

Case 200702367: Edinburgh College of Art

Summary of Investigation

Category

Higher Education: Academic Appeal

Overview

The complainant (Mr C) complained that Edinburgh College of Art (the College) did not handle his son (Mr A)'s academic appeals appropriately and that this disadvantaged him by delaying the start of his professional career.

Specific complaints and conclusions

The complaints which have been investigated are that:

- (a) there were flaws in the way the College handled the initial approach by Mr A (*partially upheld to the extent that the College did not supply Mr A with a copy of the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedures (the Appeals Policy) earlier, and did not advise him of the date of the Preliminary Assessment Panel (PAP)*);
- (b) the College attempted to influence Heriot-Watt University (the University), as the final point of appeal, inappropriately during the appeal (*not upheld*);
- (c) the College's responses to the University during the appeals process were inadequate (*upheld*);
- (d) advice given to Mr A following the initial appeal was inadequate and not documented (*no finding*);
- (e) procedures identified as potentially misleading following the first appeal (ie undocumented verbal feedback to students) were not corrected before the second (*not upheld*);
- (f) the attitude of College staff towards Mr C was not appropriate, including legal threats (*not upheld*); and
- (g) the time taken to deal with the appeals was excessive (*partially upheld to the extent that the College's failure to comply with the University's request for comment on the grounds for appeal caused some of the delay in the overall processing of the second appeal*);

Redress and recommendations

The Ombudsman recommends that the College:

- (i) provide appellants with a copy of the Appeals Policy, or information on where to obtain a copy, when they first acknowledge receipt of an appeal. The College should also advise appellants of the date of the PAP, allowing reasonable time for appellants to seek advice from the Students' Representative Council General Manager and provide further information in support of their appeal;
- (ii) include, in the letter issued to appellants after the PAP, an explanation of why a decision has been reached that there are no prima facie grounds for an appeal to proceed, and an explicit statement of what avenue of appeal remains open;
- (iii) should not supply information to the University relating to an appeal unless that information can be supported by evidence or the information is clearly an opinion or comment given in response to such a request;
- (iv) apologise to Mr A for supplying unsubstantiated information to the University regarding his attendance;
- (v) should in future comply with requests for comment on the grounds for appeal from the University;
- (vi) draw up and implement a clear policy for managing unacceptable behaviour. The Ombudsman encourages the College to refer to the SPSO Unacceptable Actions Policy when drawing up their own policy; and
- (vii) include indicative timescales for holding the PAP and the Academic Appeals Committee in the next version of the Appeals Policy.

The College have accepted the recommendations and will act on them accordingly.

Main Investigation Report

Introduction

1. The aggrieved (Mr A) was a student at Edinburgh College of Art (the College) and completed his final exams in June 2005. He was studying for a professional qualification in one of the College's Schools (the School). The College did not consider that his work merited a degree with honours because he had failed a module, so they awarded an ordinary degree. Mr A appealed this decision in July 2005. The College did not consider that Mr A had grounds to appeal so he made a further appeal to Heriot-Watt University (the University) in August 2005, under a special arrangement between the two institutions. As Mr A was studying for an award validated by the University, it was possible for him to appeal the College's decision to the University. In January 2006, the University allowed the appeal and decided that Mr A should be allowed to undertake the failed module, as if it were a first-sit opportunity, in May 2006. They informed Mr A of this outcome on 9 February 2006 and he appealed the decision as he considered that the time delay in this process disadvantaged him. The University did not consider that there were grounds to allow this appeal and Mr A was allowed to resubmit his original work with revisions in May 2006. Mr A achieved the same mark that he had been given at the original submission and, following an extended exchange of correspondence with the College, decided to appeal this grading in October 2006. The College did not allow this appeal and reminded Mr A that he was entitled to resit the module in June 2007. Mr A did not consider this to be reasonable and once again referred his case to the University in January 2007. The University eventually granted Mr A a minimum pass in August 2007:

'... on the basis that the processes in place to advise and support the student were deficient and that the student has been disadvantaged.'

Following correspondence between Mr A, the University and the College, Mr A was awarded a Bachelor's degree with Second Class (Lower Division) Honours.

2. Mr A's father (Mr C) complained to the Ombudsman on 10 December 2007.

3. The complaints from Mr C which I have investigated are that:

(a) there were flaws in the way the College handled the initial approach by Mr A;

- (b) the College attempted to influence the University, as the final point of appeal, inappropriately during the appeal;
- (c) the College's responses to the University during the appeals process were inadequate;
- (d) advice given to Mr A following the initial appeal was inadequate and not documented;
- (e) procedures identified as potentially misleading following the first appeal (ie undocumented verbal feedback to students) were not corrected before the second;
- (f) the attitude of College staff towards Mr C was not appropriate, including legal threats; and
- (g) the time taken to deal with the appeals was excessive.

Investigation

4. In my investigation of this complaint, I reviewed the relevant policies on academic appeals, the key documents in the appeals process and the extensive correspondence between Mr A, Mr C, the College and the University.

5. It is important to set out some of the constraints within which the Ombudsman must investigate matters relating to higher education institutions. The Scottish Public Services Ombudsman Act 2002 (the Act), Schedule 4, paragraph 10A, prohibits the Ombudsman from investigating 'action taken by or on behalf of [an institution] in the exercise of academic judgement relating to an educational or training matter'. This means that the Ombudsman must not investigate any matter relating to the quality of a student's work or the quality of the academic input by members of institution staff.

6. Mr C is qualified and is employed in the same subject in which Mr A was studying. Mr C has expressed views on certain aspects of the College's provision in this subject area, in relation to Mr A's appeal. However, given the prohibition in the Act relating to the exercise of academic judgement, it is not for the Ombudsman to comment. Neither is it the role of the Ombudsman to make a determination on any difference of view relating to the subject area.

7. I have not included in this report every detail investigated but I am satisfied that no matter of significance has been overlooked. Mr C and the College were given an opportunity to comment on a draft of this report.

(a) There were flaws in the way the College handled the initial approach by Mr A

8. On 8 July 2005, after hearing the outcome of his degree, Mr A wrote a letter to the College setting out the reasons for seeking to appeal. In the letter Mr A said that he had verbally indicated his intention to appeal to the College and had received a letter of 22 June 2005 from them explaining the grounds on which he could appeal. Mr A set out three grounds of appeal relating to a lack of clarity in course procedures, the assessment marking system, and assessment feedback. Mr A explained his grounds for appeal in some detail over three pages. In his penultimate paragraph, Mr A said:

'I would be grateful therefore if you would advise me if I need provide any further information to support my appeal. I would also appreciate some advice regarding the procedure going forward and in particular would like to know if [the University] or [the College] have a Student Rector who could assist me in my appeal.'

9. The College wrote to Mr A on 15 July 2005 to acknowledge his letter and informed him that his appeal would be referred to a Preliminary Assessment Panel (PAP) in the first instance for review. They also told him the date for the Academic Appeals Committee (AAC) that would consider his appeal if it was accepted by the PAP, and that support was offered to students making appeals by the Students Representative Council (SRC) General Manager. The College wrote to Mr A on 21 July 2005 to advise that the PAP had met on that day to discuss his appeal, had declined it as a prima facie case had not been established and, therefore, the award of an ordinary degree stood. Mr C told me that although the letters were dated four working days apart, Mr A received them on the same day. Mr A wrote to the College on 24 July 2005 noting his disappointment with the decision and seeking further clarification, as offered by the College in their 21 July 2005 letter. He reiterated the points he had made in his 8 July 2005 letter and asked that he:

'... be given the opportunity of consulting the SRC General Manager and be allowed to submit further information if appropriate for consideration. I would also appreciate further information on the appeals procedure itself ...'

In response to this letter, the next day the College wrote to Mr A to provide clarification in response to the points he had made, advised him that he could appeal to the University and told him how he could do this. Enclosed with the

letter was a copy of the Academic Appeals Policy and procedures (the Appeals Policy).

10. The preamble to the Appeals Policy stated that:

'The College aims to provide effective procedures for dealing with and resolving academic appeals. It is the College's aim to address appeals promptly, fairly, courteously and within the regulations of the College and those of the validating Universities. In preparing this Policy and Procedures, the College has attempted to draw up simple and transparent procedures that are in the interests of both students and the College and which reflect best practice within the [higher education] sector.'

The Appeals Policy set out the College's and students' obligations, the grounds for academic appeal, provided information about informal resolution, impartial guidance and support, and set out the stages of the formal appeal process, including ultimately appealing to the University.

11. In his complaint to the Ombudsman, Mr C said that he considered that the College had acted improperly in accepting the letter of 8 July 2005 as Mr A's formal appeal because the letter also asked for advice on the appeal procedure and if Mr A needed to provide any further information. He was of the view that Mr A had not been given sufficient time to put together the full case for his appeal. Furthermore, he considered that the College had failed to respond appropriately to Mr A's request in that letter for further information about the appeals process, including advice about sources of support for appellants. He also complained that Mr A only received full details of the appeals procedure after the College had denied his appeal.

(a) *Conclusion*

12. I have reviewed Mr A's letter of 8 July 2005 carefully. It clearly stated 'I now confirm in writing, as requested, the grounds for my appeal', and went on to set out the three grounds for appeal in some detail. At the end of the letter, he asked that the College inform him if they needed any additional information in support of the appeal, though Mr C has pointed out that the College did not respond to Mr A's request. The College then wrote to Mr A confirming receipt of his appeal and advising that it would be reviewed by the PAP, and within four working days wrote to Mr A advising him that his appeal had been declined.

13. Mr A's letter reads like a formal, detailed appeal letter and, therefore, I can understand why, and consider that it was reasonable that, the College proceeded with the PAP on the basis of this letter. The College, in retrospect, advised Mr A that the PAP also had access to all relevant documentation, including his School file. I also understand the College's aim to deal with appeals promptly. However, I am of the view that the College should have sent Mr A the Appeals Policy with the 15 July 2005 letter. The College should also have advised Mr A of the date of the PAP, so he would have had time to seek advice from the SRC General Manager and provide further information in support of his appeal if necessary. I am also of the view that the letter of 21 July 2005 from the College could have been more helpful and transparent by explaining the reasons for finding that Mr A had no prima facie grounds of appeal and what avenue of appeal remained open to him, though the College did provide clarification in the 25 July 2005 letter.

14. With all of this in mind, on balance, I partially uphold this complaint to the extent that the College did not supply Mr A with a copy of the Appeals Policy earlier, and did not advise him of the date of the PAP.

(a) Recommendations

15. The Ombudsman recommends that the College:

- (i) provide appellants with a copy of the Appeals Policy, or information on where to obtain a copy, when they first acknowledge receipt of an appeal. The College should also advise appellants of the date of the PAP, allowing reasonable time for appellants to seek advice from the SRC General Manager and provide further information in support of their appeal; and
- (ii) include, in the letter issued to appellants after the PAP, an explanation of why a decision has been reached that there are no prima facie grounds for an appeal to proceed, and an explicit statement of what avenue of appeal remains open.

(b) The College attempted to influence the University, as the final point of appeal, inappropriately during the appeal

16. As noted in paragraph 1, Mr A did appeal to the University in August 2005 following the College's decision that a prima facie case had not been established for his appeal. On 17 January 2006, the University's Appeal Committee concluded that:

'... the decision to fail the module in question had been particularly harsh when taking into consideration the student's overall performance ... [and]

... The appellant's performance may have been affected by the lack of feedback from the crit.'

The University recommended that Mr A be allowed to resit the module as a first attempt at the next available opportunity, which was in week six of the spring term in 2006. The Committee also recommended that the College consider introducing feedback for final year students' verbal crits (in this case, verbal feedback on students' professional assessments).

17. When considering the appeal, the University emailed the College on 19 December 2005 asking for clarification on the possibility of Mr A taking the module again as a first sit opportunity. The College responded the following day and said:

'Unfortunately it is not possible for [Mr A] to resubmit his existing work or simply hand in a particular component. This is in part due to the fact that the student had a poor attendance record and that the work already submitted was poor.'

Mr C complained that this correspondence from the College was prejudicial. In particular, he said that the College's comments about Mr A's abilities and attendance were unsupported assertions rather than evidence based on Mr A's student record. In responding to this, the College told me that all information submitted to the University was accurate and supported by documentation, although Mr C disputes this.

(b) Conclusion

18. I have not seen evidence to substantiate the comments about Mr A's attendance and standard of work that were in the College's email of 20 December 2005 and, therefore, it would appear that these comments were unsupported. I can understand why Mr C considered the email to be prejudicial in the context of an academic appeal. However, it is clear that this was only one part of the material submitted by the College to the University and it is clear that the University Appeal Committee considered that the material, when taken as a whole, supported their view of the quality of Mr A's work. The result of their consideration of this material was that the College's decision to fail the module had been harsh and his appeal was upheld.

19. Based on what I have read, I cannot see evidence that the College deliberately sought to inappropriately influence the University's consideration of

Mr A's appeal. The University asked for clarification, and the College responded. While I consider it was poor practice for the College to supply information which could not be supported by evidence, this does not definitively indicate an attempt to inappropriately influence the University. I do not, therefore, uphold this complaint.

(b) Recommendations

20. Although I do not uphold this complaint, the Ombudsman recommends that the College:

- (i) should not supply information to the University relating to an appeal unless that information can be supported by evidence or the information is clearly an opinion or comment given in response to such a request; and
- (ii) apologise to Mr A for supplying unsubstantiated information to the University regarding his attendance.

(c) The College's responses to the University during the appeals process were inadequate

21. In paragraph 1, I referred to the arrangement whereby Mr A was able to appeal to the University. This arrangement meant that the University had to seek relevant information from the College in order to determine the appeal.

22. During the second appeal to the University, lodged in January 2007, the University sought further comment from the College on the new grounds presented for appeal. A summary of the appeal written by an officer of the University, dated 8 May 2007, described difficulties in securing a written statement from the College in response to the new appeal. A meeting was organised between the University and the College on 28 March 2007 to discuss this matter. The summary of the appeal noted that the College staff at the meeting said that they had done more than enough work on Mr A's case and they did not wish to provide the University with a written response. Replying to this the University staff said that the issues raised in the appeal were new and '... could not just be ignored ...' and that they needed:

'... to have a written response from the College which addresses the grounds stated in this appeal and enables [the University] to consider [the College's] views as well as those of the student.'

The summary of the appeal noted that the College staff reluctantly agreed to provide a written response but that nothing had been received by the date the summary was written.

23. In a revised version of the summary of the appeal, dated 8 August 2007, it was noted that a University Vice-Principal conducted an initial investigation of the appeal case and that the College:

'... had not provided any comments with respect to the student's grounds for appeal'.

In response to the University, in a letter of 2 October 2007, the College said that they were:

'... of the belief that it provided the University with a full and adequate response to the issues raised.'

In their submission to me of 6 March 2008, the College said that there was no further information they could provide to the University and that:

'To minimise any possible confusion, regarding another summary response (which would provide duplicate information already available), the College submitted full copies of the central student file held in the Registry and [the School] file. These were handed to senior University staff at the meeting [of 28 March 2007].'

In a further submission to me of 2 February 2009, the College said that:

'In not commenting on the second appeal, but providing [the University] with all documentation concerning the case, the College was being scrupulous in not positing a view or opinion which might influence [the University's] appeals panel decision: the evidence had to speak for itself.'

(c) Conclusion

24. It is clear that there was a difference of opinion between the College and the University about the evidence required for the final appeal to be considered. Although the College considered that there was no more information they could give to the University, it is clear that what the University sought was not just documentary information, but comment from the College on the specific new grounds for appeal. I understand the College's point of view with regard to letting the evidence speak for itself. However, I consider that the University's request for comment was a simple and reasonable one that the College should have complied with and, therefore, I uphold this complaint.

(c) *Recommendation*

25. The Ombudsman recommends that the College should in future comply with requests for comment on the grounds for appeal from the University.

(d) Advice given to Mr A following the initial appeal was inadequate and not documented; and (e) Procedures identified as potentially misleading following the first appeal (ie undocumented verbal feedback to students) were not corrected before the second

26. Following his first appeal to the University, Mr A was allowed to take his failed module as a first-sit in May 2006. This took the form of a resubmission of his original work with changes made in the light of additional support from staff at the College. In a letter of 9 February 2006, the University informed Mr A that 'special arrangements' were being put in place by the College to allow him to resit his module. There was also the option of resitting the module the following year. The College then wrote to Mr A on 28 February 2006 notifying him that:

'The ... Module is underway with specialist lectures and tutorials relating specifically to your design project planned for the next four weeks.'

The College also wrote to Mr A on 1 May 2006, following a telephone conversation on 27 April 2006, about the arrangements for the assessment of his resit. The College's view, as expressed in their submission to me of 6 March 2008, was that:

'This correspondence illustrates that the advice given to the student was timely, sensitive and relevant to the requirements determined by the University.'

27. Mr A's work for the module was assessed in May 2006 and he attained the same mark as when the module was assessed the previous year and so, once again, failed the module. Indeed, the grades for each element of the module were exactly the same as those given for his original work.

28. When Mr A appealed this decision to the University in January 2007, one of his main grounds for appeal was that the College had failed to provide him with detailed written feedback on the progress of his work. In the revised summary of appeal of 8 August 2007, and in a letter of 17 September 2007 to the College, the University upheld this appeal:

'... on the basis that the processes in place to advise and support the student were deficient and that the student has been disadvantaged.'

In particular, the University committee examining the appeal found it surprising that Mr A would achieve exactly the same grades for each component of his assessment if advice had been targeted properly to areas of weakness in the original work. They found only limited evidence of written feedback given to Mr A by tutors while he was receiving support for his resubmission.

29. One of Mr A's principal grounds for appeal to the University in August 2005 was that verbal instruction and advice given in the guidance and assessment process would be of more use to the student if this was given in writing so that the student could reflect more carefully on advice given. The University agreed with Mr A that the system of giving feedback to students could be improved by giving more written advice. They wrote to the College on 27 January 2006 to say that:

'... the Appeal Committee agreed to recommend that consideration should be given by [the College] to the introduction of written crits on professional assessments in the final year. The Senate Council allowed the appeal and agreed that verbal feedback could be misleading to students, and that written feedback would provide a useful summary for students to use in preparing for final assessment.'

30. The College responded to the 27 January 2006 letter on 15 February 2006. They said that as part of ongoing quality enhancement they had:

'... identified the need across all ... programmes to be more precise in ... feedback to students. Increasingly this takes the form of written feedback.'

They also said that:

'The nature of studio teaching and the kind of observations that pass in such circumstances mean that it would be virtually impossible for the entirety of such a teaching interchange to be recorded in written form ... [The School] has been asked ... to investigate ways in which they might provide increased written guidance to students at regular intervals.'

31. In their written submission to me of 6 March 2008, the College reported that:

'The exploration of the University's recommendation found no evidence, (excepting that of [Mr C's] allegation), to support changing this very effective process of studio-based learning, teaching and assessment.'

(d) Conclusion

32. In considering Mr A's appeals, the University were careful to stress that they were not assessing the academic judgement of the College in the grade they awarded to Mr A's resubmitted work. Similarly, the Ombudsman may not question the exercise of academic judgement by the College in any educational or training matter. The University's conclusion that the processes in place to advise and support Mr A were deficient was partly based on the College not providing written evidence of their support.

33. That the College provided procedural advice on the module to Mr A is not in question, as is evidenced by the correspondence with him. However, where this advice does not relate to procedural matters, the question of the adequacy of this advice is a matter of academic judgement. I fully understand the University's judgement that they would have expected to see improvements in Mr A's work if support had adequately targeted areas of previous weakness. However, I am not in a position to assess the extent to which the second fail can be attributed to inadequate academic input from the College. The College also explained their position to the University on why feedback was given to students verbally rather than in written form. The manner in which feedback is given is also a matter of academic judgement that I cannot comment on. Therefore, I can reach no finding on this complaint.

(e) Conclusion

34. The question of the most appropriate way to deliver feedback to students in a given discipline is a matter of academic judgement. I cannot, therefore, offer any comment on the College's decision in this regard. However, I am satisfied that the College did respond to the University's recommendation to consider this matter. Having done so, and not being under any obligation to make changes, the College responded to the University on this matter. Therefore, I do not uphold this complaint.

(f) The attitude of College staff towards Mr C was not appropriate, including legal threats

35. I have already alluded to the College's view that Mr C's behaviour had been inappropriate (paragraph 22). In a letter to Mr C dated 28 November 2006, the College said that they had:

'... provided both you and [Mr A] with consistent, transparent and clearly explained information in response to all queries. If you persist in making what we believe to be repetitive and vexatious requests for information, we

will regretfully have to place this matter in the hands of our lawyers ... as you are not authorised to be on College premises, I should be obliged if you would not hand deliver letters personally ...'

36. Mr C stated that most of his contact with the College had been by means of written correspondence, that he had few meetings with members of staff at the College and, at these meetings, he was always accompanied by Mr A. The College told me that Mr C was not always accompanied by Mr A when he made 'unannounced and unauthorised visits to the College'. The College reported that Mr C did, on occasion, hand-deliver letters to staff. Mr C told me that he arranged for his office handyman to hand-deliver letters in an effort to expedite matters. Mr C did not consider his behaviour to be inappropriate but felt that he had to be persistent to progress the appeal.

37. In their submission to the Ombudsman's office, the College said that they had:

'... a duty of care towards its employees. A number of staff ... raised concerns regarding their discomfort in dealing with [Mr C] ... The above approach taken by the College was appropriate in fulfilling its duty of care responsibilities.'

38. Mr C clearly disagreed with the College's view of events. He told me that his requests were not vexatious, rather he had to repeatedly ask for information as the College failed to provide what he wanted. Mr C was also unhappy as he said the College did not provide any prior notification about his alleged behaviour before sending the letter of 28 November 2006 warning of possible sanctions.

(f) Conclusion

39. It is not my role to judge between perceptions of whether behaviour is persistent or harassing, as these can be subjective to some extent. I consider that the College had the discretion, and a duty, to respond to reports from staff that they found Mr C's behaviour difficult to manage. They did so by warning Mr C about the behaviour they considered unacceptable. I have not seen evidence of maladministration in how the College approached this situation and, therefore, I do not uphold this complaint. However, moving forward, it would help the College and complainants if the College introduce a policy for dealing with unacceptable actions.

(f) Recommendation

40. Although this complaint has not been upheld, the Ombudsman recommends that the College draw up and implement a clear policy for managing unacceptable behaviour. The Ombudsman encourages the College to refer to the SPSO Unacceptable Actions Policy when drawing up their own policy.

(g) The time taken to deal with the appeals was excessive

41. Mr A submitted his first appeal to the College on 8 July 2005 (see paragraph 1 and section (a) of this report) and they told him the outcome on 21 July 2005. Mr A then appealed to the University in August 2005 and they told him the outcome on 26 January 2006. Mr C submitted the second appeal to the College, on behalf of Mr A, on 3 October 2006 and they advised Mr C of the outcome on 17 October 2006. Mr C then appealed to the University on 12 January 2007 and the University advised him of the final outcome on 21 September 2007. The first appeal resulted in a resubmission of work in May 2006 and the second appeal resulted in a decision in September 2007 to award a Bachelor's degree with Second Class (Lower Division) Honours.

(g) Conclusion

42. The College took two working weeks to consider both appeals, the first by the PAP and the second by the AAC. The Appeals Policy does not set out indicative timescales for holding the PAP or the AAC, though I conclude that the time taken was reasonable. The appeal to the University took longer in both cases, approximately five months for the first appeal and eight months for the second. In addition to this, Mr C sought additional information and clarification from the College between October 2006 and January 2007, at which point he submitted the second appeal to the University. Although the right of appeal to the University is appropriate, it inevitably entails extra administration, including the work of an ad hoc committee to investigate the appeal. In the case of the second appeal, there were differences of view between the College and the University about what material was necessary for the full consideration of the second appeal (see section (c) of this report) and this protracted the proceedings between February and May 2007. While it is by no means certain that such differences of opinion would not arise within a single institution, it is possible that the involvement of separate institutions increases the probability of this kind of situation.

43. I consider that some of the delay in the overall processing of the second appeal was caused by the College's failure to comply with the University's request for comment on the grounds for appeal and, therefore, I partially uphold this complaint to that extent.

(g) Recommendation

44. The Ombudsman recommends that the College include indicative timescales for holding the PAP and the AAC in the next version of the Appeals Policy.

45. The College have accepted the recommendations and will act on them accordingly. The Ombudsman asks that the College notify him when the recommendations have been implemented.

Explanation of abbreviations used

Mr A	The complainant's son, a student at Edinburgh College of Art
The College	Edinburgh College of Art
The School	The academic department in which Mr A was studying
The University	Heriot-Watt University
Mr C	The complainant
The Act	Scottish Public Services Ombudsman Act 2002
PAP	Preliminary Assessment Panel
AAC	Academic Appeals Committee
SRC	Students' Representative Council
The Appeals Policy	Academic Appeals Policy and Procedures

List of legislation and policies considered

Academic Appeals Policy and Procedures (revised and approved by Heriot-Watt University, April 2005)

Scottish Public Services Ombudsman Act 2002