

A PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES FOR REQUIRING A RESEARCH DEGREE STUDENT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE UNIVERSITY FOR FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE SATISFACTORY ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE; AND FOR A STUDENT TO APPEAL AGAINST THIS DECISION

Appeals against Annual Progression decisions/outcome of viva voce examination may be lodged according to PGR Student Regulations Section B.

For further guidance, please contact the University Secretary’s Office at +44 (0) 191 227 4399

Students may seek independent advice and support from the Students’ Union Advice & Representation Centre: su.advice@northumbria.ac.uk

A.1	PRINCIPLES
A.1.1	<p>The University’s <i>Articles of Government</i> state that Academic Board is the body responsible for ‘policies and procedures for assessment...of the academic performance of students;...academic standards;...and procedures for the expulsion of students for unsatisfactory academic performance’.¹ Academic Board exercises these responsibilities by laying down academic regulations, which state the level of attainment necessary for the final award; the definition of timely duration; and the following requirements:²</p> <p>‘Satisfactory progress must be made throughout the programme with regard to the required level of timely academic achievement; and progress will be monitored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • through successful completion of Project Approval or its equivalent;³ • by the Principal Supervisor throughout the programme in the normal course of supervision, via monthly meetings with the student; • Through other monitoring mechanisms which School Research Committees may require and fully publicise to their students. <p>Continued registration of the student for the award is conditional upon the programme having approved status and upon satisfactory/timely progress being maintained by the student to meet both University requirements for Annual Progression and other monitoring requirements as specified by the School Research Committee. If a student does not satisfy all these requirements, standard procedures apply to withdraw the student from the University for unsatisfactory</p>

¹ Section 3.3(a)

² Section 3.3 of the Regulations for both MPhil/PhD and Professional Doctorate programmes

³ This clause in the regulations applies explicitly to MPhil/PhD; the equivalent clause in the Professional Doctorate regulations is 3.2: The combination of the initial research outline and taught advanced research bridging element are regarded as an equivalent to the standard postgraduate research Project Approval (PA).

	<p>academic performance.¹</p> <p>The decision that a student withdraws on academic grounds is therefore taken on behalf of Academic Board; and appeals against that decision are also formally considered on behalf of Academic Board.</p> <p>Appeals against the outcome of Annual Progression may be lodged according to PGR Student Regulations, Section B.a. Appeals against withdrawal due to unsatisfactory academic progress may be lodged according to the regulations of this Section A.</p>
A.1.2	<p>Academic Board delegates to School Research Committees authority for managing elements of PGR activity within University approved mechanisms, including student progression and the withdrawal of students from programmes for unsatisfactory academic performance. School Research Committees are therefore responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overseeing the procedures for Project Approval in accordance with the University’s PGR Code of Practice and academic regulations; • Determining, and publishing to students, any other monitoring mechanisms to support the successful and timely progress of the student through the programme;⁴ • Academic decisions regarding a student’s withdrawal for failure to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance.
A.1.3	<p>In addition, the University’s <i>Articles of Government</i> state that the Vice-Chancellor is responsible for implementing decisions to expel students for academic reasons.⁵ This responsibility is routinely delegated to School Deans who exercise authority to implement School Research Committee recommendations and so to withdraw a student for unsatisfactory academic performance.</p>
A.1.4	<p>Deans are also responsible for their School’s provision of supervision to research degree students. The primary purpose of PGR supervision is to support students in the successful completion of their programme in accordance with the University’s regulations. The requirements of supervision are set out in the University’s PGR Code of Practice.⁶ Throughout the programme, the Principal Supervisor⁷ exercises academic judgement to monitor student progress and feed back to the student both formally and informally their assessment of student performance. Should a student fail to demonstrate the required level of timely academic achievement, attempts will be made by the Principal Supervisor to help the</p>

⁴ This may include Mid-Point Progression (MPP)

⁵ Articles of Government, 2b and 2f

⁶ PGR Code of Practice sections referring to QAA precepts 11-14

⁷ Where the School PGR Director or the School Dean or the School Research Committee Chair is also the student’s Principal Supervisor, then special arrangements must be made to safeguard the student and ensure that the decision-making roles are separated from the supervisor role.

	<p>student remedy the situation before any question of withdrawal arises (by promptly informing the student of their concerns and providing advice). If necessary, the Principal Supervisor issues an informal and/or formal warning to the student, indicating the need to improve academic performance and providing the student with clear requirements (of both content and timescale for improvement) which the student must meet. The Principal Supervisor also identifies situations where a student fails to satisfy the University's published attendance requirements, to submit written work as planned or to meet requirements of relevant professional codes of conduct. In all such circumstances, the Principal Supervisor alerts the student (via informal and/or formal warnings) to the fact that the student is responsible for remedying the situation, and that continued unsatisfactory performance over a sustained period of time leads to a student being withdrawn from the University for unsatisfactory academic performance. As the requirement of monthly supervision contact enables such close monitoring and feedback, it is assumed that student difficulties in meeting the required level of timely academic performance will normally be identified first in the context of supervision, and that appropriate informal warnings will be issued and documented in that context.</p>
A.1.5	<p>The following procedures describe the process whereby a student is withdrawn from the University for failure (at any point in the programme) to demonstrate timely academic achievement at the appropriate level as defined by the University's academic regulations, including failure to demonstrate due attendance, or meet requirements of the relevant professional codes of conduct. In addition, there are procedures for a student to appeal against this decision.</p>
A.1.6	<p>The following regulations do not apply to circumstances where the student has already provided evidence, in accordance with University procedures, of ill health and personal circumstances affecting academic performance.</p>
A.1.7	<p>In circumstances where either the student or the Principal Supervisor provide evidence that the supervisory relationship has broken down, students should seek advice from the Independent PGR Counsellor.</p>
A.1.8	<p>All these procedures are operated in accordance with the principles of natural justice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the matter is dealt with in good faith, impartially, fairly and in a timely manner; • no one is the judge in his/her own cause; • all concerned have the right to a fair hearing; • full account is taken of all relevant factors; • detail of an appeal is provided to key stakeholders in advance of a hearing;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key stakeholders are informed of the outcome of the appeal and the reasons for any decision made; • the outcome represents justice having been done in respect of the appeal.
A.2	PROCEDURES FOR REQUIRING A RESEARCH DEGREE STUDENT TO WITHDRAW FOR FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE SATISFACTORY ACADEMIC PROGRESS
A.2.1	<p>Student progress is routinely supported and monitored by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project Approval monthly supervision other monitoring mechanisms which School Research Committees may require and publicise to students <p>Together, these provide a framework within which student difficulties in demonstrating satisfactory and timely academic performance can be addressed. Where the student's difficulties persist in the programme, students will always be given at least two opportunities to remedy shortcomings in a structured context (i.e. informal Stage 1 and formal Stage 2) before they are required to withdraw from the University for failure to demonstrate satisfactory academic progress.</p>
A.2.2	In order to operate these procedures, it is essential that records of Project Approval, monthly Supervision Meetings and Annual Progression and any other mechanisms approved by the School Research Committee are maintained in a complete, accurate and transparent way.
A.2.3	Where there is a discrepancy in the judgement on the student's academic achievement between the supervision team and the School Research Committee (and its Panels), the School Research Committee's judgement takes precedence.
a) Addressing difficulties within the context of Project Approval	
A.2.4	The requirements for Project Approval or its equivalent are stated in the academic regulations and in the University's PGR Code of Practice.
A.2.5	<p>Stage 1</p> <p>Where a student fails to satisfy the criteria for Project Approval at the first attempt, they are informed in writing of the shortcomings and given a deadline by which they may make a second attempt.</p>

A.2.6	<p>Stage 2</p> <p>Where a student fails to satisfy the criteria for Project Approval at the second attempt, the recommendation is made to the School Research Committee that the student be withdrawn from the University for unsatisfactory academic performance. The Student is notified of the School Research Committee decision.</p>
b) Addressing difficulties within the context of routine supervision	
A.2.7	<p>In the context of normal supervision, the Principal Supervisor meets with the student at least once per month. Routinely at these meetings, the supervisor discusses with the student the level required for the award and comments on whether (in the supervisor's academic judgement) the student's engagement with the programme is at the right level and progress is timely. This makes it possible to address difficulties at an early stage. Where students are remotely located and face-to-face meetings are not possible, monthly 'contacts' will be conducted by other means (e.g. telephone, Skype).</p>
A.2.8	<p>Stage 1</p> <p>Should the Principal Supervisor judge that the student's engagement with the programme is not at the right level and/or is not timely, the Principal Supervisor alerts the student to this and identifies the deficiencies; discusses and agrees with the student realistic and timely objectives within the student's project plan, to bring progress back on track; alerts the student to the fact that it is the student's responsibility to remedy the situation; and warns the student of the risk of being withdrawn from the University for unsatisfactory academic performance, if the objectives are not met as agreed in the action plan. This informal Stage 1 warning is both oral and is documented in the monthly supervision report.</p>
A.2.9	<p>Stage 2</p> <p>The Principal Supervisor continues to monitor the student's engagement with the programme, judging whether progress is satisfactory, and feeds ongoing assessment back to the student orally at each monthly meeting, and documents progress. In assessing the student's progress, the Principal Supervisor consults with the other members of the supervision team.</p>
A.2.10	<p>Should the student continue to demonstrate (in the judgement of the Principal Supervisor) unsatisfactory engagement with the programme over a sustained period of time (e.g. 2 months) by failing to meet the level and/or timescales required by the project plan, the Principal Supervisor issues a formal Stage 2 warning to the student, orally and in writing, as follows:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the student’s continued engagement with the programme has been unsatisfactory; • that specific objectives and/or timescales in the agreed project plan have not been met; • mutually agrees a further set of objectives and timescales to remedy the situation by the next deadline (normally the next monthly supervision meeting); • Informs the student that the full Supervision Team will assess the quality and timeliness of the work produced by the student at the next deadline, and that input from an independent member of the School Research Committee (nominated by the School Research Committee Chair specifically to represent School Research Committee with regard to authority for withdrawing a student for failing to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance) will also be taken into account in assessing the work; • That failure to meet the requirement after a formal Stage 2 warning normally triggers the procedure for the student to be withdrawn from the University for unsatisfactory academic performance. <p>This formal Stage 2 warning is documented in the monthly Supervision report, which is copied to the School PGR Director and to the student’s file.</p>
A.2.11	<p>If, at the next deadline, the student does not demonstrate satisfactory engagement with the programme, in the Supervision Team’s judgement and with input from the independent School Research Committee representative (nominated by the School Research Committee Chair specifically to represent the School Research Committee with regard to authority for withdrawing a student for failing to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance), the School Research Committee may recommend to the Dean that the student should be withdrawn from the University for unsatisfactory academic performance. The student is notified of this School Research Committee decision.</p>
<p>c) Addressing difficulties within the context of other monitoring mechanisms which School Research Committees may require and publicise to students</p>	
A.2.12	<p>The PGR academic regulations require students to comply with other monitoring mechanisms which School Research Committees require and which have been publicised to students. (These additional mechanisms may include Mid Point Progression.)</p>
A.2.13	<p>Stage 1</p> <p>Where a student fails to satisfy the criteria for these other monitoring mechanisms at the first attempt, the student is informed in writing of the shortcomings and given a deadline by which s/he may make a second attempt.</p>

A.2.14	<p>Stage 2</p> <p>Where a student fails to satisfy the criteria at the second attempt, the recommendation is made to the School Research Committee that the student be withdrawn from the University for unsatisfactory academic performance. The Student is notified of the School Research Committee decision.</p>
A.3	PROCEDURES FOR WITHDRAWING A STUDENT FOR UNSATISFACTORY ACADEMIC PROGRESS
A.3.1	<p>When the procedures outlined above result in an School Research Committee recommendation that a Student should be withdrawn from the University for failure to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance, and before that decision can be auctioned by the Dean, an independent and senior member of the Academic School (normally the School Registrar) will confirm that all procedures have been followed satisfactorily and that the decision is procedurally sound. Should it then become clear that there is no evidence that the Student has received two warnings (Stage 1 and 2), then the situation would be remedied and the Student is given a further (second) opportunity to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance to the satisfaction of the School Research Committee.</p>
A.3.2	<p>Once the School Research Committee recommendation to withdraw the Student has been confirmed as procedurally sound, it is then the responsibility of the School Dean to decide whether or not they will action the recommendation of the School Research Committee.</p>
A.3.3	<p>Normally, the Dean actions the School Research Committee's recommendation and issues a letter to the student (normally within 10 working days) notifying the student that s/he is now withdrawn for unsatisfactory academic performance, and informing the student of his/her right of appeal to an Academic Board Appeals Panel.</p> <p>The Dean also submits a full written report of the case to the Vice-Chancellor, as Chair of Academic Board, and to the Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman (in order that they may inform the student of the remaining appeals procedures). A report of the withdrawal should also be made to the School Research Committee and to the Graduate School Committee.</p>
A.3.4	<p>An important responsibility rests on the individual Student to make evidence available, in accordance with the University's published <i>PGR Policy for Extenuating Circumstances</i> and at an early stage, of any factors which might adversely affect their performance, and which might give grounds for a subsequent appeal. It may weaken a student's case, in the event of an appeal, if relevant information concerning the health or other personal circumstances of the student is not made</p>

	known until the outcome has been decided.
A.4	PROCESS FOR A STUDENT TO APPEAL AGAINST THE DECISION TO WITHDRAW THEM FROM THE UNIVERSITY FOR FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE SATISFACTORY ACADEMIC PROGRESS
A.4.1	<p>Appeals against the decision to withdraw a student for unsatisfactory academic progress may be made on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) that programme management (i.e. Project Approval, Supervision or other mechanism approved and publicised by the School Research Committee) was not conducted in accordance with the University’s PGR Code of Practice or academic regulations; b) that there have been procedural or organisational irregularities in the application of the procedures requiring a student to withdraw for unsatisfactory academic performance; c) new, relevant information is provided about the student’s health or personal circumstances, which <u>could not</u> be notified beforehand, and which has a direct bearing on the student’s progress (see A.3.4); d) Other grounds acceptable to the Vice-Chancellor, excluding appeals based on the questioning of academic judgement.
A.4.2	Appeals are not permitted which are based on questioning the academic judgement of members of staff (i.e. including supervisors). ⁸
A.4.3	<p>Stage 1 Appeal Process</p> <p>If a student considers that s/he may have grounds for appeal against being withdrawn for unsatisfactory academic performance s/he should consult in the first instance with the School’s PGR Director in order to make every effort to see whether the problem can be resolved through less formal processes. The responsibility for initiating a Stage 1 appeal lies with the student (who owns the appeal’s process). The Stage 1 appeal process lies in the discretion of the School Dean. Only when the Stage 1 processes have been exhausted, and the Student remains convinced that he/she has firm grounds for appeal (as indicated at 3.1 above) should the appeal Stage 2 procedure proceed.</p>
A.4.4	<p>Stage 2 Appeal Process</p> <p>The Stage 2 appeal process is initiated by the student (who owns the appeal) completing and submitting an appeal pro-forma to the Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman The appeal pro-forma should set</p>

⁸ With regard to supervision, the University’s PGR Code of Practice specifies the level and nature of supervision which the School provides and which is the student’s entitlement. Standard processes (currently under review) enable students to raise issues about supervision during the programme; further advice can be sought from the University Secretary’s Office.

	<p>out as fully as possible the reason(s) why the student is appealing, the ground(s) on which the appeal is being brought; should contain any relevant supporting evidence and give permission for appropriate access to sensitive information under the Data Protection Act. The deadline for the receipt is normally 10 working days after the student is formally notified that s/he has been withdrawn Appeals received after the expiry of this period will be accepted only in exceptional circumstances.</p>
<p>A.4.5</p>	<p>As the continued attendance of the student at the University will be dependent on the outcome of the appeal, the student may, at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor, be allowed to remain on the programme until the outcome is known. During any such interim period of attendance the student is normally required to continue their research. This entails continuation of any relevant studentship payments for the interim period and/or clarification by the School on continued liability for fees. Normally, the student’s registration is not suspended during a formal appeal.</p> <p>Unless the student requests otherwise, it is expected that the student’s supervision team will remain unchanged and that the supervisors will continue to support the student throughout all stages of the University’s Appeals process and until the process has concluded.</p>
<p>A.4.6</p>	<p>On receipt of an appeal pro-forma from a student, the Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman investigates the appeal on behalf of the Vice Chancellor as follows, normally within 10 working days of the appeal being submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The School Registrar assembles and submits to the Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman the following documentation: (a) the student’s personal file, which includes documentation concerning Project Approval; the student’s Annual Progression; any other monitoring mechanisms approved by the School Research Committee; supervision and enrolment records; details of any research degree studentship held by the student; (b) the relevant School Research Committee minute(s); and (c) notes of all meetings connected with the requirement to withdraw the student for unsatisfactory academic performance. • The Chair of the School Research Committee (and any relevant sub-group or representative member), School Dean, Principal Supervisor of the student, School PGR Director, and any other relevant person is invited to submit detailed written comments, in response to the student’s appeal pro-forma. These comments constitute evidence to be considered in the appeal.
<p>A.4.7</p>	<p>The Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman then considers the documents submitted and, in the light of the evidence assembled, the Vice-Chancellor decides which of the following actions is appropriate in this case:</p> <p>a) If the Vice-Chancellor is unconvinced that informal procedures have</p>

	<p>been exhausted, s/he may refer the appeal back to the Dean of School;</p> <p>b) If the Vice-Chancellor considers that the student may have a case (which is not yet proven), s/he will cause an Academic Board <i>ad hoc</i> Appeals Panel to be established to consider the case in detail;</p> <p>c) If the Vice-Chancellor concludes that the student has <i>already</i> established their case, s/he will require the School Research Committee and Dean of School to reconsider the case, in the light of evidence put forward by the student, as soon as possible;</p> <p>d) If the Vice-Chancellor considers that no <i>prima facie</i> case has been established, s/he may direct the appeal to be considered no further. The student and all stakeholders will then be notified accordingly. The Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman will issue a 'Completion of Procedures Letter'</p> <p>The Vice-Chancellor may vary these options if s/he deems appropriate.</p>
A.4.8	<p>If the appeal is to be heard by an Academic Board <i>ad hoc</i> Appeals Panel, the date for the meeting will be mutually convenient to the student and the other parties involved. The Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman will notify the student of the date, time and place of the Panel meeting and invite the student to attend, accompanied by a friend if desired. An Appeals Panel will normally be convened within 10 working days of the Vice-Chancellor's decision to convene it; and will give at least 5 working days advance notice of the date.</p>
A.4.9	<p>Academic Board Appeals Panels will normally be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair: Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation); • Three members of Academic Board of recognised research standing (being neither members of the School Research Committee nor of the same School as the student); • One student member of Academic Board. A representative of a relevant profession may attend the panel as an adviser as determined by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation). <p>The University Secretary will appoint a Secretary to the Panel. Papers relating to the appeal will be received by Panel members at least 5 working days before the Appeals Panel.</p>
A.4.10	<p>The Appeals Panel is charged with the duty of hearing and judging the</p>

	<p>student’s appeal, according to the following method:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Chair of the Appeals Panel decides, after taking account of both the written evidence assembled and the student’s wishes, and also giving full regard to natural justice, whether evidence from each party can be heard in the other’s presence; b) The student, accompanied by a friend if desired, is invited to present evidence and to respond to questions from the Panel. If the student fails to attend the Enquiry, the Panel will decide whether to proceed in his/her absence or to inform the Vice-Chancellor and Academic Board that it cannot reach a judgement (in which case, the Vice-Chancellor, taking into account all of the evidence assembled, will decide whether or not the appeal is upheld); c) Having heard evidence from the student, the Panel invites the Dean of School, School Research Committee Chair, Principal Supervisor, School PGR Director and any other relevant person to submit evidence and respond to questions from the Appeals Panel; d) No other person has the right to attend, but the Panel can, at its discretion, receive evidence from, and invite attendance by, any other individual (e.g. other supervisors). Where possible, the Secretary to the Panel will consult with the Chair of the Enquiry about the witnesses to be invited to attend; e) An Appeals Panel is not analogous to a court of law and is not governed by court procedures. However, the principles of natural justice apply to all the Panel’s proceedings; f) The Panel considers both written and oral evidence in reaching an outcome.
A.4.11	<p>The Appeals Panel submits a written report of its findings (for approval) to the Academic Board, via the Vice-Chancellor. This is done as soon as possible, and normally not later than 10 working days after it has met. A copy of the report is also sent to the Director of Academic Services, as secretary of the University’s Academic Board.</p>
A.4.12	<p>All written reports produced by an Appeals Panel will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include a statement of whether, in its judgement, the appeal is upheld or not; • be sufficiently full to reflect the reasoning by which the conclusions and recommendations have been reached; • be sufficiently comprehensive to allow the School and Academic Board to use it as a basis for review of the case; • Be compiled with all due regard for confidentiality, ensuring anonymity of all participants. <p>Once the Report has been approved by Academic Board, or by the Vice-Chancellor on its behalf, then copies should be sent to the appellant, to all</p>

	witnesses, as well as to the School Registrar and the Dean of School.
A.4.13	Once the Report has been approved, if the Appeals Panel finds against the student, the University Secretary informs the student that the appeal has been unsuccessful and the Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman issues a “Completion of Procedures Letter”. If the Appeals Panel finds in the student’s favour, the case is referred back to the School, to require the School Research Committee in conjunction with the Dean to re-consider the case taking account of the outcome of the Appeals Panel. The final decision about whether or not the student has demonstrated timely engagement with the programme at the required level must, however, rest with the School Research Committee in conjunction with the Dean; its decision cannot be rescinded or replaced by a different decision other than by that group duly convened at a later occasion.
A.4.14	The Appeals Panel may recommend its Chair, or another member of the Panel acting on behalf of the Chair, to attend discussions in the School at which the disputed case is to be reconsidered, in order to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that the conclusions and views of the Appeals Panel are fully understood by the School; and • Act as an observer, to satisfy Academic Board that all relevant factors have been taken into account.
A.4.15	With regard to those cases that are referred back to the School, the School Research Committee, in consultation with the Dean, is required to review the case normally within 10 working days, taking careful account of the findings and conclusions of the Appeals Panel; and to provide a report to the Appeals Panel of the action then taken. Academic Board expects that the decision then arrived at by the School Research Committee will have taken full account of all relevant factors and will represent justice being done in respect of the appeal. The appeals procedure will therefore, at this stage, be terminated and the University Secretary will inform the student of the outcome and issues a Completion of Procedures Letter.
A.5	INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATION
A.5.1	Under the Higher Education Act 2004 provision is made for reference of student complaints to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education when the University’s internal student complaints processes have been exhausted, but the student remains dis-satisfied with the outcome.
A.5.2	On completion of the University’s internal Appeals Procedure a student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures Letter by the University Secretary’s Office and provided with details of the services available to the

	<p>student from the OIA. The Completion of Procedures Letter will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• provide a description of the complaint• confirm that the University’s internal complaints procedure has been completed• state the outcome of the internal complaints process• confirm that the student has the right to take the complaint to the OIA• indicate how a student can contact the OIA• stipulate that the OIA will only consider complaints from students within a period of 3 months from the date of the Completion of Procedures’ Letter
A.5.3	<p>Further advice and/or assistance concerning the OIA, or in contacting or submitting a complaint to the OIA, should be obtained from the University Secretary’s Office or the Students’ Union Advice and Representation Centre.</p>

Northumbria University

Research Student Stage 2 Appeals Pro Forma

This form is to be completed in support of appeals made by students in accordance with the University's Research Student Appeals Procedures in sections A and B of the *Research Degree Student Regulations*. Please read the relevant regulation before completing this form.

1. <u>Personal Details</u>	
Name: _____	Student Number: ¹ _____
School: _____	
Research Programme (MPhil, PhD or Professional Doctorate): _____	
Contact Address: _____ _____	
Contact Telephone Number _____	
Contact e-mail Address: _____	
2. <u>Research Event / Monitoring Mechanism</u>	
Please indicate the research event or monitoring mechanism that the decision was based upon, against which an appeal is being made.	
a) Annual Progression	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Viva Voce Examination	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Withdrawal for unsatisfactory academic performance on the basis of	<input type="checkbox"/>
o Project Approval	<input type="checkbox"/>
o Routine supervision	<input type="checkbox"/>
o Other monitoring mechanism	<input type="checkbox"/>
Date of the decision against which an appeal is being made: _____	
3. <u>Grounds for Stage 2 Appeal</u>	
A Stage 2 appeal should normally be lodged within 10 working days of the completion of the Stage 1 appeal process, or of the decision against which the appeal is being made. Please note that you may only appeal on the basis of one of the grounds indicated below. You may not base an appeal on the questioning of academic judgement. Please indicate on which grounds you are appealing by ticking the appropriate box or boxes:	
d) The research event was not conducted in accordance with the University's PGR Code of Practice or Academic Regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Procedural or organisational irregularities in the application of the procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) New, relevant information about health/other personal circumstances which it was not possible to have made available, or not properly taken account of, by the University ²	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Other grounds acceptable to the Vice-Chancellor	<input type="checkbox"/>

1 Available from the School Research Administrator

2 You must have a valid reason as to why it was not possible to inform the University beforehand. If no valid reasons are provided, you will not be able to appeal

4. Academic Appeal Details

Please give details of the Stage 1 appeal process which you have followed:

- Date of discussion(s) _____
- Who did you discuss this with? _____
- Brief summary of the discussion _____

5. Documentation Attached

You must provide supporting documentation in which you explain the grounds for your appeal in detail and provide supporting evidence. Please list the documents supplied in the space below and attach them to this Pro Forma:

6. Data Protection

I hereby consent for any sensitive/confidential personal data, such as counselling records, held by the University to be made available to the Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman for use as evidence or supporting documentation as appropriate. I understand that as part of the investigation into my appeal, the Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman may be required to share this information with other University staff on a need-to-know basis.

I declare that to the best of my knowledge all of the information I have supplied is true, accurate and complete.

I give my consent for information in this Pro Forma and attached documents, and personal data held elsewhere within the University, to be shared with relevant members of University staff on a need-to-know basis for the purpose of investigating my appeal.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Please make a copy of the completed form for your records, and submit the original and attached documents to: The Student Appeals and Complaints Ombudsman, Room B225, Ellison Building, Northumbria University, NE1 8ST

This form is also available online at the University Secretary's Office website at <http://www.northumbria.ac.uk/sd/central/uso/>.