



Academic Regulations

Contents

1. Introduction	5
1.1. About the School	5
1.2. Statement of Purpose	5
1.3. Scope of Regulations	6
1.4. Status of Degrees	6
1.5. Definitions	6
2. Academic Governance	8
2.1. Academic Board	8
2.2. Academic Board Sub-Committees	8
2.3. Academic Organization	9
2.4. Faculty	9
2.5. Student Representation	10
3. Academic Awards Framework	11
3.1. Degree Titles	11
3.2. Academic Credit	12
3.3. Requirements for Awards	12
3.4. Undergraduate Majors, Minors, or Specializations	14
3.5. Research Degrees	14
3.6. Aegrotat Degrees	14
3.7. Posthumous Degrees	15
3.8. Honorary Degrees	15
3.9. Dual (Double) Degrees	15
3.10. Degree Certificates and Transcript	15
3.11. Graduation Ceremonies	16
3.12. Rescinding of Degree Awards	16
4. Assessment	17
4.1. Assessment and Grading	17
4.2. Grading System	18
4.3. Group Grading System	20
4.4. Sample Grade Review	20
4.5. Internships	21
4.6. Assessment Tariffs	21

4.7.	Academic Probation and Progression	22
4.8.	Attendance Requirements	22
4.9.	Late Submission	22
4.10.	Mitigating Circumstances	23
4.11.	Resits/Retakes	23
4.12.	Special Assignment Arrangements	24
4.13.	Intellectual Property and Public Access	24
4.14.	Transfer Credit / Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)	24
5.	Program Approval, Management and Enhancement	27
5.1.	Principles	27
5.2.	Outline Validation	28
5.3.	Program Design	28
5.4.	Final Approval	28
5.5.	Modification	30
5.6.	Annual Academic Review	31
5.7.	Periodic Review	31
5.8.	Program Closure	32
6.	External Examiners	34
6.1.	Introduction	34
6.2.	Appointment Criteria & Process	34
6.3.	Role and Responsibilities	35
6.4.	Termination of Appointment	36
7.	Admissions	37
7.1.	Public Information	37
7.2.	Entry Requirements	37
7.3.	Special Educational Needs and Disability	39
7.4.	Admissions Review	40
8.	Matriculation, Enrollment and Registration	41
8.1.	Matriculation	41
8.2.	Personal Connections and Relationships	41
8.3.	Enrollment	41
8.4.	Registration	42
8.5.	Length of Study	42
8.6.	Leave of Absence	43

8.7.	Withdrawal	44
9.	Academic and Professional Standards	45
9.2.	Honor Code	45
	<i>Key Principles</i>	45
9.3.	Academic Integrity.....	46
	<i>Plagiarism</i>	46
	<i>Referencing</i>	46
	<i>Cheating</i>	46
	<i>Collusion</i>	46
	<i>Misrepresentation</i>	47
9.4.	Professional Integrity	47
9.5.	Honor Code Violations	47
9.6.	Academic Integrity Cases.....	48
9.7.	Professional Integrity Cases.....	50
9.8.	Advice, Support, and Guidance	51
9.9.	Dismissal.....	52
10.	Assessment Appeals	53
10.1.	Scope	53
10.2.	Principles	53
10.3.	Assessment Appeals Procedure	53
11.	Student Complaints.....	55
11.1.	Scope	55
11.2.	Principles	55

1. Introduction

1.1. About the School

- 1.1.1. Hult International Business School Inc is a 501 (c)(3) non-profit organization in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Hult International Business School Ltd is a UK registered charity with the Charity Commission in England and Wales, Charity number: 1092321. The Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust is also a UK registered charity with the Charity Commission in England and Wales, Charity number: 311096. These are all separate legal entities that have merged operations under the common brand “Hult International Business School”.
- 1.1.2. Hult International Business School is accredited by the New England Commission of Higher Education (formerly the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc.). Inquiries regarding the accreditation status by the Commission should be directed to the administrative staff of the institution. Individuals may also contact: New England Commission of Higher Education, 3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100, Burlington, MA 01803-4514 (781) 425 7785 E-Mail: info@neche.org
- 1.1.3. All U.S. degrees are awarded by Hult International Business School Inc, and all U.K. degrees are awarded by the Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust.

1.2. Statement of Purpose

1.2.1. Why We Exist:

- To create a better future for all by inspiring and challenging our community to make an impact that matters

1.2.2. How We Do It:

- **We Learn Through Challenge**

We learn to do and do to learn, individually and in teams. Through our highly relevant programs, passionate teaching and focus on applied learning, we build the knowledge and skills that employers want, and entrepreneurs need to thrive in today’s workplace. We not only increase the practical ability of our community, but also their confidence, learning agility, and employability.

- **We are Global**

Our community of ‘doers’ represents over 150 nationalities and our campuses, learners, alumni, faculty, and staff celebrate togetherness across the globe. We create a truly diverse environment where we all learn from and are enriched by each other’s experiences and perspectives.

- **We Grow Ourselves and Others**

Our community of lifelong learners embodies curiosity, optimism and a growth mindset that enables us all to become our best selves. We care beyond ourselves and believe that by continually striving for integrity, equity, and authenticity, our community can help build a better world for all.

1.2.3. **What We Do:**

- We offer innovative education and foster research to advance practice within responsible, inclusive, and sustainable business.

1.3. Scope of Regulations

- 1.3.1. The scope of the Academic Regulations is the governance and operation of degree programs across Hult International Business School [the Institution], covering Hult International Business School Inc., Hult International Business School Ltd., and the Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust. In this context, a Program is a planned sequence of academic credits that normally leads to the award of a higher education qualification.
- 1.3.2. The Academic Regulations and any changes to them are approved by Academic Board. The Academic Standards & Quality Committee reviews the Academic Regulations on at least an annual basis and propose changes to the Academic Board.
- 1.3.3. Program Regulations apply these regulations in the context of a specific Program. Program Regulations refers to the Program Specification, Program Catalog and/or Student Handbook, and Course Syllabi. Program Regulations explicitly specify any variations to the Academic Regulations. Such exceptions are recorded as a 'derogation'. The Academic Standards & Quality Committee keeps a list of all derogations.

1.4. Status of Degrees

- 1.4.1. U.S. degrees are awarded by Hult International Business School Inc. and U.K. degrees are awarded by the Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust. Program Regulations state which degree will be awarded, which is normally a joint U.S./U.K. degree for students whose primary location of study is the U.K. and a single U.S. degree for students whose primary location of study is outside the U.K. The Academic Regulations apply equally to degree awards by Hult and by Ashridge. Doctoral awards made by Hult International Business School are singular U.S. awards.
- 1.4.2. Academic Board explicitly approves all Programs that lead to Degree Awards.

1.5. Definitions

- 1.5.1. "*Institution*" means Hult and Ashridge as a combined entity.
- 1.5.2. "*School*" means the organizational units (Undergraduate, Postgraduate, and Executive Education) within the Institution responsible for the delivery of Programs.
- 1.5.3. "*President*" means President of the Institution as a whole.
- 1.5.4. "*President of School*" means the designated President of the institution's Undergraduate, Postgraduate, or Executive Education School.
- 1.5.5. "*Campus Dean*" means the individual responsible for the delivery of all Programs on a Campus. The responsibilities for a specific Program within a Campus may be

delegated to other Campus staff, typically an Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, or Program Director.

- 1.5.6. “*Chief Academic Officer*” means the academic head of the Institution. The Chief Academic Officer maintains a “*Central Academic Team*” to maintain academic quality and consistency across the Institution’s Schools, Programs, and Campuses.
- 1.5.7. “*US Requirements*” are those defined by:
 - a. The New England Commission of Higher Education [‘NECHE’].
 - b. Federal law and regulations for higher education institutions.
- 1.5.8. “*UK Requirements*” are those defined by:
 - a. The Office for Students (OfS).
 - b. The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education [‘QAA’], particularly the Quality Code for Higher Education [‘UK Quality Code’].
 - c. UK law and regulations for higher education institutions (Higher Education and Research Act 2017 (HERA), and the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA)).
- 1.5.9. “*Local Requirements*” are those defined by the government and regulatory bodies in a region or country in which a Campus operates, including the education laws and regulations of the US states within which the Institution operates.
- 1.5.10. “*Academic Board*” means the highest academic-focused decision body of the Institution, chaired by the Chief Academic Officer.
- 1.5.11. “*Registry*” means the academic administration function that keeps student records.
- 1.5.12. “*Program Regulations*” means the information provided to students in one or more printed or online documents that describe the Program and its Courses, and all relevant policies that are to be applied to students. Typically, this includes a Program Specification, Student Handbook and/or Program Catalog.
- 1.5.13. “*Subject area*” means an academic discipline, inter-disciplinary field, or area of professional practice.
- 1.5.14. “*Course Syllabus*” means the information provided in a document to students enrolled on a specific Course, which is typically held online in a virtual learning environment.

2. Academic Governance

2.1. Academic Board

- 2.1.1. The Academic Board is the highest academic-focused decision body of the institution, with powers delegated by the Board of Hult International Business School Inc. and the Representative Body of the Ashridge (Bonar Law Memorial) Trust with respect to their authority to issues US and UK degrees respectively. [The Board of Hult and Representative Body of Ashridge are in practice combined within a single joint Board, known hereafter as ‘the Board’]. The Academic Board also has oversight of (i) the academic mission and strategy, and (ii) the planning and delivery of the educational provision of the Institution.
- 2.1.2. The powers of the Academic Board are delegated by the Board, which approves its terms of reference and composition. The Board nominates up to two of its current members to sit on the Academic Board.

2.2. Academic Board Sub-Committees

- 2.2.1. Through Academic Committees reporting to it, the Academic Board maintains oversight of academic standards and quality, teaching, learning and assessment, admissions, curriculum development and research and scholarship activities. The Academic Board delegates responsibility for the development and monitoring of specific areas of academic strategy and operation to its committees and sub-committees.
- 2.2.2. The Academic Board approves and maintains an Academic Governance Framework that includes (i) details of the Academic Committee structure, and (ii) the membership and terms of reference of each Academic Committee. Academic Committees may appoint sub-committees or working groups to undertake part of their work.
- 2.2.3. The following Academic Committees are part of the Academic Governance Framework and undertake specific roles in the Academic Regulations:
 - a. Academic Standards and Quality Committee
 - b. Curriculum Committee
 - c. Teaching and Learning Committee (reports to Curriculum Committee)
 - d. Admissions Committee
 - e. Research Committee
 - f. Research Ethics Committee (reports to Research Committee)
 - g. Awards Board
- 2.2.4. The Academic Governance Framework ensures that there is faculty and student representation and/or participation in Academic Committees. The Academic Board balances this representation with ex-officio and/or appointed members who bring appropriate expertise and authority to Academic Committees.
- 2.2.5. Appointed members of Academic Committees are appointed by the Academic Board and may include external members from outside the Institution. Should a vacancy arise, the Chair of the Academic Board may appoint an interim member of an Academic Committee in consultation with the respective Committee Chair. Any

such interim member is formally appointed if agreed at the next meeting of Academic Board.

- 2.2.6. Members are elected by defined constituencies. The Secretary to the Academic Board operates the election process which enables all eligible individuals to participate equally in nominations and voting.
- 2.2.7. Each Academic Committee keeps a record of their agendas, papers and minutes. Minutes are ratified at the following meeting and shared with the Committee to which it reports, where the Chair (or substitute) highlights any significant decision outcomes and/or matters arising.

2.3. Academic Organization

- 2.3.1. The School's system of governance is such that it balances the needs of central design and structure with consistent local (campus) implementation and reporting. It is designed to meet both US and UK quality assurance expectations, as well as to bring about the best of what both education systems can offer.
- 2.3.2. The Institution's President appoints the Chief Academic Officer for the Institution, as well as a Head of Undergraduate and Postgraduate respectively.
- 2.3.3. The Chief Academic Officer manages a central academic team, which operates cross-school global functions such as accreditation and regulation, academic governance, academic and program regulations, admissions, research, faculty policies, curriculum development, and oversight of academic quality and consistency.
- 2.3.4. Program delivery is the responsibility of the Head of Undergraduate or Postgraduate respectively, delegated by location to the respective Campus Dean. Campus Deans are responsible for day-to-day operation of academic programs at their campus, including management of local faculty and staff, and responsibility for campus student outcomes, within the parameters of centrally aligned program specifications, student handbooks, and policies and procedures that are established and monitored by the Central Academic Team.
- 2.3.5. Programs run at multiple campuses will:
 - i. have common academic standards and an equivalent student experience across all Campuses and,
 - ii. seek international student mobility by enabling study at multiple campuses within a Program ['Rotation'].

2.4. Faculty

- 2.4.1. Faculty are appointed to work within one or more Schools, at one or more Campuses, and to teach on one or more Programs. The definition of faculty includes those on full-time employment contracts [full-time faculty] and those contracted for a fixed period or volume of work [adjunct faculty]. There is no tenure system. In general, employed and adjunct faculty have the same obligations and opportunities to participate in the Institution, including academic governance and faculty development.

2.4.2. The role of faculty is to:

- a. Conduct teaching and assessment to facilitate learning
- b. Keep up to date with scholarship and practice in their areas of focus
- c. Make intellectual contributions based on research and/or practice that falls within the Institution's research strategy
- d. Participate in the wider Institution, including academic governance, student interaction, and links with the business and academic worlds
- e. Contribute to the design, enhancement and review of courses and programs

2.4.3. The Academic Board decides on the system of faculty academic titles across the Institution.

2.4.4. Faculty are encouraged to participate in regular faculty meetings at Campus, School, and/or Institution level. These and other mechanisms are used to inform and consult faculty on enhancements within Courses, Programs, and the Institution.

2.5. Student Representation

2.5.1. Students are active participants in their own learning experience. Students are also encouraged to contribute more widely as:

- a. Elected members of the Hult Students Association (HSA)
- b. Members of Academic Board and other committees
- c. Members of student clubs and societies
- d. Panel members for Program Validation and Periodic Review.

2.5.2. Student feedback is regularly obtained in ways that enable direct feedback on their experience, including but not limited to: (i) surveys, (ii) meetings with Academic and Campus staff, and (iii) informal access to faculty and Campus staff.

2.5.3. In any meeting where the cases of individual students or faculty are being discussed or the item is considered 'reserved business', the Chair may ask any students to withdraw from that part of the meeting. This is noted in the minutes of the meeting.

3. Academic Awards Framework

3.1. Degree Titles

3.1.1. Each Program has the following:

- a. Program Name: a descriptive name for the program used in marketing and program documentation [e.g. Masters in International Business (MIB)].
- b. Award Title: the formal name of the degree awarded on successful completion of the program and recorded on the Degree Certificate [e.g. Master of Science in International Business].
- c. Award Initials: the initials students may use after their name abbreviating the Award Title [e.g. MS].

3.1.2. The Program Name reflects the content and level of the Program in a way that is consistent with the Award Title, the curriculum, and higher education practice in the US and/or UK.

3.1.3. The Award Title follows the US and UK requirements for degrees, whenever possible being consistent with typical higher education practice in both the US and UK.

3.1.4. Degree transcripts may indicate a Specialization, Major, or Minor if the Program Regulations allow it, and when the student has fulfilled all published requirements for the Specialization or Major. Degree certificates do not indicate Specializations or Minors but may indicate Majors.

3.1.5. The following Award Initials/Titles can be approved without explicit permission of the Academic Board:

- a. BBA/Bachelor of Business Administration [including reference to a Major, Minor, or Specialization]
- b. MBA/Master of Business Administration [including with a prefix such as 'Executive']
- c. MS/Master of Science [in a Subject Area]
- d. PgCert/Postgraduate Certificate [in a Subject Area]
- e. PgDip/Postgraduate Diploma [in a Subject Area]
- f. PhD/Doctorate in [subject area]

3.1.6. Although the School currently offers a PhD program, the Academic Board should be consulted on any new Doctorate Award proposals.

3.1.7. Any other Award Title must be approved by Academic Board. For master's degrees other than Master of Business Administration, the preferred Award Title is Master of Science [in a Subject Area].

3.1.8. For a postgraduate degree indicating a specialist Subject Area rather than one in general business and management (such as 'business administration', 'management' or 'international business'), at least two thirds of the Academic Credit required for the Degree Award should be obtained in the specialist Subject Area.

3.2. Academic Credit

- 3.2.1. A Program is composed of Courses as defined in its Program Regulations. Academic Credit is awarded for the achievement of the Learning Outcomes of a Course. Course Learning Outcomes are defined in Program Regulations.
- 3.2.2. All Academic Credit specifies both:
- a. The Level of Study
 - b. The number of credits, based on the hours of learning activity required for the achievement of these learning outcomes
- 3.2.3. The following Levels of Study are used for Academic Credit defined in the UK Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and compatible with the NECHE Policy on Credits and Degrees:
- a. UK Level 4: US Freshman and Sophomore level undergraduate
 - b. UK Level 5: US Junior level undergraduate
 - c. UK Level 6: US Senior level undergraduate
 - d. UK Level 7: Postgraduate – Masters (also postgraduate certificate and diploma)
 - e. UK Level 8: postgraduate – Doctoral
- 3.2.4. The following types of Academic Credit are awarded using the conversions specified below:
- a. '*US Credit*': a measure of Academic Credit applied across undergraduate and postgraduate programs. In undergraduate, one credit typically involves one hour of in-class student work plus 2 to 2½ hours of out-of-class learning activity for a term of approximately 15 weeks (or the equivalent in other delivery formats). In postgraduate, one credit typically involves one hour of in-class student work plus 3 to 3½ hours of out-of-class learning activity for a term of approximately 11 weeks (or the equivalent in other delivery formats).
 - b. '*UK Credit*': a measure of Academic Credit equivalent to 10 estimated notional hours of learning activity of any type. One US credit is equivalent to 5 UK credits.
- 3.2.5. While the School does not award '*ECTS Credit*', it recognizes ECTS as a measure of Academic Credit associated with the Bologna Accord, which sets the credit equivalence at 1 ECTS credit = 2 UK credits.
- 3.2.6. Where learning does not follow the pattern of a full-time program with weekly classes, at least an equivalent amount of learning hours is undertaken for each Credit awarded. This approach is used for other patterns of study and non-learning including laboratory work, internships, work-based learning, projects and experiential learning.

3.3. Requirements for Awards

- 3.3.1. All degrees meet the relevant requirements of:

- a. NECHE, including its *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (On-line Learning)*
- b. The *UK Quality Code, including the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications*
- c. *AACSB Accreditation Standards*
- d. *EQUIS Standards and Criteria*
- e. *QAA Subject Benchmark Statements*

3.3.2. Master of Business Administration Degrees meet the requirements of the Association of MBAs (AMBA) MBA Accreditation Criteria.

3.3.3. The following Award Titles are determined by Hult to require the following minimum levels of Academic Credit (including Transfer Credit) and minimum numbers of credits at the Level of Study of the Degree Award. Where Credits are not at the Level of Study of the Degree Award, they are at Level of Study immediately below that of entry into the Degree (for example at Level 6 on entry into a master's program). Program Regulations may specify higher levels of credit.

	Level of Study of Degree	Minimum Credits (US/UK)	Minimum Credits (US/UK) at Level of Study of Degree
Bachelor	6	120 US/ 600 UK	18 US/ 90 UK
Postgraduate Certificate	7	12 US/ 60 UK	9 US/ 45 UK
Postgraduate Diploma	7	24 US/ 120 UK	18 US/ 90 UK
Master	7	36 US/ 180 UK	30 US/ 150 UK
Doctorate	8	70 US	48 US

3.3.4. Doctoral programs are US-only awards, hence UK credits is not shown.

3.3.5. Program Regulations may permit study of Courses at a higher Level of Study than that of the Degree, together with criteria of academic performance required to Register for such Courses.

3.3.6. Bachelor's degrees satisfy the NECHE requirements for General Education Courses in addition to Courses in the Subject Area of the degree. Bachelor's degrees are of the academic standard of a UK 'honours degree'.

3.3.7. In approving any other degree title, the amount and level of Academic Credit required follows both US and UK Requirements and general higher education practice.

3.3.8. Degree Awards are made only when all the following conditions are met:

- a. The minimum volume and level of Academic Credit has been awarded in an approved combination of Courses specified in Program Regulations
- b. Any other requirements specified in Program Regulations have been met, such as a minimum Cumulative GPA
- c. The student is in good standing as an Enrolled Student with no outstanding Honor Code issues or outstanding tuition-related fees

- d. The Degree Award is recommended by the Assessment Board for the Program and conferred by Academic Board

3.3.9. Program Regulations ensure:

- a. At least 3 US credits of Courses integrate learning across the Subject Areas of Courses in the Program
- b. Program Learning Outcomes are met by any approved combination of Courses

3.3.10. Except where specified in Program Regulations, students failing an Elective Course may replace this Course with another permitted Elective Course to satisfy the requirements for a Degree Award. The Transcript records both the failed and the replacement Course. Additional fees are payable, and the student may need to extend the length of study to register for a suitable Elective Course.

3.3.11. Program Regulations may specify a maximum number of credits that can be attempted or completed.

3.3.12. Program Regulations may permit Exit Awards when a lower volume of Academic Credit has been awarded in an approved combination of Courses that meets the requirements for the Exit Award Title. Student Enrollment ends when an Exit Award is made.

3.4. Undergraduate Majors, Minors, or Specializations

3.4.1. In undergraduate degrees, Majors, Minors, or Specializations may be offered that are based on specialized Subject Areas within the overall Subject Area of the degree (e.g. a Major in Marketing within the overall Subject Area of Business Administration).

3.4.2. Program Regulations define the detailed requirements and required combination of Courses for a Major, Minor, or Specialization in a Subject Area.

3.5. Research Degrees

3.5.1. Research Degrees are structured programs of advanced study and supervised research. Research Degree Programs may be in a single Subject Area, interdisciplinary in nature or in a field of professional practice. Research Degrees may be at Level 7 (Master) or Level 8 (Doctoral). Doctoral degrees have an Award Title of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) or other title equivalent in nature to a PhD degree.

3.5.2. The Institution publishes Doctoral Program Regulations that establish policies and practices relating to doctoral study.

3.6. Aegrotat Degrees

3.6.1. An 'Aegrotat' degree may be awarded if a registered student has been prevented from obtaining an Award due to serious illness or compassionate reasons. There must be enough evidence of the student's performance to be reasonably certain that they had already achieved the learning outcomes of the Program and, but for the serious illness or compassionate reasons, would have fulfilled all conditions required for the Award.

- 3.6.2. Aegrotat degrees are documented in the Transcript. Aegrotat degrees may not be classified as a Distinction. Any Grade Point Average [GPA] calculation is based on the Courses taken.

3.7. Posthumous Degrees

- 3.7.1. Posthumous degrees are conferred if a student dies after completing a program successfully, but before graduation. Posthumous degrees may also be awarded if the program was near completion and clear that in normal circumstances the student would have met the conditions for the Degree Award. Posthumous degrees are accepted on the student's behalf by a parent, spouse, sibling, or other appropriate individual.

3.8. Honorary Degrees

- 3.8.1. Honorary degrees may be awarded to recipients in recognition of their services to academia, to business, or to the Institution.
- 3.8.2. All honorary degrees are proposed by the Academic Board and confirmed by the Board.

3.9. Dual (Double) Degrees

- 3.9.1. Dual (Double) Degrees may be offered in which a student undertakes two Hult Programs without a time-lapse between them. Matriculation onto the second Program requires a student to have:
- a. Completed the first Program (or is on schedule to do so)
 - b. Fulfilled any requirements for pre-requisite Courses
 - c. Obtained minimum grades as specified in Program Regulations in all Courses for which Transfer Credit is granted
 - d. Good standing as an Enrolled student with no pending Academic Misconduct or disciplinary cases
 - e. No outstanding tuition or other fees payable to the Institution
 - f. Met all other requirements for admission to the Program

3.10. Degree Certificates and Transcript

- 3.10.1. The Academic Board approves the format of Degree Certificates, which should include:
- a. Student name
 - b. Award Title
 - c. Awarding institution (Hult and/or Ashridge)
 - d. Degree Classification (if higher than a pass, for example 'Distinction')
 - e. Major(s) (if any)
 - f. Date
- 3.10.2. The Academic Standards & Quality Committee approves the format of academic Transcripts, which forms a record of the student's studies. The Transcript includes details of the Program, together with a record of all Courses and Course Grades (including all re-takes, failures, and withdrawals).

- 3.10.3. Once the Academic Board has approved a Degree Award, graduated students receive a Degree Certificate.
- 3.10.4. Copies of Official Transcripts are available to order (for which a reasonable charge will be made), and students/graduates are responsible for the payment of shipping costs.
- 3.10.5. The Institution does not provide duplicate copies of Degree Certificates.
- 3.10.6. Transcripts and proof of study are available on request to a student who fails to complete a Program.
- 3.10.7. Graduates are responsible for the payment of shipping costs for Official Transcripts.

3.11. Graduation Ceremonies

- 3.11.1. Graduation Ceremonies are held to celebrate each student's achievement with their peers and Deans.
- 3.11.2. Students must wear the academic dress of the Institution at a Graduation Ceremony. The academic dress of the Institution is specified by the Academic Board.
- 3.11.3. In line with US practice of 'Commencement', the School permits a Graduation Ceremony to be open to those who have not yet completed all the requirements for the Degree Award, but who have no more than 6 credits remaining to be awarded.

3.12. Rescinding of Degree Awards

- 3.12.1. In exceptional circumstances a Degree Award may be rescinded by the Academic Board. The Chair of Academic Board will inform the Board of its action should this occur.
- 3.12.2. An award will be rescinded where evidence of fraudulent activity can be identified, such as tampering with a conferred transcript or certificate, or, gaining entry to a program through falsified information. It should be noted that, although not exhaustive, the examples provided above are construed as criminal offences that can lead to criminal prosecution.¹

¹ Advice and Guidance on Degree Fraud A Toolkit for Higher Education Providers - <https://hedd.ac.uk/>

4. Assessment

4.1. Assessment and Grading

- 4.1.1. Assessment of a Course consists of one or more Assignments which in combination assess the student's achievement of the Course Learning Outcomes. Each Assignment has an associated weighting used to calculate the Course Grade.
- 4.1.2. Assessment in each Course is designed so that it:
 - a. Promotes student learning, application and/or reflection
 - b. Measures the achievement of Course Learning Outcomes
 - c. Is appropriate to the Level of Study of the Course
 - d. Is both formative and summative
 - e. Is conducted transparently with clear assignment briefs and timetables
 - f. Is graded using approved rubrics (assessment criteria)
 - g. Enables the assurance of consistency and fairness to students
- 4.1.3. Assessment in each Program is designed so that it:
 - a. Measures the achievement of Program Learning Outcomes
 - b. Is appropriate to the Level(s) of Study of the Program
 - c. Contains an appropriate mix of types of assignment, including individual and group assignments
 - d. Balances assessment of theory, application, skills, and reflection, in line with the Program aims and Learning Outcomes
- 4.1.4. Assessment of each Assignment is based on a Rubric that specifies the criteria for achieving a specific grade, linked to the Level of Study of the Course and the nature of the Assignment. The grade awarded is an Academic Judgement of the faculty.
- 4.1.5. Grading systems used for programs are approved by the Academic Standards & Quality Committee.
- 4.1.6. The Academic Standards & Quality Committee specifies:
 - a. Detailed definitions of criteria of a Grading System
 - b. Algorithms for the calculation of a Course Grade based on the combined grades for Assignments
 - c. Algorithms for the calculation of a Program Grade (e.g. GPA) based on the combined grades for Courses
- 4.1.7. Program Regulations may permit re-attempts of Assignments or Courses through:
 - a. Equivalent internal Assignment(s) that address relevant Course Learning Outcomes
 - b. An equivalent external Course at a comparable institution taken in place of the entire Course
- 4.1.8. Transfer Credit for Courses taken outside the Institution is excluded from calculation of the GPA.
- 4.1.9. The intent of the Hult grading system is to encourage and acknowledge academic achievement while promoting a growth mindset. The Hult grading system is based

on principles of fairness and transparency, and faculty award grades based upon established criteria that are clear and visible in the course syllabus. All students should also be aware of the Hult Honor Code and the expectations regarding academic standards therein. Course grades at Hult usually involve a combination of assessments, including but not limited to written assignments, examinations, and presentations. Graded work will normally include a combination of individual and team assignments. Every Hult student is entitled to know how his or her course grade has been calculated.

4.1.10. Hult operates a policy of second-marking assignments and exams within each course, such that grades are not determined solely by the course instructor. Hult also operates a policy of sample external review of grades. As such, individual course instructors are not at liberty to adjust grades once they have been released.

4.1.11. For group work, students will normally receive the same grade as their teammates. However, an adjusted grade for an individual (either higher or lower than the 'team grade') may be awarded if it is documented that either:

- The individual has made an exceptional contribution to the group activity and assignment.
- The individual has made no (or minimal) contribution to the group activity and assignment.

4.1.12. In addition to the Grading Systems below, Schools may give prizes or make internal awards such as a "Dean's List" based on academic and other criteria. These do not form part of the Degree Award but may be listed on the Transcript.

4.2. Grading System

4.2.1. The Grading System consists of the following letter grades which are given for each Assignment and combined into a Course Grade:

Letter Grade	Grade Points	Quality Indicator
A	4	Excellent; significant strengths & few weaknesses
B	3	Good; strengths outweigh weaknesses
C	2	Adequate; balanced strengths and weaknesses
D	1	Inadequate; weaknesses outweigh strengths
F	0	Fail; significant weaknesses & few strengths

4.2.2. Academic Credit is given for a Course Grade of D or higher. These grades and any other codes, for example for withdrawal or incomplete participation in the Course, are recorded on the Transcript for every attempt of the Course.

4.2.3. A Grade Point Average (GPA) is calculated to two decimal places and appears on the Transcript. This is an average of the grades for all Courses attempted, weighted by the Academic Credit value of the Course using the following table:

- A=4
- B=3
- C=2
- D=1
- F=0

- 4.2.4. A student's grade point average (GPA) is determined by dividing the number of grade points earned by the net number of credits attempted for letter-grade. Pass/Fail courses are not used in the GPA calculation. If a course is retaken the new grade will replace the old grade in the GPA calculation. Grades for transfer credits accepted will not be used in determining the GPA.
- 4.2.5. For example, if a student takes 5 x 3-credit courses and receives grades of A, B, B, C, and D respectively, the GPA will be calculated as:

Credits	Grade	Grade Points	Quality Points	GPA
3	A	4	12	-
3	B	3	9	-
3	B	3	9	-
3	C	2	6	-
3	D	1	3	-
15	-	-	39	2.60 (39/15)

- 4.2.6. In addition to the letter grades of A, B, C, D, F, the following letter grades may be used and recorded on the transcript:
- P (Pass) - Exclusive to Pass/Fail courses, a Pass grade is denoted as P, indicating that the student completed all requirements to complete the course and is awarded the associated credits. However, there is no grade higher than pass obtainable for the course. Pass grades do not count towards the GPA calculation.
 - T (Transfer Credit) - Transfer credit does not count towards the GPA calculation.
 - I (Incomplete) - An Incomplete grade is a temporary award for the period during which the School grants an extension for the submission of course assignments beyond the end of the term. Incomplete grades must be converted to a final letter grade no later than 90 days from the date of the Incomplete grade being recorded. Students cannot graduate with any Incomplete grades on their permanent record.
 - W (Withdrawn) - Withdrawn grades are assigned when a student has withdrawn from a course after the add/drop period and before the withdrawal deadline. 'W' grades are not included in the computation of the GPA .
 - R (Repeat) - If a student repeats a course, the higher-grade counts towards graduation and the calculation of the cumulative GPA. All courses and grades remain on the student's permanent academic transcript, including an 'R' for Repeated Courses.
 - AU (Audit) - AU is recorded if a student attends a course informally, without working for credit, and is used exclusively for returning alumni.
- 4.2.7. Program Regulations may allow students to re-attempt an entire Course and all its Assignments. Re-attempts of Assignments within a Course are not permitted. When a student re-attempts a Course, the highest Course Grade is used in calculating the GPA. Both the original grade and the re-attempt grade are recorded separately on the Transcript.

- 4.2.8. Program Regulations may limit the number of re-attempts and/or the time interval between re-attempts.
- 4.2.9. Tuition fees are charged for re-attempts of Courses.
- 4.2.10. To pass a Program, a Cumulative GPA of 2.00 or higher is required. Program Regulations may specify a higher minimum Cumulative GPA.
- 4.2.11. Students who reach the scheduled end of their Program, and whose Cumulative GPA does not meet the specified minimum, are Dismissed.
- 4.2.12. A Classification of Distinction is awarded to graduating students whose Cumulative GPA is 3.60 or higher.

4.3. Group Grading System

- 4.3.1. Grades are awarded to individual students. Where learning and assessment is based on group activity, the assignment brief specifies whether the same 'team grade' is awarded to all students for an assignment. Exceptionally, an adjusted grade for an individual (either higher or lower than the 'team grade') may be proposed to the Assessment Board if it is documented that either:
 - a. The individual has made an exceptional contribution to the group activity and assignment, or
 - b. The individual has made no (or minimal) contribution to the group activity and assignment

4.4. Sample Grade Review

- 4.4.1. To assure consistency of Course Grades across campuses and Subject Areas, each School operates a system of Sample Grade Review in which a sample of Assignments is reviewed by a suitable qualified and experienced 'grade reviewer' other than the 'first grader' of the Assignment. Sample Grade Review should ensure:
 - Fairness and consistency of grading
 - Quality and consistency of feedback to students
- 4.4.2. The Academic Standards & Quality Committee approves School processes for Sample Grade Review, which:
 - Cover at least 70% of the weighted Course Grade for each Course
 - Cover every Assignment with a weight of 30% or higher
 - Ensure a representative sample of student work is reviewed (typically 7 students per Assignment in each Course Section)
 - Focus on decisions around grade boundaries
 - Enable judgements to be made regarding consistency of Course Grades across Campuses, Programs, and faculty members [as appropriate]
 - Define whether 'blind marking' is used
 - Maintain adequate records (for example videos of presentations) and audit trails which are available for internal quality assurance, external examiners and review by accreditation agencies

- 4.4.3. 'Sample Grade Review' may be sequential or simultaneous. The latter is particularly suited to presentations where both the 'first grader' and 'grade reviewer' are present.
- 4.4.4. In the event of disagreement between the 'first grader' and 'grade reviewer', they seek to agree a grade. The 'first grader' also reviews the grades of any students outside the sample whose grade may be affected by the decisions regarding changed grade(s) in the sample.
- 4.4.5. If the 'first grader' and 'grade reviewer' cannot agree, a 'third grader' is appointed by the School to review the Assignment. Other than in exceptional circumstances, the 'third grader' gives a grade within the range of grades of the 'first grader' and 'grade reviewer'.
- 4.4.6. Students are informed of their grades once Sample Grade Review for their Section has been completed. Communication of the grade to students makes clear that this grade is subject to confirmation by the Assessment Board, which has the power to adjust the grade.

4.5. Internships

- 4.5.1. Some Programs may include internships as core or elective credits towards the final degree.
- 4.5.2. Academic credit will not be awarded retroactively for an internship that is already in progress.
- 4.5.3. Internship eligibility depends on local visa regulations. Questions about internships can be addressed to both the appropriate Campus staff.

4.6. Assessment Tariffs

- 4.6.1. Student performance is evaluated and assessed according to the course learning outcomes and assessment criteria set out in each course syllabus. Means of assessment include a variety of individual and team-based assessment methods, including written assignments, classroom participation, presentations, and midterm or final exams. The Institution promotes extensive use of grading rubrics for assessments, to assure consistent and transparent grading and feedback to students. Furthermore, each School maintains an assessment tariff to assure that assessment criteria and volume of assessment is weighted appropriately according to the academic level and number of credits awarded. As such, while assessments vary between courses, there is consistency with regards to comparative assessed workload.
- 4.6.2. Assessment tariffs and methods and weighting of assessments are published in Program Regulations.
- 4.6.3. Detailed assessment information for a specific course is provided in the Institution's learning management system, including:
- Actual percentage weight of each assessment
 - Actual length or equivalent
 - Description of each assessment
 - Course Learning Outcome(s) assessed

- 4.6.4. Rubric used to grade each assessment, signposting performance expectations for each grade category.

4.7. Academic Probation and Progression

- 4.7.1. Schools define policies for Academic Probation that apply to students who are in danger of not being able to satisfy the academic requirements to complete a Program. These Academic Probation policies may include requirements for attendance, additional learning activities and further student support.
- 4.7.2. Students on academic probation must demonstrate academic progression in subsequent terms and will be dismissed from the program if the stated criteria for academic progression are not met.
- 4.7.3. Students on academic probation are encouraged to work with the appropriate Campus staff to develop a tailored action plan to improve their academic performance.
- 4.7.4. Program Regulations may specify Progression points with academic requirements that must be met before students may register for further Courses.

4.8. Attendance Requirements

- 4.8.1. Students are expected to attend and be on time for all scheduled class sessions, which includes examinations, class presentations, simulations, exercises, field research visits, discussion groups, lectures, and any other scheduled activity.
- 4.8.2. Attendance policies are documented in Program Regulations. Attendance policies are consistent across Campuses except where national law or immigration requirements demand local adaptation at a Campus. Program Regulations may specify that given levels of attendance are a requirement for the award of Academic Credit for a Course.
- 4.8.3. Late attendance policies and early departure policies are documented in Program Regulations.

4.9. Late Submission

- 4.9.1. Schools define late submission policies for Programs, which are documented in Program Regulations. Late submission policies are consistent across Campuses. Program Regulations may specify that timely submission of assignments is a requirement for the award of Academic Credit for a Course.
- 4.9.2. Program Regulations may specify the application of a grade reduction for fixed periods of late submission and may specify a date after which submission is not permitted, which leads to an automatic grade of 'Fail' for the Assignment.
- 4.9.3. Program Regulations may permit a 'bank of days' for late submission.

4.10. Mitigating Circumstances

- 4.10.1. When the academic performance of a student has been, or is likely to be, materially affected by exceptional circumstances that could not reasonably have been foreseen by the student, the student may request the Campus Dean (or designee) for changes to the assessment arrangements for an Assignment or Course.
- 4.10.2. Mitigating Circumstances are not allowed:
- If the circumstances were reasonably foreseeable and/or inadequate steps were taken to mitigate their effect
 - Allowance for the same circumstances has already been made
- 4.10.3. The following are not considered as Mitigating Circumstances:
- The pressure of academic work, employment or non-work commitments
 - Misunderstanding of assignment requirements
 - Poor time management
 - The loss of material due to inadequate IT backups or human error by the student.
- 4.10.4. It is the student's responsibility to:
- make a formal request for Mitigating Circumstances to the Campus Dean (or designee)
 - provide any necessary evidence, e.g. medical certificates
- 4.10.5. The request for Mitigating Circumstances is considered by the Campus Dean (or designee), who may authorize an appropriate change.
- 4.10.6. Exceptionally, the Campus Dean (or designee) may propose that the Assessment Board considers an adjusted mark. In such circumstances, the student's assessed work is graded as if there were no Mitigating Circumstances and any adjustment to the grade of an assignment or conduct of assessment made subsequently by the Assessment Board using its Academic Judgement.
- 4.10.7. While mitigating circumstances may accommodate missed assessments, such absences will still count towards the overall calculation of absences across the term.

4.11. Resits/Retakes

- 4.11.1. Program Regulations may allow students who receive an F grade in a course to have the option to undertake a resit exam or to retake the course, which should measure all course learning outcomes in the course. Program Regulations may exceptionally allow resits/retakes for course grades other than F, where a successful resit/retake would enable a student to meet graduation requirements.
- 4.11.2. If Program Regulations allow resits/retakes, they will specify the applicable policies and parameters, including when resits/retakes would be scheduled, the maximum number of courses a student may resit/retake, and the maximum grade that may be awarded for a resit/retake (normally capped at a C grade).

4.12. Special Assignment Arrangements

- 4.12.1. Students may request Special Assignment Arrangements that result from any pre-existing individual circumstances such as a disability at the time of Matriculation. The Campus Dean (or nominee) considers in confidence the validity of the request and associated evidence, for example medical certificates.
- 4.12.2. If authorized, the Campus Dean will:
- Decide how the request can best be accommodated within the assessment arrangements for the program
 - Communicate the decision to both the student and any faculty or staff affected
 - Note the request and the outcome on the student's records
- 4.12.3. If such special circumstances arise or change after Matriculation, the student must notify the Campus Dean in writing of a request for new or amended Special Assignment Arrangements. Failure to notify the Campus Dean of such special circumstances may not be used to request Extenuating Circumstances.

4.13. Intellectual Property and Public Access

- 4.13.1. Except as specified in the following paragraph, (i) a student holds the intellectual property rights inherent in his/her assignment work; and (ii) a student grants the Institution a free, perpetual and unrestricted license to use such intellectual property rights in educational and publicity activities.
- 4.13.2. The student may assign intellectual property rights to a sponsoring organization and/or make specific confidentiality provisions concerning an assignment, provided that such provisions are authorized in advance in writing by the Campus Dean. The Campus Dean reserves the right to reject such provisions and require the student to submit an alternative assignment without such provisions.
- 4.13.3. All material artefacts and electronic copies submitted as assignments (including project reports, essays, art works and computer files) are the property of the Institution. The Institution may at its discretion retain or dispose of physical and/or electronic copies of assignments.
- 4.13.4. Program Regulations may require that students put assignments into the public domain, for example dissertations. A student's assignment may have authorized restrictions on public access provided both:
- a. The assignment is marked 'Confidential' on every page
 - b. The Campus Dean authorizes in writing the access restrictions
- 4.13.5. Confidentiality, intellectual property and other restrictions on public access cannot include restrictions on grading by faculty, external examiner review, internal quality assurance, or external quality/accreditation reviews. Unless explicitly specified in writing, access restrictions lapse five years after submission of the assignment.

4.14. Transfer Credit / Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

Principles

- 4.14.1. Transfer Credit is the mechanism by which Academic Credit is given toward Hult Programs based on learning outside the Institution or from another Program within the Institution. It is also known as 'Accreditation of Prior Learning' and 'Recognition of Prior Learning'. Transfer Credit takes two main forms:
- a. Certified Learning – where the learning has been assessed by an educational provider and formally certified
 - b. Experiential Learning – where the learning is based on prior professional experience and continuing professional development
- 4.14.2. Program Regulations specify the volume and nature of Transfer Credit that may be granted. Applicants and students have no automatic right to transfer Academic Credit to Hult. Transfer Credit is granted only when explicitly permitted by Program Regulations where program approval and review processes have determined that learning outside the Program is a suitable alternative to learning on the Program.
- 4.14.3. Unless explicitly approved as a derogation by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, Transfer Credit is limited to a maximum of:
- a. 60 US Credits toward an undergraduate Program, provided that any Transfer Credit above 30 Credits is Certified Learning at an accredited university or equivalent higher education institution
 - b. 12 US Credits toward a postgraduate Program
 - c. A third of the Academic Credit on other Programs
- 4.14.4. Transfer Credit only applies to Academic Credit and not any grades associated with that Transfer Credit. In such circumstances, grade averages and degree classifications are calculated solely from credits taken at Hult.
- 4.14.5. The Admissions Committee:
- a. approves School policies for the operation of Transfer Credit
 - b. may delegate authority to grant Transfer Credit in straightforward cases to admissions or other staff
 - c. reviews complex or borderline cases that raise matters of policy or principle
 - d. oversees the operation of Transfer Credit within Schools

Certified Learning

- 4.14.6. Transfer Credit (Certified Learning) is granted only when the student's past academic achievement demonstrates achievement of the Learning Outcomes of the Course for which Transfer Credit is granted. The term 'Advanced Placement' refers to Transfer Credit (Certified Learning) at UK levels 3 and 4 awarded before Matriculation on an Undergraduate Program.
- 4.14.7. The decision to grant Transfer Credit is based on certified evidence of:
- a. Previous study for Academic Credit (or equivalent qualifications)
 - b. The volume and Level of Study of Academic Credit obtained
 - c. Any limitations on the institutions from which Transfer Credit (Certified Learning) is allowed in Program Regulations
 - d. Any minimum Grades required in Program Regulations

- 4.14.8. Normally, Academic Credit that has been used to obtain a Degree Award at another institution cannot be used for the granting of Transfer Credit. Any exceptions not explicitly allowed in Program Regulations must be approved in writing by the Chair of the Admissions Committee.
- 4.14.9. Program Regulations may specify time limits for requests for the granting of Transfer Credit. If not explicitly specified in Program Regulations, the latest date for such a request is Matriculation.

Experiential Learning

- 4.14.10. Transfer Credit (Experiential Learning) is granted only when the student's previous experience demonstrates achievement of the Learning Outcomes of the Course for which Transfer Credit is granted.
- 4.14.11. This decision is based on evidence such as:
- a. Relevant professional experience and achievement
 - b. Continuing professional development and other learning activity
 - c. Tests or other assessments against Course Learning Outcomes

Substitute Courses

- 4.14.12. In exceptional circumstances, Program Regulations may allow transfer credit after Matriculation, whereupon a course taken outside Hult, and after Matriculation, could substitute for a Hult course. In such cases:
- a. The Course must have:
 - I. Equivalent learning outcomes, and
 - II. Be at the same or higher Level of Study, and
 - III. Have the same or higher Academic Credit
 - b. The Course must be:
 - I. At an AACSB or EQUIS accredited school, or
 - II. Part of an AMBA or EPAS accredited program, or
 - III. At a regionally accredited US institution or at an institution issuing UK or ECTS credits
 - c. The student must apply to the Campus Dean (or designee) with details of the proposed Course and the Hult Course which it substitutes before the start of the proposed substitute course.
 - d. The Campus Dean (or designee) must authorize the proposed course and associated Transfer Credit, in consultation with the Admissions Committee.
 - e. The student provides evidence of completion of the Course and the award of Academic Credit from the institution at which the Course was taken.

5. Program Approval, Management and Enhancement

5.1. Principles

5.1.1. Program approval has two aspects:

- a. Business Approval
- b. Academic Approval

5.1.2. Business Approval is the decision by the President to allocate financial and other resources to the Program including marketing, recruitment, academic, faculty and staff resources. The Board may request to ratify business approval before a Program is marketed.

5.1.3. Academic Approval is the decision by the Curriculum Committee that the Program has Definitive Program Documentation and plans that satisfy:

- a. The Academic Regulations
- b. Other Institutional standards and policies
- c. US, UK, and Local Requirements
- d. Requirements of other countries where the Program is delivered
- e. Relevant accreditation standards, particularly those of AACSB, AMBA and EQUIS
- f. Other resource needs such as learning resources and facilities

5.1.4. The process to be followed is:

- a. Business Approval
- b. Outline Validation, plus external approvals (if required)
- c. Final Approval

5.1.5. If the Business Approval decision on a Program is revised, the Academic Approval process is reviewed in the light of the changed decision.

5.1.6. A Program may not be marketed until after Outline Validation and any required external approvals, such as those from NECHE and other regulatory bodies. No student may be Matriculated on a Program before Final Approval.

5.1.7. Upon Final Approval, Programs are Validated for a period of up to 6 years. A Periodic Review is held to permit Validation for a further period of up to 6 years.

5.1.8. Modifications to a Program that make any material change to Definitive Program Documentation are approved by the Curriculum Committee.

5.1.9. The Curriculum Committee maintains a record of the Definitive Program Documentation it has approved, as well as any Modifications to Definitive Program Documentation.

5.1.10. All Core Courses are covered in the Final Approval of a Program. Elective Courses may be approved:

- a. in advance
- b. as part of Final Approval

- c. subsequently by the Curriculum Committee.

5.2. Outline Validation

- 5.2.1. Outline Validation is the approval of the Program Specification for the proposed Program. The Curriculum Committee assesses the proposed Program against criteria including:
 - a. Fit with the Institution's and School's strategy and academic portfolio
 - b. Appropriate naming of the Degree Award, as well as any Major(s)
 - c. Academic standards and the likely quality of student experience
 - d. Coherence and currency of the curriculum
 - e. Regulatory and accreditation requirements
- 5.2.2. The Curriculum Committee may:
 - a. Give Outline Validation without conditions and with immediate effect
 - b. Give Outline Validation with conditions that must be satisfied before Outline Validation is effective, normally through Chair's action
 - c. Require a revised proposal to be submitted to a future meeting
 - d. Reject the proposal
- 5.2.3. Before Outline Validation, external regulatory, accreditation and other bodies may be consulted regarding the proposed Program. Following Outline Validation, formal external approval may need to be obtained prior to marketing of the Program.

5.3. Program Design

- 5.3.1. The Curriculum Committee, in collaboration with the Central Academic Team, appoints a team of faculty and academic staff ('program design team') to design the Program in detail, including any new Core and Elective Courses. The program design team organizes the preparation of Definitive Program Documentation, including a draft Student Handbook and/or Program Catalog.
- 5.3.2. The Program Specification is subject to change during the detailed development of the Program. Material changes are reported to the Curriculum Committee for approval.
- 5.3.3. Once Definitive Program Documentation has been finalized and approved by the Curriculum Committee, the program may proceed to the Final Validation and Approval stage.

5.4. Final Approval

- 5.4.1. Final Approval of a Program has three stages:
 - a. Submission of proposed Definitive Program and Course Documentation including:
 - i. An updated Program Specification
 - ii. A Program Catalog and/or Student Handbook
 - iii. A Master Course Syllabus for every Core Course
 - iv. A representative selection of master Course Syllabi for Elective Courses
 - v. Information on proposed faculty, student support and other resources

- vi. A statement describing if and how themes of ethics, responsibility and sustainability are integrated into the curriculum design, delivery and assessment of the program
 - b. Validation Panel review of the Program
 - c. Decision by the Curriculum Committee
- 5.4.2. The Curriculum Committee appoints a Validation Panel to scrutinize the proposed Definitive Program and Course Documentation. The Panel normally comprises:
 - a. An experienced Chair
 - b. Three faculty members not involved in the proposed Program, one of whom is appointed to review the curriculum from an ethics/sustainability perspective
 - c. An external member with academic experience of the Subject Area of the Program
 - d. An external member with experience of graduate employment in the Subject Area of the Program
 - e. An internal Quality Assurance representative
 - f. A student or recent alumnus
 - g. A secretary to the Validation Panel
- 5.4.3. The proposed Definitive Program and Course Documentation must be submitted in full at least two weeks before the date of the Validation Panel meeting. This meeting may be physical or virtual.
- 5.4.4. The program design team are invited to present the proposed Program and discuss the Program, its curriculum and resourcing with the Panel. The Validation Panel may invite others to attend all or part of its meeting for discussions or as observers.
- 5.4.5. The Validation Panel reviews the content and planned delivery of the Program, the quality of the Definitive Program and Course Documentation, the cohesiveness of the curriculum, the likely student experience, and the sufficiency of faculty, student support, and other resources required. At Course level, the Validation Panel focuses on new and modified Courses rather than further reviewing Courses that have already been approved.
- 5.4.6. The Validation Panel recommends to the Curriculum Committee:
 - a. Whether or not to give Final Validation to the Program:
 - i. With or without conditions to be met before Final Validation is effective
 - ii. With or without recommendations to be considered by the School and Program
 - b. Any commendations for the Program
 - c. The proposed duration of Validation – for up to 6 years, with documented reasons if a shorter duration is proposed.
- 5.4.7. The Secretary to the Validation Panel produces a formal record of the Validation Panel meeting to be submitted to the next Curriculum Committee meeting.
- 5.4.8. The Curriculum Committee monitors progress in meeting conditions and considering recommendations arising from the Validation Panel. Conditions must be met and signed off by the Curriculum Committee before the decision on Final Approval.

- 5.4.9. The Curriculum Committee makes the decision on Final Approval. Unless it has good reason to decide otherwise, it accepts the judgements made by the Validation Panel including any conditions and recommendations.
- 5.4.10. Upon Final Approval, students may be matriculated into the Program.

5.5. Modification

- 5.5.1. Modifications are material changes to a Program or Course that affect the Definitive Program and Course Documentation.
- 5.5.2. Modifications to Programs and Courses are generally categorized depending on the type of modification being proposed, such as:
 - a. Administrative
 - b. Minor
 - c. Major
- 5.5.3. The extent of approval and scrutiny is designed to be proportionate to the level of modification(s) being proposed. Interpretation of the scale and scope of proposed changes is determined by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
- 5.5.4. Administrative modifications are changes to Course Documentation of a factual nature only, such as:
 - a. Amended reading lists
 - b. Grammatical edits to a Course Description
- 5.5.5. Administrative modifications are recorded by the Registry, but do not require approval by the Curriculum Committee.
- 5.5.6. Minor modifications are modifications to Course or Program Documentation, which generally involve less than 25% change to the substance of a Course, such as:
 - a. Changes to the list of topics covered within a Course
 - b. Changes to a Course Description
 - c. Changes to Course Learning Outcomes and/or their mapping to Program Learning Outcomes
 - d. Changes to Course or Program Teaching & Learning text
 - e. Changes to the methods and/or weighting of assessments within a Course
- 5.5.7. Minor modifications are submitted to the Curriculum Committee for approval.
- 5.5.8. Major modifications are significant modifications to Course or Program Documentation, such as:
 - a. Changing Program Learning Outcomes
 - b. Changing Program Credits/Structure
 - c. Changing Program Award Title
 - d. Changing Course Titles
 - e. Changing the Level of a Course (UG)
 - f. Changing the mode of delivery of a Course/Program

- 5.5.9. Major modifications are submitted to the Curriculum Committee for initial consideration. The Curriculum Committee will then inform Academic Board of its recommendation. Academic Board approval is required for all Major modifications.
- 5.5.10. Students affected by a proposed modification will be consulted directly, or through their student representatives, where it materially affects the student experience or conflicts with published information provided before or during the Program.
- 5.5.11. Approval of the Modification is recorded in the minutes of the Curriculum Committee and/or Academic Board. Definitive Program and Course Documentation is updated accordingly.
- 5.5.12. Should proposed Modifications to a Program exceed 25% of the content of the Program in any academic year or from one academic year to the next, a Periodic Review is required.
- 5.5.13. If the cumulative approved/proposed Modifications to a program since its last Validation or Periodic Review exceed 50% of the content of the Program, a Periodic Review is required.
- 5.5.14. Decisions on whether a proposed Modification is Administrative, Minor, or Major, or whether the sum of Modifications has reached the 25% or 50% threshold for Periodic Review, are made by the Academic Standards & Quality Committee.

5.6. Annual Academic Review

- 5.6.1. An Annual Academic Review is written each year for each Program, in a format defined by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. The Annual Academic Review covers achievements and challenges during the previous year, the main changes in the Program in the previous year and any anticipated future changes, review of student admissions, progression and outcomes, review of student and other stakeholder feedback, external examiner feedback and any actions taken, and expectations for the coming year.
- 5.6.2. Annual Academic Reviews are considered by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, which may propose subsequent consideration by other committees.

5.7. Periodic Review

- 5.7.1. Before the end of the period of Validation of a Program, the Curriculum Committee arranges the schedule for its Periodic Review. Before the Periodic Review is conducted, the President of School confirms that there is ongoing Business Approval for the Program.
- 5.7.2. The Curriculum Committee requests an internal review of the Program involving faculty and other stakeholders, which produces a Periodic Review Report.
- 5.7.3. Periodic Review of a Program has three stages:
 - a. Submission of the Periodic Review Report and Definitive Program and Course Documentation including any proposed Modifications with updated versions of:
 - i. A Program Specification
 - ii. A Program Catalog and/or Student Handbook

- iii. A Master Course Syllabus for every Core Course
 - iv. A representative selection of master Course Syllabi for Elective Courses
 - v. Information on proposed faculty, student support and other resources
 - vi. A statement describing if and how themes of ethics, responsibility and sustainability are integrated into the curriculum design, delivery and assessment of the program
 - b. Periodic Review Panel review of the Program
 - c. Decision by the Curriculum Committee
- 5.7.4. The Curriculum Committee appoints a Periodic Review Panel with the same composition as a Validation Panel. The Periodic Review Panel undertakes the same process to that of a Final Validation with an emphasis on recent outcomes and future enhancement of the Program.
- 5.7.5. The Periodic Review Panel recommends to the Curriculum Committee:
 - a. Whether or not to continue Validation of the Program:
 - i. With or without conditions to be met before Validation is renewed
 - ii. With or without recommendations to be considered by the School and Program
 - b. Any commendations for the Program
 - c. The proposed duration of Validation – for up to 6 years, with documented reasons if a shorter duration is proposed.
- 5.7.6. The Secretary to the Periodic Review Panel produces a formal record of the Validation Panel meeting to be submitted to the next Curriculum Committee meeting.
- 5.7.7. The Curriculum Committee monitors progress in meeting conditions and considering recommendations arising from Periodic Review. Conditions must be met and signed off by the Curriculum Committee before the decision on continuing Validation.
- 5.7.8. The Curriculum Committee makes the decision on continuing Validation. Unless it has good reason to decide otherwise, it accepts the judgements made by the Periodic Review Panel including any conditions and recommendations.

5.8. Program Closure

- 5.8.1. Any proposed closure of a Program is approved by the President.
- 5.8.2. Both the Board and Academic Board are informed in advance of any proposed closure of a Program. Academic Board approves any transitional arrangements associated with any Program closure.
- 5.8.3. Matriculation of students for the Programs affected by the closure ceases. Any students holding an offer of admission, though not Matriculated, are informed of the closure, together with suggestions of alternative Programs at the Institution or elsewhere. Any deposits or similar payments are returned to those affected and application fees refunded.
- 5.8.4. Other than in exceptional circumstances, for example loss of facilities, or when the number of Enrolled students is too low for an effective educational experience, no

Program is closed to Enrolled students during the normal duration of study for the Program.

- 5.8.5. Should students be affected by closure of a Program, the Institution shall take reasonable steps to enable Enrolled students to complete their studies on another Program, or transfer to a suitable alternative program at another institution.
- 5.8.6. Where reasonable alternatives cannot be provided, the Institution refunds an appropriate proportion of tuition fees paid for the Program.
- 5.8.7. Where it is necessary to terminate the Enrollment of a student, or an Enrolled student Withdraws from a Program affected by a closure, the relevant Assessment Board will consider whether any Exit Awards can be made in line with Program Regulations. A Transcript for any credits obtained will also be available to the student.

6. External Examiners

6.1. Introduction

- 6.1.1. External Examiners provide a formal mechanism by which the Academic Standards of Programs are confirmed. The Academic Board has ultimate responsibility for External Examiners and has delegated responsibility for appointment and oversight of External Examiners to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
- 6.1.2. At least one External Examiner is appointed for every Program. Programs are required to have sufficient External Examiner coverage such that all assessments (at Level 4 and above) can be effectively reviewed.

6.2. Appointment Criteria & Process

- 6.2.1. External Examiners are appointed in accordance with the UK Quality Code. The criteria for appointment include:
 - a. Knowledge and understanding of UK and US Requirements for academic standards and quality, including the standard expected of students to achieve the Degree Award covered by the role
 - b. Competence and experience in the Subject Areas covered by the role, with sufficient standing and credibility to command the respect of academic and/or professional peers
 - c. Academic and/or professional qualifications to at least the Level of Study of the Degree Award, and/or extensive appropriate practitioner experience
 - d. Awareness, competence and experience of:
 - i. design and operation of assessment
 - ii. design and delivery of relevant curricula
 - iii. enhancement of the student learning experience
 - e. Fluency in English, together with fluency in any foreign languages covered by the role
 - f. Meeting of any visa and immigration requirements applicable to the role
- 6.2.2. When appointing them, not every External Examiner is required to meet all the above criteria individually, provided that the External Examiner(s) for a Program has sufficient competence, experience and support. External Examiners should normally hold no more than two External Examiner appointments.
- 6.2.3. Retired nominees can be considered who have continuing engagement with current developments in higher education teaching, learning and assessment.
- 6.2.4. To avoid potential conflicts of interest, External Examiners are not appointed if they are any of the following:
 - a. An employee, board member, committee member or consultant at the Institution and for five years afterwards
 - b. Anyone with a substantive professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the Program or a student Enrolled on the Program
 - c. Anyone required to assess colleagues who are Enrolled as students, or who could influence significantly the future of students on the Program

- d. A previous External Examiner, unless five years have elapsed since the previous appointment ended
 - e. A current client of the Institution
- 6.2.5. Should a potential conflict of interest arise during or after an appointment, the School informs the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, which takes any relevant action.
- 6.2.6. An External Examiner is normally appointed for up to four years. An exceptional extension of one year can be approved by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
- 6.2.7. In appointing External Examiners, the Academic Standards and Quality Committee seeks nominations (preferably several for each role) from academic leaders in the School responsible for the Program. In the absence of suitable nominations, the Academic Standards and Quality Committee has the right to seek appointments.
- 6.2.8. Newly appointed External Examiners are sent a formal appointment letter as well as information on their role, the Program and the Academic Regulations. The School or Program arranges an induction appropriate to the individual External Examiner.
- 6.2.9. If the Academic Standards and Quality Committee uses its discretion to make an exception to the above criteria and processes, the Academic Board is informed.

6.3. Role and Responsibilities

- 6.3.1. External Examiners are appointed as independent expert reviewers of the assessment process on Programs to ensure that:
 - a. The academic standards of the Program are met
 - b. Institution and Program assessment processes are followed
 - c. Assessment outcomes are appropriate and fair
- 6.3.2. The External Examiner's role is limited to reporting an opinion and confirming the overall Academic Standards of the Program. No External Examiner may personally amend assignments or grades.
- 6.3.3. The role of the External Examiners within the assessment procedures of the Program include the obligations to:
 - a. Attend all Assessment Board meetings at which Grades are confirmed and/or Degree Awards are recommended (and where attendance is not possible, to make a written report available to the meeting)
 - b. Scrutinize representative samples of assessed work, together with the feedback to students
 - c. Review and comment on:
 - i. design and operation of assessment
 - ii. design and delivery of relevant curricula
 - iii. enhancement of the student learning experience
 - d. In exceptional circumstances (such as an Academic Appeal or Mitigating Circumstances), to participate in additional review of a student's assignment or Special Assignment Arrangements
 - e. Confirm in writing that they approve all confirmed grades and Assessment Board Degree Award recommendations

- f. Comment on whether the Academic Standards of the Program meet UK and US requirements
 - g. Submit an Annual Report in the format decided by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
- 6.3.4. The relevant staff on the Program(s) covered by the role of an External Examiner formally review the Annual Report and submit a written response. The names of External Examiners as well as their Annual Reports and the Program responses are made available to students Enrolled on the Program on the virtual learning environment (or equivalent).
- 6.3.5. External Examiners have the right to:
 - a. Attend any meeting of an Assessment Board of which they are a member
 - b. Review any Assessment of any student on the Program(s) for which they are External Examiner
 - c. On request, to be consulted in advance on any Assessment Briefs and assignment arrangements before they are implemented
 - d. Escalate any decision proposed at an Assessment Board to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee before a final decision is made, for example on confirmation of Course Grades, Degree Awards, or a matter of principle
 - e. Inform in confidence the Chair of the Academic Board, or the Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, of any concern about Academic Standards or the fair treatment of students

6.4. Termination of Appointment

- 6.4.1. An appointment of an External Examiner may be terminated by either party, subject to three months' notice.
- 6.4.2. The Institution may terminate an appointment of an External Examiner without notice if one of the following has occurred:
 - a. Failure to carry out responsibilities effectively and efficiently
 - b. Failure to provide the External Examiner's Annual Report
 - c. Failure to attend Assessment Boards when required to do so
 - d. The existence or emergence of a potential conflict of interest that endangers, or could be seen to endanger, the independence of the External Examiner
 - e. Action detrimental to the Institution
- 6.4.3. No External Examiner may be terminated for fair comment on academic standards and quality on a Program.
- 6.4.4. Termination of any appointment is by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, which sends a report on the reasons for the decision to the Academic Board.

7. Admissions

7.1. Public Information

- 7.1.1. The information provided to potential applicants and other interested parties in brochures, on the internet and through other channels about the Institution and Programs ('Public Information') presents an accurate, up-to-date picture of the Institution and Programs.
- 7.1.2. Public Information complies with US and UK Requirements, NECHE Standard 9 on 'Integrity, Transparency and Public Disclosure', the UK Quality Code, and Competition and Markets Authority Guidelines. In relation to specific Campuses at which a Program is offered, Public Information complies with Local Requirements. Location-specific information is normally made available on web pages about the Campus and its location.
- 7.1.3. Public Information about the Institution includes contact details for further enquiries.
- 7.1.4. Public Information promoting a Program includes relevant information about the Program to enable informed decision-making about whether to consider making an application. More detailed information may require provision of contact details, which can be used to maintain contact with the potential applicant.
- 7.1.5. No Program is marketed until it has obtained: (i) Outline Academic Validation from the Curriculum Committee, (ii) any required approvals from NECHE, and (iii) any other required approvals covering the Campus(es) at which it is offered.
- 7.1.6. Until the Program has Final Academic Validation, Public Information includes a statement that the Program is marketed subject to Final Academic Validation.
- 7.1.7. The Institution operates processes that ensure that Public Information is accurate before it is published. If an error is subsequently identified, it is corrected when feasible, and any material discrepancy is brought to the attention of applicants who could be adversely affected.

7.2. Entry Requirements

- 7.2.1. The Institution promotes applications to Programs through a variety of channels, both internal and external. This 'recruitment function' seeks to generate formal applications from well-qualified candidates with the ability and resources to complete the program. The 'recruitment function' accurately promotes the Institution and its Programs at all times. It meets US, UK, and Local Requirements in how it conducts its operations, including registration of individuals and/or groups with regulatory authorities if required.
- 7.2.2. Admissions to Programs is based on published Admissions Criteria in the relevant Program Specification. Decisions are made by an 'admissions function' which forms part of the academic staff of the Institution, independent of the 'recruitment function', and which reports to the Admissions Committee. Admission is only permitted when there is a reasonable expectation that an applicant can fulfil all the requirements of the Program and achieve the standard for the Degree Award.

- 7.2.3. Admissions Criteria are established by decision of the Admissions Committee, normally on an annual basis in preparation for the subsequent recruitment/admissions cycle.
- 7.2.4. No candidate admitted to a Program will later be denied admission because of subsequent changes to Admissions Criteria.
- 7.2.5. Applicants are responsible for providing evidence, authenticated if requested, in support of their application, such as:
- a. Qualification certificates and/or transcripts to demonstrate past academic achievement
 - b. Employment and other experience or achievements
 - c. English language test results as proof of competency
 - d. Results of other tests such as cognitive or psychometric assessments
 - e. Personal academic and character references
- 7.2.6. Applicants may be required to undertake further tests or other forms of assessment, to write personal statements, participate in interviews, or submit other papers, as deemed necessary by the Admissions function to make an informed decision on the applicant's suitability for the Program.
- 7.2.7. Admission to an undergraduate Program normally requires a high school leaving certificate or equivalent, with specified grades or grade point average. Admission to a postgraduate Program normally requires a bachelor's degree or equivalent, with specified grades or grade point average. The criteria for Admissions to a Doctoral program can vary depending on whether there is direct entry to the Doctoral level or whether there is a postgraduate stage. The Admissions Committee approves the specific requirements and a list of international equivalents to ensure fair treatment of applicants from diverse backgrounds.
- 7.2.8. In cases where a student does not have the academic qualifications normally required for admission, account may be taken of the length and level of professional experience of the applicant, and/or other appropriate personal or experiential factors that are deemed relevant to an applicant's likelihood to succeed in the Program. If this assessment demonstrates that the applicant is likely to be able to participate successfully in the Program, an exception may be made. Such exceptions are recorded on the applicant's file.
- 7.2.9. Applicants may be required to disclose any unspent criminal convictions or similar, which might inhibit their ability to study successfully or adversely affect the running of the Degree program (for example limiting their ability to undertake international travel). With such applications, care is taken to balance the interests of the applicant with those of the Institution and other students.
- 7.2.10. Scholarships and other forms of financial assistance are described in Public Information, together with the criteria used to decide their award. Published criteria are consistently applied.
- 7.2.11. A successful applicant is offered a place on the Program or on a waiting list for a Program. The offer of a place may depend on meeting conditions such as:
- a. Obtaining a language test score
 - b. Payment of a deposit or other fee
 - c. Passing academic qualifications at a given grade

- d. Evidence of the financial resources required for the Program
- e. Obtaining immigration permission to study

7.2.12. Any offer may state that:

- a. There is a waiting list for the Program and/or a specific Campus
- b. Study at a particular Campus is subject to further conditions including availability of places at that Campus.

7.2.13. The applicant must sign and return the offer letter, accepting any such conditions, as well as any associated other terms and conditions, after which the applicant has an 'accepted offer'.

7.2.14. The School reserves a place for all applicants who have an accepted offer and meet the associated conditions for Programs, provided there is no waiting list.

7.2.15. Offers are normally made for a specific Program start date. If a student requests a change of start date, the School considers this request but is under no obligation to grant the request.

7.2.16. A decision on admission is separate from decisions on Transfer Credit. Eligibility for Transfer Credit is evaluated either during the admissions process or at the time of Matriculation.

7.2.17. Should there be a material change in a Program after an offer has been made (e.g. change of degree title or change in accreditation status), the prospective student is informed in good time so that an informed decision can be made whether to continue to accept the offer of a place.

English Language Competency

7.2.18. An applicant whose first language is not English or who has not been educated wholly or mainly in English must demonstrate a suitable minimum level of competence in both written and spoken English. This may include an English language test, proof of the use of English as a working language, or equivalent mechanisms. All English language admission requirements must be satisfied before Matriculation.

7.2.19. Local Requirements are implemented for Program Admission Criteria and/or local Campus regulatory/immigration/visa requirements if they demand higher standards or more restrictive admissibility of English language test evidence than the minimum levels above.

7.3. Special Educational Needs and Disability

7.3.1. Hult International Business School is committed to providing equal access to its educational opportunities, programs, and activities. In compliance with the Disability Section of the Rehabilitation Act and Section III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the UK Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) of 2005 and the Equality Act of 2010, Hult will provide reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities. A reasonable accommodation is a modification or adjustment to a course, program, or activity that enables a qualified student with a disability to obtain equal access.

- 7.3.2. All applications for admission to a Program are treated in an equal manner. All decisions are made based on the applicant's likely ability to succeed in the program as well as potential benefit from, and contribution to, the Program. Admissions Criteria and processes are fair and open, applied consistently and with no discrimination on the grounds of race, gender, age, religious or political belief.
- 7.3.3. Applications from individuals with special educational needs or disabilities are welcomed and reasonable accommodations made to support such applicants. A reasonable accommodation is a modification or adjustment to a course, program, or activity that enables a qualified student with a disability to obtain equal access.

7.4. Admissions Review

- 7.4.1. The Institution is committed to providing fair and efficient admissions for Programs. Applicants are not disadvantaged in any way if they use this Admission Review Procedure.
- 7.4.2. An Admission Review is a serious concern about the admissions process that affected a candidate's application. The grounds for an Admissions Review are:
 - a. Irregularity in admissions processes
 - b. Inconsistency with Institution policies such as those for diversity
 - c. New information that was not available at the time of the application
- 7.4.3. Any Admission Review must be in writing, accompanied by any evidence, and is only accepted from the applicant. It must be submitted by the earlier of: (i) 30 days after the decision on the application, (ii) 15 days before the Matriculation date for the Program.
- 7.4.4. Any Admission Review is sent to the Chair of the Admissions Committee. The Chair confirms the eligibility of the Admission Review, organizes any necessary investigation, and formally decides the validity of the Admission Review, as well as any lessons learned as feedback to Enrollment and Admissions staff. There is no further appeal or review process.

8. Matriculation, Enrollment and Registration

8.1. Matriculation

- 8.1.1. Students Matriculate when they start their studies at the Institution. Matriculation is completed when the student has:
- a. Met any outstanding admissions requirements
 - b. Paid all tuition and related fees due
 - c. Agreed in writing any terms and conditions for the Program
 - d. Signed the Honor Code (or equivalent)
 - e. Completed any other requirements specified for the Program or Campus

8.2. Personal Connections and Relationships

- 8.2.1. To ensure personal, business or other relationships do not call into question the academic integrity of the Institution, faculty and staff are required to make an immediate and confidential written declaration to the Campus Dean of any such relationship with an applicant or Enrolled student.
- 8.2.2. In such cases, assessment arrangements will ensure that the student with a relationship with a member of staff is seen not to have been advantaged in respect of any admission, assessment or other decision. Faculty or staff who have any personal or other form of relationship with any student are, upon the decision of the Campus Dean, excluded from certain roles in: (i) admissions, (ii) assessment, (iii) decisions on Academic Credit and Degree Awards, and (iv) complaints, appeals, academic misconduct and other disciplinary action, where such roles risk a conflict of interests.

8.3. Enrollment

- 8.3.1. Once Matriculated, students are Enrolled on a Program at a Campus. Enrollment continues without lapse subject to:
- a. Satisfactory academic performance as specified in Program Regulations
 - b. Good standing as a student without Suspension or Dismissal
 - c. Satisfactory attendance and participation as specified in Program Regulations
 - d. Payment of all tuition and related fees due
 - e. The Maximum Time after Matriculation for the Program
 - f. Any other requirements specified in Program Regulations
- 8.3.2. Enrollment lapses if any of the terms noted in 8.3.1 above occur, or if:
- a. Health or other circumstances of the student have changed to the extent that reasonable accommodations made by the Institution are insufficient to enable the student to complete his/her studies
- 8.3.3. If Enrollment lapses, the School informs the student in writing of the lapse of Enrollment and any requirements for the student to continue to be Enrolled.
- 8.3.4. Enrollment is terminated if:

- a. A student is Dismissed from the Program by the School
- b. The student voluntarily Withdraws from the Program
- c. A period of 45 days has passed since the School informed the student of their lapse of Enrollment, and conditions for continued Enrollment have not been met. In such cases the student is Dismissed

8.3.5. Program Regulations may require that students re-Enroll periodically or after a Progression point.

8.3.6. Without the written permission of the Campus Dean(s), no student can be Enrolled on more than one Program at a time, whether at the Institution or externally. Where such written permission is granted, this must be reported to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

8.4. Registration

8.4.1. To participate in learning activities, submit assignments and obtain Academic Credit, students Register for specific Courses at the Campus where they are Enrolled, in accordance with Program Regulations. Registration may be automatic for Core Courses. Schools communicate arrangements for Registration on Core and Elective Courses to students during the Program.

8.4.2. Only an Enrolled student may Register for Courses. The Transcript records all Courses for which the student Registered, including those in which the student did not participate in learning and/or submit assignments. Program Regulations may specify a period after the start of a Course in which it can be 'dropped' with no record on the Transcript.

8.4.3. On Global Programs with the option of studying at multiple campuses, Schools operate a system of Registration for Rotation. Program Regulations may specify academic and other prerequisites for a student to Register for Rotation and for Courses at the Rotation campus(es).

8.5. Length of Study

8.5.1. Unless specified otherwise in Program Regulations, the Maximum Time after Matriculation for the Program is double the normal published length of the Program. The Maximum Time after Matriculation includes any periods of Leave of Absence.

8.5.2. A student may petition, in writing, for one additional year extension to Maximum Time after Matriculation. The petition is made to the Campus Dean, who submits it to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee for approval.

8.5.3. If a student successfully petitions to remain enrolled beyond the normal program length, this may be subject to reasonable conditions, and their Program may be modified, for example:

- a. Availability of Core and/or Elective Courses
- b. Availability of Majors or Specializations
- c. Timing and/or location of Courses
- d. Specific requirements for the Degree Award

- 8.5.4. If a student exceeds the Maximum Time after Matriculation, without a successful petition for an extension, Enrollment is terminated by the School. Students may not Register for further Courses and must complete any Courses on which they are Registered at the next deadline.

8.6. Leave of Absence

- 8.6.1. Students may request Leave of Absence for a period of up to one year at a time.
- 8.6.2. During Leave of Absence:
- a. The student's Matriculated/Enrolled status is replaced with Leave of Absence status
 - b. Maximum Time after Matriculation continues to accumulate
 - c. Outstanding fees remain payable
- 8.6.3. There is no automatic right to Leave of Absence. Students are required to obtain formal authorization from the Campus Dean (or designee) for Leave of Absence. Requests must specify reasons for Leave of Absence, and the request will only be approved if there is a reasonable expectation that the student will return to the Program. The Campus Dean notifies the Assessment Board of authorization and rejection of such requests.
- 8.6.4. Leave of Absence requests that push the total period of Leave of Absence beyond one year must be approved by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. Such students would submit their request to their Campus Dean, who would request approval of the Leave of Absence from the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
- 8.6.5. Students are notified in writing of the outcome of a request for Leave of Absence. If a request is authorized, this may be subject to reasonable conditions.
- 8.6.6. Students returning from Leave of Absence are subject to all the caveats relating to students who remain enrolled beyond the normal program length. Additionally, the following conditions apply:
- a. Fees for Courses after re-Enrollment are payable at the rate in force at the time of re-Enrollment
 - b. If the Program has been modified or closed during a student's Leave of Absence, the School makes reasonable efforts to:
 - i. Enable completion of the Program with a different combination of Core and/or Elective Courses, or
 - ii. Offer a suitable alternative Program including full or partial Transfer Credit for Courses already passed, or
 - iii. Identify a suitable external program and assist in the transfer to that program
- 8.6.7. At least 30 days before the end of the Leave of Absence (or earlier if required by Program Regulations), the student must notify the Campus Dean whether:
- a. A further Leave of Absence is requested
 - b. The student intends to re-Enroll, in which case the Campus Dean authorizes the arrangements for re-Enrollment, including any changes to

the Program on which the student was Enrolled and the meeting of any conditions for re-Enrollment

8.7. Withdrawal

- 8.7.1. A student may Withdraw voluntarily from Enrollment on a Program. Any Withdrawal must be notified in writing to the Campus Dean and follow any procedure set out in Program Regulations.
- 8.7.2. The Campus Dean authorizes the Withdrawal of the student and notifies the student in writing that the Withdrawal has been accepted, stating any conditions and remaining obligations of the student, such as outstanding tuition and other fees.
- 8.7.3. Any refund of tuition and other fees is made according to the Program and/or Campus terms and conditions.
- 8.7.4. The Assessment Board for the Program is notified of the Withdrawal.

9. Academic and Professional Standards

9.1. Introduction

- 9.1.1. Hult students are expected to conduct themselves with due regard to their academic and professional responsibilities, with good sense, and with due consideration for other members of the Hult community and the community at large. Every Hult student has both the privilege and the duty to represent the Hult name and Hult's core values. Hult students should take pride in demonstrating these values in every interaction they have with their peers, professors, campus staff, and the business world outside of the School. Additionally, students are expected to demonstrate these values in all their academic and professional work. Hult has a duty of care to all those who form part of its community. Moreover, Hult wishes to uphold and promote certain standards and values fundamental to its underlying purposes of teaching and practice. The School also has the right to protect its reputation and, where necessary, defend its good name.

9.2. Honor Code

- 9.2.1. The Honor Code is a standard of conduct firmly observed throughout the School, which encompasses academic integrity, professional integrity, and interpersonal behavior. It applies to all members of the Hult community and applies equally to on campus or off campus behavior. Once enrolled, it is each student's responsibility to understand Hult's published policies and procedures and to abide by them, and ignorance of the Honor Code or other policies will not be considered a legitimate excuse for violation. The Honor Code applies to all behavior, whether expressed orally, in writing and/or social media.

Key Principles

- 9.2.2. All members of the Hult community are expected to be honest and respectful toward each other, and to observe the rules and norms of the School. Honesty in academic matters, as in all other matters, is an expectation of all members of the Hult community. The Honor Code covers both academic and social conduct, and violations will result in penalties of varying degrees of severity, up to and including dismissal from the school.
- 9.2.3. All members of the Hult community are expected to:
- Be civil in words and deeds
 - Be honest in work, action, and speech
 - Respect the diversity of every individual
 - Extend courtesy to every individual
 - Agree to respect the property of our School and of others
 - Maintain academic integrity
 - Abide by campus and institutional rules
 - Conduct themselves professionally
 - Protect Hult's institutional integrity
 - Report any violation of the Honor Code when a breach has been witnessed

9.3. Academic Integrity

9.3.1. Any work submitted must be the student's own work. Academic integrity is incompatible with the following actions:

- Giving or receiving unauthorized aid during an examination or quiz.
- Falsifying data of any kind (for example attendance records).
- Giving a false reason for requesting a make-up examination, an extension on an assignment, or an excused absence.
- Giving false testimony (either to protect oneself or someone else) to someone investigating a possible Honor Code violation.
- Plagiarism (submitting work without citation that incorporates someone else's ideas).
- Self-plagiarism (turning in the same work or part of assignments for two or more courses without the explicit approval of all the instructors involved).
- Submitting another student's work with or without that student's knowledge.
- Unauthorized cooperation between students in individual work situations.
- Not abiding by exam rules.
- Cheating of any kind
- Visiting online sites where exam questions and/or solutions from academic institutions may be posted.

Plagiarism

9.3.2. Plagiarism is the failure to adequately acknowledge the ideas, language, or research of others in papers, presentations, or other work. This includes direct, word-for-word copying, as well as the use of ideas, even if the original work is not copied word-for-word. Rules of plagiarism apply to all media through which students might communicate, including oral, graphical, text, or any electronic or physical media. Professors will expect students to provide their own original analysis and opinion, not the work of others.

Referencing

9.3.3. Hult follows the American Psychological Association (APA) citation format for all assignments. Information on proper use of APA citation format is made available to students on *myHult*.

9.3.4. Please also note that assignment submissions that include a large amount of third-party materials, even when properly cited, are not usually appropriate. While this is technically not plagiarism if a student provides proper references, the professor may nonetheless conclude that the student did not do the work they were asked to perform and award a low or failing grade for the assignment.

Cheating

9.3.5. There are many kinds of behavior that can be interpreted as cheating. For example, failure to observe examination or assignment instructions. In general, if it feels like a certain behavior might be considered as cheating, it probably is. If in doubt, students should ask a member of staff before committing to a course of action that may be considered cheating.

Collusion

9.3.6. Collusion is a form of cheating. It includes voluntarily assisting in another student's cheating and/or helping another student in an unauthorized manner whether the

latter has requested assistance or not. Collaborating on an assignment which calls for individual work is also considered unacceptable academic behavior.

Misrepresentation

- 9.3.7. If students are found to have submitted false information at any time, such as educational record or business experience, they may be subject to expulsion from the school. Students will be held to this standard before, during, and after their time at Hult.

9.4. Professional Integrity

- 9.4.1. All students as well as all other members of the Hult community, are expected to use reasonable and sound judgment in their daily campus life, to show respect and due concern for the welfare and rights of others. Students must behave in a manner that is considerate of others, does not jeopardize the health and safety of others, or damage the reputation of Hult. Professional integrity applies to all behavior, whether expressed orally, in writing and/or social media.
- 9.4.2. Professional integrity is incompatible with the following actions:
- Using abusive or obscene language and engaging in any form of deviant or anti-social behavior.
 - Displaying inappropriate and/or offensive reactions when communicating with any member of staff, students, faculty or visitors.
 - Violent, indecent, disorderly, threatening, or offensive behavior or language including harassment and bullying towards any student, member of staff, faculty or visitors.
 - Stereotyping, harassing, victimizing, or discriminating against any person on grounds of age, gender, disability, race, ethnic or national origin, religion or beliefs, sexual orientation, or socio-economic background.
 - The possession and/or use of alcohol or substances under legal age.
 - Unacceptable behavior arising from the consumption of alcohol or other substances.
 - The possession and/or use of illegal drugs or substances.
 - Making false, frivolous, malicious, or vexatious complaints.
 - Violation of the School's attendance policies.
 - Any action that caused, or could have caused, a health and safety concern on the School's premises.
 - Any behavior, action or language which could be considered to bring the institution or the Hult community into disrepute or damage its relationship with corporate connections, accrediting bodies or any other external party.
- 9.4.3. The Honor Code applies to all subsidiary policies that the school publishes.

9.5. Honor Code Violations

- 9.5.1. Hult is committed to enforcing the Honor Code. Any breach of academic or professional integrity may be considered a violation of the Honor Code. A student who is found to have breached the Honor Code will receive an Honor Code Violation (HCV), which will remain on the student's permanent record.
- 9.5.2. Program Regulations will specify the maximum number of Honor Code Violations a student may accumulate before being Dismissed from the School.

- 9.5.3. Severe breaches to the Honor Code may result in immediate dismissal from the School. The School reserves the right to suspend or dismiss a student who at any time is convicted of a criminal offense, acts in any way which is contrary to the interests of the School or its students or acts in a manner which could damage Hult's reputation or bring it into disrepute.

9.6. Academic Integrity Cases

- 9.6.1. The Academic Integrity Committee is responsible for conducting a complete and impartial review of any suspected violation, notifying the student concerned, the student's faculty member(s), and the academic administration of its findings and any sanctions. The student will be advised in writing regarding the decision of the Academic Integrity Committee.
- a. Once a case is submitted to the Academic Integrity Committee, the student will be notified that a case has been reported and will be given details of the suspected violation.
 - b. The student may respond in writing to describe what happened in their own words, including any extenuating circumstances that the student wishes to present.
 - c. Academic Integrity Committee will investigate the suspected violation, taking care to include all relevant information and speaking to the relevant parties.
 - d. The Academic Integrity Committee will decide whether a violation occurred on the basis of preponderance of evidence.
 - e. If the Academic Integrity Committee determines that a violation has occurred, it will decide the sanctions and notify the appropriate parties.
- 9.6.2. The Institution may use electronic and other methods (including the use of third-party systems and services) to detect Academic Misconduct.
- 9.6.3. Academic misconduct covers all cases of collusion with others, such as assistance to another student in academic malpractice. In such cases, similar penalties apply to both the giver and the recipient of unfair assistance.
- 9.6.4. Academic misconduct is normally levied by the AIC at one of the following three levels:
- a. Level 1: Poor Academic Practice (usually reserved for first-offences of minor scale or scope, for example clumsy/deficient referencing. Repeated Poor Academic Practice, where there has been previous warning, may be considered Academic Misconduct).
 - b. Level 2: Academic Misconduct (for example when the misconduct was a result of reasonable misunderstanding, or plagiarism of a restricted scope. Repeated Academic Misconduct, where there has been previous warning, may be considered Major Academic Misconduct).
 - c. Level 3: Major Academic Misconduct (for example cheating in an examination or use of an essay bank or writing service, admission fraud, or substantial plagiarism).
- 9.6.5. An Honor Code Violation is normally issued only for instances of Level 3 Major Academic Misconduct or repeat instances of Level 2 Academic Misconduct where a Level 3 penalty is issued.

- 9.6.6. In the case of Level 1 Poor Academic Practice, normally the relevant faculty member (or suitable alternative person) gives feedback to the student, including the nature of the poor academic practice and how it can be avoided in future. The student may be required to resubmit the assignment (possibly with a grade cap). The student may be required to undertake specific activity such as additional training in good academic practice.
- 9.6.7. Sanctions for Level 2 Academic Misconduct are at the discretion of the AIC, for example:
- a. Reduction of the grade for the Assignment by one or more grades
 - b. A fail grade for the Assignment
 - c. Require that the student resubmit the work remedying the Academic Misconduct (which may indicate a grade cap for the resubmission)
 - d. Require that the student undertake training in academic practice
- 9.6.8. Sanctions for Level 3 Major Academic Misconduct are at the discretion of the AIC, for example:
- a. Reducing the grade for the Course to a Fail
 - b. A recommendation that the student be Suspended or Dismissed from the Program
- 9.6.9. All penalties imposed by the AIC (whether Level 1, 2, or 3) are recorded on a student's academic record for internal purposes but are not listed on Transcripts.
- 9.6.10. To investigate a claim exhaustively, contact all relevant parties, and ensure a fair decision made on full facts, the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) may, on occasion, take substantial time before making a ruling. Furthermore, due to privacy concerns, results of individual AIC hearings will not be publicly disclosed. A fair process normally takes about 30 days, but the timing of rulings will depend upon the situation.
- 9.6.11. It is expected that all members of the Hult community conduct themselves openly and honestly at all times. Thus, dishonest statements made to AIC members or campus staff, or actions which impede an AIC review will be treated as additional violations.
- 9.6.12. Students may appeal AIC decisions. Valid grounds for appeal are:
- a. Procedural error that materially affected the outcome of the case
 - b. New evidence that was not available at the time of the case review
 - c. Substantive bias exhibited by a panel member
 - d. Disproportionate penalty applied by the AIC
- 9.6.13. Appeals of AIC decisions are reviewed by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. Appeals must be submitted within 14 days of notification of the original ruling.
- 9.6.14. Appeals are made in writing to the Chair of the AIC, who will refer the appeal to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. The Academic Standards & Quality Committee will convene an Appeal Panel consisting of members of the Academic Integrity Committees of at least two other Hult campuses.

- 9.6.15. The Appeal Panel reviews the outcome of the Academic Integrity Committee, considering the Misconduct, the evidence, and process by which it was handled.
- 9.6.16. The Appeal Panel may:
- a. Investigate to provide further evidence
 - b. Consult with the student and other involved parties either individually or together
 - c. Propose alternative penalties
- 9.6.17. The outcome of the Appeal Panel may be to uphold the outcome of the Academic Integrity Committee or propose a revised outcome. The outcome is communicated to the student in writing and is final.
- 9.6.18. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, internal procedures have been exhausted, and the student may seek an External Review of the outcome.

9.7. Professional Integrity Cases

- 9.7.1. Professional integrity infractions are reviewed and administered by the Professional Integrity Committee (PIC). The campus PIC is responsible for conducting a complete and impartial review of any suspected infraction, and in the case of serious allegations may consult with the global Professional Integrity Committee. The campus Professional Integrity Committee administers any sanctions imposed.
- a. Once an allegation has been made, the student will be notified that a case has been reported and will be given details of the suspected violation.
 - b. The student may respond in writing to describe what happened in their own words, including any extenuating circumstances that the student wishes wish to present.
 - c. The Professional Integrity Committee will investigate the suspected violation, taking care to include all relevant information and speaking to the relevant parties.
 - d. The Professional Integrity Committee will determine whether a violation occurred on the basis of preponderance of evidence.
 - e. Where a violation is determined to have occurred, the Professional Integrity Committee in consultation with the Campus Dean will determine and implement sanctions and notify the appropriate parties.
- 9.7.2. Sanctions for Professional Integrity cases are at the discretion of the Professional Integrity Committee, for example:
- Reprimand: a written warning to a student, including notice that further misconduct will result in more severe penalties.
 - Social Probation: Terms of the probation will be articulated and may include denial of specified social privileges, exclusion from co-curricular activities, exclusion from designated areas of campus, no-contact orders, and/or other measures deemed appropriate.
 - Issuing an Honor Code Violation (HCV)
 - Apology: a formal letter of apology, either private or public, to an individual or organization within or outside the Institution

- Restitution: a full and complete reimbursement for damage to, or destruction of, the property of the Institution or others.
 - Termination of Institutional financial aid and/or scholarship support
 - Removal of eligibility for campus rotation.
 - Suspension, for a fixed period of up to one academic year
 - Dismissal, to be confirmed by the Head of School
- 9.7.3. To investigate a claim exhaustively, contact all relevant parties, and ensure that a fair decision is arrived at based upon full facts, the Professional Integrity Committee may, on occasion, take substantial time before making a ruling. Furthermore, owing to privacy concerns, results of individual committee hearings will not be publicly disclosed. A fair process normally takes about thirty days, but the timing of rulings will depend upon the situation.
- 9.7.4. In exceptionally serious cases, the Chair of the Campus Professional Integrity Committee may Suspend the student pending the outcome of disciplinary action. A Suspended student may not attend classes, enter the Campus, or use other facilities such as IT services.
- 9.7.5. It is expected that all members of the Hult community conduct themselves openly and honestly at all times. Thus, dishonest statements made to PIC members or campus staff, or actions which impede a PIC review will be treated as additional violations.
- 9.7.6. Students may appeal PIC decisions. Valid grounds for appeal are:
- a. Procedural error that materially affected the outcome of the case
 - b. New evidence that was not available at the time of the case review
 - c. Substantive bias exhibited by a panel member
- 9.7.7. Appeals of PIC decisions are reviewed by the global Professional Integrity Committee. Appeals must be submitted within 14 days of notification of the original ruling.
- 9.7.8. The Appeal Panel reviews the outcome of the Professional Integrity Committee considering the Misconduct, the evidence, and process by which it was handled.
- 9.7.9. The Appeal Panel may:
- a. Investigate to provide further evidence
 - b. Consult with the student and other involved parties either individually or together
 - c. Propose alternative penalties
- 9.7.10. The outcome of the Appeal Panel may be to uphold the outcome of the Professional Integrity Committee or propose a revised outcome. The outcome is communicated to the student in writing and is final.
- 9.7.11. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, internal procedures have been exhausted, and the student may seek an External Review of the outcome.

9.8. Advice, Support, and Guidance

- 9.8.1. Help, support, guidance, and representation are available to Hult students. It is the responsibility of the student against whom an allegation has been made to seek advice and assistance where necessary. A typical point of contact for help or advice would be a staff member within the Dean's Office, although students may approach any staff or faculty member not directly involved in the case.

9.9. Dismissal

- 9.9.1. A student will be Dismissed with immediate effect if the student:
- Through poor academic performance is unable to progress to the next stage of the program
 - Through poor academic performance is ineligible for the Degree Award at the normal completion date of the program
 - Is Dismissed as a result of a decision of Academic Board
 - Fails to return from a Leave of Absence within the approved time
 - Has Enrollment terminated as specified above
 - Has exceeded the Maximum Time after Matriculation
 - Is Dismissed for Academic or Professional Misconduct
 - Is Dismissed due to the accumulation of the maximum number of Honor Code Violations, as specified in Program Regulations
- 9.9.2. Following Dismissal, Enrollment is terminated and the student is no longer entitled to access the facilities, faculty, and other resources of the Institution. A Transcript is available to the student on request, provided that all outstanding tuition-related fees have been paid.
- 9.9.3. A Dismissed student has no entitlement to a refund of tuition or other fees, except where explicitly stated in terms and conditions, or as a result of specific US, UK or Local Requirements applying to that student.
- 9.9.4. The Campus Dean (or designee) notifies the student in writing of Dismissal, including:
- The reasons for, and date of, Dismissal
 - The consequences of Dismissal, including those for fees and Degree Award
 - A statement that the student has no right to resume the Program
 - Any other matters, such as outstanding financial obligations
- 9.9.5. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, internal procedures have been exhausted, and the student may seek an External Review of the outcome.
- 9.9.6. Dismissed students may apply for readmission to the School, normally no earlier than 180 days after their date of Dismissal. Applications for readmission are reviewed by the Admissions Committee, using the same essential criteria used to review a new applicant. Furthermore, the Admissions Committee may deny applications where the dismissed student has a track record of behavior, including Honor Code Violations, which runs counter to the core values of the School.

10. Assessment Appeals

10.1. Scope

- 10.1.1. An Assessment Appeal is defined as a request from the student that the decision of an Assessment Board (e.g. confirmed grades or a recommended Degree Award) be reviewed because the student believes that an injustice has occurred.

10.2. Principles

- 10.2.1. Assessment Appeals can only be on one or more of the following grounds:

- a. The student's performance in an assignment suffered through Mitigating Circumstances of which the student was unable (or in exceptional circumstances unwilling) to inform the School before the assignment was submitted
- b. There was an administrative error in the management of the assignment
- c. The assignment was not run in accordance with the Academic Regulations and/or Program Regulations

- 10.2.2. Assessment Appeals are rejected without further recourse if judged to be:

- a. Vexatious or frivolous
- b. A disagreement with the academic judgement of faculty or an Assessment Board
- c. The result of ignorance or misunderstanding of the Academic Regulations, Program Regulations, or assignment briefs
- d. Lacking sufficient documented evidence of Mitigating Circumstances

- 10.2.3. A complaint that poor teaching, supervision, or guidance affected academic performance will be referred as a Complaint, and will be processed according to the Student Complaints policy

- 10.2.4. An Assessment Appeal must be submitted within 14 days of the notification of the assessment outcome to the student.

- 10.2.5. Assessment Appeals are:

- a. Considered in accordance with the School's policies and procedures
- b. Resolved or escalated promptly through the stages of the procedure, normally within 14 days at each stage

- 10.2.6. The School maintains reasonable confidentiality regarding an Assessment Appeal.

- 10.2.7. Where the same issue is raised by more than one student, the Assessment Appeal of the group of students may be considered as one Assessment Appeal if raised collectively, or at the discretion of the School. In such cases, in the Assessment Appeal Procedure, 'student' means the group of students.

10.3. Assessment Appeals Procedure

- 10.3.1. The student submits a written Assessment Appeal to their Program Manager, together with relevant evidence and/or a proposed amended decision.
- 10.3.2. The Assessment Appeal is referred to the Campus Academic Integrity Committee for consideration. The AIC may deem it necessary to communicate with the student, External Examiner(s), Academic Standards & Quality Committee, and/or others. The Campus Academic Integrity Committee will decide whether the Assessment Appeal is:
 - a. fully or partially upheld
 - b. not upheld
- 10.3.3. The decision of the Academic Integrity Committee is communicated in writing to the student and their Program Manager.
- 10.3.4. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, internal procedures have been exhausted, and the student may seek an External Review of the outcome.

11. Student Complaints

11.1. Scope

- 11.1.1. A student Complaint is defined as an expression of dissatisfaction by a student (or group of students) Enrolled on a Program with any individual, service or lack of service at the Institution, where a response is reasonably expected, and which has not already been resolved.
- 11.1.2. This Complaints Procedure and any decisions made under it do not give rise to legal rights or obligations on the part of the School to pay compensation in respect of a decision made according to these procedures or for a breach of these procedures.
- 11.1.3. The Complaints Procedure does not apply to:
 - a. Academic Misconduct
 - b. Academic Appeals and other matters of academic judgement
 - c. Honor Code Violations and Disciplinary Action
 - d. Staff grievances
 - e. Anonymous complaints

11.2. Principles

- 11.2.1. Complaints are:
 - a. Resolved informally if possible
 - b. Considered in accordance with the School's policies
 - c. Resolved or escalated promptly through the stages of the procedure, normally within 14 days at each stage
- 11.2.2. The School maintains reasonable confidentiality regarding the Complaint.
- 11.2.3. Where the same issue is raised by more than one student, the Complaint of the group of students may be considered as one Complaint if raised collectively, or at the discretion of the School. In such cases, in the Complaints Procedure, 'student' means the group of students.
- 11.2.4. Disciplinary action may be taken if the Complaint is malicious, frivolous or vexatious in intent or design, or a result of default or negligence.

11.3. Procedure

- 11.3.1. The procedure has four stages:
 - a. Informal Stage
 - b. Formal Stage
 - c. Internal Review
 - d. External Review

11.4. Informal Stage

- 11.4.1. Within a period of 14 days from the event which has caused the Complaint, the student making the Complaint needs to raise the matter with either:
 - a. The faculty or staff member who is directly responsible for the cause of the Complaint
 - b. The head of the department that is responsible for the cause of the Complaint
- 11.4.2. The member of staff or faculty discusses the Complaint with the student and, with the student's consent, anyone else involved, to see if it can be resolved informally.
- 11.4.3. The outcome of the Complaint is communicated to the student in writing.
- 11.4.4. Normally, Complaints at this Informal Stage are dealt with within 14 days.
- 11.4.5. If a student is not satisfied with the outcome of the Informal Stage, the student may raise a Formal Complaint within 14 days of notification of the outcome.

11.5. Formal Stage

- 11.5.1. The student submits a written Complaint, together with relevant evidence and/or a proposed solution.
- 11.5.2. The Complaint is submitted to the Campus Dean on the student's current campus. The receipt of the Complaint is acknowledged in writing.
- 11.5.3. The Complaint is considered by the student's Campus Dean (or designee), unless the complaint is against that person, in which case the person's line manager considers the complaint.
- 11.5.4. The Campus Dean (or designee):
 - a. Considers the evidence provided by the student
 - b. Meets or corresponds in writing with the student, to understand the Complaint and any proposed solution
 - c. Investigates as appropriate to provide further evidence
- 11.5.5. The Campus Dean (or designee) may consult with the student and other involved parties regarding potential solutions either individually or together.
- 11.5.6. The outcome of the Complaint is communicated to the student in writing, together with the grounds for the decision.
- 11.5.7. Normally, Complaints at this Formal Stage are dealt with within 14 days.
- 11.5.8. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the Formal Stage, the student may request an Internal Appeal within 14 days of notification of the outcome.

11.6. Internal Appeal

- 11.6.1. The student submits the request for an Internal Appeal together with valid grounds for dissatisfaction with the outcome of the Formal Stage to the Campus Dean, who refers it to the President of School. Valid grounds are:
 - a. Procedural error sufficient to affect the outcome of the Complaint
 - b. Substantive bias in decision-making in the Complaint
 - c. New evidence that was not available at the time of the Complaint
 - d. Insufficient remedy for a Complaint that was upheld
- 11.6.2. The request for Internal Appeal of the Complaint is acknowledged in writing.
- 11.6.3. The President of School reviews the Complaint and the outcome of the Formal Stage, considering the Complaint, evidence, and process by which it was handled.
- 11.6.4. The President of School may consult with the student and other involved parties regarding potential solutions either individually or together.
- 11.6.5. The outcome of the Internal Appeal may be to uphold the outcome of the Formal Stage or propose a revised outcome. The outcome of the Internal Appeal of the Complaint is communicated to the student in writing, together with the grounds for the decision.
- 11.6.6. Normally, Complaints at this Internal Appeal stage are dealt with within 14 days.
- 11.6.7. The decision of the President of School is final.

11.7. External Review

- 11.7.1. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, internal procedures have been exhausted, and the student may seek an External Review of the outcome.