent student) may appeal in writing within 10 working days of receiving confirmation that they are being withdrawn from their studies according to the College’s International Student Attendance and Engagement Policy. The appeal should be made to Academic Quality and include detail of the grounds on which the appeal is being made. An appeal submission form is provided [here](#).

112. The College will not accept an appeal against withdrawal due to non-payment of fees.

113. Students can appeal on one of the following grounds:

- That the procedure described in the College’s International Student Attendance and Engagement Policy was not followed properly such that the legitimacy of the decision reached is called into question;
- The student’s engagement with their studies was affected by Mitigating Circumstances that the student could not report at the time for valid reasons, and which have not been considered by the College.

114. The College will not consider an appeal based on evidence that relates to alleged ill-health or other Mitigating Circumstances that could have been reported to the College at the time they occurred, but were not, and the student is unable to provide a valid reason for not having disclosed the information at the time.

115. If the student’s appeal submission is not wholly based on one or more of the grounds set out above, or is submitted late without good reason, some or all of it may be referred to a different procedure or it may be rejected entirely. If it is rejected, the student will be issued

with a Completion of Procedures letter explaining the rejection and details of how the student may apply to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review.

116. In the first instance, an eligibility check will be undertaken of the academic appeal submission. If it is agreed that the academic appeal submission falls under the scope of the grounds for appeal (as identified above) and is submitted on time or late with good reason, then the appeals will be referred for consideration.

### **Stage one**

117. Once received, the Academic Quality nominee will consider whether the appeal falls within an issue excluded from review or whether the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit. Where it is determined the appeal is excluded from review or vexatious, frivolous or without substance or merit the academic quality nominee shall have the authority to reject it summarily and inform the appellant of the decision in writing within 10 working days.

118. If the appeal submission is held to be admissible, it will be scrutinised by the Academic Quality nominee, together with the supporting documentation, and an investigation undertaken if necessary. The Academic Quality nominee, will then determine whether to:

- a. Uphold the appeal, in which case the student will be informed of the decision within 10 working days of receipt. Where the student does not accept the Stage One decision, the matter will be referred to Stage Two;
- b. Reject the appeal, in which case the student will be notified within 10 working days that the appeal submission has not demonstrated that there are sufficient grounds to uphold the appeal, and advised of the options available to them;
- c. Refer the appeal. Where the Academic Quality nominee believes the appeal is complex; raises a new point and/or requires a determination on policy, they will have the discretion to refer the appeal to the Appeals Panel.

### **Stage two**

119. Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage One decision or the Academic Quality nominee has referred the appeal, the matter will proceed to consideration by an Appeals Panel. Where an appeal is referred by the Academic Quality nominee, no further action will be required from the student.

120. Where the student is seeking a Stage Two review, they should submit a Stage Two Appeal Form within 10 working days of the date of notification of the decision at Stage One.

121. The grounds on which a request for review of a Stage One may be granted are as follows:

- a. There is new evidence that could not be provided earlier in the procedure

(providing objective and authoritative evidence of why it could not be provided earlier); or

- b. There is evidence that the correct process was not followed at Stage One of the process; or
- c. The outcome at Stage One is not reasonable given the evidence.

122. Dissatisfaction with the outcome of Stage One alone is not grounds for review.

123. The Appeals Panel will be provided with the Stage One decision, the evidence submitted by the student at Stage One and at Stage Two; and any further evidence used or collected by the Academic Quality nominee at Stage One. Decisions will be made based on the evidence submitted and students will have no right to attend the Panel meeting or to give oral evidence.

124. Following consideration by the Panel, they may either:

- a. Reject the appeal and advise the student accordingly that their appeal is not upheld;
- b. Refer the decision back to the Visa Attendance Panel for reconsideration in the light of their findings through the appeal.

125. The student will be provided with a written statement of the outcome and reasons for it, including any relevant recommendations, normally within 10 working days of the panel making its decision. This statement will also include a Completion of Procedures notification and details of how the student may apply to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education for an external review of the outcome.

<i>Version number</i>	<i>4.11</i>
<i>Approved by</i>	<i>Academic Council</i>
<i>Approval date</i>	<i>July 2024</i>
<i>Review date</i>	<i>July 2025</i>
<i>Policy owner</i>	<i>Academic Quality</i>