UCL STUDENT AND REGISTRY SERVICES REGISTRAR'S OFFICE



By email <u>mvs25@cam.ac.uk</u>

9 July 2015

Dear Mr Sewell

Complaint Panel Hearing Outcome

You had been registered as a PhD Student in the Department of Computer Science from January 2000 onwards. On 15 August 2011 you submitted a Student Grievance Procedure Application Form, which University College London (UCL) acknowledged same day and subsequently emailed you to explain how the matter would be dealt with on 9 September 2011. Your case was reviewed by the Director of Student Services and the Head of the Graduate School.

A Grievance Panel was established and met on 25 January 2012, at which no decision was reached as further information was required by members of the Panel to consider. This information was submitted by the Department of Computer Science and yourself in February 2012. The Panel reconvened its review of your case on 20 April 2012 without a representative of the Department or yourself being present. You subsequently submitted further information on 25 October 2012 and 12 November 2012 which was received by the Chair of the Panel in December 2012. A Completion of Procedures Letter was issued to you on 15 February 2013, and a revised Completion of Procedures Letter was sent by email to you on 1 March 2013.

You further submitted an appeal against the decision of the Grievance Panel on 6 April 2013, following which a final Completion of Procedures Letter was issued to you on 27 August 2013 notifying you that your appeal had not been upheld. On 26 November 2013 you filed a Complaint Form with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) on the grounds of UCL's decision not to uphold your appeal and that the findings and decision of the initial Grievance Panel stood.

On 10 December 2014, UCL received the Complaint Outcome to your case, a recommendation of which was to offer you the opportunity to resubmit your Grievance to take account of information presented after you had submitted your original application, and subsequently be reconsidered by a new Grievance Panel at a Complaint Panel Hearing.

A Complaint Hearing Panel was convened and the Panel Hearing took place on 7 May 2015, and the grounds that you had raised were considered. Please find attached to this Complaint Hearing Outcome Letter, a full detailed Report of the Panel Hearing held. Your requested outcome was to be allowed to obtain your PhD.

Panel members had read the paperwork in advance of the Hearing. The purpose of the Panel was to explore areas of uncertainty with all parties in order to reach a decision on the case. Having considered all the written material and oral evidence, the Panel concluded that your Appeal is upheld and propose the recommendations as detailed below.

Recommendations of the Panel:

- 1. The Panel noted that it was not within its authority to award you a PhD.
- 2. The Panel agreed that you should be granted the opportunity to resubmit your Thesis but with new Examiners. To this effect, you should be permitted to do an extra calendar year, which is to be broken down into two parts; six months supervision with a further six months to revise your Thesis. It was felt that this should be sufficient time to tweak and firm up your Thesis and enable you to resubmit.
- 3. The Panel had felt that good quality feedback had been given previously.
- 4. Fees should be waivered for the supervision.
- 5. One year's stipend should be offered so as not to be seen materially disadvantaged. This would equate to £16,057.
- 6. Both you and the Department of Computer Science should comply with Doctoral School Regulations.
- 7. A draft Thesis should be submitted and written feedback given before final submission.
- 8. Faculty Graduate Tutor will sign Examiners Forms.
- 9. The Panel strongly suggest that you and your Primary Supervisor try to engage better.
- 10. The Panel recommend that the Faculty Graduate Tutor take forward the recommendations, oversee the initial six months supervision period and, seek new Examiners. Extra care should be taken to ensure that potential Examiners are appropriate to the subject area. A timetable should be put together between yourself and your Primary and Secondary Supervisors over the course of the recommended six months supervisory period, which should also be overseen by the Faculty Graduate Tutor.

If you remain unhappy with this decision you are entitled to seek to appeal this decision and must do so in writing within twenty-one days of this communication, in accordance with paragraphs 70 to 75 of UCL's Complaints Procedure.

Yours sincerely

Dr Dave Spratt

Faculty Graduate Tutor, Medical Sciences & Vice Head of the Doctoral School

University College London Gower Street London WC1E 6BT Tel: +44 (0)20 34561107 d.spratt@ucl.ac.uk

IIIA AMAT