

EMMIR complaint procedures

As a student, you may raise a complaint either before, during or after your study period. You are expected to follow the procedures outlined below step-by-step.

| Assessment and supervision of academic performance (grades) | Payment of scholarship grants | Academic or organisational aspects of course delivery | Other issues |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| Step 1: Student contract If you consider that programme requirements have not been respected or that you have not been treated fairly, please consult the student contract in order to find out if your concern is covered. | | | |
| Step 2a: Teacher and/or supervisor In order to better understand an assessment or grade, first of all ask the relevant teacher to better justify a grade or assessment | Step 2a: Programme admin at UOL If you are concerned about the regularity and the amount of scholarship payments or the minimum insurance requirements, get in touch with the EMMIR admin at UOL in order to sort out the issue. | Step 2a: Course Director of your hosting institution If you are concerned about any aspect of the academic and/or organisational delivery of the programme or other issues that cannot be solved with the actors involved (e.g. teachers/professors), address the Course Director. | |
| Step 2b: Student representatives You may also discuss the respective issue with the student representatives and/or the EMA representatives. Representatives may have additional information and/or may wish to refer the issue to the Consortium Coordinator, the Consortium Committee or the EMA Course Quality Advisory Board | | | |
| Step 3: Project coordination/management at UOL If no agreement or solution can be found it is advised to contact the project coordination/management at UOL. This can be done either directly or – if you prefer – through the student representatives. | | | |
| Step 4: Examination Board In case no agreement can be | Step 4: Consortium Committee If, after the dialogue (which should preferably result in summary minutes circulated among the parties involved), you still consider that your concern has not been properly addressed, you may choose to start formal complaint procedures within the consortium by means of | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>found with the teacher, you may want to file an appeal to the examination board; find details on procedures in the EMMIR Examination Regulations §25</p> <p><i>The decision of the Examination board is binding.</i></p> | <p>sending an email to emmir@uni-oldenburg.de including full documentation of your concern and previous communication (Steps 1 to 3). Depending on the urgency of your concern it will either be dealt with during a Consortium Committee Meeting or by means of circular resolution</p> |
| | <p style="text-align: center;">Step 5: EACEA</p> <p>If no satisfactory solution can be found you may file a formal complaint to the agency* (details and a complaint form can be found at https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/actions/key-action-1-learning-mobility-individuals/erasmus-mundus-student-complaints_en)</p> |

* *The agency (EACEA) may only intervene if*

a) the requirements for the concerned programme have not been respected:

- *The regularity and the amount of scholarship payment;*
- *The minimum insurance requirements;*
- *The award of a degree and the recognition of credit mobility.*

b) the terms and provisions of the student contract and its annexes as well as the information provided on the course's website or other official documentation of the consortium/ partnership are not respected

The agency may not intervene if

- *the complaint concerns the assessment and supervision of academic performance;*
- *the complaint addresses issues relating to the internal regulations of the higher education institution(s) in question;*
- *the complaint addresses national regulations such as visa requirements and residence permits.*

Study and Examination Regulations for the European Master in Migration and Intercultural Relations (EMMIR)

at Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg (Germany), Ahfad University for Women (Sudan), Makerere University Kampala (Uganda), Mbarara University of Science and Technology (Uganda), Univerza v Novi Gorici (Slovenia), Jihočeská univerzita v Českých Budějovicích (Czech Republic), Universitetet i Stavanger (Norway)

passed by the EMMIR Consortium Committee on 22 September 2011,
revised on 12 May 2012 and 7 February 2013,

and approved by the seven universities jointly offering
the European Master in Migration and Intercultural Relations.

PROVISIONAL

EXCERPT PROCEDURE FOR APPEALS

§ 25 Procedure for Appeals

(1) The Consortium Committee acknowledges the procedure for appeals at all partner universities. Appeals against decisions concerning the grading of an examination can be lodged with the Examination Board within one month of being informed of the grading. The Examination Board will collaborate with appeal panels at the partner universities before arriving at a final decision.

(2) An appeal can be filed electronically and necessarily includes

- a) a statement by the student detailing the reasons for his/her appeal, especially the professional misjudgement on the part of the examiner,
- b) a copy of the disputed material,
- c) documentation of the feedback and other communication with the examiner.

The appeal should be sent to the Chair of the Examination Board, who will forward it to all members of the Examination Board, barring their involvement in the grading as outlined in (11). Should the Chair of the Examination Board be involved in the grading, the appeal shall be sent to another member of the Examination Board.

(3) Upon receiving the appeal, the Chair of the Examination Board shall, on behalf of the Examination board, inform the supervising examiner of the appeal for a recheck/remark. The examiner has to respond to this appeal in writing (addressed to both the Examination Board and the student) within two weeks after he/she was informed of the appeal.

(4) The supervising examiner may respond by either

- a) changing the grade and outlining the reasons for this decision.
- b) not changing the grade and outlining the reasons for this decision.

(5) In either case, the student may choose to

- a) accept the grade (revised or not)
- b) request a review of the grade by the Examination Board.

(6) Upon the student's request, the Examination Board reviews the decision on the basis of both the student's and the examiner's comments, to see whether:

1. the examination was conducted in a proper manner;
2. the grading was based on correct information;
3. general grading principles were followed;
4. the examiner's reasoning for the award of the disputed grade is sound and in line with EMMIR grading principles;
5. no reasonable answer, with a logical and justified argument was judged to be false;
6. the examiner was guided by relevant considerations;

(7) The Examination Board shall make a decision within four weeks after it received the student's request for review and inform both the student and the supervising examiner of its decision. If it finds all criteria listed under (6) respected, the grade remains unchanged. If it finds any of the criteria violated then a second reader not previously involved in the grading is appointed to remark the disputed work.

(8) A second reader appointed by the Examination Board shall be chosen based on his familiarity with the field of the examination and shall, preferably, be a faculty member of a partner institution thus far not represented in the relevant student's assessment.

(9) Within two weeks of his/her appointment, the second reader shall inform the Examination Board of the revised grade and outline the reasons for the decision. Should the Examination

Board be satisfied that the criteria listed under (6) were respected by the second reader, the Examination Board upholds the decision and the student will be formally informed of the decision and the revised grade. All relevant transcripts shall be re-issued to reflect the revised grade. Should the Examination Board not be satisfied that the second reader's decision follows these criteria, it may choose to appoint another reader.

(10) The original grade cannot be lowered (by either the examiner in reviewing his original grade or a second reader) unless during the appeal process it is determined that the paper is partially or fully plagiarised. In this case, procedures outlined in §20 are to be followed.

(11) If any member of Examination Board is involved in the grading of the disputed assignment, he/she shall not be part of any deliberations or decisions regarding the appeal, albeit by responding to the appeal as outlined in (4), should they have been the supervising examiner of the work in question.

PROVISIONAL