

5. Managing Concerns Overarching Statement

This overarching Statement applies to applicants, students, graduates, clients, research participants, staff and contributing lecturers, and in principle relates to all statements, policies and procedures in this digital policy handbook.

POSITION STATEMENT:

The Centre is committed to supporting and enhancing a culture of integrity and a sense of an ethical community among staff, students, graduates, clients and other Stakeholders. As indicated in our **Aims, Vision, Mission & Business Culture, Strategy & Governance Statement our Business Culture** aims to:

- Engender commitment, accountability, integrity and partnership among staff and students in line with our Vision and Mission;
- Promote excellence, consistency and commitment in our teaching and support to students;
- Communicate with staff and students fairly and with transparency;
- Acknowledge successes achieved by staff and students and encourage them to work at their optimal level;
- Work as a team to promote excellence and a collegiate environment with students, staff and other Stakeholders;
- Implement systems that support staff and students to work effectively;
- Create an environment where staff and students enjoy being at work and studying with us.

Within the broad cultural aims the Centre seeks to enhance the understanding of the concept of academic integrity, amongst students and staff, and uphold standards in a fair and transparent manner. **Wherever appropriate** the Centre will support students who may have alleged and upheld cases of academic or professional misconduct to learn from, and reflect on their mistakes and move forward with integrity.

Similarly, we seek to support students, staff and other Stakeholders with respect, honesty, compassion and in an open-minded and consistent manner in the management of concerns and conflict resolution.

Applicants for Courses: Decisions related to course applications are the prerogative of CNELM. CNELM will abide by its **Recruitment & Disability Policy** and will be compliant with the Equality Act 2010. CNELM will make decisions regarding course offers against demonstration of meeting published entry requirements. CNELM's decisions are final. An applicant can appeal against a decision to decline an offer of a place on a course/s if CNELM has not followed its own procedure and published entry criteria. If an applicant had any other concern about how they had been treated then they can contact the Centre Administrator Dave.Lee@cnelm.ac.uk. If the applicant was able to provide evidence that they had been treated in contravention of this Statement then they could pursue a complaint that may involve CNELM's **Business & Education Ethics Committee** (BEEC). **Please note that** Middlesex University (MU) is not involved in the Admissions process for students enrolling on validated degree programmes. This is the responsibility of CNELM. For further information refer to our **Admissions & Enrolment Policy**.

Students: The majority of students studying at CNELM are registered with Middlesex University for a degree programme of study and as such we are required to comply with [Middlesex University Regulations](#) which include the management of concerns, complaints and appeals, student conduct and discipline, Academic Integrity and Misconduct.

In addition, CNELM embeds the principles of managing concerns and complaints of the [Good Practice Framework: handling student complaints and academic appeals](#), published by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

Confirmation Agreements signed by applicants **prior to enrolment** for all degree, clinical and entry courses includes the following statement:

CNELM is required by Law to be a member of the OIA Scheme, as set out in the Higher Education Act 2004. Section 11 of the Higher Education Act 2004 defines those providers, known as "**qualifying institutions**" which are required to be members of the Scheme.

The legislation was subsequently amended to extend membership to the Scheme to a wider range of providers including those:

1. Providing courses designated for student support funding;
2. Providers on the Office for Students Register; and
3. Providers of higher education courses leading to the grant of an award by another OIA member.

NS3UK Ltd t/a CNELM, as an Alternative Higher Education provider, is a qualifying institution as the degree courses we teach lead to the grant of an award by Middlesex University who is a member of the OIA and is covered by point (3) above.

Students on Higher Education courses leading to the grant of an award by Middlesex University can appeal to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator Scheme. The OIA will expect students to have exhausted internal CNELM procedures to address a complaint or appeal in the first instance. Normally, students must exhaust CNELM's own internal complaints

procedures including those processed by the rules and regulations of Middlesex University before taking a complaint to the OIA.

For the purpose of clarity, the OIA scheme, for CNELM students, only relates to complaints and appeals for the degree programmes validated by Middlesex University.

Please note that

- With specific regard to Academic Misconduct CNELM manages minor cases of admitted academic misconduct for degree programmes validated by MU unless the student denies the allegation in which case it is referred to MU.
- Most minor cases of academic misconduct relate to students that are new to higher education and may take time to learn how to reference their work appropriately.
- If there is an alleged case of academic misconduct for a student registered on a degree programme that is considered moderate, serious or gross then CNELM will refer the case, as required to MU for further investigation.
- CNELM's internal Academic Integrity Panel* seeks to ensure that the processes in escalating a moderate, serious or gross case of alleged academic misconduct are consistently applied and in alignment with MU Regulations.
- An MU Grade U is awarded if there is a case of suspected academic misconduct with release of marks for degree students, and Grade U for students on CNELM only courses.
- Grade U is a holding grade and refers to academic misconduct 'under investigation'. A Grade U is neutral and issued without prejudice while an allegation is investigated.
- If the case is proven and/or admitted then an appropriate penalty will be applied in accordance with MU Regulations. In accordance with the regulations please see the table detailed in Middlesex University Regulations that indicate possible penalties that might be applied. Please refer to [MU Regulations](#).
- For CNELM only courses the principles of the processes detailed above would be applied.
- Students registered on the CNELM Nutritional Therapy Practice Diploma (NTPD) or the CNELM Personalised Nutrition Practice Diploma (PNPD) who do not meet the requirements for professional practice may not be eligible for this qualification irrespective of their academic achievement.
- In all instances if an alleged case of academic and/or professional misconduct is disproved then all records are deleted from the students record.

***Members of the CNELM Academic & Professional Integrity Panel (APIP) are:**

Kate Neil - Managing Director & Head of Quality Assurance (Chair) casting vote if required

Dr James Neil - Principal and Director of Research

Dr Michelle Barrow - Academic Team Director (Lead Investigator unless agreed otherwise)

Dave Lee - Centre Administrator & Practice Supervisor (non-voting member)

The External Academic Quality Reviewer (EAQR) will independently review CNELM's management of cases of Academic Misconduct and report any concerns to the BEEC and to the Directors of CNELM. The EAQR will spotcheck Turnitin submissions, review the submission of cases considered Minor, Moderate, Serious or Grave and will review cases of professional misconduct and appeals as well as cases considered in breach of research governance regulations. **The EAQR will also review CNELM's management of students raising concerns regarding Grades awarded.**

CNELM Process Prior to referring a case of Academic Misconduct to MU for degree students, or to the BEEC Committee for students registered on CNELM only courses in regard to both Academic and Professional Misconduct.

Academic and/or Professional Misconduct - Steps to be followed in pursuance of a suspected case of Academic and/or Professional Misconduct.	
MU Validated Courses	CNELM Only Courses
<p>Step 1 Raising A Concern</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marker identifies a concern. 2. Marker can arrange to discuss a concern informally with a designated member of the APIP for the purpose of determining if the concern constitutes potential academic misconduct. If the case is progressed then the process for documenting the concern is initiated. 3. In reaching a decision the APIP may consult a relevant member of staff at MU for guidance. In particular, to determine if the allegation is correctly classified as minor. The following process will only be followed for minor cases. Cases of Moderate, Serious or Grave Academic Misconduct will be referred to MU. 4. The Marker should not discuss their concerns with the student including written communication. 5. The designated member of the APIP will log the allegation on the 	<p>Step 1 Raising A Concern</p> <p>As for MU Validated Courses other than point 3. In this instance the APIP may consult the BEEC Committee and if considered Serious or Grave Academic and/or Professional Misconduct would be formally presented to the BEEC for their review and recommendation.</p>

<p>academic misconduct log and set up a secure folder as a repository for the evidence associated with the case to be stored and distributed to authorised members of staff.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The Marker will provide the evidence to the secure folder. For Coursework the Marker will make available the students submission, where applicable the Turnitin Report and the Marking Grid. In all cases the Academic Misconduct Progress Report will contain the outline of the allegation. If applicable copies of students' written communications for example emails may be added to the folder. 7. The designated member of the APIP will contact the student to invite them to a meeting either in person or online to discuss the allegation. 8. If a case of Academic Misconduct is Under Investigation at the time the marks are due to be released to the cohort then a Grade U will be issued to the student and the student will be advised accordingly, and this will usually be prior to the release of marks in order to forewarn the student. Please note that the APIP may decide to delay release of marks to the cohort if pre-warning students of an MU Grade U could enable tampering or destruction of evidence, especially in a case of potential collusion among one or more students. <p>TimeScales: CNELM aims to resolve Step 1 within 10 working days (exceptionally 15 working days) to the point of APIP classification of the nature of misconduct and meeting with students if a Minor Case or referral to MU. If referred to MU then MU timescales apply. MU will usually contact the student within 5 Working days of receipt of concern. MU will give guidance to student/s in initial contact communication letters regarding timescales thereafter. Upon any final Outcome if proven then the student will have 10 Working Days to lodge any Appeal.</p>	
<p>Step 2 Processing a Concern (If Minor and managed by CNELM)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meeting arranged with the student by the delegated member of the APIP (Lead Investigator). This meeting may also include the Module Leader. 2. The Lead Investigator prior to the meeting will inform the student of the nature of the allegation in writing. This will only be to inform the student that there is an allegation and of the general nature. The evidence is not sent in advance. 3. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the allegation and the evidence with the student and offer the student an opportunity to provide an explanation. 4. Following the meeting the Lead Investigator will present the completed Academic Progress form to the APIP for a decision in relation to the case. 5. The Lead Investigator will then update the Academic Misconduct Log recording the decision of the APIP. 6. The Lead Investigator will share with the student via a secure folder the decision of the APIP including information related to Appeals, if required. 	<p>Step 2 Processing a Concern</p> <p>As for MU Validated Courses</p>
<p>Step 3a Outcome If Admitted</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the allegation of Minor Academic Misconduct is admitted by the student then the outcome will be decided by the APIP. 2. The APIP will take account of the student's explanation, any extenuating circumstances, the student's overall performance and other mitigation in reaching its decision. The APIP will give attention to any evidence of intentionality which may result in the case being referred to MU. 3. The APIP will, if applicable, take account of the views of the academic team involved. 4. The APIP will be guided by the principles of Academic Integrity and the support of a student as a learner when setting an appropriate action/sanction as below. 5. Potential Outcomes can include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Requirement of Student to engage with learning support for 	<p>Step 3a Outcome If Admitted</p> <p>In principle the process is as for MU Validated Courses.</p> <p>The differences are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The APIP will consult the BEEC Committee where required. 2. Additional outcomes may include: competency assessments including reflections, corrections to potentially 'unsafe' written and verbal guidance,

<p>example, a tutorial on referencing, or reviewing our referencing policy, reviewing lecture materials related to academic writing, completion of a learning reflection, oral presentation, resubmission of work or Timed Assessment, potential Grade Penalty, Written Warning.</p> <p>6. If the student's original submission of coursework is permitted to proceed by the APIP then the marker can complete the marking and release the mark (with or without Penalty as determined by the APIP).</p> <p>Please note that students will be guided to Student Support Services and Student Reps as appropriate to the case.</p>	<p>retake of a consultation.</p>
<p>Step 3b Outcome If Denied</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the allegation is denied by the student and the APIP considers that following discussion with the student the allegation remains valid then the case will be referred to MU. 	<p>Step 3b Outcome If Denied</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The APIP will refer the case to the BEEC.
<p>Step 3c Outcome Is Unfounded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If following an investigation the APIP determines the allegation to be unfounded then the student will be notified of this decision and their Coursework marked. - The Lead Investigator will ensure all records pertaining to the case including the Secure Folder are deleted. - The Academic Misconduct Log will just note the outcome as unfounded. - No record of the allegation will appear on the students formal records. 	<p>Step 3c Outcome Is Unfounded</p> <p>In principle the process is as for MU Validated Courses.</p>
<p>Step 3d Outcome if Student Withdraws from Study during Investigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In this scenario the case will be closed but the records pertaining to the allegation will be retained. - The Chair of the APIP will write formally to the Student acknowledging their withdrawal confirming the case of academic misconduct is closed, advising the Student of their rights to return to study and making clear that if they were to do so the case of alleged Academic Misconduct would be reactivated until an Outcome is reached. <p>Please note that if the Student Interrupts their Studies during the Investigation especially if the interruption is related to 'fitness to study' then the investigation will be put on-hold until the student is fit to return to study. Please see the Fitness to Study and Fitness to Practice Policy.</p>	<p>Step 3d Outcome if Student Withdraws from Study during Investigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Processes the same as for MU Validated Programmes except the BEEC may recommend to CNELM and the APIP that the Authorities mentioned below are informed. - If the evidence is indisputable the Student may not have the option to return to the programme.
<p>Footnote: If through the process of investigating an allegation of a minor case of Academic Misconduct it becomes evident that the case is Moderate, Serious or Grosse then investigation will be suspended and MU consulted where applicable for the continuation of the case to be pursued by MU.</p>	<p>Footnote: If the case is Moderate, Serious or Grave the matter will always involve the BEEC and the EAQR. A determination of Serious or Grave may have been made at the outset or a result of investigating a minor case. Additional sanctions may be: suspension, withdrawal from the clinical programme, sharing information with External Regulatory, Professional and if required Legal Agencies.</p>

A significant number of students registered on degree programmes or students having completed the degree component of their studies are also registered on the CNELM Nutritional Therapy Practice Diploma (NTPD) or the CNELM Personalised Nutrition Practice Diploma (PNPD). Degree programmes combined with the NTPD or the PNPD are accredited by the [Nutritional Therapy Education Commission \(NTEC\)](#).

Students enrolled on courses leading to nutritional therapy practice have the right to raise concerns directly to the NTEC if they consider CNELM is in breach of any of the [17 Essential Requirements for Accreditation](#).

NTEC Address: Nutritional Therapy Education Commission, BM Box 3304, LONDON, WC1N 3XX

As most students are enrolled on either or both programmes CNELM has in principle adopted MU's guidance and that of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for the management of concerns, complaints and appeals in relation to CNELM's own courses of which the PNP/NTPD is the major CNELM only course. Other courses are the Nutrition Coach Diploma (NCD), Dietary Educator Course (DEC), Return to Practice Programme (RTPP) and Bioscience Entry Courses (BEC).

For the sake of clarity, CNELM has adopted the principles of MU procedures/OIA Guidance for the management of concerns, complaints and appeals for non-degree courses and other CNELM activities, it is the **Business & Education Ethics Committee** (BEEC) that fulfils the role of the oversight of all concerns, complaints and appeals that are not managed locally by the Centre's internal processes. **Please note that** MU and the OIA are **not** involved at any level in the management of concerns, complaints and appeals related to CNELM only courses.

To confirm: MU and the OIA are involved for students on validated degree programmes only.

The Personalised Nutrition Practice Diploma (PNPD) is Endorsed by Qualifi as being assessed up to level 6 outcomes. [Qualifi](#) is a recognised UK Awarding Organisation, regulated by [Ofqual](#). 'An Endorsed course is a course which [Qualifi](#) has evaluated and endorses as a suitable and beneficial learning platform for learners.'

PNPD students that are registered with Qualifi have the right to make a complaint to Qualifi. The following Qualifi policy documents are made available to Qualifi registered students.

1. Complaints Policy and Procedure
2. Appeals Policy
3. Access to Fair Assessment
4. Plagiarism, Collusion and Cheating
5. Malpractice and Maladministration
6. Conflicts of Interest

Graduates: Areas in which a graduate may wish to raise a concern or make a complaint include, but are not limited to:

- a) accuracy of academic record, transcripts and certificates
- b) retrospective concerns about the content and quality of teaching
- c) data breaches relating to continuing permissions to maintain contact
- d) retrospective concerns regarding payment, charges and refunds
- e) retrospective concerns regarding their student experience
- f) concern related to CNELM sharing academic records and confirmation of graduation at the request of third-party academic institutions, potential employers, regulators, and law enforcement in pursuance to prevent academic and/or financial fraud and public safety.

To pursue a concern/complaint graduates should in the first instance contact the Centre Administrator

Dave.Lee@cnelm.ac.uk

Clients: All clients that participate in the CNELM Nutritional Therapy Training Clinic are provided with a copy of our Client Charter as an appendix to extensive Terms of Agreement.

A Client may address a complaint in the following ways:

- a) A complaint about the Clinic Supervisor or the clinical intervention, which may include the student involved in their case, can be made direct to the Clinic Supervisor in the first instance. The Client has the right to complain directly to the Clinic Supervisor's regulatory body and/or professional body and/or accrediting body and not via the Clinic Supervisor. Details are provided in the Client Charter.
- b) If a client's concern/complaint is in relation to the management of the clinic then the client can raise their concern with the Clinic Manager in the first instance. This includes any concern in respect of not being offered a consultation. In addition, the concern/complaint may involve CNELM's BEEC Committee.
- c) In some circumstances it may be appropriate for the client to lodge a concern/complaint to CNELM via both the Practice Supervisor and the Clinic Supervisor.

Research Participants - Student projects approved by CNELM's Research Ethics Committee (REC) that involve participants must comply with expected academic and professional integrity. All such projects should make it clear to participants or organisations supporting the project how they might pursue a complaint. Module Leaders and/or Research Supervisors must ensure that a complaints clause is included for participants as part of their agreement to participate in research. Research modules at CNELM are: Level 7 Research Dissertation, Level 6 Research Project and Level 6 Health Culture. Depending on the nature of the complaint the subsequent investigation may lead to invoking the academic and/or professional misconduct process. Please refer to the **Research Ethics Committee and Publications Policy**.

To pursue a complaint a Research Participant should in the first instance contact the Centre Administrator

Dave.Lee@cnelm.ac.uk who will then inform internal staff members in accordance with the **Research Ethics Committee Policy**.

Students and Employers engaged in Online Work Experience OWE - students should refer to the **Online Work Experience Policy** and Terms of Agreement. Students and Employers are expected to abide by the Terms of Agreement. If a student or employer has a concern in the first instance they should raise it with the Module Leader for the Nutrition in

Practice module taken at the end of Level 5 as part of the BSc (Hons) Nutritional Science programme. The Module Leader must inform the Managing Director of any concerns raised by any party during or after the completion of an OWE Placement so that such issues can be considered and addressed by the Senior Management Team in conjunction with the Module Team, and the student and employer where appropriate. Such concerns may involve the Senior Management Team seeking recommendations from CNELM's **Business & Education Ethics Committee**.

Applicants for Jobs: All Staff have access to a Staff Handbook that includes complaints, grievances, appeals and whistleblowing policies and procedures. Any applicant can request a copy of these procedures if they wish to pursue a concern/complaint following an interview process or its outcome. In relation to job applications CNELM complies with the Equality Act 2010 and would not discriminate in shortlisting or making job offers on the basis of the nine characteristics identified in the Act. Interviews are conducted in accordance with our Staff Recruitment Policy a copy of which is available upon request. All requests should be made to the Centre Administrator.

Staff: All policies, procedures and guidance are detailed for staff in the Staff Handbook available via Moodle.

Contributing Lectures: A Contributing Lecturer may wish to lodge a concern or make a formal complaint for various reasons including, but not limited to the following:

- a) Discrimination, bullying, both direct and indirect victimisation, evidence of malicious or harmful gossip, and dissemination of misinformation by CNELM staff and/or students
- b) Inappropriate behaviour of students participating in an onsite or live webinar or tutorial; and/or inappropriate contact with the Contributing Lecturer following an Event.
- c) Health & Safety
- d) Payment for services

Contributing Lecturers are shared a copy of the Events and Speakers Policy when contributing a lecture at CNELM for the first time. When the **Events and Speakers Policy** is notably updated all Contributing Lecturers are sent a revised copy. This Policy describes the process that students and/or staff engage in, if they raise a concern about the behaviour and/or quality/academic standing of the lecture/lecturer.

Please note that should a student or group of students or a staff member have a particular concern regarding a Contributing Lecturer then please refer to the **CNELM Etiquette Policy**.

To pursue a concern or complaint a Contributing Lecturer should in the first instance aim to resolve the issue with the named Module Leader or Event Host. Where this is not possible, or considered inappropriate the Contributing Lecturer should contact the Managing Director/Head of Quality Assurance Kate Neil Kate.Neil@cnelm.ac.uk and/or the Centre Administrator Dave Lee Dave.Lee@cnelm.ac.uk.

Other Stakeholders: Similarly, other Stakeholders attending CNELM or engaging with students and/or staff onsite or online should expect to be treated with courtesy and respect. Such Stakeholders might include representatives from Middlesex University, Qualifi, the Nutritional Therapy Education Commission or External Verifiers. If an external Stakeholder has a concern or wishes to make a complaint they should seek to attempt to resolve the issue locally with the named senior staff representative. Where this is not possible, or considered inappropriate the external Stakeholder should contact the Managing Director/Head of Quality Assurance Kate Neil Kate.Neil@cnelm.ac.uk and/or the Centre Administrator Dave Lee Dave.Lee@cnelm.ac.uk.

MARKING AND ASSESSMENT:

All courses will involve assessment of coursework. CPD courses may involve assessment of coursework and this is invariably optional.

Students enrolled on the NTPD/PNPD, NCD and DEC programmes are invariably also enrolled on the BSc Hons Nutritional Science, MSc or PG Diploma in Personalised Nutrition. Some of the modules of the NCD and DEC are taken as part of the BSc, PG Diploma in combination with coaching modules. BSc students also partially fulfil some module requirements of the PNPD/NTPD as part of the degree programme.

Due to the close relationship of the PNPD/NTPD, NCD and DEC programmes with degree studies CNELM has adopted the principles of the marking and assessment processes detailed in [MU Regulations](#) and relevant Qualifi policies for the PNPD, as well as the management of appeals and academic integrity and misconduct; and the Good Practice Framework published by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

Please note that as previously explained above Middlesex University (MU) is **not** involved in the management of the above CNELM only courses in any context. As well as drawing on the expertise of the BEEC Committee the External Verifier for the PNPD, NTPD, NCD and DEC programmes acts in a similar capacity to the University Link Tutor for degree programmes at Verification of Module Grades and Awards Panel meetings.

Students enrolled on BEC courses or modules, or Bridging modules must also complete coursework unless enrolled on the module as a Refresher. Coursework is marked and assessed in a similar way. Any Appeal against a Grade or case of Academic Misconduct would be addressed internally and would involve the **BEEC** if a case should escalate to that extent.

Students enrolled in degree programmes plus the CNELM Nutritional Therapy Practice Diploma (NTPD) or the CNELM Personalised Nutrition Practice Diploma (PNPD) and/or completing an interim CNELM Award i.e. the DEC or NCD will also be assessed against a range of Professional Competency Criteria leading to practice as a nutritional therapist, nutrition coach or dietary educator. Students must demonstrate a wide range of competencies in both academic and hands-on contexts leading to practice. Students record and reflect on Professional Competency in their Clinic Log (for those on the NTPD) or the PNPD Assessment Log (for those on the PNPD). Please also refer to the CNELM Personalised Nutrition/Nutritional Therapy Practice Diploma Course for further information regarding Professional Competency assessments.

CNELM is ultimately responsible for the Module Grades and Awards it issues to students on its own CNELM courses. Should the **BEEC** be involved in a case of Appeal against a Grade or Academic Misconduct CNELM commits to demonstrate how it takes account of the recommendations of the BEEC when presenting the outcome to the student.

It is CNELM's ultimate responsibility to ensure that students enrolled in courses leading to practice have demonstrated through their training that they have met requirements for a wide range of Professional Competencies in preparation for practice. The CNELM **BEEC** would be involved in situations where meeting Professional Competency requirements has not been achieved. CNELM commits to demonstrate how it has taken account of the recommendations of the **BEEC** in the management of Professional Competency issues that are presented to them.

Assessment Authenticity: Students are expected to submit their own work. Students are recommended to submit a Draft of their summative assessment coursework to Turnitin which provides a Similarity Score. Students are recommended to review the Similarity Score whether high or low to identify whether any similarity might constitute plagiarism and to correct their work prior to final submission via Turnitin. Students should reference their work as guided and appropriately cite the source of evidence including citing their own work. When students submit their work to Turnitin (Draft or Final) they are required to confirm the work is their own by checking a tick box next to a statement of confirmation. After submission via Turnitin the student will receive a receipt with a paper ID number which confirms submission. No student can submit without accepting the statement of authenticity.

As taken from the [Good Practice Framework: handling student complaints and academic appeals](#) the following table sets out the principles of a good complaints process, and a good academic appeals process.

Complaints Process	Appeals Process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open to any recently registered student - Easy to navigate - Provides clear information regarding how to access advice and support - Allows students to appoint a representative - Responsive to the needs of students - Well sign-posted so that students know which process to follow - Easy to understand and clear about time limits - Is clear about what constitutes a complaint - Includes effective record keeping - Flexible when issues are raised under more than one process - All parties act reasonably and fairly towards each other, and treat the processes themselves with respect - Allows for informal resolution as early as possible including mediation or conciliation where possible and appropriate - Has three clear stages: Early resolution locally, formal stage and review stage - Clear time limits for submitting complaints - Enables identification of complaints requiring swift action - Normally enables completion within 90 calendar days from the start of a formal process - Ensures staff making decisions are properly trained, resourced and supported, and able to approach each decision afresh - Allows each party an equal opportunity to present their case - Requires clear reasons to be given for decisions reached - Ensures students are not disadvantaged as a result of bringing a complaint - Ensures that decisions are taken by people without actual or perceived conflicts of interest at all stages of the process - Ensures an appropriate level of confidentiality without disadvantage - Captures learning to ensure that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Decisions are made consistently b) Decisions are made at the appropriate level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is open to anyone who is or was recently a registered student. - Is easy to navigate for students. - Gives students clear information about how to access advice and support. - Allows students to appoint a representative. - Is responsive to the needs of individuals - Is well signposted so that students know which process to follow. - Is easy to understand and gives clear information about time limits. - Sets out the grounds upon which an academic appeal may be brought. - Includes effective record keeping. - Is flexible where a student raises issues which fall under more than one process. - Expects all parties to act reasonably and fairly towards each other, and to treat the processes themselves with respect. - - Normally consists of two stages: – Formal stage – Review stage. - Includes time limits within which students are normally expected to submit academic appeals. - Allows for the identification of academic appeals which require particularly swift action. - Will normally be completed within 90 calendar days of the start of the formal stage. - Ensures that decision-making staff are properly trained, resourced and supported, and able to approach each decision afresh. - Allows each party an equal opportunity to present their case. - Requires clear reasons to be given for decisions reached. - Ensures that students are not disadvantaged as a result of bringing an academic appeal. - Ensures that decisions are taken by people without actual or perceived conflicts of interest at all stages of the process. - Ensure an appropriate level of confidentiality without disadvantage.

<p>c) Appropriate action is taken on issues identified</p> <p>d) Information gathered is used to improve services to students and the student experience</p>	<p>- Captures learning to ensure that:</p> <p>a) Decisions are made consistently.</p> <p>b) Decisions are made at the appropriate level.</p> <p>c) Appropriate action is taken on issues identified.</p> <p>d) Information gathered is used to improve services for students and the student experience.</p>
	<p>Please note that for validated degree programmes CNELM follows the MU Regulations and will refer appeals to MU Registry if unresolved following CNELM's internal procedures.</p> <p>CNELM Internal Procedures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Early resolution 2. Consideration by the Internal Student Progression Committee and Assessment Boards <p>Appeals are only considered when the grounds for an appeal have been met. Please refer to the MU Regulations.</p>

Named Contact Person/s responsible for this Statement

Kate Neil Managing Director and Head of Quality Assurance Kate.Neil@cnelm.ac.uk

Dave Lee Centre Administrator, Data Manager and Practice Supervisor Dave.Lee@cnelm.ac.uk.

Dr Michelle Barrow Academic Team Director, Clinical Director and Institution Link Tutor

Michelle.Barrow@cnelm.ac.uk

Chris Neil Director of IT and Head of Student Recruitment Chris.Neil@cnelm.ac.uk

Dr James Neil Principal and Research Director James.Neil@cnelm.ac.uk