



A current student is anyone who:

(a)



<p><b>Prejudice or bias (actual or perceived) which can be proved</b></p>	<p>Evidence exists which shows there was prejudice or bias, or the perception of prejudice or bias, on behalf of a marker and/or the decision-making body such that the result of the assessment, progression or withdrawal decision should not stand.</p>	<p>The student must clearly and fully explain the reasons for the claim of prejudice or bias, or perception thereof. This may include comments from a third party concerning comments or remarks made by others</p>
---	--	---

3.3 The following are **not** grounds for appeal and will be rejected:

<b>Academic judgment</b>	<b>Programme management</b>	<b>Vexatious appeal</b>
<p>Students cannot appeal against a mark because they are dissatisfied with it. It has to be demonstrated that there are grounds for</p>	<p>Problems that arise during studies, including problems with conveying information</p>	

If a student believes that there has been an error in calculating or recording marks, they can request a clerical check of marks via the Academic Administrator by emailing [AcadAdmin@iis.ac.uk](mailto:AcadAdmin@iis.ac.uk)

received after this must include a statement explaining why. Late appeals will only be considered if the reason is found acceptable by the Academic Council. If not, the student will receive a written explanation of why their appeal has been rejected, and they can request a review of that decision.

- 5.5 The Quality Assurance & Evaluation Department will ask the Investigating Officer to respond within an appropriate timeframe so that the Quality Assurance & Evaluation Department can inform the student of the outcome within twenty-one (21) calendar days (or sooner if the appeal requires swift action, i.e. where the student has severe health issues or there are external deadlines).
- 5.6 The Investigating Officer will make one of the following decisions and report this to the Quality Assurance & Evaluation Department:
- (a) **Reject the appeal due to insufficient grounds.** The reasons will be communicated to the student by the Quality Assurance & Evaluation Department and they will be advised of their right to request a review of the decision.
  - (b) **Make a recommendation on the appeal for the decision-making body to consider.**

- (a) Chair: The Chair of the Academic Council (if unconnected with the case) or nominee, who must be a member of academic staff unconnected with the case
- (b) A member of academic staff who is unconnected with the case
- (c) A member of staff from the senior management team who is unconnected with the case.

An administrator unconnected with the case will be appointed to act as Secretary to







9.1 The Academic Appeals Policy, the procedure, and the outcomes of any appeals will be produced by the Head of QA&E, in consultation with the relevant department, for the SOAS and IIS Joint Programme Committee, the Academic Council and the OIA to review.

## 10 Document Control

Version	Role / Activity	Person(s) responsible	Date
Version 1	Document Owner and Author	GPISH and STEP Programme Leaders	June 2018
	Reviewer	Student Services Manager	July 2018
	Consultation	Students: GPISH 2020 and 2021; STEP C11	October 2018
	Approval	AMC	November 2018
	Evaluation and review	AMC	May 2019
	Amendments as necessary	GPISH and STEP Programme Leaders	May 2019
Version 2	Approval	AMC	June 2019
	Review	Eversheds and QA&E	Feb 2020