**PROCESS FOR REMOVAL OF A COMMITTEE OR COURT MEMBER**

1. Any member of Court may be removed by a resolution of Court passed by two thirds of the members of Court on any of the following grounds:
   1. inability of the relevant member to exercise the relevant member’s functions or (as the case may be) the functions of membership generally (whether through medical incapacity, legal impediment (such as an unspent criminal conviction or disqualification as a charity trustee), or otherwise);
   2. persistent absenteeism; or
   3. breach of any condition of their appointment or of the Code of Conduct for Members of Court.
2. If any Court member or any other person believes that there are grounds for removal of any Member of Court, they may inform the Convener (or Vice-Convener, if the Convener is the subject of the allegation(s)) who shall, if they consider that there is a *prima facie* case under any ground set out above ask the University Secretary to: (i) notify Court members of the relevant allegation(s); (ii) notify the relevant member of the allegation(s), and invite them to participate in an independent investigation; and (iii) instruct an appropriate independent investigation of the matters alleged. Where necessary, the investigator will be appointed from out with the University. The investigator will be asked to provide a written report to Court which will outline the process followed, the information gathered in their investigation, and their conclusions. The investigator will be asked to conclude their investigation within a reasonable timeframe and in a fair and reasonable manner but may otherwise conduct such investigation as they see fit. The member under investigation will be entitled to receive, and respond to, a copy of the final written investigator’s report.
3. Following receipt of the investigator’s report, any written response provided by the member of Court under investigation, and conclusion of any other investigatory steps Court may agree are reasonably required (which may include hearing from and questioning the investigator and/or relevant member directly), Court will be asked to vote on a resolution for removal of the relevant member.
4. The relevant member may be suspended from membership of Court, without prejudice, pending the outcome of the investigation and until completion of the voting on the resolution, by a vote passed by two thirds of the members of Court where it is considered such suspension reasonably necessary to protect the University’s community, reputation, or good governance. During any period of suspension, the relevant member will not be entitled to participate in or vote on any matters of Court.
5. The relevant member will not count in any calculation required under this process, and nor shall they be entitled to vote.
6. If the resolution to remove the relevant member is passed, they shall cease to be a member of Court. A member so removed shall have a right to seek a review of the decision of Court in order to have the resolution reconsidered or quashed. Such request for review must be intimated in writing to the Convener (or Vice-Convener, if the Convener was the subject of the allegation(s)) within 10 working days following the date of the resolution. Court will only review a decision on the following grounds:
   1. the removed member has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process and which evidence is likely to have had a material bearing on the decision of Court;
   2. the procedures set out above have not been followed, to the material detriment of the removed member; or
   3. the decision to remove the member was clearly unreasonable.
7. The process for replacement of any removed member shall not commence until the completion of any review under paragraph 6 above.
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