

NON-COMPLIANCE WITH SCD ACADEMIC POLICIES PROCEDURE

Approved	Academic Board/Council
Approval Date(s) (from most recent)	29/02/2016, 17/02/2016, 07/02/2011, 09/09/2009, 07/09/2009
Date for Review (no more than five years from last approval)	2021
Responsible Officer	Dean
Author(s) and Role(s) from most recent	D. Speed (Dean)
Related Documents (explicitly cross-referenced)	
Higher Education Standards (2021)	6.2(k), 6.3
National Code (2018) (if directly relevant)	

Introduction

The federated structure of SCD, in which the Member Institutions comprise SCD, relies upon mutual trust, co-operation and shared responsibility. Underpinning this structure is a presumption of compliance. The responsibility for compliance lies across the whole of SCD. It is expressed in the Memorandum of Understanding between the SCD and MIs, and is willingly undertaken when that document is signed. Compliance in itself is therefore a serious obligation.

The specific purpose of these General Procedures is to provide guidelines to be followed when it becomes known that SCD Academic Policies are not being followed by an individual or by an MI. Whilst it is acknowledged that each instance will most likely be different, requiring a different response, these procedures provide the basis of following a basic pathway that should assist in handling the matter.

Academic Board has responsibility for ensuring its Academic Policies and Procedures are followed. Each faculty member and each MI is also responsible for actions taken under these policies and procedures. However, the SCD Dean and SCD Directors have specific duties in relation to these policies and procedures on a day-to-day basis. Accordingly, in the event of non-compliance, the particular instance will determine which SCD personnel will become involved, and how and when the Academic Board will become involved.

Identification or notification of non-compliance

Non-compliance can range from quite minor matters to those which have very serious consequences. The reasons for the non-compliance may vary from mere oversight to deliberate breach. Issues at the

lower end of these ranges can be defined as minor infractions, which should be dealt with easily, and handled collaboratively between those individuals responsible. This policy relates more specifically to matters and issues of serious non-compliance, which have potential and significant consequences for SCD, MIs and perhaps individuals.

Whilst it is impossible to set out a predetermined set of consequences of serious non-compliance, the nature and seriousness of such consequences can be observed in the following illustrative examples:

<i>Non-compliance</i>	<i>Breach of MOU</i>	<i>Consequences</i>
a. MI website	accuracy of information to students; compliance with SCD Handbook and PPM	failure in student welfare; breach of terms of registration by government regulators
b. accredited teachers	proper service to students; compliance with PPM (Academic Faculty Accreditation)	failure in student welfare; breach of terms of registration by government regulators

The manner in which non-compliance is identified will vary. Where an individual identifies a minor non-compliance, that individual may deal with it direct with other relevant persons, through mutual co-operation. If that process does not resolve the matter successfully, it should be reported to the Dean. The Dean will take appropriate action, either within or outside this policy, depending upon the seriousness of the consequences.

Where an individual identifies a matter which appears to be of a serious non-compliance, it should be reported immediately to the Dean. If the Dean agrees that it is a matter of serious non-compliance, it is the role of the Dean to determine which academic area (e.g. teaching, research, curriculum, student support) is the domain of the non-compliance identified and/or which SCD policies/procedures are implicated. Once identified, the Dean will liaise with the relevant Director and inform the Chair of Academic Board. The Dean and Chair of Academic Board will determine if and when the Council should be informed of the non-compliance.

Procedures to be followed in a serious case

1. The relevant Director will prepare a written statement/ summary, which clearly indicates:
 - a. The name of the individual or MI involved
 - b. The specific policy section/ regulation that has been breached
 - c. A description of how it has been breached
 - d. What implications flow from the breach
 - e. Suggestions/recommendations as to who should be immediately informed
 - f. Possible actions that might be taken towards establishing compliance
2. The Director will provide a copy of the statement prepared to the Dean and the Chair of Academic Board.
3. The Dean and Chair of Academic Board will determine the next most appropriate step. Generally, this will be to approach the individual concerned, or the Principal if it is an MI breach of policy. This approach will be in writing, with a request to meet to further discuss the statement prepared. Subsequent to the discussions, a written response will be requested from the individual or Principal involved.

4. The Chair of Academic Board, in consultation with the Dean, will determine the next course of action, such as:
- Take it to Academic Board for advice/action
 - Refer it to the relevant faculty member or Principal for action and report that to Academic Board, as appropriate.
 - Proceed to gather further information, as relevant
 - Seek external professional advice
 - Other

Follow-up after resolution of the matter

There may be various reasons as to why any non-compliance has occurred.

Where deemed appropriate by the Dean or Academic Board, feedback from the process should be provided to the individual or MI involved. This feedback is to be accompanied by a discussion with the individual, Principal/Academic Dean, in terms of reinforcing the relevant policy and its implementation. This is to be carried out in the context of professional development, rather than in the context of blame and remediation.

At the appropriate time, the Academic Board will have an obligation to reflect upon what has occurred, and to determine what has been learned from this experience and the procedures followed.