

## REGULATIONS

---

## GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR HIGHER DEGREES

The following procedure reflects the general recommendations of the QAA *Quality Code: Chapter B11*

- 3.1 The higher doctorates (the degrees of LLD, DLitt, and DSc) may be awarded on the basis of published work.
- 3.2 The degree of DPhil may be awarded **either** on the basis of a programme of supervised research assessed by means of a thesis **or** on the basis of published work.
- 3.3 The degree of MPhil may be awarded on the basis of a programme of supervised research assessed by means of a thesis.
- 3.4 The degrees of MA, MSc, and LLM may be awarded **either** on the basis of a programme of taught courses and assessment by examination or by examination and dissertation **or** on the basis of a programme of supervised research assessed by means of a thesis. These last are called the MA by research, the MSc by research, and the LLM by research respectively.

The regulations for these degrees are set out below.

### GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF HIGHER DOCTORATES

- 3.5 The degrees of Doctor of Laws (LLD), Doctor of Letters (DLitt), and Doctor of Science (DSc) may be conferred on:
  - i. graduates of this University of not less than seven years standing;
  - ii. holders of a higher degree of this University of not less than four years standing;
  - iii. graduates of another University of not less than seven years standing who have also held an appointment as a member of staff of this University for at least two years.
- 3.6 Candidates must have fulfilled such conditions as are prescribed below and have submitted published work which, in the opinion of the examiners, gives clear proof that the candidate is a leading authority in the field of study concerned and has made an original and distinguished contribution to the advancement or application of knowledge in that field.
- 3.7 A person wishing to be admitted to the degree shall submit to the Registry Officer, with the appropriate fee, three copies of:
  - i. a list of the published works upon which the application is based. The list should indicate whether and with what result any of the works have previously been submitted for any degree of any university or awarding body;
  - ii. a supporting statement indicating the area of knowledge to which the published work relates and the ways in which it makes an original and distinguished contribution to the advancement or application of knowledge meriting the award of the degree;
  - iii. where any of the works submitted have been produced jointly with others, a written statement signed by the other contributors to the works concerned indicating the share which the candidate took personally in the work;
  - iv. the published works upon which the application is based.
- 3.8 The works submitted as part of the application must be published and freely available. Unpublished work, or material in the course of being published, will not be accepted. Work which has successfully been submitted for the award of a degree at this or any

other university or awarding body can only be considered as supporting material explaining the context or background to other works submitted. All the works submitted shall be written in English, except where the prior approval of the Research Committee has been given for the submission of work in another language.

- 3.9** Any application for the degree shall first be considered by the Dean who, after such consultation as may be considered necessary or desirable, shall determine whether in his or her opinion there is a *prima facie* case for the award of the degree. Where the Dean is of the opinion that a *prima facie* case has been made, s/he shall proceed to nominate examiners for the degree to be appointed by Senate and where applicable to be approved by the Academic Advisory Council. Where the Dean is not of the opinion that there is a *prima facie* case for the award of the degree, the candidate shall be so informed and the published works submitted shall be returned together with such portion of the fee as is prescribed.
- 3.10** There shall be three examiners for the degree, at least two of whom shall be external examiners. The examination shall consist of a consideration of the works and prescribed materials submitted. In cases where the examiners consider it desirable, the candidate may be given an oral examination on the works submitted and on the general area of knowledge to which they relate.
- 3.11** Each examiner shall make an independent report on the published works and shall indicate whether in his or her opinion the candidate has achieved the standard required for the award of the degree and whether an oral examination should be held. Each examiner should be present at any oral examination, and shall sign a joint statement of the result of the oral examination.
- 3.12** The reports and statement of the examiners shall be considered by the Research Committee which may recommend to Senate the award of the degree, permit a further examination on such conditions as it sees fit, or decline to award the degree. Except where the Research Committee permits further examination, no further application for the award of the degree may be made until the expiry of at least two calendar years from the date upon which any previous application was made.
- 3.13** Where Senate confirms the award of the degree, one copy of the works and prescribed materials submitted shall be deposited in the University Library. Except where the nature of the publications renders this impracticable (for instance where they are in book form), they should be bound together with the prescribed materials in a form similar to that required by the Rules for the Form and Submission of Theses for Higher Degrees.

#### **GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DPhil ON THE BASIS OF PUBLISHED WORK**

- 3.14** The degree of DPhil on the basis of published work may be conferred on:
- i. graduates of this university of not less than five years standing;
  - ii. graduates of another university of not less than five years standing who have also held an appointment as a member of staff of this university for at least two years;
  - iii. graduates of another university of not less than five years standing who have also held a Fellowship of this university for at least two years.
- 3.15** Candidates must have fulfilled such conditions as are prescribed below and have submitted published work which, in the opinion of the examiners, gives clear proof of a significant and original contribution to learning, for example through the discovery of new knowledge, the connection of previously unrelated facts, the development of new theory,

or the revision of older views. The standard required for the degree is the same as that required for a DPhil.

- 3.16** In the first instance, a person wishing to pursue a DPhil by published works should contact the appropriate Research Officer, who will identify an appropriate supervisor. The supervisor will be appointed for a minimum of 12 months and be responsible for providing assistance to the student in preparing the submission for the degree. In due course, the submission for the degree will be delivered to the Registry Officer, with the appropriate fee, and will comprise three copies of:
- i. a list of the published works upon which the application is based. The list should indicate whether and with what result any of the works have previously been submitted for any degree of any university or awarding body;
  - ii. a supporting commentary indicating the area of knowledge to which the published work relates and the ways in which it makes a significant and original contribution to learning meriting the award of the degree;
  - iii. where any of the works submitted have been produced jointly with others, a written statement signed by the other contributors to the works concerned indicating the share which the candidate took personally in the work;
  - iv. the published works upon which the application is based.
  - v. a *curriculum vitae*.
- 3.17** The works submitted as part of the application must be published and freely available. Unpublished work, or material in the course of being published, will not be accepted. Work which has successfully been submitted for the award of a degree at this or any other university or awarding body can only be considered as supporting material explaining the context or background to other works submitted. All the works submitted shall be written in English, except where the prior approval of the Research Committee has been given for the submission of work in another language.
- 3.18** Any application for the degree shall first be considered by the Research Officer and or supervisor (for DPhil by Publication) who, after such consultation as may be considered necessary or desirable, shall determine whether in his or her opinion there is a *prima facie* case for the award of the degree. Where the Research Officer and supervisor is of the opinion that a *prima facie* case has been made, s/he shall proceed to nominate examiners for the degree to be appointed by Senate and where applicable to be approved by the Academic Advisory Council. Where the Research Officer and supervisor is not of the opinion that there is a *prima facie* case for the award of the degree, the candidate shall be so informed and the published works submitted shall be returned.
- 3.19** There shall be three examiners for the degree, at least two of whom shall be external examiners. The examination shall consist of a consideration of the works and prescribed materials submitted together with the commentary and an oral examination on the works submitted.
- 3.20** Each examiner shall make an independent report on the published works and the commentary before the oral examination, shall be present at the oral examination, and shall sign a joint statement of the result of the oral examination.
- 3.21** The reports and statement of the examiners shall be considered by the Research Committee which may recommend to Senate the award of the degree, permit a further examination on such conditions as it sees fit, or decline to award the degree. Except where the Research Committee permits further examination, no further application for the award of the degree may be made until the expiry of at least two calendar years from the date upon which any previous application was made.

- 3.22** Where Senate confirms the award of the degree, one copy of the works and prescribed materials submitted shall be deposited in the University Library. Except where the nature of the publications renders this impracticable (for instance where they are in book form), they should be bound together with the prescribed materials in a form similar to that required by the Rules for the Form and Submission of Theses for Higher Degrees.

### **GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF MEDICINE (MD) ON THE BASIS OF PUBLISHED RESEARCH**

- 3.23** The degree of Doctor of Medicine shall be awarded to medical graduates for original published contributions of excellence in any branch of medical science. The degree of MD on the basis of published work may be conferred on:

- i. holders of the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (MB BS), or equivalent approved medical qualifications, of not less than five years standing who have held an appointment as a member of staff of this university for at least two years;
- ii. holders of the degrees of MB BS, or equivalent approved medical qualifications, of not less than five years standing who have held a Fellowship of this university for at least two years.

- 3.24** Candidates must have fulfilled such conditions as are prescribed below and have submitted published work which, in the opinion of the examiners, gives clear proof of an original contribution to learning in the field of medical science.

- 3.25** In the first instance, a person wishing to be registered on a programme of study should contact the appropriate Research Officer, who will identify an appropriate supervisor. The supervisor will be appointed for a minimum of 12 months and be responsible for providing assistance to the student in preparing the submission for the degree. In due course, the submission for the degree will be delivered to the Registry Officer, with the appropriate fee, and will comprise three copies of:

- i. a list of the published works upon which the application is based. The list should indicate whether and with what result any of the works have previously been submitted for any degree of any university or awarding body;
- ii. a supporting commentary indicating the area of knowledge to which the published work relates and the ways in which it makes an original contribution to medical learning meriting the award of the degree;
- iii. where any of the works submitted have been produced jointly with others, a written statement signed by the other contributors to the works concerned indicating the share that the candidate took personally in the work;
- iv. a *curriculum vitae*.
- v. the published works upon which the application is based.

- 3.26** All applications will be considered first by the Dean who, after such consultation as may be considered necessary or desirable, shall determine whether in his/her opinion there is a *prima facie* case for the award of the degree.

- 3.27** Where the Dean is of the opinion that a *prima facie* case has been made, the candidate will be asked to submit two copies of the works upon which the application is based, together with the required fee. Additional work, published or unpublished, may be

submitted in support of the application. Permanently bound copies are acceptable if the work is already in that format.

Where the Dean is of the opinion that a *prima facie* case has not been made, the candidate will be so informed and all submitted materials will be returned.

- 3.28** The submitted work shall be assessed by two examiners, at least one of whom shall be an external examiner. The examination shall consist of a consideration of the works and materials submitted, with an oral examination on these works and on the general area of knowledge to which they relate.
- 3.29** Each examiner shall make an independent report on the published works before the oral examination; they shall be present at the oral examination, and they shall sign a joint statement of the result of the oral examination.
- 3.30** The reports and joint statement of the examiners shall be considered by the Research Committee which may recommend to Senate the award of the degree, permit a further examination on such conditions as it deems fit, or decline the award of the degree. Except where the Research Committee permits further examination, no further application for admission to the degree may be made until the expiry of at least two calendar years from the date upon which any previous application was made.
- 3.31** Where Senate confirms the award of the degree one copy of the works and prescribed materials shall be deposited in the University Library. Except where the nature of the publication renders this impracticable (e.g. where they are in the form of a book), or where bound copies were submitted originally, the submitted works should be bound together with the prescribed materials in a form similar to that required by the Rules for the Form and Submission of Theses for Higher Degrees.

#### **GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR CANDIDATES INTENDING TO PROCEED BY THESIS**

- 3.32** The degree of MA, MSc, LL.M (by research), MPhil, or DPhil may be conferred on graduates of this University or on those of other Universities or on such other persons as may be deemed acceptable by Senate. (In the case of the LL.M the qualifying degree must be in Law or in a degree with a substantial Law component.) Candidates must have:
- i. undertaken such research as approved by Senate for not less than the period prescribed below;
  - ii. fulfilled such other conditions as may be prescribed below;
  - iii. submitted the results of their research in a thesis satisfactory to the Examiners appointed by the University who at their discretion may further examine the candidate in any matters relating to the research and the thesis.
- 3.33** A member of staff of the University may be registered on a programme of study as a candidate for a higher degree if he is a full-time member of the academic, library, administrative or other related staff of the University; research or analogous staff may be similarly registered on a programme of study. The normal regulations for higher degrees will apply in the case of such candidates.

#### **ADMISSION**

- 3.34** A person wishing to begin a course of research for a higher degree by thesis shall apply as indicated on the website or send to the Admissions Officer an application on the prescribed form (Appendix 1) see QAA Quality Code: Chapter B11

- 3.35** The application must be scrutinised and agreed by at least two members of academic staff in the area of study, one of whom may be the Research Officer. They should draw on the full range of information supplied by the prospective student, and may if necessary require the student to attend for interview or ask for further information from the student, or from referees, so as to ensure that only a student appropriately qualified and prepared commences work on a higher degree. In some areas of study, it is normal to require a research proposal from the prospective student, which will allow the academic staff to determine if appropriate supervision can be offered. Any special needs or disabilities should ideally be declared prior to commencement, but must be dealt with as they emerge between the Admissions Tutor and Student Welfare.
- 3.36** In the process of admission particular care must be taken with English language level. Entry level should normally be in the range IELTS 6.0–6.5, though Admissions Tutors retain discretion in this regard. Where there is any doubt or concern about an applicant’s language level, the Admissions Tutor should seek more information (via interview, sample essays, telephone/web interview) to assess more precisely the applicant’s level in relation to the demands of the particular degree. If an applicant has potentially borderline language level and is registered on a programme of study, it must be with the proviso that s/he takes pre-sessional courses to improve his or her language level before formally commencing the degree or alternatively takes language-support courses to run in parallel with the degree.
- 3.37** A ‘Checklist for Registration of a Research Student’ (Appendix 2) must be completed for each registering student. Departments may vary the Checklist to their particular needs but the main heads should remain. A copy of the Checklist should be sent for approval to the Research Officer and copied to the Admissions Officer. Admission is subject to approval by the Research Officer. Only the Admissions Office may make an offer of admission on behalf of the University.
- 3.38** The Offer Letter to the prospective student constitutes a contract between the student and the institution. Departments may vary the standard template letter, but must retain the main sets of information, including the approximate total fees, the expected period of study, the arrangements for enrolment and registration, and the references to this *Handbook* and to other relevant website material.
- 3.39** Students intending to proceed to the DPhil would normally be first registered on the MPhil programme. A student who has been registered on the MPhil programme may apply for an upgrade to the DPhil after not less than one academic year. A student who has been registered on the MA by Research, MSc by Research or LLM by Research programme(s) shall not normally be permitted to transfer to the MPhil/DPhil. If however this is deemed appropriate (see the last paragraph of this regulation 3.39), the following steps should be adhered to:
- i. the research project must be scrutinized by the supervisor(s) and the Research Officer, to check that it is appropriate to the higher level of degree;
  - ii. a transfer meeting must be held with student, supervisor(s) and Research Officer, and if the outcome approves the re-registration, the application to re-register as an MPhil/DPhil student form should be completed (see Appendix 17) and sent to Registry;
  - iii. the student will then be re-registered onto the MPhil/DPhil programme as an MPhil student in the first instance;
  - iv. the student should be made aware of the new requirements for the higher degree in the Research Degrees Handbook.

As the work carried out at Masters level can be carried over to the higher degree, the time spent at Masters level should also be able to count directly towards the DPhil, if that is deemed appropriate by the supervisor(s) and the Research Officer. Thus it is possible

for the re-registering student to complete their PG research studies three years after commencing.

The timing of the first Annual Review after re-registration is flexible, but would not normally take place within the first six months after re-registration onto the MPhil/DPhil programme. The exact timing will depend on the progress the student has made during the Masters level period and how easily they adapt to working at the MPhil/DPhil level. It should be remembered that work at a Masters level has different expectations, descriptors, etc. from work at MPhil/DPhil level (see section 1 of the Research Degrees Handbook). Although one year will have been spent on work at Masters Level this is not necessarily at the same level as one year on an MPhil/DPhil. Therefore, before any change in status to DPhil a student would need to demonstrate that they were achieving the level of MPhil and all things being equal capable of achieving work of a DPhil level.

## **RESEARCH PROPOSAL OR PLAN**

**3.40** At the commencement of studies for all higher degrees by research the student and supervisor(s) must work together to develop or refine the research proposal/plan. The research proposal should specify

- i. the field of study;
- ii. the working title;
- iii. an outline of the proposed plan of work;
- iv. the facilities available for the investigation (an outline bibliography, for example), and, where appropriate, the resources identified elsewhere;
- v. any additional support, including supporting studies, that the student will require.

**3.41** For an MPhil/DPhil student, the research proposal must be available at the first Annual Review (see paras 3.55–3.56), and will form an important part of the discussion at the Review. For Masters level students by research (MA, MSc, LLM), the research proposal should normally be fully evolved and a work-in-progress by the end of the second term of study (fourth term for part-time students).

**3.42** If the research proposal for MPhil/DPhil is not considered satisfactory at the first Annual Review, the review panel may grant an extension of time to achieve a satisfactory proposal or may terminate the student's studies. If the research proposal at Masters level is not considered satisfactory after two terms by the supervisor(s) and the Research Officer (after four terms for part-time students), they may grant an extension of time to achieve a satisfactory proposal or may terminate the student's studies. In both instances the student will be informed from the Registry by letter, which will indicate the student's right of appeal (see paras 4.46–4.56). A student who withdraws or whose studies are terminated within the first six months from registration will not count for the purposes of completion statistics.

## **METHOD AND PERIOD OF STUDY**

**3.43** Candidates may be registered on a full-time or part-time basis. During the time of their study many students will live in or near the university and attend regularly. For those at a distance and/or part-time, individual departments may require the student to spend a stipulated minimum number of days at the university each year to help ensure the progress of their research, and this minimum number of days must be adhered to. The supervisor and student should maintain such appropriate regular serious intellectual contact as will further the student's project in a timely way. Compliance by both the supervisor and the student is ensured in the following three ways:



- i. A minimum number of formal supervisor-led meetings with students should be held:
  - Humanities - a minimum of 8 meetings per annum
  - Business - a minimum of 12 meetings per annum
  - Science - a minimum of 12 meetings per annum
  - Law - a minimum of 10 meetings per annum
- ii. the supervisor should maintain a logbook of contact, signed jointly with the student, of formal meetings, and of video conference/telephone/e-mail discussion, so that it is possible to review the contact; an acceptable alternative is a filed e-mail correspondence, whereby the student writes a brief e-mail summary of each supervisory meeting and the supervisor replies emending or adding to the content;
- iii. at the Annual Review (see paras 3.55–3.56) the pattern of contact and its effectiveness should be considered, and a formal note made of the plan for meetings and consultations in the next period of study.

In the event that certain candidates, for reasons approved by the Research Officer, are engaged in their research at a distance from the University, then, where appropriate, alternative supplementary supervisory arrangements shall also be approved by the Research Officer, to include a specified minimum number of visits by the supervisor and/or the additional supervisor (see para 3.54), and an undertaking that student and supervisor (and additional supervisor, where appropriate, see para 3.54) shall place with the Registry office full contact details, including telephone numbers and email addresses and that each undertake to ensure that these are kept up to date at all times during the research student's registration for the degree.

**3.44** The prescribed periods of study shall be:

		<b>(full-time)</b>	<b>(part-time)</b>
MA	-	one academic year	(two years)
MSc	-	one academic year	(two years)
LLM	-	one academic year	(two years)
MPhil	-	two academic years	(four years)
DPhil	-	three academic years	(six years)

These periods may be reduced in specific cases with the approval of the Research Committee, which may permit submission to be made no earlier than after the lapse of two-thirds of the prescribed period of study (see 4.32)".

These periods may also be increased by up to one year for full-time study and two years for part-time study in specific cases, with the approval of the Research Committee. The School of Study will provide the Research Committee with its justification for longer periods, including, where appropriate, details of the structure of the extra period of study at the start of the programme.

## **EXTENSION OF TIME AND SUSPENSION OF STUDIES**

**3.45** Students, both full-time and part-time, should submit the thesis within the prescribed periods of study or apply for an extension of time. For all students a first extension of time of up to a year may be granted within the department with the agreement of the supervisor(s) and the Research Officer. This is called a Departmental Extension. In the case of MPhil and DPhil, the extension request should be discussed at the Annual Review, in the second or third year of study respectively, and the reasons for it noted in the Annual Review report form. Appendix 9 should then be completed, selecting 'Departmental Extension' and the form returned to Registry.

If at the end of this first extension of time the thesis is not ready for submission; or if the first extension request is for longer than one year, an application for a Research Committee Extension must be made by completion of Appendix 9, selecting 'Research Committee Extension', and the form returned to Registry. Registry then coordinate the approval of the request with the Chairman of the University Research Committee. All Departmental Extensions and Research Committee Extensions are reported to the next Research Committee by Registry.

- 3.46** The Research Officer will not normally grant a suspension of studies. Periods of suspension cannot be counted towards the prescribed period of study for the degree.

## **SUPERVISION**

The supervisor(s)-student relationship lies at the heart of successful research practice, the one leading the other in what is essentially an apprenticeship in research/scholarship. The following regulations are to help ensure the integrity and quality of that relationship. (See QAA Quality Code Chapter B11: Research Degrees)

- 3.47** A supervisor is appointed to his/her role by the Research Officer in conjunction with the Head of Department/Dean. The following must be considered regarding eligibility: a supervisor should normally:
- i. have the DPhil/PhD;
  - ii. be research-active and publishing in one or more specialist fields;
  - iii. not carry an undergraduate teaching-load or administrative-load that is incompatible with having appropriate time for supervision. This is ensured via the use of the Supervisor Workload Monitoring Form (Appendix 10).
- 3.48** Before a student is registered on a programme of study it is crucial to ensure that there is an appropriate match between the potential student's research interests or agenda and those of a supervisor, depending on the supervisor's experience and range of interests. See 'Checklist for registration as a research student' (Appendix 2).
- 3.49** The supervisory role may be appropriately considered at each supervisor's PDR to ensure the on-going development of the supervisor's own research, research expertise, and teaching knowledge, and to identify training needs.
- 3.50** Where it is possible, students will have joint supervision, i.e. two named and equally-acting supervisors. At least one of the supervisors should be an employee of the University, and that the principle supervisor allocated to a student, should be an employee of the University. Where that is not possible or appropriate supervision will involve one named supervisor (first supervisor), and a second named supervisor who takes a subsidiary role. The first supervisor must be identified prior to entry and named at entry; the second (joint) or (subsidiary) supervisor may be appropriately appointed later, but within the first year, as the precise direction of the research becomes clear. The supervisor shall normally have had successful experience of supervising to the level of the degree proposed, either solely or as co-supervisor. Where the subject-specialist supervisor does not have such supervisory experience, a director of studies (i.e. principal supervisor with appropriate supervisory experience) must be appointed. Where a proposed supervisor is wholly new to the role, s/he will usually be appointed to act in the first instance as second supervisor with an experienced supervisor who, in the initial stages, is first supervisor. If the student is based abroad, a local person will normally be appointed to act as a second supervisor (see para 3.54).

**3.51** Where a proposed supervisor, who has a successful record of supervision elsewhere, is newly in post at the University, then s/he must undergo at least A (ii), B (iv), and C in the induction process for new supervisors (below).

**3.52** The Research Officer in each subject-area is primarily responsible for the induction of a new supervisor. There are four elements:

**A.** The new supervisor should him/herself seek to understand proactively the role.

This should involve at least:

- i. the study of educational literature on the role and responsibilities of a supervisor, and on what helps and hinders effective supervision. Standard works are in the library: i.e. Delamont, Sarah, et al. *Supervising the PhD: A Guide to Success* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn, 2004), etc.;
- ii. reading of the *Research Degrees Handbook* (obtainable in hard copy from Registry, or on the university website), in particular the 'Postgraduate Feedback Questionnaire' (Appendix 8);
- iii. reading one successful recent DPhil thesis from within their department or subject-area, and the examiners' report on the thesis obtainable from Registry;
- iv. reading feedback from previous students of the same School if this is available.

**B.** The induction meeting with the Research Officer should cover at least the following:

- i. the needs of research students and the issues they face. The new supervisor should reflect on her/his own experience of supervision when working for the DPhil/PhD, and what was good and bad in that experience;
- ii. effective approaches to supervision and the range of strategies available;
- iii. how both the supervisor and his/her students will effectively engage in the wider research environment, both within and beyond the University: this may involve consideration of Funding councils, conference/seminar attendance, funding and grant applications, research resources and libraries elsewhere, computer and data-based resources, research grants available within the university, and so forth (in accordance with QAA Quality Code Chapter B11: Research Degrees).
- iv. the normal progression of a research student, and the formal Regulations and Procedures governing that progression, as laid out in the *Research Degrees Handbook*. This will include discussion of how the supervisor advises the student on development of a research plan and maintains contact with the student;
- v. transferable skills outlined by the UK Research Councils and how these might be developed in the student. See Research Council training requirements, see QAA Quality Code Chapter B11: Research Degrees);
- vi. An awareness of the Supervisor Workload Monitoring Form and its implications (Appendix 10).

**C.** A new Supervisor should normally attend at the meeting of the Research Committee, in the term s/he is starting supervision or in the next term. Meetings are on the Wednesday afternoon in the second week of each term. Attendance at the meeting will allow the new supervisor to meet the other Research Officers, get a wider view of the university's research environments, and see in the round how research students' progression is discussed and monitored, and the problems research students face.

**D.** Where it is deemed appropriate, and where available, the new supervisor should be funded to attend the next appropriate external course on the role of the supervisor.

- 3.53** Students who are permitted to spend part of the period of their research elsewhere than in Buckingham shall be required to maintain such personal contact with their supervisors as the latter specify. In such cases the appointment of an additional supervisor other than a member of the University shall be made when circumstances make such an appointment desirable.

### **ANNUAL REVIEW (see also Appendix 3)**

- 3.54** The main progress review for each MPhil / DPhil and DPhil research student is called the Annual Review. (This review does not apply to the MA, MSc, and LLM by research.) However, student progress is routinely monitored by the supervisor throughout the degree programme see QAA Quality Code Chapter B11: Research Degrees). For full-time students the review will be conducted at the end of the first year of study, and then in each subsequent year of study. For part-time students the first three reviews follow this same pattern (i.e. yearly), but after the third-year review, assuming progress is good, the review may take place every 18 months. The Research Officer in the area of study is responsible for convening and chairing the review (unless s/he is the supervisor, when another designated colleague will take this role). The annual review may take place at any time within the calendar year as appropriate to the student's needs and development. Its purpose is:

- i. to make a considered review of the progress of the research project in both intellectual and practical terms;
- ii. to ensure arrangements for supervision are satisfactory;
- iii. to receive feedback from the student via the completion of the 'Research Postgraduate Feedback Questionnaire' (Appendix 8), and, where appropriate, to take action in relation to that feedback;
- iv. to act, at the appropriate time, as the formal stage-review for transfer from MPhil / DPhil status to full DPhil status;
- v. to discuss and grant an extension of time of up to a year if this is required (see 3.45).

The review will comprise a summary of progress by the student in the prescribed form; a written report on progress by the student's supervisor(s); and a viva voce examination. The first supervisor will check that the summary of progress does not contain plagiarized material (see 2.4 paragraph 7). The Research Officer will be responsible for, or will oversee, the resulting formal report on the review, a copy of which must be given to the student, and another copy sent to the Registry Officer for inclusion in the student's central file.

- 3.55** The panel for the review will normally comprise the Research Officer (or a designated colleague) as chair, the supervisor(s), and at least one other member of the academic staff. The discussion with the student should be a substantial one. At some point in the review the supervisor(s) should leave the room to allow the student the opportunity to discuss progress independently with the other panel members. Following the review the Research Officer may approve the continuation of the student's studies; impose conditions on the continuation of study; or terminate the student's studies. In cases where the student has been allowed to waive the residence requirement, the viva voce examination component of the annual review shall involve the student's supervisor and, if possible and appropriate, the additional supervisor where applicable (see 3.54), and, if possible, and in cases where the student is affiliated to, or conducting research at, another academic institution, a member of the academic staff from that institution. The supervisor shall prepare a full report of the viva voce examination for the Research Officer at the University of Buckingham. The Research Officer shall prepare a brief report which shall be forwarded to the Registry Officer. The Registry Officer shall send a copy to the student concerned.

## THE THESIS

**3.56** The thesis embodying the results of the candidate's research, together with an abstract of it, may be sent to the Registry Officer at any time after the beginning of the final term of the prescribed period of study. (For issues of earlier submission, see paras 3.44 and 4.39.) The thesis must be accompanied by a completed 'Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis for a Higher Degree' form (Appendix 5), if this form has not previously been submitted: see para 3.63.

**3.57** The thesis shall be written in English unless prior permission has been obtained. Reference to sources shall be made in such a manner as to be readily identifiable. A list of books and other sources used to prepare the thesis shall be included in it. The literary form of the thesis must be satisfactory and the text free from typographical errors. It should be suitable for publication in whole or in part, either as submitted or in amended form. (See Rules for the Form and Submission of Theses for Higher Degrees.)

### **Fair dealing and 3rd party copyright**

**3.58** The rules on 'fair dealing for the purposes of criticism and review' apply to sources and authorities quoted within the thesis, so it is normal to quote widely via the usual scholarly protocols. However, in cases where it is appropriate, it is important to request permission to use copyright material created by other people (3rd party copyright materials) at the time of writing the thesis if, as is now likely, it is to be made available electronically, as for example, in the Library's digital archival repository or on British Library's EThOS (see 'Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis for a Higher Degree', appendix 5). Where copyright permissions are required and are not forthcoming from the rights owners, third-party material might have to be removed from the thesis. Alternately, the thesis may only be made available in the University Library as hard copy, since print theses deposited in the Library are legally seen as unpublished manuscripts. The supervisor should advise the student on these matters.

**3.59** For the requirements of theses for the different higher degrees by research, see Section 1 on 'Higher Degrees'. For the MA by research, MSc by research, and LL.M by research, see also the Grade Descriptors in Appendices 9, 10, and 11 respectively, which make clear the expectations in each case.

### **3.60 Academic Misconduct**

i. The University's Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure (which can be found in the University Handbook – here: <http://www.buckingham.ac.uk/life/handbook> sets out the policy for identifying and responding to academic misconduct. Appendix 7 sets out the University's Code of Practice for Study by Research, the principles of which provide information about good practice in research.

ii. The supervisor is responsible for providing students with guidance on the issue of plagiarism, raising student awareness about good practice in research, and informing the student of the University's academic misconduct policy and procedures, including the seriousness of plagiarism as viewed by the wider academic and professional community. The supervisor is also responsible for guiding the student on copyright and the need to obtain permission from third parties.

iii. The student is responsible for considering carefully the importance of avoiding plagiarism, and taking heed of the University's academic misconduct policy and procedures, including the seriousness of plagiarism as viewed by the wider academic and professional community and the principles of good research contained within the University's guidance in Appendix 7 in the Code of Practice for Study by Research. The student is also responsible for checking copyright issues and the need to obtain permission from third parties; signing the originality declaration on the Intention to Submit

form and disclosing full particulars of all sources of information consulted and any money paid in respect of the preparation of the work.

iv. The internal and the external examiner will be provided with the outcome of any investigation or enquiry into alleged academic misconduct if this has been identified before the thesis has been released to the examining team and where a judgement of Poor Academic Practice or Academic Misconduct has been applied. However, should the internal or external examiner have any concerns about the presentation or originality of the work when assessing the thesis, the assessment process should cease and advice should be sought from the University's Central Academic Misconduct Offer in Registry.

v. TurnItIn is a service currently used by the University to check for originality and potential instances of plagiarism in student work. Postgraduate research students have the opportunity to submit their penultimate draft through Turnitin via their supervisors. The Turnitin report will be used to help identify potential instances of plagiarism or concerns over originality and will contribute to the overall assurance of academic integrity prior to formal submission to examiners. The University's resources on academic writing, referencing and plagiarism include a sample TurnItIn report, which can be found in the 'Useful Resources' section of this page:

<http://www.buckingham.ac.uk/life/library/authorship-plagiarism>.

vi. The supervisor is responsible for checking the work submitted for the annual report and the draft thesis for evidence of plagiarism using Turnitin and discussing with the student any issues that arise. The supervisor is also responsible for providing a copy of the final TurnItIn report when the thesis is submitted as part of the Intention to Submit process, and signing the relevant declaration.

vii. The University provides a number of helpful resources for students around academic writing and referencing. These can be found here:

<http://www.buckingham.ac.uk/life/library/authorship-plagiarism>. Support and referencing workshops are also run by the Foundation and Academic Skills department.

## **Word Limits**

**3.61** The text of a thesis should not normally exceed the following limits: for the MA by research, MSc by research, and LLM by research: 40,000 words; for the MPhil: 80,000 words; for the DPhil: 100,000 words. These word limits exclude appendices, footnotes, tables, references, and bibliography/works cited, unless there are departmental rules to the contrary. The abstract of the thesis (counted separately) should not exceed 1,000 words in length.

## **3.62 THE EXAMINATION (see Appendix 7 and Appendix 14) Approval and Appointment of External Examiner**

### **3.62.1 Approval and Appointment of External Examiner for DPhil students**

i. the Supervisor will discuss possible examiners with the candidate;

ii. the Supervisor will submit a Nomination and Approval Form, and a CV for the proposed examiner to the Quality Assurance (QA) Office;

iii. The QA Office then sends the nomination to the Research Officer, and the AAC subject-specialist (or the AAC Chairman where no subject specialist exists), for approval. Once the nomination has received approval from the Research Officer and the AAC subject-specialist, the QA Office notify the Research Officer, Supervisor and Registry Office.

iv. Where an examiner is appointed to a programme, rather than an individual thesis basis, the QA Office will then prepare and send a contract to the examiner.

v. the Supervisor and the Research Officer submit the 'Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis for a Higher Degree' form to the Registry Office, including the name of the approved external examiner, and the examination procedure will commence.

### **3.62.2 Approval and Appointment of External Examiner for MA, MPhil or MSc student**

i. For examiners appointed on an individual thesis basis:

- the Supervisor will submit a Nomination and Approval Form, and a CV for the proposed examiner to the Quality Assurance (QA) Office;
- The QA Office then sends the nomination to the Research Officer, and the AAC subject-specialist (or the AAC Chairman where no subject specialist exists), for approval.
- Once the nomination has received approval from the Research Officer and the AAC subject-specialist, the QA Office notifies the Research Officer, Supervisor and Registry Office.

ii. For examiners appointed to a programme:

- The Research Officer will submit a Nomination and Approval Form, and a CV for the proposed examiner to the Quality Assurance (QA) Office;
- The QA Office then sends the nomination to the AAC subject-specialist (or the AAC Chairman where no subject specialist exists), for approval.
- Once the nomination has received approval the AAC subject-specialist, the QA Office notifies the Research Officer and Registry Office.
- The QA Office will then prepare and send a contract to the examiner.

iv. The Supervisor and the Research Officer submit the 'Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis for a Higher Degree' form to the Registry Office, including the name of the approved external examiner, and the examination procedure will commence.

### **3.62.3 Maximum Limits for Examination of Theses**

Examiners appointed to a programme for a four year term are permitted to examine no more than eight theses per year. Examiners appointed to a thesis should not normally be appointed to examine more than two research degree candidates in the same department in any 12 month period, and more than four research degree candidates in the same department in any 36 month period.

### **3.62.4 Failure to Reach Consensus**

- i. In cases where the original examiners are unable to reach agreement on the recommendation on the outcome of the examination the following shall apply.
- ii. The candidate shall be re-examined by new examiners. The new examiners shall be appointed in accordance with Regulation 3.62.1/3.62/2, except where two external examiners may be appointed if no suitable internal examiner is available as reflected in Regulation 3.68. None of the new examiners shall have been an original examiner.
- iii. The new examiners shall conduct a fresh examination on the original thesis. They shall not see the reports of the original examiners, and no candidate shall have

- the right to amend a thesis in any way before re-examination by the new examiners.
- iv. If the new examiners are unable to reach agreement on re-examination of the original thesis; OR if the original examiners are unable to reach agreement following resubmission of, or major modifications on the thesis, an appropriately-qualified adjudicator, who may or may not be a member of staff of the University, should be appointed by the Chairman of the Research Committee.
  - v. If the new examiners of the original thesis reach agreement that the thesis undergo major modifications or be resubmitted, they remain the examiners of the resubmitted/revised thesis. If the new examiners are then unable to reach agreement following examination of the resubmitted/revised thesis an appropriately-qualified adjudicator, who may or may not be a member of staff of the University, should be appointed by the Chairman of the Research Committee.
  - vi. The adjudicator should make a recommendation based on the thesis and the reports of the original and of the new examiners. The adjudicator should not have been the chairperson of the oral examinations. They should not normally conduct an oral examination.

### **Notice of Intention to Submit Form / Retention of Thesis**

- 3.63** Some months prior to the intended submission date for a thesis, the candidate and supervisor should begin to consider the matters raised in the 'Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis for a Higher Degree' (end of Appendix 5). A fully completed and signed copy of the 'Notice of Intention to Submit' form must be submitted to Registry in the week before the copies of the thesis are delivered there, or, at the latest, actually with the copies of the thesis. The examination process can only go forward once the Registry Officer has received the form, and candidates should bear this in mind during their final work to complete their theses, so as to avoid delays. "Care should be taken in relation to the section 'Retention of Thesis'. It is normal that a successful thesis is made widely available to other scholars and researchers, for the good dissemination of knowledge, and this is in fact required by most of the research councils as a term of their funding. Exceptionally a candidate may request that access to his/her thesis be restricted. The most likely acceptable reasons are:
- i. it is intended to be published in a book or a journal form at a future date and it is reasonable that it should be withheld until that date or two years from this date whichever is sooner
  - ii. the contents constitute a trade secret, or its disclosure would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of any person;
  - iii. disclosure would be likely to endanger an individual's health or safety;
  - iv. publication would cause the candidate or third parties mentioned in the text to be open to persecution eg racial, ethnic, political.

If the student wishes to apply for restriction of access this would be done via completion of the 'Restriction on Access' form (appendix 18) detailing the reasons for the application and the period for which the restriction is required. The Research Officer should bring the application to the next Research Committee for approval

### **Final or Near-Final Draft**

- 3.64** In order for Section D of the 'Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis for a Higher Degree' to be signed, the supervisor should have been able to see a final or near-final copy of the thesis in a timely way before the intended submission date. The candidate should submit three copies of the thesis (two wire/comb bound, and one unbound) to the Registry Officer. The form and content of the thesis shall conform to the 'Rules for the Form and



Submission of Theses for Higher Degrees' (see paras 5.1–5.11).

- 3.65** A candidate shall not be permitted to submit as his/her thesis a thesis which is being submitted for a degree in another university or for which a degree has already been conferred on him/her in this or any other university. A candidate shall not be precluded, however, from incorporating work which s/he has already submitted for a degree in this or any other university, or work which has been published previously, provided that:
- i. he/she indicates which work has been so incorporated;
  - ii. the work must **not** have been published in the same form as it appears in the thesis.

#### **Viva voce examination**

- 3.66** The Registry Officer shall forward the thesis and abstract to the Examiners. S/he shall request them to fix within a reasonable time afterwards a date on which they may require the candidate to present him/herself for oral examination. An oral examination is mandatory for MPhil and DPhil. An oral examination is normally a requirement for the MSc by research; it is not normally a requirement for the MA by research and the LLM by research, though it may be held for these degrees if the examiners require it.
- 3.67** Normally there should be one External Examiner, who shall be an established authority within the field, and one Internal Examiner, who shall be a member of the academic staff who has **not** supervised the candidate. The examining team (internal and external/s) shall normally be appointed for the duration of the examining process, including any resubmissions. The supervisor is required to be available in the Department/School to provide any information requested by the examiners, and may, if s/he wishes, volunteer information in advance of the oral examination. The supervisor will not normally be present at the oral examination. At the discretion of the Examiners and the candidate jointly, however, the supervisor may be present at the oral examination but only in a non-participatory role.
- 3.68** Alternatively, and exceptionally, there shall be two External Examiners. Both these Examiners shall be approved by the procedures above. This situation will occur in the following circumstances:
- a) Where, aside from the supervisor, there is no appropriate member of the academic staff to act as Internal Examiner. (The supervisor **cannot** act as an Internal Examiner.) In these circumstances, two external examiners may be appointed, and a senior member of the University's academic staff will also attend the oral examination in a non-participatory role. This member of staff will normally be the Research Officer.
  - b) A less experienced External Examiner is approved (e.g. when they are subject specialists with a good publication record). In this case, two external examiners should be appointed and the internal examiner must be experienced in the assessment process.
  - c) Two external examiners must be appointed in those cases where the candidate is a current or former member of staff of the University.

Again, the supervisor is required to be available in the Department/School to provide any information requested by the examiners, and may, if s/he wishes, volunteer information in advance of the oral examination.

#### **3.69 Conduct of viva voce examination**

Internal and external examiners should meet before the viva to determine between themselves how the viva should be conducted. Examiners have the full confidence of the University and are given a substantial degree of discretion as to how the viva should be conducted. They are asked, however, to observe the following guidelines:

- i. Candidates are liable to be nervous and examiners should do everything that is possible to put candidates at their ease to give them the best chance of performing well;
- ii. Examiners should not, however, give any indication of their likely recommendations at the beginning of the viva. They may take the opportunity to explain that the viva itself is part of the examination process and hence no final recommendation can be determined until after it has been completed;
- iii. At the conclusion of the viva, the examiners may:
  - a. Inform the candidate of their recommendation (provided that this recommendation is for a pass, revision, or referral)  
**Note: Examiners should not give any indication of their recommendation if this is likely to be a fail.**
  - b. Inform the candidate that further discussion is needed before any recommendation can be made.
- iii. If examiners decide to give the candidate some indication of their likely recommendation, they should make it clear that their report is a recommendation only and that the final decision remains with Senate or with the Vice-Chancellor acting on behalf of Senate.

**3.70** There are five 'final recommendations' open to the examiners, which may be summarized as follows:

- 1 approval for the degree;
- 2 approval for the degree subject to minor modifications to the thesis;
- 3 approval for the degree subject to major modifications to the thesis;
- 4 leave to revise the thesis more broadly, and subsequently to **resubmit** it for the degree;
- 5 (a) the award of an appropriate lower degree;  
(b) the award of an appropriate lower degree after emendation;  
(c) complete resubmission of the thesis for an appropriate lower degree.

The revision required in **4** is more substantial than the 'major modifications' required in **3**. In the case of **4** it is usual for the thesis to be re-examined by a new oral examination. Recommendations **5** a, b, and c are subject to the candidate's acceptance: see Appeals procedure: paras 4.46–4.56.

Recommendations 2, 3 and 4 allow one revision/resubmission only.

Minor modifications are of two types:

- i. simple corrections (typographical errors, references, etc.), and
- ii. changes of statement or arrangement that do not alter or affect the conclusions of the thesis in any significant manner.

If the examiners require such amendments, they will make the candidate aware of them directly on the occasion of the oral examination, usually by handing him/her a list of corrections or indicative corrections, and/or by, in the report, indicating the nature and extent of the corrections, and/or in a statement they should prepare for the candidate's guidance. Minor modifications should normally be made within three months. The Internal Examiner should indicate to the Registry Officer when they have been satisfactorily completed by checking the edited thesis and signing the emendations' form. This process ensures that the copy of the thesis deposited in the library is professionally presented for the benefit of future researchers who may wish to consult it.

Where major modifications are required under para 3.70 (3) and (4), in these instances the examiners are required to provide clear and detailed feedback to the candidate, via their report and any additional material that seems advisable, so that the nature of the re-workings required to bring the thesis up to the standard of the degree are clear both to the candidate and to the candidate's supervisor(s). Hence a recommendation under **3** and **4** will permit the candidate a longer time lapse before in accordance with 3 (major modifications) and under 4 major modifications and resubmission. Major modifications should normally take a minimum of six months. Submission before six months has elapsed requires approval from the University Research Committee Chair.

- 3.71** An MPhil/DPhil candidate whose thesis is not acceptable to the Examiners may, at the discretion of the Examiners, present him/herself for re-examination (resubmission) on **one** subsequent occasion within two years of the original decision being made known. Students on all other programmes, including Masters programmes (MA, and MSc and the LLM by research) may present themselves for re-examination (resubmission) on **one** subsequent occasion within one year of the original decision being made known. Candidates approved for the award of the degree under para 3.70 (3) above, where major modifications are required, but not so onerous as to require a resubmission must complete these modifications within one year for all programmes.

Such period as is recommended by the Examiners in accordance with the above must elapse before re-examination, except where a candidate is asked to make what are deemed by the Examiners to be minor changes.

- 3.72** If a thesis submitted for the degree of DPhil or MPhil is not deemed to be of an adequate standard then the Examiners may recommend that the degree of MPhil, MA, MSc, or LLM (as appropriate) be awarded.

- 3.73** Examiners' recommendation shall be communicated to the Registry Officer, and thereafter shall be reported to Senate (Examination Senate)., The following internal process will apply:

- i. When the Examiners' Report recommends the award of the degree without conditions, the Registry Officer is to send the Examiners' Report for checking and signing off to the Chairman of the Research Committee, and then to the Vice-Chancellor, or the Vice-Chancellor's representative, for Chairman's action to be reported to Senate (Examination Senate)..
- ii. When the Examiners' Report recommends the award of the degree subject to minor modifications to the thesis, then the Registry Officer will inform the Internal Examiner. The Internal Examiner will certify to the Registry Officer that the required changes have been made. Then the Registry Officer is to send the examiners' report for checking and signing off to the Chairman of the Research Committee, and then to the Vice-Chancellor, or the Vice-Chancellor's representative, for Chairman's action to be reported to Senate (Examination Senate)..
- iii. When the Examiners' Report recommends resubmission, the Registry Officer is to inform the Chairman of the Research Committee.
- iv. When the Examiners' Report recommends rejection or the award of a lower degree, the Registry Officer is to inform the Chairman of the Research Committee. Thereafter, if the candidate accepts the lower degree, the Registry Officer is to send the examiners' report for checking and signing off to the Chairman of the Research Committee, and then to the Vice-Chancellor, or the Vice-Chancellor's representative, for Chairman's action to be reported to Senate (Examination Senate).

- 3.74** After due internal process, and as soon as possible thereafter, the Registry Officer will inform the candidate of the final result.

### **3.75 Special Regulations relating to the Integrated PhD at the Sarajevo School of Science and Technology (SSST)**

The General Regulations for Higher Degrees as set out in Section 3 of the Research Degrees Handbook above shall apply to doctoral candidates on the Integrated PhD programme at the Sarajevo School of Science and Technology, with additional special regulations as follows:

1. On commencement on the taught phase of the programme, a supervisor/mentor must be approved and appointed in accordance with Regulation 3.48 in the University of Buckingham Research Degrees Handbook. The role of this supervisor will be to advise and monitor progress during the taught phase of the programme
2. A supervisory team for the research phase must be approved and appointed in accordance with Regulations 3.48-3.54 in the University of Buckingham Research Degrees Handbook.
3. The taught phase of the programme will be specific to the area of the PhD and must be approved by the SSST Research Committee
4. The taught phase of the programme must include a Research Methods component
5. Students must complete the taught phase of the programme successfully in order to progress to the research phase of their studies
6. Assessment of the taught phase will be by examination or by the presentation of papers (with a *viva voce* if required by the examiners)
7. Following completion of the taught phase of the programme, students are required to pass an assessment conducted by a Review Panel in order to continue with their studies.
8. The external examiner will be approved and appointed in accordance with University of Buckingham procedures as set out in Regulation 3.62 in the Research Degrees Handbook
9. The final thesis *viva voce* examination will be conducted in accordance with University of Buckingham procedures as set out in Regulations 3.66-3.74 in the Research Degrees Handbook