

Trustee Decision on Student Complaint

Complainant: [REDACTED]

Institution: 3763 – InFocus Film School Inc.

1. Introduction

The Complainant was enrolled in the Film Production program [Program]. The Complainant filed a complaint against the Institution [Complaint] on July 4, 2025, after having withdrawn from the Program on November 14, 2024, approximately seven weeks into the 48-week Program.

The Complainant exhausted the Institution's dispute resolution process [DRP] prior to filing this Complaint.

The Complainant alleges he was misled in respect of the quality of the instruction, access to and condition of equipment, and career outcomes. The Institution denies misleading the Complainant as alleged, or at all.

For the reasons outlined below, I find the Institution did not mislead the Complainant regarding a significant aspect of the Program and, accordingly, deny the claim.

2. Statutory Scheme

Section 23(1) of the *Private Training Act* [PTA] provides that, a student may file a claim against the Student Tuition Protection Fund [Fund] on the ground that a certified institution misled the student regarding any significant aspect of an approved program of instruction in which that student was enrolled. Claims are filed with the Trustee, being the minister or the person to whom the minister has delegated the relevant powers or duties.

Claims must be filed no later than one year after the student completed or was dismissed or withdrew from the program and only after the student has exhausted the institution's dispute resolution process.

Following receipt of the complaint, the process is as follows:

Claim the student was misled		
Who	What	When
Trustee	Gives a copy of the claim to the institution	As soon as practicable
Institution	May respond to the claim [Response]	Within 15 days of receiving a copy of the claim from the Trustee
Trustee	Gives the Response from the institution, if any, to the student	Within 15 days of receiving the Response from the institution
Student	May reply to the Response from the institution [Reply]	Within 15 days of receiving the Response from the Trustee
Trustee	Must give the Reply from the student, if any, to the institution	Within 15 days of receiving the Reply from the student
Trustee	Adjudicates the claim to determine whether any refund should be issued, and provides written reasons to the student, the institution, and the registrar.	

If a claim is approved, the Trustee may authorize payment from the Fund of all or a portion of the tuition paid to the institution by or on behalf of the student. Section 25(4) of the *Fees and Student Tuition Protection Fund Regulation* requires that payments from the Fund be directed first to the government if all or a portion of the tuition was paid using funds from a provincial or federal student assistance program, and then to the claimant.

3. Program Information

Program:	Film Production
Start date:	September 23, 2024
End date:	September 19, 2025
Withdrawal date:	November 14, 2024
Total charged:	\$ 25,950
Tuition:	\$ 25,300
Application fee:	\$ 150
Materials fees:	\$ 500
Required Damage Deposits:	
Equipment damage deposit:	\$ 400
Key deposit	\$ 20
Amount paid to date by Complainant:	\$ 11,945
Amount of tuition paid to date by Complainant:	\$ 11,795

4. Issues

The following issues arise for consideration: Was the Complainant misled in relation to the quality of the Program, including the instruction, equipment, and career support?

5. Chronology

September 23, 2024	Program start date
November 5, 2024	[REDACTED]
November 14, 2024	Complainant emails Institution stating intention to “drop out” from Program; Institution acknowledges notice of withdrawal and issues refund calculation waiving the tuition balance owing under the contract
November 15, 2024	Complainant clarifies his wishes to “drop out”, not “withdraw”, [REDACTED]
November 18, 2024	Institution confirms withdrawal has been processed
March 2, 2025	Complainant email to Institution asking for assistance with student loan repayment process and to “initiate the refund process”
March 3, 2025	Institution responds it will submit notice of withdrawal to SABC and confirms that tuition paid is not refundable
April 4, 2025	Complainant requests clarification of refund calculation applied
April 7, 2025	Institution confirms no refund due and explains that the total contracted program cost was used to calculate the refund.

May 28, 2025	Complainant initiates DRP
June 18, 2025	Institution decision denying refund request [DRP Decision]
July 4, 2025	Complaint files Complaint

6. Analysis

The Complainant started the Program on September 23, 2024. The Complainant [REDACTED] on November 14, 2024, notified the Institution of his intention to “drop out” of the Program after “an amazing month” at the Institution. The Institution acknowledged the notice of withdrawal and provided a refund calculation, based on the Tuition Refund Policy, waiving “on compassionate grounds” the tuition balance of \$1,250 owing by the Complainant under the student enrolment contract. On November 15, 2024, the Complainant clarified that he wished to “drop out”, not withdraw, [REDACTED] and that he would contact StudentAid BC (SABC) about his loan. On November 18, 2024, the Institution confirmed it had processed the Complainant’s withdrawal from the Program and issued a refund for the gear deposit.

On March 2, 2025, the Complainant emailed the Institution asking for assistance with the student loan repayment process and to “initiate the refund process”. He noted that according to National Student Loans his status still showed him as enrolled in the Program. On March 3, 2025, the Institution responded it would submit a notice of withdrawal to SABC and confirmed that tuition paid is not refundable. On April 7, 2025, the Institution again confirmed no refund was due and explained that the total contracted program cost was used to calculate the refund.

On May 28, 2025, the Complainant initiated the DRP alleging he had been misled as follows:

- Program was marketed as being taught by experienced industry professions, but the instruction he received was disorganized and lacked clear learning outcomes.
- He was promised hands-on access to professional equipment, but equipment was outdated, malfunctioning and difficult to access.
- Promotional material emphasized employment opportunities, but no career support or placement assistance was provided.
- Former students have raised similar concerns.

On June 18, 2025, the Institution issued the DRP Decision, denying the Complainant’s refund request and rejecting the claims that it misled the Complainant:

- All instructors for Term 1 Film Production courses were industry professionals. Learning outcomes were listed in the Program Outline and lesson plans, power-points, videos, grading rubrics and more were available on the Learning Management System.
- Students are provided access to industry-standard equipment. The booking procedure is set out in the student handbook. Training sessions and support resources are regularly offered.
- Career Pathways course is scheduled in Term 4. Career preparation is not a significant part of earlier terms. The Complainant withdrew before the end of Term 1.

On July 4, 2025, the Complainant filed the Complaint alleging he was "...materially misled...regarding multiple core aspects..." of the Program, citing the poor quality of instruction and lack of access to equipment and career support.

The Institution's Response closely mirrors its reasoning in the DRP Decision.

7. Decision

Other than bare assertions, the Complainant has not provided evidence to support his claims of being misled in respect of a significant aspect of the Program. As a result, there is not a sufficient evidentiary basis for me to approve the claim.

In addition, I find the Institution's responses to the allegations to be reasonable.

As a final comment, when a student withdraws from a program, I encourage the Institution promptly contact SABC. This will hopefully avoid any confusion about the student's enrollment status and repayment obligations.

The claim is denied.

This decision is final. The Trustee does not have authority to re-open or reconsider the decision and there is no appeal under the PTA. Parties may wish to seek legal advice regarding a judicial review by the BC Supreme Court.

January 13, 2026



Joanna White

Trustee, Student Tuition Protection Fund