

Behaviour, Health and Practice Case Panels

Student Casework – Education Services

Contents

Behaviour, Health and Practice Case Panels	1
Contents.....	2
1. Purpose, Status and Authority	5
Purpose	5
Policy Status	5
Delegated Authority	5
2. Scope and Applicability	5
Panels Covered.....	5
Exclusions.....	6
Relationship to Other Policies	6
3. Core Principles Governing All Panel Decision-Making	6
Lawfulness, Fairness, and Transparency	6
Natural Justice and Impartiality	7
Evidence-Based Decision-Making.....	7
Proportionality and Least Restrictive Outcomes	7
Procedural Consistency and Structured Escalation	8
Transparency and Communication	8
Safeguarding, Wellbeing, and Trauma-Informed Practice.....	8
Defensibility and Institutional Accountability	8
4. Panel Types and Decision Domains	9
Student Disciplinary Panels	9
Fitness to Practise Panels	9
Support to Study Panels	9
Risk Assessment Panels (Precautionary)	9
Return to Study	10
Appeal and Review.....	10
5. Decision-Making Standards.....	10
Standard of Proof	10
Criteria for Decisions	10
Proportionality in Outcomes	10
Public Protection and Professional Standards.....	11

6. Governance of Panel Composition, Independence, and Authority	11
Composition Principles.....	11
Independence and Conflict of Interest.....	11
Training and Expertise.....	12
Roles and Authority.....	12
Quorum and Decision-Making	12
7. Interaction with Other Policies and Avoidance of Duplication	13
Single-Process Principle.....	13
Parallel External Proceedings	13
Information Sharing	13
Integration by Reference	13
8. Appeals, External Review, and Institutional Accountability	14
Appeal Rights	14
Completion of Procedures	14
External Oversight: Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)	14
Professional Body and Legal Remedies	14
Institutional Accountability	14
9. Records, Confidentiality, and Data Protection	15
Record-Keeping.....	15
Confidentiality.....	15
External Disclosure.....	15
Data Subject Rights	15
Monitoring and Equality Analysis.....	16
10. Governance, Ownership, and Review	16
Delegated Authority and Oversight.....	16
Integration and Consistency.....	16
11. Regulatory Alignment and Institutional Commitment	16
12. Ownership and oversight	17
13. Version history	18
14. Further advice and guidance	19
Schedules	20
Schedule 1: Definitions.....	20
Schedule 2: Outcomes	21

Schedule 3: Appeals	25
---------------------------	----

1. Purpose, Status and Authority

Purpose

This Policy establishes the University's institutional commitment to lawful, fair, independent, and proportionate decision-making in formal student casework panels. It sets out the strategic principles, governance framework, and decision-making standards that govern all formal panels convened to make high-stakes determinations affecting students' rights, status, or continuation of study.

The Policy provides the definitive institutional statement on the operation of panels across the student behaviour, health, and practice framework, ensuring consistency, regulatory compliance, and defensibility of panel decisions.

Policy Status

This is a University-level policy approved under the Student Policy Framework. It forms part of a unified ecosystem of student casework policies and operates as the overarching framework for panel decision-making.

All substantive student policies (including Student Conduct, Fitness to Practise, Fitness to Study, Return to Study, and related policies) incorporate this Policy by reference as the authoritative source for panel governance and standards.

Delegated Authority

Panels operate under authority delegated by the Vice-Chancellor and Academic Board. Panel decisions are made formally on behalf of the University within defined limits of delegated authority documented in the University's Scheme of Delegation.

The limits and scope of delegated authority for each panel type are specified in the relevant substantive policy and must be observed by all panel members and convenors.

2. Scope and Applicability

Panels Covered

This Policy applies to all formal student decision-making panels convened by the University as part of student casework processes, including but not limited to:

- Student Disciplinary Panels (serious or complex misconduct)
- Fitness to Practise Panels (professional suitability on regulated programmes)
- Support to Study Panels (serious health or wellbeing concerns affecting continuation)
- Risk Assessment Panels (precautionary interim measures)

- Return to Study Reviews (post-suspension or exclusion readiness assessments)
- Appeal or Review Panels (where convened under the Behaviour, Health and Practice Appeals Policy)

Exclusions

This Policy does not govern:

- Informal or investigatory stages preceding formal panel referral (these are governed by the respective substantive policies)
- Academic appeals or student complaints processes where formal hearings are not convened (these incorporate panel principles where relevant but typically involve paper-based review)
- Matters that do not meet the threshold criteria for formal panel consideration

Relationship to Other Policies

This Policy provides overarching governance, principles, and standards. Substantive student policies provide context-specific thresholds, criteria, and outcomes frameworks appropriate to their domain (for example, professional standards in Fitness to Practise, sanctions frameworks in Student Conduct).

In the event of any conflict between this Policy and a substantive policy, the principles set out in this Policy guide interpretation to ensure consistency and fairness.

The Policy operates within a unified student policy framework designed to close gaps, align processes, and ensure defensibility of decisions across all casework domains.

3. Core Principles Governing All Panel Decision-Making

All panel proceedings, regardless of type or substantive area, must adhere to the following institutional commitments:

Lawfulness, Fairness, and Transparency

The University ensures that all panel processes are:

- **Lawful**, operating in compliance with consumer protection law (CMA guidance), the Equality Act 2010, UK GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018, and all relevant statutory and common-law obligations
- **Fair**, consistent with natural justice principles and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Framework
- **Transparent**, ensuring students understand what to expect, how decisions are made, and their rights throughout

- **Aligned with regulatory expectations**, including Office for Students (OfS) conditions of registration and sector standards

Natural Justice and Impartiality

The University commits to:

- **Independence of decision-makers:** Panel members must be free from conflicts of interest, prior involvement in the case, or close connections to the student or matter under consideration
- **Impartial hearing:** The student's right to be heard is central; all participants are treated with dignity and respect
- **Presumption of non-responsibility:** Students are presumed not responsible for alleged misconduct or unfitness until a panel determines otherwise (except in precautionary risk panels, which do not determine responsibility)
- **Absence of bias:** Common-law principles of fairness, including the rule against bias, are embedded throughout

Evidence-Based Decision-Making

Panel decisions must be:

- **Founded on evidence:** Decisions are based on careful assessment of available, relevant evidence presented at the hearing
- **Subject to appropriate standards of proof:** Panels apply the balance of probabilities standard when determining contested facts or findings of responsibility (i.e. whether it is more likely than not that conduct or circumstances are proven)
- **Risk-focused where appropriate:** Precautionary panels assess risk and safety considerations rather than determining responsibility
- **Documented and reasoned:** Where evidence is incomplete, panels proceed carefully on best available evidence if a decision is necessary to manage risk, and document the rationale

Proportionality and Least Restrictive Outcomes

The University applies the principle of proportionality in all panel decisions:

- **Minimum necessary intervention:** Panels impose the least restrictive outcome sufficient to achieve the legitimate purpose (protection, education, risk management, professional standards)
- **Justified escalation:** More severe sanctions or restrictions are imposed only where justified by seriousness, impact, risk, or pattern of behaviour

- **Clear reasoning:** All outcomes must be supported by documented reasons referencing proportionality factors

Procedural Consistency and Structured Escalation

The University commits to:

- **Structured escalation:** Formal panels are convened only as a last resort when informal support, early intervention, or summary processes are insufficient
- **Consistent approach:** All panel processes follow a similar structured approach, ensuring that safeguards and standards are consistent regardless of case type

Transparency and Communication

The University ensures:

- **Informed participation:** Students are kept informed at every stage of panel processes
- **Written outcomes with reasons:** Panel outcomes are communicated in writing with clear reasons and information on further steps, including appeal rights
- **Lawful external disclosure:** Where outcomes are communicated to external bodies (professional regulators, partners, public protection agencies), this is done transparently and lawfully, with the student normally informed

Safeguarding, Wellbeing, and Trauma-Informed Practice

The University commits to:

- **Sensitive conduct of proceedings:** Panels are conducted acknowledging the potential stress for students and others involved
- **Appropriate support and adjustments:** The University offers reasonable adjustments and support to students (and others) throughout panel processes
- **Trauma-informed approaches:** In cases involving sensitive matters (harassment, sexual misconduct, safeguarding concerns), the University applies trauma-informed practice to minimise re-traumatisation and ensure safety and respect
- **Precautionary measures:** Risk management measures (for example, no-contact arrangements) may be applied during processes to ensure safety

Defensibility and Institutional Accountability

The University ensures panel decisions are legitimate and defensible through:

- Well-designed, consistently applied, and evidence-sensitive processes
- Alignment with regulatory frameworks (OIA, OfS, consumer protection law)

- Regular monitoring, oversight, and review

4. Panel Types and Decision Domains

The University convenes formal panels only for high-stakes decisions where issues are serious, complex, or have major implications for the student or others (for example, possible suspension, expulsion, or removal from professional programmes).

Student Disciplinary Panels

Decision domain: Determination of serious or complex misconduct allegations and imposition of sanctions up to and including expulsion.

Referral trigger: Allegations of serious, significant or gross misconduct, persistent serious breaches, or any case where potential outcomes include suspension or expulsion from the University.

Fitness to Practise Panels

Decision domain: Determination of whether a student's fitness to practise on a regulated professional programme is impaired, with consideration of public protection and professional standards.

Referral trigger: Serious concerns about professional suitability (conduct, health, competence) that cannot be resolved through early intervention and that may indicate risk to the public or breach of professional standards.

Support to Study Panels

Decision domain: Determination of a student's ability to continue studies safely, and decisions on whether continuation, interruption, or withdrawal is appropriate, with consideration of risk and support options.

Referral trigger: Serious or ongoing health, wellbeing, or behavioural concerns creating unmanageable risk that cannot be addressed through support measures alone.

Risk Assessment Panels (Precautionary)

Decision domain: Neutral, interim decisions on precautionary measures (for example, temporary suspension, access restrictions) to manage immediate risk pending substantive process.

Referral trigger: Urgent situations presenting serious and immediate safety or wellbeing risks requiring action that cannot await completion of full substantive procedures.

Scope limitation: Risk Assessment Panels do not determine responsibility or impose permanent sanctions; their role is time-limited, protective risk management. Can make decisions and recommendations relating to Support to Study cases only.

Return to Study

Decision domain: Forward-looking assessment of a student's readiness and conditions for return following suspension, exclusion, or enforced interruption.

Referral trigger: Any situation where a student seeks to resume studies following a period of enforced absence and return is not automatic.

Appeal and Review

Decision domain: Independent review of panel decisions on defined grounds (procedural irregularity, new evidence, unreasonableness).

Scope: Appeals are focused reviews, not re-hearings, governed by the Behaviour, Health and Practice Appeals Policy (Schedule 2).

5. Decision-Making Standards

Standard of Proof

Panels apply the **balance of probabilities** standard when determining contested facts or findings of responsibility: the panel must decide whether it is more likely than not that alleged conduct or circumstances are proven.

Precautionary risk decisions do not require proof of misconduct; they assess risk and necessity for interim protective measures.

Criteria for Decisions

Panels must apply the criteria, thresholds, and definitions set out in the relevant substantive policy and the Definitions document (Schedule 3).

Decisions must be based only on evidence presented to the panel and must disregard irrelevant information.

Proportionality in Outcomes

All outcomes must be:

- **Proportionate** to the circumstances, seriousness, impact, and risk
- **Justified** by reference to mitigating and aggravating factors, patterns of behaviour, and policy criteria

- **Consistent** with established outcomes frameworks and precedent
- **Documented** with clear reasons

The full range of outcomes, criteria for their imposition, and governance arrangements are set out in the Case Outcomes Policy (Schedule 5).

Public Protection and Professional Standards

Where panels consider matters involving professional programmes or public protection (Fitness to Practise), public safety is paramount and takes precedence over the student's individual interests where there is a genuine risk.

Decisions must take account of Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements and standards where applicable.

6. Governance of Panel Composition, Independence, and Authority

Composition Principles

All formal panels are composed to ensure:

- **Collective expertise:** Panels bring appropriate knowledge, perspectives, and experience to the decision domain
- **Independence:** Panel members are free from conflicts of interest and prior involvement
- **Fairness:** Multi-disciplinary composition ensures balanced, robust decision-making

Standard panels comprise three decision-makers: an independent Chair and two additional members, supported by a non-voting Clerk or Secretary.

Risk Assessment Panels are multi-disciplinary teams drawing on relevant expertise (wellbeing, security, academic leads) appropriate to risk assessment.

Independence and Conflict of Interest

The University requires that:

- Panel members have no prior significant involvement in the case (not as witness, investigator, or adviser)
- Panel members have no close personal connections to the student or others in the case
- Panel members have no stake in the outcome
- Any potential conflict of interest is declared and results in replacement of the member

- Students and other participants may raise concerns about bias or conflict, which the University will consider seriously

Panel Chairs are typically senior staff from outside the student's department where possible.

Training and Expertise

All panel Chairs and members receive appropriate training covering:

- Relevant policies, procedures, and legal context (OIA, OfS, consumer protection, Equality Act 2010)
- Evidential reasoning and decision-making standards
- Equality, diversity, unconscious bias, and trauma-informed practice
- Natural justice and due process

Panel members are expected to remain current with policy and legal developments.

Roles and Authority

Panel Chair: Leads proceedings, ensures fairness and compliance with procedure, manages the hearing, and leads deliberation toward a decision. The Chair is responsible for finalising the panel's written decision and reasons.

Panel Members: Review evidence, participate in questioning and deliberation, and jointly decide outcomes (normally by consensus or majority vote if needed).

Panel Clerk/Secretary: Provides administrative and procedural support, ensures accurate record-keeping, and advises on procedural rules. The Clerk does not vote or influence substantive outcomes.

Convenor/Case Manager: Initiates and coordinates the panel process under delegated authority, appoints panel members, and ensures preparations are completed. The convenor does not participate in decisions.

Quorum and Decision-Making

The normal quorum is two panel members (including the Chair). Where a three-member panel sits, decisions may be by majority vote if consensus cannot be reached; the Chair does not have a casting vote.

Panels strive for consensus in practice.

7. Interaction with Other Policies and Avoidance of Duplication

Single-Process Principle

The University commits to dealing with a given matter under one primary policy route at a time, to avoid double jeopardy or conflicting decisions.

Where a matter implicates multiple policy areas (for example, conduct and fitness to practise), the responsible senior officer determines the appropriate primary route and ensures coordination of processes.

The University does not impose multiple penalties for the same underlying conduct.

Parallel External Proceedings

Where external proceedings (for example, criminal investigations) are active, the University may pause or adjust its internal process to avoid prejudice, using precautionary measures to manage risk during any pause.

The University coordinates internal processes to avoid duplication of evidence or inconsistent outcomes.

Information Sharing

The University permits relevant information to be shared internally between processes where necessary for risk management, coherent decision-making, or public protection, with due regard to confidentiality and privacy.

Panels do not re-judge issues already decided by another panel but may take prior outcomes into account where relevant.

Integration by Reference

This Policy is incorporated by reference into all substantive student casework policies, ensuring that improvements or changes to panel governance propagate consistently across all processes.

Substantive policies may include context-specific schedules (for example, sanctions matrices, professional standards frameworks) that complement but do not conflict with this overarching Policy.

8. Appeals, External Review, and Institutional Accountability

Appeal Rights

Students have the right to appeal formal panel decisions on defined grounds. Appeals are focused reviews of process and decision, not re-hearings.

The grounds, scope, procedures, timescales, and outcomes of appeals are governed by the Behaviour, Health and Practice Appeals Policy, which ensures fairness, accessibility, independence, and compliance with regulatory expectations.

Completion of Procedures

Once internal appeal or review processes are exhausted, the University issues a Completion of Procedures letter confirming that internal processes are complete and informing the student of their right to seek external review.

External Oversight: Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)

The University is subject to external review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA), an independent ombudsman that reviews whether the University's processes and decisions were fair and reasonable.

The University's panel processes align with the OIA Good Practice Framework, ensuring sector-standard fairness and rigour.

Students normally have 12 months from the date of the Completion of Procedures letter to bring a complaint to the OIA.

Professional Body and Legal Remedies

In cases involving professional programmes, students may have access to external professional body appeal or review processes in accordance with PSRB requirements.

In exceptional circumstances, students may seek judicial review if they believe a decision was unlawful.

Institutional Accountability

The University ensures panel processes remain accountable and subject to independent scrutiny through:

- Internal appeal on clear grounds

- External recourse to the OIA
- Compliance with sector norms and regulatory expectations

9. Records, Confidentiality, and Data Protection

Record-Keeping

The University maintains detailed, accurate records of panel proceedings and outcomes in accordance with records management policies, data protection law, and the University's retention schedule.

Records are kept securely and used for internal reporting, monitoring, ensuring compliance with conditions or sanctions, and responding to appeals or external reviews.

Records are retained for a specified period and confidentially destroyed thereafter unless ongoing need (for example, litigation) requires retention.

Confidentiality

Panel proceedings are confidential. Information is shared on a need-to-know basis only.

The University protects personal data disclosed during panel processes in compliance with UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.

Panel members and participants are bound by confidentiality and may not discuss cases with others except advisers or support persons similarly bound.

External Disclosure

Where information must be disclosed externally (for example, to police, public protection agencies, Disclosure and Barring Service, professional regulators, or placement providers), the University follows applicable legal protocols and normally informs the student.

Data Subject Rights

Students have the right under data protection law to request access to their personal data, including panel records.

The University handles subject access requests carefully, balancing the student's rights with the privacy of witnesses and others, and complying with legal exemptions where applicable (for example, legally privileged documents).

Monitoring and Equality Analysis

The University periodically reviews aggregate data on panel cases (numbers, outcomes, timelines, appeals) to ensure effective operation and identify issues such as potential bias or inconsistency.

The University monitors for equality issues, including whether particular student groups are disproportionately represented, and uses findings to inform training, process adjustments, and policy development.

10. Governance, Ownership, and Review

Delegated Authority and Oversight

Panels operate under delegated authority from the Vice-Chancellor and Academic Board.

Governance bodies (for example, Academic Board, relevant committees) maintain oversight through mechanisms such as annual reporting on student casework panels (numbers, types, issues, recommendations).

This oversight ensures accountability and alignment with the University's strategic commitments to safeguarding student welfare and upholding standards.

Integration and Consistency

As a cross-cutting policy forming part of a unified student casework framework, updates to this Policy are mirrored in references within related policies to maintain internal alignment.

The Policy Owner ensures that when this Policy is updated, all related student policies are checked for consistency in tone, terminology, and structure.

This holistic approach demonstrates the University's commitment to a fair, transparent, and regulator-ready approach to student decision-making.

11. Regulatory Alignment and Institutional Commitment

This Policy demonstrates UWE Bristol's commitment to:

- **Consumer protection:** Ensuring terms are clear and students know what to expect (CMA guidance)
- **Equality and inclusion:** Compliance with the Equality Act 2010, provision of reasonable adjustments, and trauma-informed practice
- **Data protection:** Compliance with UK GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018
- **Sector standards:** Alignment with OIA Good Practice Framework and OfS regulatory conditions

- **Natural justice:** Adherence to common-law principles of fairness and the rule against bias
- **Transparency and accountability:** Clear communication, reasoned decisions, and external oversight

By establishing a unified, principled framework for panel decision-making, the University ensures that all students subject to formal panels receive fair, consistent, and defensible treatment, and that the University's casework processes withstand internal and external scrutiny.

12. Ownership and oversight

Document name:	Casework Panels
Version number:	26_09_01
Equality Analysis:	Yes
Approved by (committee and date):	LTSEC – June 2026
Effective from:	01 September 2026
Next review date:	June 2029
Senior Policy Owner:	Assistant Director (Learning Teaching and Student Experience)
Policy Author:	Head of Student Casework and Insight
Overseeing committee:	Learning Teaching and Student Experience Committee
Compliance measures:	Annual Casework Report External scrutiny via the OIA
Related policies, procedures and codes of practice:	• Student Conduct and Disciplinary Policy • Support to Study Policy • Fitness to Practice / Professional Suitability Policy • Behaviour, Health and Practice Panels Policy (Casework Panels) • Behaviour, Health and Practice Appeals Policy (including any Part B Reporting-Student Request for Review as approved) • Reporting, Risk Assessment and Precautionary Actions Policy • Case Outcomes and Sanctions Policy • Return to Study Policy • Master Definitions Document (BHP definitions) • Policy Governance Framework (the umbrella governance instrument for UWE policies) • Complaints Policy and Procedure for Students; Complaints Policy for Non-Students; and, once approved, the Policy

	on Reportable Complaint Outcomes to the Office for Students • Academic Appeals Policy, as the distinct route for challenges to academic judgment • Freedom of Speech Policy and Code of Practice (currently v1.4, November 2025) • Dignity at Work and Study Policy and the University's Anti-Racism Strategy commitments • Statement of Expectations and Duty of Care Framework • Safeguarding arrangements and the University's Prevent duty response • Data Protection Policy, Records Retention Schedule, and the Advocate CMS Data Protection Impact Assessment • Academic Regulations and Student Terms and Conditions (as the contractual context within which this Framework operates)
Related legislative and/or regulatory requirements	• Office for Students regulatory framework and ongoing conditions of registration • Statutory external student complaints scheme • Equality Act 2010, • Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023, • Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023, • UK GDPR, Data Protection Act 2018 and Data (Use and Access) Act 2025 • Consumer Rights Act 2015 • Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Act 2024 • Higher Education and Research Act 2017 • Prevent duty • Children Acts 1989 and 2004, • Care Act 2014 • Protection from Harassment Act 1997 • UKVI Student Sponsor Guidance • PSRB standards and reporting duties

13. Version history

Version	Date	Summary of changes	Author
---------	------	--------------------	--------

26_09_01		N/A - new	Head of Student Casework and Insight

14. Further advice and guidance

Further advice and guidance on the operation of this Framework is available from the Student Casework Team (studentcasework@uwe.ac.uk).

Schedules

The following Schedules form part of this Policy and should be read in conjunction with it:

Schedule 1: Definitions

This Policy uses terms that have specific meanings within the Behaviour, Health and Practice framework. Details can be found in the Framework for Student Behaviour, Health and Practice

Schedule 2: Outcomes

The outcomes available to case panels are detailed in the relevant schedules for the applicable policy.

Level	Outcome/Sanction Type	Conduct	Fitness to Practice	Support to Study	Duration / Notes
0	No further action / Not proven / Case closed	✓	✓	✓	N/A
1	Informal resolution / No formal sanction	✓	✓	✓	N/A
2	Verbal warning / Expectations reminder	✓	✓	✓	N/A
3	Written warning (Level 1)	✓	✓	Not applicable (use supportive language: "outcome letter setting expectations")	Typically 12 months or remainder of registration
4	Acceptable Behaviour Contract / Action Plan	✓ (Acceptable Behaviour Contract)	✓ (Professional Development Plan)	✓ (Support to Study Action Plan)	Typically 3-12 months with regular review
5	Formal reprimand	✓	✓	Not applicable	Typically remainder of studies
6	Apology	✓	✓	Not applicable	One-off requirement
7	Confiscation of items	✓	✓	Not applicable	Permanent or time-limited

Level	Outcome/Sanction Type	Conduct	Fitness to Practice	Support to Study	Duration / Notes
8	Attendance on educative/reflective programme	✓	✓	Not applicable (but training may be recommended as part of support)	Cost and duration specified; completion required
9	Restorative justice / Restorative practice	✓ (optional)	✓ (optional)	✓ (optional, where appropriate)	Victim-led; trauma-informed facilitation required
10	Short-term access restriction	✓	✓	✓ (framed as protective arrangement)	Up to 7 days
11	Time-limited access restriction	✓	✓	✓ (framed as protective arrangement)	Up to one term
12	IT or system restrictions	✓	✓	Not applicable	Time-limited or until conditions met
13	Non-contact arrangement	✓	✓	✓ (framed as protective boundary)	Duration specified; breach is serious escalation
14	Exclusion from specific activities or events	✓	✓	✓ (framed as temporary adjustment)	Time-limited or permanent
15	Reparation / Restitution	✓	✓ use cautiously	Not applicable	Must specify: loss, calculation, payment timeline
16	Financial penalty (fine)	✓	✓ use cautiously; (typically only for non-clinical breaches)	Not applicable	Up to £1,000

Level	Outcome/Sanction Type	Conduct	Fitness to Practice	Support to Study	Duration / Notes
17	Suspension from specific placement, module, or activity	✓	✓	✓ (framed as temporary measure pending assessment or support)	Time-limited or permanent
18	Suspension from University (time-limited)	✓	✓	Not applicable (use "temporary withdrawal" language)	Specified period (e.g., one term, one academic year)
19	Mandatory interruption of studies / Withdrawal from registration (time-limited)	✓ (termed "interruption" or "suspension")	✓ (termed "interruption" or "temporary exclusion")	✓ (termed "supported withdrawal" or "mandatory interruption")	Time-limited; conditions for return specified
20	Expulsion from one course with permission to register on another (non-qualifying) course	✓ (rare; case-specific)	✓	Not applicable	Permanent exclusion from named course; eligibility for alternative course specified
21	Exclusion from a course or profession (with possible re-entry elsewhere)	✓ (use in serious/persistent cases)	✓	Not applicable	Permanent exclusion from specified course/programme; portability to other institutions not guaranteed but not prohibited
22	Time-limited expulsion (with possible re-entry after review)	✓	✓	Not applicable	Time-limited (specify period); conditions for re-

Level	Outcome/Sanction Type	Conduct	Fitness to Practice	Support to Study	Duration / Notes
					entry application clearly set out
23	Permanent expulsion (with no right to return)	✓ (most serious cases only)	✓ (most serious cases only)	✓ (last resort; termed "permanent withdrawal of registration")	Permanent; no re-entry possible

Schedule 3: Appeals

The grounds, procedural requirements, timescales, submission process, scope of review, composition of appeal panels, and outcomes available on appeal are fully set out in the Behaviour, Health and Practice Appeals Policy.