

## SPSO decision report

**Case:** 201301781, University of Strathclyde  
**Sector:** further and higher education  
**Subject:** academic appeal/exam results/degree classification  
**Outcome:** not upheld, no recommendations

### Summary

Mr C was unhappy with the decision of a university faculty appeal committee (the FAC) not to uphold his appeal against a decision to transfer him from a PhD (doctor of philosophy) study path to a Masters course. Mr C appealed the FAC decision and submitted evidence of personal difficulties to be heard by the senate appeals committee (the SAC). He appealed on the grounds that he had new information and documentary evidence to support his view that the FAC was not given enough background information on issues raised by a supervisor. Mr C also considered that that the documentary evidence sometimes contradicted written information submitted by a supervisor. The university decided that there were no grounds for an SAC hearing and ruled that the FAC's decision stood.

Mr C complained to us that the university did not follow their appeals policy when they considered whether the senate appeal should be heard, as he said they did not accept the new documentary evidence he submitted or his statement that his supervisor's written response to the FAC was an inadequate representation of events. We did not, however, uphold his complaint. After we carefully considered all the relevant policies related to Mr C's complaint alongside all the points of his complaint, we found that the university had correctly followed their policies and procedures with the FAC appeal and had correctly followed their policies in not holding a SAC hearing.