

Student Voice & Improvement Framework

Feedback routes, case-handling expectations, academic appeals boundaries and secure service safeguards.

1. Listening routes

Learners should have different channels for suggestions, routine service feedback, complaints, academic appeals and safeguarding issues. They must be told which route applies, how information is used and when the receiving organisation is responsible for a partner-controlled decision.

Route	Use	Handling principle
Suggestion / experience feedback	Ideas about content, navigation, learning support and student services.	May be analysed in aggregated form for improvement.
Service complaint	Concern about information, conduct, delays, fees or support services.	Track case, owner, response and closure.
Academic appeal	Request to review an academic decision under the applicable academic rules.	Refer to the authority controlling the decision; maintain procedural fairness.
Confidential concern	Sensitive wellbeing, harassment, discrimination or data privacy issue.	Use restricted access and priority escalation.

2. Minimum safeguards before activating an online form

- A verified and monitored mailbox or secure case database is connected.
- The form identifies the privacy notice, data controller and lawful handling purpose.
- The submission flow provides a reference number and confirms receipt.
- Access is role-restricted, exports are protected and cases are not publicly indexed.
- No student is directed to submit sensitive information into an unconnected mock form.
- Partner academic appeals are transferred only where the appropriate basis and permissions exist.

3. Recommended case lifecycle

Stage	Definition
Received	Submission is securely recorded, categorised and assigned a reference.
Acknowledged	Sender is informed of next steps through a verified channel.
Triage	Urgency, confidentiality, safety and jurisdiction are considered.
Investigating	Relevant evidence is reviewed fairly by an appropriate function.
Resolved	A reasoned outcome and any review route are communicated.
Improvement verified	Systemic findings become tracked actions with closure evidence.

4. Student voice to programme improvement

An anonymised pattern in feedback may prompt curriculum redesign, staff support, clearer fee information, more accessible resources or a change to digital service processes. Improvement should be communicated to affected learners when appropriate without disclosing confidential student information.

5. Practical division of duties

- Student support receives ordinary requests and routes them securely.
- A quality-coordination function tracks themes, response quality and systemic improvements.
- Academic oversight reviews academic policy implications within its defined remit.
- The correct awarding body handles academic decisions and appeals that legally fall within its jurisdiction.

Current website integration

If secure submission handling is not connected, the public website should show an informative process and link to a verified contact page; it should not claim to accept or store submissions. Form activation requires an end-to-end test.