

SPSO decision report

Case: 201508865, University of Glasgow
Sector: further and higher education
Subject: policy/administration
Outcome: not upheld, no recommendations

Summary

Ms C complained that the university failed to follow the relevant procedure in marking her dissertation. She said that the second marker should not have been able to see the first marker's comments and that the second marker had simply agreed with the first marker's comments.

We found that the university's guidance did allow for the second marker to see the first marker's comments in some cases. Whilst the second marker's comments were brief, we did not consider that this amounted to unreasonable practice and therefore we did not uphold the complaint.

Ms C also complained that the university failed to consider bias in dealing with her appeal. We found that the issue of bias was considered during the consideration of her appeal and that the decision made by the university on this was not unreasonable. We therefore did not uphold this aspect of Ms C's complaint.

Ms C complained that the university failed to agree to her request for a third marker. In their response to us on this matter, the university said that the appeal did not establish any procedural irregularity in the marking of Ms C's dissertation and that there were therefore no grounds for appointing an additional marker. They also stated that the appointment of an additional marker would have been contrary to their procedures and would have meant inconsistency of treatment for students. We considered that the university's decision on this matter was reasonable and we did not uphold this aspect of Ms C's complaint.

Finally, Ms C complained that the university unreasonably decided that her appeal was about academic judgement. We found that the university had clarified to Ms C that they did not consider the appeal to be a challenge to academic judgement. We did not uphold this aspect of Ms C's complaint.