ACADEMIC QUERIES & APPEALS APPLICATION FORM (Level 2)



This form is applicable for student appeals against:

- Board of Examiners decisions (degree classification, final module results, stage results or other progression decisions, etc)
- Decisions about Personal Extenuating Circumstances (PEC)
- Unsatisfactory Progress decisions and/or sanctions
- Degree Programme Director's Decisions via a DPD Request Form (requests for exemptions, interruption of studies, etc)
- Deans of Postgraduate Study decisions regarding; Project Approval, Annual Progression, Extensions, Interruptions, etc.

Please note: before completing this form, you should read the 'Academic Queries & Appeals Procedure for Students' guidance, attached.

This form is for applications at Level 2 of the procedure. You should normally have completed Level 1 of the procedure by submitting your query directly to the relevant School/Faculty contact first before submitting this formal appeal. This form must be submitted within **21 calendar days** of the outcome of your academic query, or the relevant academic decision about which you are appealing. Late applications will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances. (see <u>Guidance Note 2</u>).

Please send this form, together with your supporting documentation, to:
The Casework Team, Student Progress Service, King's Gate, or casework@ncl.ac.uk

SECTION 1 - PERSONAL DETAILS

Name:			Student Nur	mber:			
Emails:							
	(We will primarily use email to correspond with you. You must, therefore, provide an email address that you check regularly and will have access to for the foreseeable future in addition to your Newcastle University email)					nd will have	
Address for Correspo	ndence:						
	-						
Telephone:			School:				
Programme Title:			-				
Stage/Year of Study:							
Name of School/Faculty Contact with whom your Academic query was considered:							
Date of Level 1 outco	me:		-				
Have you taken advice from the Student Advice Centre?		Yes / No					
i							

It is your responsibility to keep the University updated with changes to your contact details throughout the academic appeal process.

SECTION 2 – APPEAL DETAILS What are you appealing against?

See $\underline{\textit{Guidance Note 4}}$ below for definitions of grounds and guidance for appeal

	Tick box	:: Give detail:	Then go to:		
Board of Examiners Decision (i.e. Academic failure, progression, classification)			3A		
PEC Decision (N.B. only applicable to decisions made by the School PEC Committee or nominated school officer)			3B		
Unsatisfactory Progress Decision (N.B. Only applicable to Progress regulation UG: G23 -26 decisions / PG: F15-18)			3C		
DPD/Dean of PG Studies Request Decision (i.e. requests for exemptions, etc.)			3D		
Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa – (applicable to decisions made under Progress Regulation III. F.24.)			3E		
Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box(es) the grounds on which you wish to appeal. For each box ticked a brief explanation is required in the relevant section below (full details should be provided in your letter of appeal – which should be submitted with this form). 3A) Board of Examiners decisions:					
•	plication sly unawa	·			
(ii) Procedural irregularity or other error on the part of the examiners Brief details:					
(iii) Bias or prejudice on the part of an exam Brief details:	iner or e	xaminers			
 (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: 					

3B) <u>PEC Committee</u> decisions:

Please note that you cannot appeal on the basis of new evidence. You should submit a new PEC application to the PEC Committee for consideration. If the Board of Examiners have considered the PEC Committee's recommendation however, and new evidence is now available, you should tick the relevant ground under 3A) above – grounds for appeal following Board of Examiners decisions. If you are unsure about any aspect of a PEC appeal, please contact the Casework Team (casework@ncl.ac.uk) or the Student Advice Centre (www.nusu.co.uk/sac) for assistance.

If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of a PEC decision which has not been considered by a Board of Examiners, the following grounds of appeal are available:

(ii) Procedural irregularity or other error on the part of the PEC Committee Grief details:	Brief details: (ii) Bias or prejudice on the part of the PEC Committee Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: 3C, 3D and 3E) Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details:			
(ii) Bias or prejudice on the part of the PEC Committee Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: 3C, 3D and 3E) Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details:	(iii) Bias or prejudice on the part of the PEC Committee Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity	(i)	Procedural irregularity or other error on the part of the PEC Committee	
Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Brief details: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously price details: (ii) Procedural irregularity procedural irregularity price details: (iii) Bias or prejudice price details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief	details:	
Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details:	Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Procedural irregularity Proced			
Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details:	Brief details: (iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Procedural irregularity Proced	/::\	Disa sa analis disa sa tha sant of the DEC Committee	
(iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details:	(iii) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.			Ц
could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Could be a could be available evidence.	could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously	Brief	details:	
could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Could be a could be available evidence.	could have reached on the available evidence. Brief details: Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.			
Color Colo	SC, 3D and 3E) Unsatisfactory Progress OR DPD/ Dean of Postgraduate Studies Request decision OR Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa: (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details:	(iii)		
(i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	(ii) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (iii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details:	Brief	details:	
(i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	(i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.			
(i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	(i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.			
Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief details: (ii) Procedural irregularity Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	3C, 3D	·	est decision
(iii) Procedural irregularity	(ii) Procedural irregularity	(i)	Evidence which was not available or considered previously	
Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief	details:	
Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief details: (iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.			
(iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	(iii) Bias or prejudice Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	(ii)	Procedural irregularity	
Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief		
Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	Brief details: (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.		details:	
(iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.	(iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence.		details:	
could have reached on the available evidence.	could have reached on the available evidence.	(iii)		
could have reached on the available evidence.	could have reached on the available evidence.		Bias or prejudice	
Brief details:	Brief details:		Bias or prejudice	
		Brief	Bias or prejudice details: That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person	

SECTION 4 – SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

- (i) Supporting documentation is required for your appeal. You must submit a letter, detailing your reasons for appealing, with this form. You must also submit <u>all</u> supporting evidence (e.g. medical certificates, statements, copies of email correspondence). Any documents more than two pages long must be submitted electronically to <u>casework@ncl.ac.uk</u> (a scanned version is fine).
- (ii) Under the current Data Protection legislation, we are required to obtain your consent for an Appeal Adjudicator or members of the Appeal Panel to view any personal data you may provide in connection with your appeal. It will also be necessary for other members of staff in your Academic Unit to be able to review your documentation this would normally include your tutor / supervisor, Degree Programme Director, Chair of the Board of Examiners or other staff with a designated role relevant to your appeal. By signing this form, or emailing your appeal request, you are giving permission for all relevant staff to have access to your appeal documentation. If you do not wish a particular staff member to see your documents, please ensure that this is made clear in your letter of appeal but also note that the University may be unable to proceed with your appeal if we are unable to seek input from a key member of staff.
- (iii) <u>It is your responsibility to seek consent for any third party data submitted to the University in support of your appeal.</u> This consent should be sent together with the relevant supporting evidence.

Please list all documentation:

rease list all documentation.		
Description of Document	Attached	To Follow*
1. Outcome from Academic Appeal Query (Level 1 outcome) made directly with school/faculty's nominated contact.	Ø	
2. Letter explaining grounds for appeal	V	
3. Evidence of date of relevant decision (if applicable)		
4. Copy of the full PEC application and outcome documentation (if applicable) (MUST BE INCLUDED WITH PEC APPEALS)		
5. Copy of the DPD Request form, any supporting evidence and outcome documentation (if applicable) (MUST BE INCLUDED WITH DPD REQUEST DECISION APPEALS)		
6.		
7.		
8.		

* Please note that all supporting documentation must be available to the Student Progress Service (SPS) within the 21 calendar days appeal period. Documents received late will only be considered at the discretion of the Head of the Student Progress Service. If you are unable to send documentation electronically, you must provide the documents by post. It will be helpful if each document is labelled clearly with your name and student number and the date that you submitted this Application.

	[Date:
Signature:		

Please send this form, together with your supporting documentation, to: The Casework Team, Student Progress Service, King's Gate (casework@ncl.ac.uk)

N.B. Assistance in submitting an academic appeal may be sought from the <u>Student Advice Centre</u>, or Personal Tutor.

ACADEMIC QUERIES & APPEALS GUIDANCE NOTES AND INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS



Note 1 – Does this procedure apply to you?

If you are considering making an Academic Appeal, you are strongly advised to carefully read the Academic Queries and Appeals Procedure, together with this guidance.

Please remember that every Academic Query & Appeal is considered individually and general statements noted in this guidance may not apply in all circumstances. Before you complete this form to make a formal Academic Appeal submission under Level 2 of the procedure you <u>must follow Level 1</u> of the procedure by submitting the query directly to the nominated contact in your School. If this is not possible, you can approach the Student Progress Service for advice. You may also contact the <u>Student Advice Centre</u>.

A formal Academic Appeal (Level 2) can take several weeks/months to process. N.B. Academic Appeals supported by strong evidence are likely to be more successful than those with little or no supporting evidence.

The type of evidence that is acceptable varies, but can include medical certificates, statements from academic staff, copies of specific regulations, detailed personal statements, and confirmation from authorities that you were involved in a particular incident. Evidence that independently confirms your own statement (including medical evidence) and is obtained at the time of the difficulty is of particular value in establishing a valid Appeal. It is also important that the evidence indicates the significance of the impact on you – and relates to specific time periods. It is your responsibility to provide the evidence for the appeal authorities to consider – the University cannot approach doctors or others on your behalf. N.B. It is also your responsibility to seek consent for any third party data submitted to the University in support of your appeal. This consent should be submitted together with your appeal documentation.

Consider whether an Academic Appeal is the appropriate course of action for you. Two options that may be more appropriate are:

- The Student Complaint & Resolution procedure
- A PEC Application (if the Board of Examiners have not yet met)
 www.ncl.ac.uk/students/progress/Regulations/Procedures/change/PEC.htm

Note 2 - Delay / Late appeals

Academic Queries (**Level 1**) regarding academic results must be submitted to the School/Faculty within **14 days** of receiving the decision. Formal Academic Appeals (**Level 2**) must be submitted within **21 days** of receiving the outcome of the Level **1** outcome. You must clearly explain any reason for a delay beyond these times. You should also note that a late Appeal is unlikely to be considered unless there is a good reason for the delay.

Examples of unacceptable reasons for late Appeals include:

- Being unaware of the procedure.
- Being on holiday.
- Being unwell and not having independent confirmation by medical certificates or other evidence obtained at the time of the matter put in evidence.
- Being uncomfortable or embarrassed about raising the issue earlier.

Note 3 – Personal Extenuating Circumstances

There are protocols for advising Examiners of Personal Extenuating Circumstances (PEC) - www.ncl.ac.uk/students/progress/Regulations/Procedures/change/PEC.htm. You would therefore need to demonstrate that there was a substantial and valid reason for not disclosing to the Examiners by the published school deadline for PEC applications. You should note that less weight may be given to claims made after results are released.

Note 4 - Grounds for Academic Appeal (Level 2)

You are required to make your case on one of the specified grounds. You should consider the following when making your Academic Appeal as they will be considered by the Appeal Officer / Head of the Student Progress Service / Appeal Adjudicator.

A) Grounds for appeal following **Board of Examiners** decisions:

(i) Personal Extenuating Circumstances that you were unable to disclose in advance of the Board of Examiners meeting via a PEC application, or were unable to provide evidence for at that time, or of which you were previously unaware - see Note 3. Therefore, if you make this claim you MUST give strong reasons why you had not advised the Examiners of your circumstances by the published school deadline.

Examples of strong reasons for late disclosure may include:

- Traumatic and highly personal family circumstances which were exceptionally serious.
- Being in hospital for the weeks between the assessment and the Board of Examiners.
- Evidence of being in active discussion with the academic unit about the matter although in such circumstances it is also reasonable to advise SPS that this is pending.

Examples of weak reasons for late disclosure may include:

- Being unaware of the procedure.
- Being embarrassed.
- Being on holiday.

You should note that University awards are issued on the basis of academic merit. Often personal circumstances only influence the examiners for borderline cases. There are occasions when - even if a student proves in an Academic Appeal that there were problems that the Examiners were unaware of - the circumstances are not strong enough for the Examiners to alter their overall decision. For example, where a student has an average mark of 67 (2:1) and the run of marks throughout the programme is also in the 2:1 band or lower, the Examiners are unlikely to feel that the personal circumstances – however severe – is sufficient to alter the 2:1 classification.

- (ii) Procedural irregularity or other error on the part of the examiners. <u>Administrative Errors</u> (e.g. errors in the calculation of your marks) should clarify:
 - the reasons for the belief that an error has taken place,
 - what you think the computation should have been and why,
 - in what way this was material to the determination of your results.

<u>Material Procedural Error</u> i.e. the conduct of assessments or examinations, the proceedings of the PEC Committee or Board of Examiners or other Examination Committee. You must:

- provide details of the procedural error which you believe has occurred,
- explain in what way this was material to the determination of your results,
- explain in what way you feel disadvantaged on account of this alleged error,
- provide evidence of the error, and, if available, evidence of adverse consequences.
- (iii) Bias or prejudice on the part of an Examiner or Examiners. This is a particularly serious allegation. Unsupported assertions of bias or prejudice do not constitute valid grounds for appeal. Claims under this ground require a full explanation and should:
 - detail exactly the evidence of bias/prejudice,
 - explain in what way this affected your performance or determination of your results,
 - explain in what way you feel disadvantaged,
 - provide evidence.

B) Grounds for appeal following <u>PEC Committee</u> decisions:

- (i) Procedural irregularity or other error on the part of the PEC Committee. You must provide:
 - the reasons for the belief that an error has taken place,
 - in what way this was material to the outcome.
- (ii) Bias or prejudice on the part of the PEC Committee. This is a particularly serious allegation. Unsupported assertions of bias or prejudice do not constitute valid grounds for appeal. Claims under this ground require a full explanation and should:
 - detail exactly the evidence of bias/prejudice, provide evidence
 - explain in what way you believe this affected the outcome.

Grounds for appeal following:

- C) <u>Unsatisfactory Progress</u> decision,
- D) <u>DPD Request decision</u>,
- E) <u>Termination of Studies due to Breach of Tier 4 Visa decision:</u>
 - (i) Evidence which was not available or considered previously, although you **MUST** give strong reasons why this evidence was not disclosed to the relevant deciding body, earlier.

Examples of strong reasons for late disclosure include:

- Traumatic and highly personal family circumstances which were exceptionally serious,
- Being in hospital which prevented you from accessing the evidence earlier.

Examples of weak reasons for late disclosure include:

- Being unaware of the procedure,
- Being embarrassed,
- Being on holiday.
- (ii) Procedural irregularity. You must provide:
 - the reasons for the belief that an error has taken place,
 - in what way this was material to the outcome.
- (iii) Bias or prejudice. This is a particularly serious allegation. Unsupported assertions of bias or prejudice do not constitute valid grounds for Appeal. Claims under this ground require a full explanation and should:
 - detail exactly the evidence of bias/prejudice, provide evidence
 - explain in what way you believe affected the outcome,
- (iv) That the decision reached was perverse in that it was one which no reasonable person could have reached on the available evidence. You must provide:
 - details of why you believe this and provide evidence

Note 5 – Examples of Successful and Unsuccessful Appeals

Relatively few Academic Appeals are successful. This is normally because students make general claims without evidence.

Examples of weak claims which were unsuccessful in the past include:

- Being stressed during examinations
- Being unwell without medical certificates or other evidence.
- Being unaware of the procedure.
- Being on holiday.
- Not reporting problem at the time it occurred.
- Having a disability where an adjustment, such as extra time/extensions etc. has already been made

Successful Academic Appeals are usually:

• Well founded, well documented and include good evidence.