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# Overall guidance for students

##### Please use this form to submit an appeal under the Appeals Regulations for Research Students. Before completing it, please read the appeals regulations, which can be found in the [LSE Calendar](https://www.lse.ac.uk/resources/calendar/research.htm). You are encouraged to seek advice from the PhD Academy Team ([phdacademy@lse.ac.uk](mailto:phdacademy@lse.ac.uk)), and you are also entitled to seek advice from the Students’ Union Advice Centre: <http://www.lsesu.com/advice>.

##### As set out in the appeals regulations, you must submit an appeal within 20 working days of the School confirming the upgrade, de-registration or examination decision with you. If you are not sure what your deadline is, please contact the PhD Academy at ([phdacademy@lse.ac.uk](mailto:phdacademy@lse.ac.uk)). Appeals submitted after the 20 working day deadline are not normally accepted.

##### You should submit your completed form by email to [phdacademy@lse.ac.uk](mailto:phdacademy@lse.ac.uk), along with copies of supporting evidence or information which meet the standards set out [here](https://info.lse.ac.uk/current-students/services/assets/documents/standards-of-evidence-information.pdf). If you would like to submit evidence by alternative means (e.g. SharePoint or DropBox), please make arrangements to do so before you submit your appeal, by arrangement with the PhD Academy team. It is vital that you submit all of the evidence which is available to you with your appeal, as the School will normally not accept evidence at a later date unless the relevant decision maker is convinced that factors beyond your control prevented your from providing this with your initial appeal.

# Section 1: Student details (to be completed by the student)

\* Indicates required field.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student number\* |  |
| Student forename\* |  |
| Student surname\* |  |
| Student department\* |  |
| Student programme\* |  |
| Student email\*  *If you are appealing against a de-registration decision, please provide your personal email address as well as your LSE email address.* |  |

# Section 2: Details of the decision being appealed

\* Indicates required field.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Appeals against progress review and upgrade assessment process decisions | | |
| Type of decision being appealed\*  *Please write x next to the decision type which you are appealing. Please write N/A next to decision types which you are not appealing.* | (6.1) your department’s decision that you have not met the progression requirements of your programme, and that… (6.1.1) your continued registration should be subject to conditions. |  |
| (6.1) your department’s decision that you have not met the progression requirements of your programme, and that… (6.1.2) you should be allowed to continue in registration only as an MPhil candidate. |  |
| (6.1) you should be allowed to continue in registration only as an MPhil candidate (6.1.3) your registration should be terminated. |  |
| (6.2) your department’s decision that you have not met the requirements to be upgraded to the PhD, at either the first or the second attempt. |  |
| Grounds for appeal  *Please write x next to the ground/s for your appeal. Please write N/A next to ground/s which you are not appealing.* | (7.1) That the department did not follow the correct procedure, such that there is reasonable doubt that the decision would have been the same if the department had followed the correct procedure. |  |
| (7.2) That there is evidence of bias, prejudice or inadequate assessment on the part of one or more members of the panel involved in the decision such that the result should not be allowed to stand. |  |
| (7.3) That there is new information about exceptional circumstances affecting your performance that the panel was not aware of when it took its decision, which factors beyond your control prevented you from disclosing prior to the relevant assessment, and that this produced an unfair result. |  |
| Appeals against examination decisions | | |
| Type of decision being appealed\*  *Please write x next to the decision type which you are appealing. Please write N/A next to decision types which you are not appealing.* | (6.3) your examiners’ decision that you are required to be re-examined… (6.3.1) after completing revisions to your submitted thesis. |  |
| (6.3) your examiners’ decision that you are required to be re-examined… (6.3.2) without completing revisions to your submitted thesis. |  |
| (6.4) your examiners’ decision not to award you either an MPhil or a PhD degree. |  |
| (6.5) your examiners' decision to award you an MPhil degree, rather than a PhD degree. |  |
| Grounds for appeal [examination process decisions only only]\*  *Please write x next to the ground/s for your appeal. Please write N/A next to ground/s which you are not appealing.* | (9.1) That the examiners did not follow the correct examination procedure such that there is reasonable doubt that the decision would have been the same if the examiners had followed the correct procedure. |  |
| (9.2) That there is evidence of bias, prejudice or inadequate assessment on the part of one or both examiners such that the result of the examination should not be allowed to stand. |  |
| (9.3) That your performance at the oral examination (viva) was affected by exceptional circumstances of which the examiners were not aware when they took their decision, which factors beyond your control prevented you from disclosing prior to the examination, and that this produced an unfair result. |  |

# Section 3 – student statement

##### In this section, and in section 4, please clearly state the case for your appeal, and any evidence which you would like to be considered. Exhaustive detail is not required, but you should ensure that you have disclosed and described all of the information and evidence which you would like to be considered in your appeal. This is vital, as you will not normally be permitted to raise new grounds and/or submit further evidence once you have submitted your appeal.

##### The School understands that it will not always be possible to provide evidence to support every statement made in an appeal submission. However, wherever possible, please provide evidence. If you are not able to provide evidence to support your statements, please explain why you are not able to provide this. When referring to evidence, please also use the document number and title set out in your Statement of evidence in section 4 of this form.

##### Specific guidance for each ground for appeal is set out below.

##### Procedural error

##### If you are appealing on the basis that you have evidence to demonstrate that the correct procedure was not followed (regulation 7.1 or regulation 9.1), please specifically address the following points.

##### (i) Why do you believe that the correct procedure was not followed?

##### (ii) Why do you believe that this affected the decision made by your department/examiners?

##### (iii) Why you believe that this means there is reasonable doubt that the assessors/examiners would have made the same decision if the correct procedure had been followed?

##### School expectations for annual progress review, upgrade assessment and examination processes are set out in the Regulations for Research Degrees, and the regulations for your programme, which can be found in the [LSE Calendar](https://www.lse.ac.uk/resources/calendar/research.htm).[[1]](#footnote-2) Further procedural guidance and expectations are normally published locally by departments, normally via the departmental PhD students’ handbook, and via [Moodle](https://moodle.lse.ac.uk/).

##### Bias, prejudice or inadequate assessment

##### If you are appealing on the basis that you have evidence to demonstrate that bias and/or prejudice and/or inadequate assessment (regulation 7.2 or regulation 9.2), please specifically address the following points.

##### (i) Which members of the assessment/examination panel does this apply to?

##### (ii) How did the assessors/examiners demonstrate bias, prejudice or inadequate assessment?

##### (iii) Why does this mean that the decision should not stand?

##### Exceptional circumstances

##### If you are appealing on the basis that a decision was affected by exceptional circumstances of which your assessors/examiners were not aware when they took their decision, which factors beyond your control preventing you from disclosing prior to the examination, and that this produced an unfair result (regulation 7.3 or 9.3), please specifically address the following points.

##### (i) Which factors prevented you from disclosing your exceptional circumstances?

##### (ii) How did these factors prevented you from disclosing your exceptional circumstances before the decision was made?

##### (iii) Which exceptional circumstances do you feel affected your performance?

##### (iv) How did these exceptional circumstances affect your performance?

|  |
| --- |
| *Please enter your statement in this box. Please expand as necessary.* |

# Section 4 – Statement of evidence

|  |
| --- |
| Please list the evidence which you have attached to your appeal. Documents should ideally be numbered and titled, as suggested in the example below. You do not need to describe these – please just list them.  *Document 1: Email correspondence with programme director.*  *Document 2: Department PhD programme handbook.*  *Document 3: Letter from doctor.* |
| *Please enter your evidence list in this box. Please expand as necessary.* |

# Section 5 – Student statement and signature

##### By signing this form (below) and submitting your appeal documentation (including evidence) to [phdacademy@lse.ac.uk](mailto:phdacademy@lse.ac.uk), you confirm that:

##### i. you have read the Appeals Regulations for Research Students;

##### ii. you have disclosed all of the factors and evidence relevant to your appeal to the best of your ability;

##### iii. you aware that the Appeals Regulations for Research Students do not normally permit submission of additional evidence after this point, or in any later stages of the appeals process;

##### iv. you are aware that the Appeals Regulations for Research Students do not normally permit students to raise additional grounds for appeal after their initial submission.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student signature\*  *Wet signature not required – e-signatures, including typed signatures, permitted.* |  |
| Signature date (dd/mm/yy)\* |  |

# Section 6 – Next steps

##### Once you submit your appeal, the PhD Academy will acknowledge receipt, and your appeal submission will now be considered in accordance with the Appeals Regulations for Research Students.

##### In practice, the first step in the process is for the PhD Academy to contact members of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee to ask them to confirm their availability to consider your appeal within the 20 working day limit set out in the appeals regulations, and also to confirm that they are not aware of any conflict of interest (i.e. close working relationship with the colleagues involved in the processes which led to the decision you are appealed) which would prevent them from considering your appeal. It can take time to identify a decision-maker, but this normally takes no longer than a week. Once a decision-maker has received your documentation, the 20 working day period The PhD Academy team will update you when we have identified a decision-maker for your appeal.

##### The first step is for the decision-maker to determine under regulations 16-22 whether your appeal should be accepted, or rejected as you have no valid reason for appeal. This decision will normally occur within 5 working days of the date on which the stage #1 decision-maker receives your appeal documentation. Immediate rejections can happen for a variety of reasons, but the most common are where a student has submitted their appeal (i) late without sufficient explanation for the lateness, and (ii) without evidence, and without an explanation for the absence of the evidence. We will notify you of your appeal decision-maker’s initial decision as soon as possible.

##### If your appeal is accepted for consideration, the appeal decision-maker will then conduct an investigation under regulations 23-27 of the Appeals Regulations for Research Students and determine the outcome of your appeal within 20 working days of the date on which they initially received your appeal documentation. This investigation will be conducted under the principles set out in section 74 of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator’s [Good Practice Framework for Handling Complaints and Academic Appeals](https://lsecloud.sharepoint.com/sites/TEAM_LSE-PhD-Academy/Shared%20Documents/RDM%20team%20(public)/Processes/05%20Doc%20review/Appeals/Appeals%20submission%20form/24-25/01%20Comments/In%20such%20cases,%20the%20PhD%20Academy%20will%20keep%20you%20informed,%20providing%20updated%20timescales%20wherever%20feasible.). It is normal for decision-makers to contact colleagues who were involved in the processes which led to your appeal. You should also monitor your inbox, as the decision-maker may deem it necessary to interview you as part of their investigation.

##### As set out in regulations 35-36 of the Appeals Regulations for Research Students, in complex cases, such as those involving significant quantities of evidence or particularly complex procedural questions, decision makers may exceed the timescales stated above. Some appeals cases may also raise matters which overlap with other School procedures. Where an appeal overlaps with these procedures, the School may need to pause consideration of your appeal to allow consideration to be undertaken under another procedure. In such cases, the PhD Academy will inform you at the earliest appropriate juncture, and will provide updated timescales for completion of the appeal consideration process wherever feasible.

## Version log

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Review interval | New review start date | New review due by |
| Yearly | July 2025 | August 2025 |

Version history

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Publication date | Approved by | Notes |
| 23-24.01 | Unknown | PhD Academy Assistant Director | Extant version |
| 24-25.01 | 15/10/2024 | PhD Academy Manager | Change in style to reflect new PhD Academy ‘house style’ for all published documents. Comprehensive re-working of guidance. |

Contacts

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Query type | Contact | Email |
| Operational | PhD Academy, Research Degrees Management Team | [phdacademy@lse.ac.uk](mailto:phdacademy@lse.ac.uk) |
| Policy | Pete Mills, PhD Academy Manager | [phdacademy.manager@lse.ac.uk](mailto:phdacademy.manager@lse.ac.uk) |

Feedback

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mechanism description | Mechanism access details |
| Email | [phdacademy@lse.ac.uk](mailto:phdacademy@lse.ac.uk) |

Communications and Training

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Query | Answer | Notes |
| Will this document be publicised through internal communications? | Yes/No | N/A |
| Will training needs arise from this document? | Yes/No | N/A |

1. Please remember that you are governed by the regulations for your entry year. In practice, this means that if you enrolled during the 2023/24 academic year, you will be governed by the *Regulations for Research Degrees* and the programme regulations visible in the [LSE Calendar](https://www.lse.ac.uk/resources/calendar/research.htm) for your entry year. If you are not certain about which regulations govern your enrolment, please contact the PhD Academy ([phdacademy@lse.ac.uk](mailto:phdacademy@lse.ac.uk)) for confirmation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)