

PGR Academic Appeals Procedure

Author (and Department): Academic Services academic.appeals@chester.ac.uk

Date of Approval: 28 November 2024

Date of Review: 30 September 2026

Approving Body: Senate

Version 2.1

Contents

1. Introduction to the PGR Academic Appeals Procedure	1
2. Rights and Responsibilities.....	2
3. Grounds for Appeal.....	4
4. Exclusions from Appeal	5
5. Submission of an Academic Appeal	5
6. Preliminary Stage	7
7. Review of the Preliminary Stage	8
8. Investigatory Stage.....	9
9. Hearings of the Academic Appeals Board.....	10
10. Outcomes of the Academic Appeals Board.....	11
11. Powers of the Academic Appeals Board	12
12. Review of the decision of the Academic Appeals Board.....	13
13. Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education	14
14. Enhancement Opportunities.....	14

Policies and Procedures referred to in this document can be located in the [Policy Library](#).

The Postgraduate Research (PGR) Academic Appeals Procedure is intended to allow students of the University of Chester to raise concerns about their academic progress, where there is evidence to suggest that it is reasonable to do so. The procedure is designed to ensure that these concerns are fully considered and that, where appropriate, action is taken to deal with them.

The University strives to ensure that the academic experience of each of its students is positive and productive. However, where students do have concerns, it is important that these are directed appropriately. The PGR Academic Appeals Procedure is designed to ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to achieve outcomes that are appropriate to their ability. However, the University recognises that there may be times when a student is dissatisfied with their experience which has not had a direct impact on their academic achievement; the University operates a comprehensive complaints policy to deal with this.

1. Introduction to the PGR Academic Appeals Procedure

1.1. This procedure relates to students registered on the programmes listed in the [Postgraduate Research Degrees Policy](#).

1.2. Students registered for modules designated as ‘taught’ as part of their programme of study (e.g. those registered for programmes leading to the award of a professional doctoral degree) who wish to appeal an outcome relating to such a module are not covered by this procedure.

Instead, they must follow the procedure outlined in the Academic Appeals Policy. This also applies to students registered on the Master by Research.

- 1.3. In the event of a dispute about the designation of a module or whether the student is at either the taught or research stage of a programme, and therefore which procedure shall apply, the Academic Registrar shall make a determination. That decision shall be final.
- 1.4. It is in the student's interest to raise concerns with either their Principal Supervisor, or their Senior Faculty Postgraduate Tutor prior to submitting an appeal. This is especially true in cases where the student believes that there is clear evidence of an administrative error which could be corrected without the need to submit a formal appeal.
- 1.5. This procedure is designed to enable students to raise concerns relating to:
 - 1.5.1. Decisions of the Independent Progress Assessment Panel;
 - 1.5.2. Decisions of the University PGR Progress Panel;
 - 1.5.3. Decisions of the Postgraduate Research Degrees Awards and Progression Board; and
 - 1.5.4. Decisions of the PGR Academic Integrity Review Panel;
- 1.6. When a student or former student of the University submits an appeal, they are referred to as 'the appellant'.
- 1.7. The PGR academic appeals procedure is primarily evidence based. It is the appellant's responsibility alone to provide sufficient independent documentary evidence to substantiate the contents of their appeal. An appeal is highly unlikely to succeed if no suitable evidence is provided. The University will publish separate guidance on the type of evidence that appellants may wish to consider submitting.
- 1.8. Throughout these procedures, where reference is made to specific post-holders, the line manager of that post-holder may nominate another person to act instead.
- 1.9. Throughout these procedures, indicative timescales are given in calendar days. However, where a deadline (either for the appellant or for the University) falls on a Saturday, Sunday, English Bank Holiday or any other day that the University is closed, the deadline is extended to 2pm the next weekday (i.e. Monday – Friday).

2. Rights and Responsibilities

- 2.1. Any decision that is the subject of an academic appeal remains in force while the appeal is being considered and the appellant must abide by that decision until the PGR academic appeals procedure has been completed. Where an award has been conferred upon an appellant, they must not attend any award ceremony until the PGR academic appeal is completed. Attendance at a ceremony will invalidate the appeal and all decisions will stand.

- 2.2. The University undertakes that any student who submits an appeal under this procedure will not be academically disadvantaged for having done so. Any student who believes that they have been disadvantaged by submitting an academic appeal at any point should contact the Deputy Head of Academic Services immediately.
- 2.3. The University accepts that any student who submits a PGR academic appeal under this procedure will do so in good faith and that any statements made in writing or verbally are truthful. However, it reserves the right to investigate the authenticity of any documents submitted in support of an academic appeal. Any student found to have deliberately attempted to deceive, manipulate or in any way interfere with the operation of this procedure will be subject to disciplinary action.
- 2.4. All members of staff who have been involved in the investigation, management or administration of an academic appeal will observe the requirements for confidentiality. The appellant has the right to restrict the extent to which any part of their appeal submission is disclosed outside of Academic Services and to the Academic Appeals Board. However, appellants exercising this right must be aware that doing so may impair the full investigation of the case.
- 2.5. As long as the appellant has not had their studies at the University terminated or has otherwise completed their programme of study, they will retain the same rights of access to the resources and support of the University as any other student. Following submission of an appeal, communication which directly relates to the substance of that appeal must be channelled through the Student Casework Team in Academic Services.
- 2.6. The University will use its best endeavours to ensure that academic appeals are dealt with in a timely way. If the appellant meets all of the deadlines outlined in these procedures, a decision by the Academic Appeals Board should normally be made within 90 days of the date of submission. Where any delay is caused by the University, the appellant will be kept informed and reasons provided.
- 2.7. To facilitate the swift handling of appeals, communication will be to the appellant's University of Chester email address and will be copied to one other alternate email address specified by the appellant. It is the appellant's responsibility to check their email regularly during the appeals process. The University will regard any email sent to an appellant by 4pm (Monday-Friday) as having been received on the same day.
- 2.8. If at any point in the conduct of an appeal under these procedures it appears that other students who may or may not have appealed have been affected by an identified irregularity, this will be reported to the Deputy Head of Academic Services and the Deputy Academic Registrar who shall be empowered to instruct that appeals are considered on behalf of all students believed to have been affected.
- 2.9. Appellants may be referred to an alternative procedure (e.g. complaints, professional suitability, disciplinary etc.) where their appeal submission, supporting evidence or outcome of any investigation into the appeal, suggests that it would be prudent to do so. Such a decision may be made by the Deputy Head of Academic Services at any point during the preliminary or investigatory stages or by the Academic Appeals Board if the case is sent to it for consideration.

- 2.10. The University will not be liable for any expenses an appellant might incur arising out of an academic appeal, irrespective of whether the appeal is successful or not.
- 2.11. The appellant is permitted to withdraw their appeal at any point until 5pm on the day prior to its hearing by the Academic Appeals Board. After this time, an appeal may not be withdrawn. In the event of the appeal being upheld, the appellant must abide by the decision of the Examiners which shall be determined by the Assessment Review Board.

3. Grounds for Appeal

3.1. A student may appeal against a decision of the **Independent Progress Assessment Panel** to decline to upgrade their registration to PhD or to downgrade their registration from PhD to MPhil or of the **University PGR Progress Panel** to terminate studies (only once that decision has been reported to the Postgraduate Research Degrees Awards & Progression Board):

- 3.1.1. That there were procedural or administrative irregularities in the conduct of the Annual Progress Monitoring process generally or the Independent Progress Assessment Panel or University PGR Progress Panel specifically;
- 3.1.2. That there is evidence of bias or unlawful discrimination on the part of one or more of the members of the Independent Progress Assessment Panel or University PGR Progress Panel;
- 3.1.3. That there is some **new** evidence of satisfactory progress which, for compelling reasons, could not have been made available to the Independent Progress Review Panel at an earlier stage.
- 3.1.4. That there were factors which materially affected the appellant's performance, provided that these circumstances were not known to the Independent Progress Review Panel **and** there are compelling reasons why the appellant failed to notify the Independent Progress Review Panel or University PGR Progress Panel in advance.

3.2. A student may appeal against a decision of the **Postgraduate Research Degrees Awards & Progression Board** on the following grounds only:

- 3.2.1. That there is evidence of procedural or administrative irregularity in the conduct of the examination process;
- 3.2.2. That there is evidence of bias or unlawful discrimination on the part of one or more of the Examiners;
- 3.2.3. That there were factors which materially affected the appellant's performance, provided that these circumstances were not known to the Examiners and there are compelling reasons why the appellant failed to notify the Examiners in advance.

3.3. A student may appeal against a decision of the **PGR Academic Integrity Review Panel** on the following grounds only:

- 3.3.1. That there is evidence of procedural or administrative irregularity in the conduct of the published PGR academic and research integrity procedures;
- 3.3.2. That the appellant, for compelling reasons that can be substantiated, was unable to mount a defence of the allegation of a breach of academic or research integrity.

4. Exclusions from Appeal

- 4.1. Students may not appeal on the basis of unsatisfactory or poor-quality supervision unless there is clear and compelling independent evidence which suggests that the negligence of one or more members of the supervisory team may have had a material impact on the student's performance. In the normal course of events, the University expects that students will raise concerns about supervision at the point that these arise using one of the confidential mechanisms for doing so.
- 4.2. Students may not appeal a decision of the Independent Progress Assessment Panel to require a further review within a specified period of time. Such a decision is regarded solely as an academic judgement.
- 4.3. Students may not appeal on the basis of circumstances which they might reasonably have foreseen and taken steps to avoid. For example, the University will not normally consider an appeal where the student encountered IT problems.

5. Submission of an Academic Appeal

- 5.1. A student may only submit an appeal after formal notification of the decision they are appealing against.
- 5.2. In all cases, appeal submissions must be made using the appropriate Microsoft Form (AA-03) and be received no later than 10 days after the date of publication of results or notification of outcome. This form can be accessed on the Academic Appeals page via the University's corporate site or the Academic Services Portal page. It is the appellant's responsibility to seek advice from Academic Services if they are unsure on how to access the relevant form. The form can be completed by the student signing into Microsoft 365 with their university log-in details. Where the appellant is unable to access the online form, refer to [5.4.]
- 5.3. Where an appellant chooses to submit an appeal by email, it must meet the following requirements:
 - 5.3.1. Documentary evidence provided in support of an appeal (e.g. medical certificates, letters, records, etc.), must be attached to the form as full-colour scans and preferably

as PDF files. Where a student is unable to attach the evidence to the form it must be emailed to academicappeals@chester.ac.uk and reported on the form. The submission of this evidence must be received no later than 10 days after the publication of results or notification of outcome.

- 5.3.2. It is the appellant's responsibility to be able to produce the original documents submitted in support of an academic appeal if requested to do so by the University. Failure to produce such original documents will invalidate the appeal.
- 5.4. If the appellant is unable to submit an appeal by submission of the Microsoft Form they should contact Academic Services for guidance and to discuss provision or alternative arrangements. Alternative arrangements may include an open access online form or a PDF form.
- 5.5. Irrespective of the method chosen to submit, it is the appellant's responsibility to ensure safe receipt of an appeal submission.
 - 5.5.1. If emailed or submitted via Microsoft Forms, the appellant should expect to receive an acknowledgement from Academic Services within 7 days.
 - 5.5.2. If alternative provision has been made for submission of an appeal, such as a postal submission, the appellant is strongly advised to use a suitable tracking service. The appellant should expect to receive an acknowledgement from Academic Services within a reasonable amount of time depending upon where the documents were posted from and, in every case, should make contact if no acknowledgement is received within 14 days of submission.
 - 5.5.3. If the appeal is submitted in person at the University and the appellant has not received an acknowledgement within 14 days they should email academicappeals@chester.ac.uk to confirm the status of their appeal.
- 5.6. Where it is not possible to provide all of the supporting documentation with the appeal submission, the appellant must clearly indicate this and undertake to provide it separately, normally within no more than 10 days.
- 5.7. The Assistant Manager (Student Casework) will receive appeal submissions.
- 5.8. Where an appeal is submitted late it will be considered only if the Assistant Manager (Student Casework) determines that not doing so would be unreasonable in the circumstances. An appellant who submits a late appeal must clearly explain why it was not possible to adhere to the relevant deadline.
- 5.9. The appellant may give consent for their appeal to be discussed with a nominated third party by indicating this on the Academic Appeal Form.
- 5.10. Where the appellant supplies supporting evidence that is not in English, it is their responsibility to arrange for translation by a qualified, certified translator with copies appropriately marked.

6. Preliminary Stage

- 6.1. The preliminary stage will be conducted by the Deputy Head of Academic Services.
- 6.2. The Deputy Head of Academic Services will review the submission and may make some limited investigations, only to the extent of verifying information contained in the appeal.
- 6.3. Following review of the submission, the Deputy Head of Academic Services will determine that either:
 - 6.3.1. There are sufficient reasons to accept the submission for further investigation; or
 - 6.3.2. The appeal should be rejected.
- 6.4. A decision to reject the appeal at this stage may be based on any of the following:
 - 6.4.1. The appeal has been submitted outside of the stipulated deadline, the appellant has not given a sufficient explanation for the delay and nothing in the submission gives cause to suspect that it would be unreasonable to declare it ineligible;
 - 6.4.2. The appeal is based wholly on disagreement with academic judgement;
 - 6.4.3. The appeal is not accompanied by appropriate or relevant independent documentary evidence, the appellant has not indicated that this is to follow and/or the appellant has failed to provide documentary evidence requested by the Deputy Head of Academic Services by the stipulated deadline;
 - 6.4.4. The appeal is based wholly on factors which were outside of the University's control and which the appellant might reasonably have been expected to foresee and/or take reasonable steps to avoid.
- 6.5. If the appellant has indicated that further documentary evidence is to follow, it will normally be expected within 10 days of the appeal submission deadline. Where the appellant cannot meet this deadline, it is their responsibility to notify the Assistant Manager (Student Casework) and suggest a reasonable deadline.
- 6.6. The appellant alone is responsible for the content of their appeal submission and any accompanying documentary evidence. However, where it is reasonable to do so based on the full submission received, the Deputy Head of Academic Services may delay the decision and invite the appellant to provide further documentary evidence. Where this happens the appellant will normally be invited to supply evidence within 10 days, as set out in 6.5.
- 6.7. The decision of the Deputy Head of Academic Services will be communicated to the appellant normally within 7 days of the deadline for the appeal submission. If the appeal had been

submitted late, or if the appellant was asked to provide further evidence, the decision will be communicated within 14 days of the date of the submission or receipt of evidence.

6.8. If the decision is to reject the appeal at this stage, the Deputy Head of Academic Services (or nominee) will:

- 6.8.1. Write to the appellant giving reasons for the decision to reject the appeal;
- 6.8.2. Explain any additional information that was requested of the department/service which was the subject of the appeal at the preliminary stage;
- 6.8.3. Explain whether there might be a different procedure that the appellant can use to pursue the case (for example, the Complaints Procedure);
- 6.8.4. Explain the review procedure and the grounds upon which an appellant whose appeal has been rejected at the preliminary stage can request a review of that decision;
- 6.8.5. Explain the procedure for requesting a Completion of Procedures Statement if the appellant does not believe that they have grounds to request a review; and
- 6.8.6. Offer the opportunity of a telephone conversation or, in some circumstances, a meeting with the appellant within 28 days. Any such conversation or meeting will be to clarify the reasons why the appeal was rejected and is not an opportunity to have the decision reviewed or overturned.

6.9. If the decision is to accept the appeal for further investigation, the Deputy Head of Academic Services (or nominee) will:

- 6.9.1. Write to the appellant to explain that the appeal is to be investigated further and, wherever possible, give an estimated date when the case might be heard by the Academic Appeals Board;
- 6.9.2. Explain the possible outcomes if the Academic Appeals Board was to uphold the appeal, where it seems that the appellant's expectations go beyond what the Academic Appeals Board might reasonably be expected to do.

7. Review of the Preliminary Stage

7.1. Following the rejection of an appeal at the preliminary stage, the appellant may request a review of that decision by a Faculty Dean, who shall be entirely independent of the appellant.

7.2. A request for a review of the decision at the preliminary stage may only be made on the following grounds:

- 7.2.1. That the preliminary stage was not conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in section 6; and/or

- 7.2.2. That new evidence has come to light which could not have been disclosed in time to be considered at the preliminary stage.
- 7.3. An appellant wishing to request a review of the decision at the preliminary stage must do so in writing to the Assistant Manager (Student Casework) within **10 days** of receiving the letter outlining the reasons why the appeal was rejected.
- 7.4. The Faculty Dean will consider the request and determine either:
 - 7.4.1. The decision to reject the appeal at the preliminary stage should stand and that a Completion of Procedures Statement should be issued; or
 - 7.4.2. The decision to reject the appeal at the preliminary stage should be overturned and that the case should be accepted for further investigation.
- 7.5. The decision of the Faculty Dean will be communicated to the appellant, normally within **21 days** of the date that the request was received.

8. Investigatory Stage

- 8.1. The investigation will normally be carried out by the Assistant Manager (Student Casework).
- 8.2. Where necessary, the Investigating Officer will contact the appellant to clarify any aspect of the appeal submission at any point during the investigatory stage.
- 8.3. The nature of the investigation will depend on the contents of the appeal submission. However, the following may be regarded as indicative of what might be requested (this list is not exhaustive):
 - 8.3.1. Copies of letters outlining the decision of the Independent Progress Assessment Panel or the Postgraduate Research Degrees Awards & Progression Board;
 - 8.3.2. Copies of reports compiled by the Independent Progress Assessment Panel or the Examiners;
 - 8.3.3. Statements from the Chair of the Independent Progress Assessment Panel or Examination Panel;
 - 8.3.4. Evidence of correspondence between the appellant and their supervisors;
 - 8.3.5. Evidence of supervisory meetings;
 - 8.3.6. Copies of reports produced during the annual progress monitoring cycle;
 - 8.3.7. Reports from the PGR Academic Integrity Review Panel.

- 8.4. Where appropriate, and subject to the provisions of 2.4, the appeal submission may be forwarded to the relevant Head of Division or School for a general response. However, where the appellant has indicated that some part of their appeal or supporting evidence should not be disclosed, they may opt to provide a summary instead. The Assistant Manager (Student Casework) may consult with the appellant to determine what may be disclosed.
- 8.5. Divisions, Schools, or individuals asked to provide evidence or otherwise respond to the appeal submission will be asked to do so within a reasonable amount of time which shall not normally exceed **30 days**. Where additional time is requested, reasons for this will be communicated to the appellant.
- 8.6. If a Division or School or individual asked to provide evidence or otherwise respond to the appeal submission fails to do so within a reasonable amount of time, the Academic Appeals Board will be notified. The Academic Appeals Board may draw whatever conclusions it wishes from a failure to respond or it may compel members of the University to respond under powers delegated to it by Senate.
- 8.7. At the conclusion of the investigation, the Assistant Manager (Student Casework) will compile a full case file, including the appeal submission and evidence gathered during the investigation and forward it to the appellant. The appellant will also be advised of the date that the Academic Appeals Board will hear the case.

9. Hearings of the Academic Appeals Board

- 9.1. The Academic Appeals Board operates with the full delegated authority of Senate. This means that it has the power to require staff and students of the University to make written submissions, give evidence and answer any questions.
- 9.2. The Academic Appeals Board will meet as frequently as necessary to deal with cases referred to it in a timely way.
- 9.3. The members of the Academic Appeals Board will be appointed by Senate for a two-year term. Retiring members may be re-nominated.
- 9.4. Each Academic Appeals Board will be composed as follows:
- 9.4.1. A Chair, who will normally be a Dean or an Associate Dean;
 - 9.4.2. Normally two members of academic staff, at least one of whom shall appear on the Accredited PGR Supervisor List.
- 9.5. The Board shall be deemed quorate when 75% of the membership (including the Chair) is present.

- 9.6. Wherever possible, no member of the Academic Appeals Board should work in the same department as the appellant's Principal Supervisor. Members of the Board will be asked to declare any perceived interest which could give rise to conflict at the beginning of the meeting and this will be recorded. If deemed appropriate by the Chair, the member will absent themselves from any relevant areas of discussion.
- 9.7. The Assistant Manager (Student Casework) or nominee will attend the Academic Appeals Board to give regulatory advice and take a record of the meeting but will not be a member of the Board.
- 9.8. Other than through the presentation of their case via the means explained in this procedure, appellants must not seek to influence the Chair or members of the Academic Appeals Board or in any other way seek to sway the operation of the Academic Appeals Procedure. Any attempt to do so may invalidate the appeal and constitute a disciplinary matter.
- 9.9. Neither the University nor the appellant may be legally represented at meetings of the Academic Appeals Board. However, the Academic Appeals Board may take advice from a member (or members) of staff of the University with appropriate clinical expertise or from others with such expertise relating solely to the interpretation of medical or other evidence supplied in support of an academic appeal. Any such advice is to be requested and received in writing and made available to the appellant.
- 9.10. The Academic Appeals Board will consider each case individually and on its own merits.
- 9.11. The Academic Appeals Board will not be bound by legal rules of evidence nor by previous decisions and in all cases will have due regard to whether a decision that is the subject of an appeal was reasonable in all the circumstances.
- 9.12. The appellant is permitted to attend the hearing and may be accompanied by a student of the University or by an Officer of the Chester Students' Union only.
- 9.13. The appellant will be permitted a reasonable amount of time, not normally exceeding 30 minutes, in which to present their case to the Academic Appeals Board.
- 9.14. The members of the Academic Appeals Board may ask whatever questions of the appellant as they deem relevant to determine the facts of the case.
- 9.15. At the end of questioning by members of the Academic Appeals Board, the appellant will be permitted a reasonable amount of time, not normally exceeding 10 minutes, in which to sum up their case and will then withdraw.
- 9.16. Where possible, the Academic Appeals Board may give an indication of their findings to the appellant in person following its deliberations.

10. Outcomes of the Academic Appeals Board

- 10.1. For each case, the Academic Appeals Board will decide either:
- 10.1.1. The appeal should be upheld in part or in full or;
 - 10.1.2. The appeal should be dismissed and the original decision should stand.
- 10.2. Where the Academic Appeals Board decides in accordance with 10.1.1. it will determine a remedy using the procedure at section 11. The appellant will receive a letter from the Assistant Manager (Student Casework) within **14 days** of the decision containing the following:
- 10.2.1. Where necessary, the reasons for the decision in relation to each part of the appeal submission; and
 - 10.2.2. Details of the remedy decided upon by the Academic Appeals Board.
- 10.3. Where the Academic Appeals Board decides in accordance with 10.1.2. it will give full reasons for the decision. The appellant will receive a letter from the Assistant Manager (Student Casework) within **14 days** of the decision containing the following:
- 10.3.1. The reasons for the decision in relation to each part of the appeal submission;
 - 10.3.2. Advice on whether there might be a different procedure that the appellant can use to pursue the case (for example, the Complaints Procedure);
 - 10.3.3. An explanation of the review procedure and the grounds upon which an appellant whose appeal has been dismissed can request a review of that decision;
 - 10.3.4. An explanation of the procedure for requesting a Completion of Procedures Statement if the appellant does not believe that they have grounds to request a review; and
 - 10.3.5. An offer of a telephone conversation or, in some circumstances, a meeting with the appellant within **28 days**. Any such conversation or meeting will be to clarify the reasons why the appeal was rejected and is not an opportunity to have the decision reviewed or overturned.

11. Powers of the Academic Appeals Board

- 11.1. The Academic Appeals Board operates with the full delegated authority of Senate. Therefore, when it decides to uphold an appeal, it can impose whatever remedy it deems is reasonable to resolve the matter, except it can never interfere with the academic judgement of the Independent Progress Assessment Panel, the Postgraduate Research Degrees Awards & Progression Board (representing the judgement of the Examiners) or the PGR Academic Integrity Review Panel.
- 11.2. Where the Academic Appeals Board decides to uphold an appeal against a decision of the Independent Progress Review Panel, University PGR Progress Panel or the Postgraduate Research

Degrees Awards & Progression Board, it will determine an appropriate remedy to be overseen by the relevant Senior Faculty PGR Tutor and the Deputy Academic Registrar (or nominees).

- 11.3. Where the Academic Appeals Board decides to uphold an appeal against a decision of the PGR Academic Integrity Review Panel, it will determine whether the original Panel should be reconvened to review its decision or whether a new Panel should hear the case afresh.

12. Review of the decision of the Academic Appeals Board

- 12.1. Following notification of the decision of the Academic Appeals Board, where the decision was to dismiss the appeal, the appellant may request a review of that decision. In the event that the appeal was upheld in part, a review may be requested only of those parts which were not upheld.
- 12.2. In order to request a review of the academic appeal, the appellant must be able to demonstrate one or both of the following:
- 12.2.1. There is evidence of some procedural or administrative irregularity in the operation of the PGR Academic Appeals Procedure;
 - 12.2.2. New evidence has come to light which could not have been disclosed in time to be considered by the Academic Appeals Board.
- 12.3. An appellant wishing to request a review of an academic appeal must do so in writing to the Deputy Head of Academic Services within 10 days of receiving the full outcome of the Academic Appeals Board.
- 12.4. If, on receipt of the request for review, the Deputy Head of Academic Services identifies any potential conflict of interest, a Dean of an Academic Faculty will be asked to undertake the review.
- 12.5. On receipt of the request for a review of an academic appeal, the Deputy Head of Academic Services will review only the conduct of the PGR Academic Appeals Procedure and/or the evidence submitted. The review is not an opportunity for the case to be re-heard and consequently the circumstances which lead to the decision that was subject to appeal will not normally be considered.
- 12.6. The Deputy Head of Academic Services will consider the request and determine either:
- 12.6.1. The decision of the Academic Appeals Board to dismiss the appeal should stand and that a Completion of Procedures Statement should be issued; or
 - 12.6.2. The case shall be reconsidered by the Academic Appeals Board.
- 12.7. The decision of the Deputy Head of Academic Services will be communicated to the appellant, normally within 21 days of the date that the request was received.

- 12.8. Where the Deputy Head of Academic Services decides in accordance with 12.6.2., the case will normally be heard by a new Academic Appeals Board.

13. Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education

- 13.1. If an appellant remains dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal, they may ask the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) to review their case. In order to do this, the appellant must normally have been issued with a Completion of Procedures Statement.
- 13.2. The University will automatically issue a Completion of Procedures Statement when an appellant has exhausted all of the University's internal procedures; this will normally only follow a review of the decision at the preliminary stage or of the Academic Appeals Board.
- 13.3. An appellant is entitled to request a Completion of Procedures Statement at an earlier point provided that they confirm their understanding that they do not have grounds to request a review according to these procedures.
- 13.4. Further and specific details about the OIA can be obtained from its website:
www.oiahe.org.uk.

14. Enhancement Opportunities

- 14.1. The University will use information gathered throughout the conduct of appeals to determine areas of its practice that might be enhanced.
- 14.2. Where the need arises, the Academic Appeals Board will write to the Deputy Head of Academic Services and, where appropriate, other office holders to draw attention to any specific matters that may require attention or to general issues of policy that the University may wish to reflect on.
- 14.3. Academic Services (the Student Casework Team) will record details of each appeal received, its nature and the outcome. Statistical data will be compiled on an annual basis in order to provide reports to Senate. Such reports will not include any personally identifiable information.