

# Progress and Appeals Procedures for Research Degree Students

- A. [Progress Procedures for Research Students](#)
- B. [Appeals Procedure against a Progress Decision – Postgraduate Research Students \(excluding Professional Doctorates\)](#)
- C. [Appeals Procedure against a Progress Decision – Professional Doctorate Students](#)
- D. [Appeals against a Progress Appeal Outcome \(all Postgraduate Research Students\)](#)
- E. [Appeals Procedure against an Examination Decision – Postgraduate Research Students \(including Professional Doctorates\)](#)
- F. [Appeals against an Examination Appeal Outcome – Postgraduate Research Students \(including Professional Doctorates\)](#)

## A. Progress Procedures for Research Students

These procedures focus exclusively on Academic Progress and Appeals, staff involved in consideration of progress matters or appeals should not consider immigration status. However, all outcomes in relation to a student's continued registration at the University are subject to their having met the terms of their immigration status where applicable. The immigration status is a secondary decision but may mean that a student cannot legally accept the decision that has been confirmed as part of the Progress and Appeals Procedures.

Where immigration status is questioned by evidence being considered through a supervisory panel or Research Students' Progress Board (RSPB), then the Secretary and/or chair of the supervisory panel or RSPB should seek advice from the International Services Team who will confirm either: that there is no issue to consider; or to refer the matter to the Academic Registrar who shall review the case and advise the Registrar in accordance with [7.22.-7.28](#) in the [General Regulations, Academic Conduct](#).

Where a supervisor has concerns over the engagement of a research student at any time, they should refer the matter to the Academic Registrar; Heads of Department are responsible for ensuring effective measures are in place within their department in order to achieve this.

### A1.

#### MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS

- a. Supervisory meetings, ongoing interaction with one's supervisor, and submission of work to the Supervisory Panel and/or Research Students' Progress Board are the primary means by which research student progress is monitored in and by departments.
- b. Heads of Department (or their nominee) are responsible for ensuring that an effective means of monitoring students' progress and attendance is established and maintained in each department in accordance with the requirements set out below.
- c. Heads of Department (or their nominee) are responsible for any additional progress monitoring procedures the Department may decide to operate.
- d. Departmental procedures, including norms for formal face-to-face meetings between students and their supervisor(s), should be communicated to all students in the Department.
- e. Students and supervisors are required to communicate, whether face-to-face or by electronic means, to engage in discussion/review of the student's work and progress at least once per month. For part-time students contact should be at least bi-monthly. A record of this monthly contact should be kept in the department in an accessible and immediately available format and then made available upon request.
- f. Supervisors are responsible for making contact with their student if the student fails to meet/communicate with them as expected each month. If the student fails to meet/communicate with the supervisor in that month they should be contacted to arrange another meeting at the earliest possible point in that same month or within two weeks. If this is not possible or they do not attend, then the supervisor should refer the student to the Graduate Director who will arrange a meeting with the student to discuss their progress. If the student continues to fail to meet/communicate with the supervisor, their progress remains unsatisfactory, or they fail to

attend the meeting with the Graduate Director, the matter should be considered by the Research Students' Progress Board.

- g. The Research Students' Progress Board will arrange an ad hoc meeting with the student to assess their progress and determine whether they should be permitted to continue with their studies.
- h. If a student is co-supervised by staff in two different departments, the lead supervisor should liaise with the second supervisor to ensure that there is full co-ordination on the monitoring of progress.

## **A2.**

### **STUDENTS SUBJECT TO IMMIGRATION CONTROL**

- (a) A student subject to immigration control, including Tier 4 is required to engage with their programme (be present, in person, on a regular basis commensurate with full-time education). Where a student fails to do this their visa sponsorship will be withdrawn.
- (b) Information related to PGR progress for students subject to immigration control must be kept in a robust way and be immediately accessible upon request as it is all subject to audit by the Home Office; the information (or a subset as appropriate) should also be passed to the International Services Team upon request.
- (c) Any students subject to immigration control can, in respect of the required monthly meeting under A1(e) above, have a virtual meeting although this should be very rare; the overwhelming majority in any six month period should be in-person.
- (d) Any student referred to the Graduate Director or where there is concern related to their visa status and or our obligations as a sponsor or similar will be referred to the International Services Team by the supervisor or Graduate Director.
- (e) Departments may decide to nominate a member of administrative staff to co-ordinate the responses in relation to immigration requirements.
- (f) Departments may decide to require students to sign in to their department on a regular basis (ie at least 15 days apart and no more than 31 days) in addition to ensuring regular monthly meetings in line with institutional requirements of PGR progression.

### **B. Appeals Procedure against a Progress Decision – Postgraduate Research Students (excluding Professional Doctorates)**

- 1. A research student who wishes to appeal against the recommendation of a Research Students' Progress Board that they be downgraded or discontinued, which has been confirmed by the Executive Dean or their deputy, must do so in writing on the [Form of Appeal \(Progress Decision\)](#) (.pdf), stating fully and precisely the grounds for appeal, within ten working days of receiving confirmation of the decision from the Postgraduate Research Education team. Forms of Appeal are available online. If the student can show that circumstances beyond their control prevented this time limit being adhered to and that injustice would result from adhering to it, the Academic Registrar or their nominee may extend the time limit in which an appeal may be lodged, normally up to the period of 30 working days from the date on which the notification of the decision was sent.
- 2. An MPhil/PhD registered student whose PhD status has not been confirmed and who wishes to appeal against the recommendation of a Research Students' Progress Board that their registration be changed to MPhil or Masters by Dissertation, may appeal using this procedure only after the Research Students' Progress Board has considered their case twice and has recommended a change of status. There is no right of appeal following a decision of a Research Students' Progress Board not to confirm PhD status following the first Supervisory Panel meeting.
- 3. A research student on the first year of an Integrated PhD (a 4-year programme) who wishes to appeal against a progress decision of the Research Students' Progress Board (eg being downgraded or discontinued) should do so in accordance with this procedure. However, if they wish to appeal against the decision of the Board of Examiners' consideration/decision of their taught marks, then they should appeal in accordance with the procedures for Appeals against the Decisions of Board of Examiners for all taught programmes.
- 4. The main legitimate grounds for appeal are the following:
  - (a) Extenuating circumstances of which the Research Students' Progress Board was unaware and of which the student could not reasonably have been expected to inform the Committee

- in advance, of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result might have been different had they not occurred.
- (b) Procedural irregularities in the conduct of either the Supervisory Panel and/or the Research Students' Progress Board (including alleged administrative error) of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result might have been different had they not occurred.
  - (c) That there is *prima facie* evidence of prejudice, bias, or inadequate assessment on the part of one or more of the members of the Supervisory Panel/Research Students' Progress Board.
5. Other grounds will be considered on their merits.
  6. The following are not considered legitimate grounds on which to appeal, and any appeals based exclusively on one or more of these grounds will be rejected automatically:
    - (a) Prior informal assessments of the student's work by the supervisor.
    - (b) The retrospective reporting of extenuating circumstances which a student might reasonably have been expected to disclose to the Research Students' Progress Board before their meeting.
    - (c) Appeals where the grounds concern the inadequacy of supervision or other arrangements during the period of study; such complaints must be raised, in writing, before the Research Students' Progress Board meets.
  7. Any other officer of the University who receives a formal appeal from a research student concerning their progress shall forward it to the Academic Registrar.
  8. The Academic Registrar will acknowledge the appeal within five working days of receipt.
  9. The Academic Registrar will refer to the Executive Dean or their deputy any appeal that meets the criteria stated above (4 and 5), who may consult such persons as they think fit, including the student who has lodged the appeal. The Executive Dean or their deputy will determine whether or not the appeal is well-founded and will outline their reasons for upholding or dismissing the case.
  10. In some cases, where the circumstances of the case merit it, the Executive Dean or their deputy may arrange an Appeal Committee to consider the appeal.
  11. Such an Appeal Committee shall consist of the Executive Dean or their deputy (as Chair), and two members from outside the student's department who had no previous connection with the student. The Committee shall be serviced by a Secretary.
  12. The Appeal Committee may consult such persons, including the student and their supervisor, and take such advice as it thinks fit.
  13. The student will be invited to be present at the Committee whenever oral evidence is being heard by the Committee, and will receive all the papers. They may be accompanied by a student of the University, a member of staff of the University or by an employee of the Students' Union.
  14. The Executive Dean or their deputy or the Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, and taken such advice as may be necessary, may;
    - (a) reject the appeal, in which case the result originally recommended by the RSPB shall stand;
    - (b) ask the RSPB to reconsider their decision for reasons specified by the Appeal Committee;
    - (c) consult with the RSPB and/or the student's supervisor(s) and/or other member of academic staff before reaching a decision on an appropriate outcome which takes into account the evidence provided by the student in support of their appeal. The Committee will then decide whether or not to change the original decision of the RSPB in whole or part, and decide upon a new outcome.
  15. All decisions of the Executive Dean or their deputy or the Appeal Committee must be notified to the student, the supervisor and the Graduate Director in writing, together with a statement of any conditions that are attached to the decision. A copy must also be sent to the Head of Department. If a student's status is altered, a copy of the relevant written statement of arrangements for supervision must be included and the supervisor requested to ensure that the student fully understands these.
  16. An appeal following the formal conclusion of the procedures set out above may be made on the following grounds only.
    - (a) Procedural irregularity in the appeals process;
    - (b) consideration of whether the outcome was reasonable in all the circumstances;
    - (c) new material evidence which the student was unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process.
  17. To appeal against a Progress Appeal Outcome (all Postgraduate Research Students, including Professional Doctorates)), please refer to [Section D](#).

### **C. Appeals Procedure against a Progress Decision – Professional Doctorate Students**

1. A Professional Doctorate student who wishes to appeal against the recommendation of a Research Students' Progress Board that they be discontinued or downgraded, which has been confirmed by the Executive Dean or their deputy, must do so in writing on the Form of Appeal (Progress decision), stating fully and precisely the grounds for appeal, within ten working days of receiving confirmation of the decision from the Postgraduate Research Education team. Forms of Appeal are available online. If the student can show that circumstances beyond their control prevented this time limit being adhered to and that injustice would result from adhering to it, the Academic Registrar or their nominee may extend the time limit in which an appeal may be lodged, normally up to the period of 30 working days from the date on which the notification of the decision was sent.
2. The main legitimate grounds for appeal are the following:
  - (a) Extenuating circumstances of which the Examination Board/Research Students' Progress Board was unaware and of which the student could not reasonably have been expected to inform the Board in advance, of such a nature to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result might have been different had they not occurred.
  - (b) Procedural irregularities in the conduct of either the Supervisory Panel and/or the Examination Board/Research Students' Progress Board (including alleged administrative error) of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result might have been different had they not occurred.
  - (c) That there is *prima facie* evidence of prejudice, bias, or inadequate assessment on part of one or more of the members of the Supervisory Panel/Examination Board/Research Students' Progress Board.
3. Other grounds will be considered on their merits, but the following are not considered legitimate grounds on which to appeal, and any appeals based exclusively on one or more of these grounds will be rejected automatically:
  - (a) Prior informal assessments of the student's work by the supervisor.
  - (b) The retrospective reporting of extenuating circumstances which a student might reasonably have been expected to disclose to the Research Students' Progress Board before their meeting.
  - (c) Appeals where the grounds of complaint concern the inadequacy of supervision or other arrangements during the period of study; such complaints must be raised, in writing, before the Research Students' Progress Board meets.
4. Any other officer of the University who receives a formal appeal from a research student concerning their progress shall forward it to the Academic Registrar. The Academic Registrar will refer to the Executive Dean or their deputy any appeal that meets the criteria stated (see 2-3 above). The Academic Registrar will acknowledge the appeal within five working days of receipt.
5. Any such appeal will be considered by the Executive Dean or their deputy, who may consult such persons as they think fit, including the student who has lodged the appeal. The Executive Dean or their deputy will determine whether or not the appeal is well-founded and will outline their reasons for upholding or dismissing the case.
6. In some cases, where the circumstances of the case merit it, the Executive Dean or their deputy may arrange an Appeal Committee to consider the appeal.
7. Such an Appeal Committee shall consist of the Executive Dean or their deputy (as Chair), and two members from outside the student's department who had no previous connection with the student. The Committee shall be serviced by a Secretary.
8. The Appeal Committee may consult such persons, including the student and their supervisor, and take such advice as it thinks fit.
9. The student will be invited to be present at the Committee whenever oral evidence is being heard by the Committee, and will receive all the papers. They may be accompanied by a student of the University, a member of staff of the University or an employee of the Students' Union to help them in presenting their appeal to the Committee
10. The Executive Dean or their deputy or the Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, and taken such advice as may be necessary, may:
  - (a) reject the appeal, in which case the result originally recommended by the RSPB shall stand;
  - (b) ask the RSPB to reconsider their decision for reasons specified by the Appeal Committee;
  - (c) consult with the RSPB and/or the student's supervisor(s) and/or other member of academic staff before reaching a decision on an appropriate outcome which takes into account the evidence provided by the student in support of their appeal. The Committee will then decide

whether or not to change the original decision of the RSPB in whole or part, and decide upon a new outcome.

11. All decisions of the Executive Dean or their deputy or the Appeal Committee must be notified to the student, the supervisor and the Graduate Director in writing, together with a statement of any conditions that are attached to the decision. A copy must also be sent to the Head of Department. If a student's status is altered, a copy of the relevant written statement of arrangements for supervision must be included and the supervisor requested to ensure that the student fully understands these.
12. An appeal following the formal conclusion of the procedures set out above may be made on the following grounds only.
  - (a) Procedural irregularity in the appeals process;
  - (b) consideration of whether the outcome was reasonable in all the circumstances;
  - (c) new material evidence which the student was unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process.
13. To appeal against a Progress Appeal Outcome (all Postgraduate Students, (including Professional Doctorates)), please refer to Section D.

#### **D. Appeals against a Progress Appeal Outcome (all Postgraduate Research Students (including Professional Doctorates))**

1. A student who wishes to appeal against the outcome of these procedures should write to the Academic Registrar within twenty working days setting out in detail the nature of the evidence to support their claim. If *prima facie* there is evidence to support the claim then the case will be reviewed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or their nominee. If the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, or their nominee, determines that there are grounds for appeal, an Appeal Committee will be established, and paragraphs B11-15 (PGR students, excluding Professional Doctorates) / C7-11 (Professional Doctorates only) above will apply. No member of the Committee will have had any previous involvement in the case.
2. The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) provides an independent scheme for the review of student complaints or appeals. When the University's internal procedures for dealing with complaints and appeals have been exhausted, the University will issue a Completion of Procedures letter. Students wishing to avail themselves of the opportunity of an independent review by the OIA must submit their application to the OIA within twelve months of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter. Full details of the scheme are available on request and will be enclosed with the Completion of Procedures.

#### **E. Appeals Procedure against an Examination Decision – Postgraduate Research Students (including Professional Doctorates)**

1. A candidate for a research degree whose examination result is 'fail', or 'referred', or is the award of, or option to resubmit for a lower degree, may submit an appeal against that decision on one or more of the following grounds:
  - (a) Extenuating circumstances materially affecting the student's performance of which the examiners were not aware when their decision was taken and of which the student could not reasonably have been expected to inform the examiners in advance;
  - (b) that there were procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination (including alleged administrative error) of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result might have been different had they not occurred; or
  - (c) that there is *prima facie* evidence of prejudice, bias, or inadequate assessment on the part of one or more of the examiners.
2. The following are not considered legitimate grounds on which to appeal, and any appeals based exclusively on one or more of these grounds will be rejected automatically:
  - (a) Appeals against the academic judgement of internal or external examiners. Coursework and examinations cannot be remarked, except in cases of procedural irregularities.
  - (b) Any provisional or informal assessment of the student's work by a member of staff, that is not the final assessment by the examiners.
  - (c) The retrospective reporting of extenuating circumstances which a student might reasonably have been expected to disclose to the examiners.
  - (d) Where the grounds of complaint concern the inadequacy of supervisory or other arrangements during the period of study; such complaints must be raised, in writing and

preferably during the minimum period of study and research, with the Executive Dean or their deputy.

3. A candidate for a research degree whose examination result is 'fail', or 'referred', or is the award of, or option to resubmit for a lower degree shall be informed of their right of appeal. A candidate who wishes to appeal must do so in writing on the Form of Appeal (Examination decision) not later than forty working days after the notification to them of the result of the examination. If the student can show that circumstances beyond their control prevented this time limit being adhered to and that injustice would result from adhering to it, the Academic Registrar or their nominee may extend the time limit in which an appeal may be lodged, normally up to the period of an additional thirty working days. The candidate's submission must state fully the grounds on which it is based. The Academic Registrar will dismiss any appeals which do not meet the criteria stated above (1). All other appeals will be referred to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) to determine where *prima facie* there is evidence to support the claim.
4. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) shall consider the appeal and may decide that the case is not well-founded, in which case the appeal or complaint is dismissed and the candidate shall be informed of the reasons.
5. In those cases where the Pro-Vice-Chancellor decides that there is a *prima facie* case, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, having considered the evidence and taken such advice as may be necessary, may:
  - (a) Ask the examiners to reconsider their decision for reasons specified as part of the consideration of the appeal, the examiner's report shall be submitted to the Executive Dean or their deputy together with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor's statement of the reasons for reconsideration.
  - (b) Determine that the unamended thesis shall be re-examined by new examiners.
  - (c) Consult with the Examiners and/or the student's supervisor(s) and/or other members of academic staff before reaching a decision on an appropriate outcome which takes into account the evidence provided by the student in support of their appeal. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor will contact the student if any additional information or evidence is required. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor will then decide whether or not to change the original decision of the Examiners, in whole or part, and decide upon a new outcome. This might include, but is not limited to, an additional period of completion. The student will be informed accordingly.
  - (d) Determine that the case should be considered by an Appeal Committee.
6. An Appeal Committee, appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, will consist of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor as Chair, not fewer than two Deans (including Executive Deans, Deputy Deans (Education), Dean/Deputy Dean of Partnerships, Dean of Postgraduate Research and Education) and Deputy Dean (Postgraduate Research Education)), but excluding the Dean who had originally approved the result, and a student member appointed by the President of the Students' Union.
7. In those cases where the Pro-Vice-Chancellor decides that an Appeal Committee should be appointed to hear the case, the candidate shall be informed by the Secretary to the Appeal Committee of the date for consideration of the appeal not less than two weeks in advance. Candidates may present their case to the Committee in person, but, if they choose not to or are unable to, the Committee may proceed in their absence. Candidates may be accompanied by a student of the University, a member of staff of the University, or an employee of the Students' Union. A student who is unable to attend the meeting may ask a member of the University, student of the University, a member of staff of the University, or an employee or a member of the full-time staff of the Students' Union, to attend on their behalf. No person may represent the student in their absence unless they have expressly been asked to do so by the student.
8. The onus shall be on the candidate to produce evidence before the Appeal Committee which substantiates the grounds of appeal set out in the original submission to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor.
9. The Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, and taken such advice as may be necessary, may:
  - (a) reject the appeal, in which case the result originally recommended by the examiners shall stand;
  - (b) ask the examiners to reconsider their decision for reasons specified by the Appeal Committee; the examiners' report shall be submitted to the Executive Dean or their deputy together with the Appeal Committee's statement of the reasons for reconsideration;
  - (c) determine that the unamended thesis shall be re-examined by new examiners.

- (d) Consult with the Examiners and/or the student's supervisor(s) and/or other members of academic staff before reaching a decision on an appropriate outcome which takes into account the evidence provided by the student in support of their appeal. The Committee will then decide whether or not to change the original decision of the Examiners, in whole or part, and decide upon a new outcome.

#### **EXAMINERS' RECONSIDERATION OF THEIR INITIAL DECISION**

10. Where the Pro-Vice-Chancellor or Appeal Committee determines that the examiners should be asked to reconsider their decision under paragraph 5(a)/9(b), the Executive Dean or their deputy shall do the following on receipt of the examiners' report and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor or Appeal Committee's statement of the reasons for reconsideration:
  - (a) Where the examiners agree to amend their decision, accept the amended decision as the revised result of the examination and issue a new results letter to the candidate.
  - (b) Where the examiners decline to amend their decision, accept that the examiners' original recommendation stands and confirm the original result in a letter to the candidate.

#### **RE-EXAMINATION**

11. Where the Pro-Vice-Chancellor or Appeal Committee determines on a re-examination under paragraph 5(b)/9(c), the new examiners shall be appointed under the normal procedures. The new examiners shall be given no information about the previous examination except the single fact that they are conducting a re-examination on appeal. The re-examination will follow the standard examination procedure. Any such re-examination will be chaired by an Independent Chair.

#### **F. Appeals against an Examination Appeal Outcome – Postgraduate Research Students (including Professional Doctorates)**

1. An appeal following the formal conclusion of the procedures set out above may be made on the following grounds only.
  - (a) Procedural irregularity in the appeals process;
  - (b) consideration of whether the outcome was reasonable in all the circumstances;
  - (c) new material evidence which the student was unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process.
2. A student who wishes to appeal against the outcome of these procedures should write to the Academic Registrar within twenty working days of receiving their appeal outcome, setting out in detail the nature of the evidence to support their claim. If *prima facie* there is evidence to support the claim then the case will be reviewed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or their nominee. If the Pro-Vice-Chancellor or their nominee determines that there are grounds for appeal, an Appeal Committee will be established, and paragraphs F.5-12 will apply.
3. Notwithstanding paragraph 1 above, a student whose original examination result was 'fail', or 'referred', or is the award of, or option to resubmit for a lower degree, cannot appeal against the original examination result following their resubmission and re-examination. Any subsequent appeal can only be made against the outcome of the re-examination and not the original examination.
4. The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) provides an independent scheme for the review of student complaints or appeals. When the University's internal procedures for dealing with complaints and appeals have been exhausted, the University will issue a Completion of Procedures letter. Students wishing to avail themselves of the opportunity of an independent review by the OIA must submit their application to the OIA within twelve months of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter. Full details of the scheme are available on request and will be enclosed with the Completion of Procedures.

#### **Appeals Committee for an Appeal against an Examination Appeal Outcome**

##### **MEMBERSHIP OF THE APPEAL COMMITTEE**

5. An Appeal Committee will be appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and will consist of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor as Chair, not fewer than two Deans (including Executive Deans, Deputy Deans (Education), Dean/Deputy Dean of Partnerships, Dean of Postgraduate Research and Education and Deputy Dean (Postgraduate Research Education), but excluding the Executive Dean or their

deputy who had originally approved the result, and a student member appointed by the President of the Students' Union.

6. The Appeal Committee will be serviced by a Secretary.

### **ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS**

7. The Chair of the Committee shall have the authority to determine the order of proceedings and exclude any material which appears irrelevant to the case.
8. The usual pattern of proceedings is:
  - a. The members of the Committee have a preliminary discussion without the student, the student's representative or any persons who have been called to give evidence being present.
  - b. The student and the student's representative enter the room and the Chair introduces all those present.
  - c. The Chair checks that the student has received details of the case and any supporting documentation.
  - d. The Chair explains the order of proceedings to the student.
  - e. The Chair summarises the evidence relating to the appeal and members of the Committee are invited to put questions to any persons who have been invited to the Committee to give evidence.
  - f. The Chair then invites the student to make a statement orally if they wish to do so including any mitigation, and members of the committee are invited to put questions to the student.
  - g. The Chair invites the student's representative to put forward any additional statement.
  - h. The Chair invites the student to make any final response.
  - i. The student, the student's representative and any persons who have been invited to the Committee to give evidence are then asked to leave the room (or equivalent for meetings conducted by video-conferencing or similar).
  - j. The Committee then, having considered the evidence, and taken such advice as may be necessary, comes to a decision regarding the outcome of the appeal. Please see F12.
  - k. The student is then recalled to the room to be told the decision as to whether the appeal is well-founded. The outcome of the appeal and the reasons why are explained to the student.
9. The Committee may proceed in the absence of the student or the student's representative provided that the Chair is satisfied that due notice has been given to the student.
10. Only members of the Committee and the Secretary shall be present while a committee is reaching a decision of the outcome of the Appeal Committee.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

11. The Appeal Committee may adjourn where this is necessary to obtain further information.

### **OUTCOMES OF THE APPEAL COMMITTEE**

12. The Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, and taken such advice as may be necessary, may:
  - (a) reject the appeal, in which case the result originally recommended by the examiners shall stand;
  - (b) ask the examiners to reconsider their decision for reasons specified by the Appeal Committee; the examiners' report shall be submitted to the Executive Dean or their deputy together with the Appeal Committee's statement of the reasons for reconsideration;
  - (c) determine that the unamended thesis shall be re-examined by new examiners.
  - (d) Consult with the Examiners and/or the student's supervisor(s) and/or other member of academic staff before reaching a decision on an appropriate outcome which takes into account the evidence provided by the student in support of their appeal. The Committee will then decide whether or not to change the original decision of the Examiners, in whole or part, and decide upon a new outcome.



<b>Title</b>	Progress and Appeals Procedures for Research Degree Students
<b>Version number</b>	1.0
<b>Document author</b>	Andrew McCarthy, Postgraduate Research Education Manager
<b>Original document author</b>	Laura Ruddick, Senior Postgraduate Research Education Manager
<b>Document owner</b>	Postgraduate Research Team, Academic Services
<b>Approved by</b>	Senate
<b>Date of approval</b>	4 July 2018
<b>Effective date</b>	1 October 2018
<b>Frequency of review</b>	Annual
<b>Date of last review</b>	June 2018
<b>Date of next review</b>	June 2019
<b>Document status</b>	Published
<b>Document classification</b>	Public
<b>Questions and queries</b>	pgresearch@essex.ac.uk
<b>Related policies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Regulations relating to Higher Degrees</li> <li>■ Guidelines and appeal form – progress decisions</li> <li>■ Guidelines and appeal form – examination decisions</li> <li>■ Code of Practice, Postgraduate Research Degrees</li> <li>■ Code of Practice, Professional Doctorates</li> </ul>
<b>Supersedes</b>	Progress and Appeals Procedures for Research Degree Students 2017-18
<b>Superseded by</b>	Not Applicable

#### Further information

- [Charter, Statutes and Ordinances](#)
- [University Regulations](#)
- [Students – Policies, procedures and guidance](#)
- [Appeals Procedures](#)
- [The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education \(OIA\)](#)