

The University of Derby

The Postgraduate Research Framework (PGR)
Part C

The Regulations for the Higher Degree by Peer Reviewed Works

Leading to the awards of
Master of Philosophy (MPhil)
or
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

August 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Introduction	1
	1.1 The primary aims	1
	1.2 Eligibility	1
	1.3.1 Definition of peer reviewed and creative works	1
	1.3.2 Authentication of work	2
	1.3.3 Submission for the award	2
	1.4 The Research Skills modules	2
2.	Admissions, Enrolment and Registration	4
	2.1 Admissions and enrolment	4
	2.2 Qualifications	6
	2.3 Students transferring to the University of Derby	6
	2.4 Registration (RD5)	6
	2.5 Criteria for registration	7
	2.6 Transfer of registration	8
	2.7 The target submission period	8
	2.8 The registration period	8
	2.9 Expiry of the target submission period	9
	2.10 Changing the target submission period / mode of study (RD11)	9
	2.11 Suspension of registration (RD10)	9
	2.12 The extension of the period of registration (RD8)	9
	2.13 Withdrawal from registration (RD12)	10
	2.14 Termination of registration	10
	2.15 Student Participation Policy	10
3.	The Supervision of Research Students	11
	3.1 The appointment of the Director of Studies and Second Supervisor	11
	3.2 The supervision of Distance Learning students	12
	3.3 The appointment of approved Mentors to supervisory packages	12
	3.4 Mandatory Staff Development for first time PGR Supervisors	12
	3.5 The appointment of Advisers	13
	3.6 Changes to the supervisory arrangements (RD9)	13
4.	Annual Progress Reports	13
5.	Confirmation of Registration (RD7)	13
	5.1 The purpose of the process	13
	5.2 The Confirmation Report	14
	5.3 The appointment of an Assessor	14
	5.4 The <i>viva voce</i> assessment	15
	5.5 The value of presenting a seminar as well	15
	5.6 The Assessor's recommendation to FRRDC	15
	5.7 The requirement to complete research training elements satisfactorily	15
	5.8 The FRRDC decision	16
	5.9 The location of the <i>viva voce</i> event	16
	5.10 The transfer of registration to Doctor of Philosophy	16
	5.11 The transfer of registration to Master of Philosophy	16
6.	Final examination for a higher degree	17
	6.1 The two stages of assessment	17
	6.2.1 The content of the submission for examination	17
	6.2.2 The language of communication	18
	6.3 The examination of creative works and inventions	18
	6.4 Waiving the <i>viva-voce</i> examination in highly exceptional circumstances	18
	6.5 The location of the <i>viva-voce</i> examination	19
	6.6 Notification of the intention to submit for examination (RD13)	19
	6.7 The appointment of the examiners (RD14)	19
	6.8 The examiners: qualifications and requirements for appointment	19
	6.9 The examination process: the submission	20
	6.10 The examination process: the reports	21
	6.11.1 The assessment criteria for the award of the Doctor of Philosophy [PhD]	21
	6.11.2 The application of the criteria	23
	6.12.1 The assessment criteria for the award of the Master of Philosophy (MPhil)	23
	6.12.2 The application of the criteria	24

	6.13	The examination of submissions with theory and practice elements	24
	6.14	The <i>viva-voce</i> examination	24
	6.14.1	The purpose of the <i>viva voce</i> examination	24
	6.14.2	The <i>viva-voce</i> process and the appointment of a Chair	25
	6.15	The recommendations of the examiners	26
	6.16	The referral opportunity	26
	6.17	Feedback to candidates following the <i>viva voce</i> examination	27
	6.18	The approval of recommendations for the award of higher degrees	27
	6.19	In the event of the examiners failing to agree a recommendation	27
	6.20	The communication of recommendations for re-examination	27
7.		Re-examination for a higher degree	28
	7.1	The forms of re-examination	28
	7.2	The period permitted for preparing for re-examination	28
	7.3	The action required when it is necessary to appoint a new examiner	28
	7.4	The recommendations following re-examination	29
	7.5	Registration for the Master of Philosophy following unsuccessful referral	30
8.		Academic Appeals: requesting a review of an examination decision	30
	8.1	Grounds for an appeal	30
	8.2	Time-scale for requesting an appeal	30
	8.3	The Appeal process	31
9.		Lodging materials and confidentiality	31
	9.1	Lodging written works and related materials	31
	9.2	Confidential materials	32
10.		Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)	32
	10.1	Introduction	32
	10.2	The definition of Intellectual Property Rights	32
	10.3	The general position on the IPR of students	33
	10.4	The ownership of physical artefacts	33
	10.5	The University's rights to hold works submitted for assessment	33
	10.6	Publication of research works	34
	10.7	The transfer of IPR	34
	10.8	Collaborative work on a project	34
11.		Research Ethics: Code of Practice	35
	11.1	University policy	35
	11.2	Definition of research and scope of research ethics	35
	11.3	The Guiding Principles	36
	11.4	Obligations, Rights and Responsibilities	36
	11.5	General principles	36
	11.5.1	Informed consent	36
	11.5.2	Confidentiality and data protection	37
	11.5.3	Animal rights	38
	11.5.4	Research undertaken in public places	38
	11.5.5	Academic Integrity	38
	11.5.6	Contractual responsibilities	38
	11.6	Procedures for Implementation	38
	11.7	National Health Service-related procedures	39
12.		Academic Offences	40
	12.1	Types of Academic Offence	40
	12.2	Plagiarism	40
	12.3	Inventing data	41
	12.4	Collusion and other forms of deception	41
	12.5	Action in the event of a suspected academic offence	41
	12.6	The duty of the director of studies	41
13.		The University Complaints Procedure: how to lodge a complaint	42
		Appendices	
	1	Guide for the conduct of viva voce examinations	43
	2	Guidance for Chairs of viva voce examinations	46
	3	Layout for the hardbound submission	48
	4	Policy regarding candidates making presentations at viva voce examinations	50

1. Introduction

1.1 The primary aims

The University of Derby offers suitably qualified staff the opportunity to achieve a higher degree through a supervised training in research culminating in the production of peer reviewed research papers that have been accepted for publication and/or other creative works. This facility is only available to members of staff of the University. The primary aims are to enable students to:

- (i) develop a range of research skills and gain a training in research in a chosen discipline;
- (ii) undertake work leading to a new understanding of a chosen field of enquiry;
- (iii) engage in academic research which promotes innovative thinking and creativity.

Collaborative research with industrial, commercial and professional organisations is highly valued.

Students need to undertake the following requirements:

- (i) provide a critical appraisal of a body of research, which has led to an independent and original contribution to knowledge through peer reviewed works that have been accepted for publication or the production of other creative works;
- (ii) demonstrate a command of the research methods appropriate to the chosen field;
- (iii) present and defend the critical appraisal by oral examination to the satisfaction of the examiners.

The academic standards associated with the degree shall be comparable with those for the degree of Master of Philosophy or Doctor of Philosophy taken by thesis.

Guidance: *Enquiries relating to the award of the Master of Philosophy or Doctor of Philosophy through peer reviewed works should be directed through the Research Office at the KR site in the first instance. Copies of the regulations, procedures and all forms are available on the research website or in the Research Office. The Research Office staff can provide advice and guidance.*

1.2 Eligibility

A candidate for a research degree based on peer reviewed works shall normally be:

- (i) a current member of staff (FT or PT on a permanent contract);
- (ii) a graduate of not less than three years standing.

1.3.1 Definition of peer reviewed and creative works

The peer reviewed works shall refer to papers for journals, chapters, monographs, research volumes and scholarly editions of textbooks that can be evidenced as having been accepted for publication. Creative work includes the production of artefacts in any field including fine art, photography, film, design, musical composition, architecture, engineering and information technology. It also includes performance disciplines such as dance and drama.

1.3.2 Authentication of work

For the purpose of these regulations, a work shall be regarded as accepted for publication only if it is traceable through ordinary catalogues, critical reviews, abstracts, or websites. Copies can have been available to the general public including, for example, public exhibitions with published catalogues and public performances with published programmes. As a consequence of this requirement, reports provided exclusively for the public or private sector may not be submitted unless they have been accepted for publication and will be generally available.

1.3.3 Submission for the award

The student submits a series of works either published or accepted for publication together with a critical appraisal which contextualises and reflects upon these works. The critical appraisal is also expected to assess the contribution made by each work and the collective whole to understanding in the field of enquiry. Assessment takes the form of an examination of the submitted materials and a *viva-voce* examination.

The submission process is as follows:

- (i) The Candidate submits notification of the intention to submit for examination (RD13) & the candidates declaration form (RD17) to the Research Office.
- (ii) An examination package is recommended by the Director of Studies, approved by the Chair of FRRDC then forwarded to the Research Office for approval by the Chair of URRDC. (RD14)
- (iii) The candidate submits a critical appraisal together with the published works/ works accepted for publication/ creative works to the Research Office which forwards the works to the examiners.
- (iv) The examiners examine the submission, hold a viva voce examination and make recommendations.
- (v) The examiners' recommendations are approved by the Chair of URRDC and reported to URRDC.

1.4 Research skills modules

All students registered on the programme are expected to continue the development of their research skills as they progress. Every student should participate in the programme of research training seminars (RTS) which is offered every year. In addition, students may participate in the on-line research skills modules and if required relevant subject modules, although they will normally not be formally assessed or credited for these modules. The core PGR research skills modules outlined below aim to develop a strong understanding of the elements involved in planning, organising and undertaking research.

Introduction to Research at the University of Derby

To include the University Research Centres and Groups; the University website for research; introduction to the stages of research; the Research Office; The Research Contract; engaging in Personal Development Planning; establishing rapport with the supervisors; the roles of the Committees; planning and preparing for registration (RD5); preparing for confirmation of registration (RD7); preparing for submission; preparing for *viva voce* examinations. The mechanisms for complaints and appeals.
Not credit bearing

<p>1. Planning, Managing and Funding Research</p> <p>Key principles Research design and methodology; approaches to strategy; scoping and phasing research; specification of aims and objectives; project management; critical review of literature sources; research with theory and practice elements; national and European funding bodies.</p> <p>Case studies: You may select one from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research design in the sciences • Research design in the social sciences • Research design in the arts and humanities • Research design in IT & technology subjects 	<p>2. Ethics, Risk Assessment and Health & Safety in Research</p> <p>Key principles The general principles of research ethics; utilitarianism, Kant; autonomy and research; codes and duties in research; resource allocation and justice in research; issues research governance; health and safety legislation and research; risk assessment in principle and practice.</p> <p>Case studies: You may select two from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • research ethics • risk assessment of projects • health and safety in the laboratory
<p>3. Research Methods: Data Collection & Analysis</p> <p>Key principles The requirements for writing a research methodology for your submission; evaluating different research philosophies and approaches; evaluating quantitative and qualitative research methods; overview, development, planning, data collection, analysis and presentation of qualitative and quantitative methods.</p> <p>Case studies: You may select any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative techniques in the sciences • Quantitative techniques in the social sciences • Qualitative techniques 	<p>4. Getting Research Published & Exhibited, Intellectual Property and Patents</p> <p>Key principles Why write? The motivations for getting published; the process of writing and different writing strategies; editing your drafts; writing for journals; the nature of rights and interests that arise from research; the scope of rights protection for researchers, authors and exhibitors; contemporary issues; protection of third parties; infringement of copyright; patents and trademarks.</p> <p>Case studies: You may select two from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPR issues on published research • IPR issues on exhibited research • Issues encountered in obtaining a patent • Getting a book published
<p>5. The Art of Thesis Writing</p> <p>Reading and using the University's regulations; What is originality? What is a review of the literature? Writing an Introduction; writing an abstract; Writing the main body; Writing styles; Using a Reference System; Writing a conclusion; Proof reading.</p>	

Figure 2 : A schematic representation of the research skills modules which are available to students on a selected basis.

Special note : Students who wish to be assessed and credited for these or other modules may do so on payment of the appropriate module tuition fee. The assessment regulations for Level 7 modules are located in the Postgraduate Regulatory Framework for Taught Programmes (PGT). Readers should refer to the PGT regulations for information about the assessment process, the PG grade scale, referrals and other related matters.

2. Admissions, Enrolment and Registration

2.1 Admissions and enrolment

Admission is the process by which the University faculties exercise their responsibility to ensure that individuals who are admitted to undertake a postgraduate training programme in research are suitably qualified and demonstrate a highly capable and enquiring mind. The consideration of an applicant should be conducted by the prospective director of studies and another experienced researcher. They are expected to adopt a risk-based approach to admissions. Strong qualifications, a research mind, a good command of the English Language, sound financial arrangements for maintenance and the payment of fees and stable personal circumstances are all requirements. Any shortfalls are areas of potential risk. If one of these areas is borderline, then there is a moderate risk which may be acceptable and manageable. However, if more than one of these areas is borderline or unsatisfactory, then acceptance of the applicant is probably a substantial risk and unacceptable. Applications should be considered promptly giving responses to confirm that the process is proceeding. Any complaint regarding undue length of time of consideration which is upheld may result in financial compensation which will be borne by the school..

Enrolment is the process by which the University formally accepts a postgraduate research (PGR) student onto a PGR programme and the student signifies acceptance of the University regulations and procedures.

All new PGR students should be members of a formally recognised research centre or group. Tuition fees and project related charges (if applicable) are payable from the date of enrolment.

All **continuing PGR students are required to re-enrol** in July/August each year. If a student fails to re-enrol by the 1st August, they will be withdrawn from their programme, this will be reported to the relevant Faculty Research and Research Degrees Committee (hereafter FRRDC). Research students are not entitled to any supervisory support, or access to any facilities, until enrolment or re-enrolment has been completed. The faculties carry responsibility for establishing each of the following aspects **prior to** acceptance and initial enrolment :

- (i) the applicant is embarking on a viable programme of research which relates broadly to the existing expertise and research interests of the Faculty and one of the formally approved Research Centres or Groups;
- (ii) In the case of a programme of research involving the production of creative work or an invention and a critical appraisal there should be an appropriate balance of theory and practice which is agreed by the PGR student and director of studies. The practice element may comprise up to 80% of the total planned effort. Thus the critical appraisal element should exceed 20%. The balance should be quantified for future reference. There should be a coherent relationship between theory and practice with the two forming an integrated whole. The relationship may evolve as the research develops.

Normally the critical appraisal should contextualise the creative work which makes up the practice element but other relationships may be valid and acceptable. A cogent case should be presented at registration. The theory element should have the level 8 characteristics of enquiry and scholarship. A high standard must be attained in theory and practice. A documentary sketch book or portfolio may be included as a planned and significant element of the submission but this will not suffice alone as the theory element.

- (iii) the Faculty is able to make satisfactory supervisory arrangements including training in relevant research methods ;
- (iv) the Faculty is prepared to make available the necessary facilities to support on-campus

students; or that suitable facilities are known to be available for distance learning students ;

- (v) the Faculty is satisfied with the proposed arrangements for the mode of study (full time or part time) and the location of study (at the University, workplace or other agreed location).
- (vi) Distance learning applicants, defined as those students who propose to reside and study from a location outside the United Kingdom, are required to pay a non-refundable deposit on acceptance of a conditional offer. This must be paid prior to an unconditional offer being made. Prospective DL students who have paid the deposit will normally be interviewed in their home country to confirm the availability of adequate facilities and a suitable research environment prior to receipt of an unconditional offer. It must be confirmed that the applicant is highly motivated and understands the commitment involved and the challenges to meet in order to achieve a research degree as a distance learner. The proposed research must accord with faculty strategy and Research Centre interests.

DL students normally undertake the confirmation of registration event and the final examination viva-voce in Derby. If it is agreed that the confirmation of registration, viva voce examination or an exhibition will take place elsewhere this must be declared on the RD4 (Application Decision Proforma) and be authorised by the Faculty Dean.

In the case of distance learning students there must be an agreed learning contract signed by the student, supervisors and dean, which schedules the first year's supervisory meetings indicating how and where they will take place. This must be completed prior to enrolment.

- (vii) the Faculty is satisfied that the prospective student's commitments to other activities are not such as to render the prospects of successful completion of the research improbable;
- (viii) the Faculty has made full and appropriate arrangements for overseas students who study on-campus;
- (ix) the student is appropriately qualified for the planned route (Section 2.2).

Guidance: *Very careful consideration must be given to the recruitment of distance learning students. All should have prospects of a good University of Derby research experience. The Faculty must be satisfied that there is a team, which is willing and able to provide the supervision. In addition there must be satisfactory arrangements for access to research facilities including a computer, books, journals and any equipment required for the investigation. DL students need to understand at the outset that they will be required to visit Derby for the confirmation of registration and the final examination.*

There must be a nominated Director of Studies who has discussed the programme of research with the applicant. The discussion should ensure that the applicant satisfies the required standard of English and that there is a viable programme of research. If everything is satisfactory, the applicant may pay the fees and enrol. S/he can then proceed to induction, undertake the agreed research methods training and commence the preparation of the RD5 for registration. DL applicants will be visited by their prospective director of studies to discuss the detailed arrangements. Access to a video link may be an advantage.

The ability to interact is regarded as a valuable part of their research experience and the scheduling of interaction activities should be undertaken prior to registration. Clusters of overseas DL students should be visited by the director of studies on a regular basis as set out in a learning contract. All applicants must be inducted with regard to the regulations, the code of practice, health, safety and ethics.

The supervisory package for a DL student comprises a director of studies and a second supervisor. The package may include the appointment of a supervisor in the country of residence but this is not normally necessary [see Section 3.1]. The Dean of Faculty should ensure that the nominated director of studies and the Faculty Research

Manager have completed the Distance Learning checklist prior to making the offer (RD4).

2.2 Qualifications

Candidates enrolling onto the programme leading to the award of the Master of Philosophy or the Doctor of Philosophy should normally hold a first or second class honours degree of a UK University and a master 's degree with well developed research skills or hold a qualification, or demonstrate relevant experience, which is deemed by the University to be equivalent. The Faculty *must* be satisfied that the student has the necessary command of the English Language to undertake the research investigation.

Guidance: *Applicants are required to demonstrate ability and background knowledge in relation to the nature and scope of the proposed programme of research. Professional experience, publications, written reports and other works may be taken into consideration. An applicant, who has not demonstrated an adequate command of English through the recent successful completion of an award-bearing programme from a UK university, should achieve a score of at least 7.0 IELTS before being enrolled. Certificates or Transcripts of qualifications should be checked by staff of the International Office to confirm the legitimacy of the awarding institution. All international PGR students will be expected to participate in a 24 week programme in enhancing academic English Language.*

2.3 Students transferring to the University of Derby

Occasionally, a PGR student who has commenced research studies elsewhere will request consideration for transfer of registration to the University of Derby. This should only occur if there are compelling reasons for the student to leave their former institution. In addition to the standard considerations, the following aspects should be considered:

- (i) the transfer must be considered with a view to the further research necessary to bring a research investigation to completion. The further research required should be significant and not normally less than the equivalent of one year's full-time studies;
- (ii) the University does not accept students who have effectively failed to satisfy requirements for awards elsewhere. If a student has already been examined elsewhere, or is very close to completion elsewhere, it is inappropriate to consider transfer;
- (iii) if the transfer proceeds it will be necessary for the transferred student to prepare an Application for Confirmation of Registration (RD7) for confirmation of the registered award. The prospective director of studies should make a recommendation on this matter for FRRDC to approve.

Guidance: *The applicant should have a full interview with the prospective director of studies. If this member of staff, having considered the points above, is satisfied that the transfer would benefit the student and the University is equipped and willing to support the student, then arrangements may be made through the Research Office. Following enrolment the student should submit a confirmation of registration (RD7), making clear the stage that has been reached. Generally, a full-time student who is within the first 18 months of research studies, or a part-time student in an equivalent position, should be capable of preparing an RD7 to confirm the registration. An annual progress report will be required*

2.4 Registration (RD5)

Registration is the process by which the University formally recognises the PGR student's intention to satisfy, through a suitable programme of research, the academic requirements of a specified award. The responsibility for the process of registration rests with the **Faculty** that has accepted and enrolled the student. Students may only apply to register for the award that they are enrolled on. The awards are the Master of Philosophy or the Doctor of Philosophy.

All research students are required to submit an application for registration within **twelve weeks** of enrolment. The FRRDC has the responsibility for considering applications for registration and deciding the outcomes. The FRRDC should be satisfied that the title, aim and phases of work including a planned progress chart are satisfactory and that the student will have the benefit of a relevant

programme of research training support. The research training programme set down on the RD5 form should be understood as a **commitment** on the part of the student, supported by the director of studies. If the FRRDC is not satisfied with the submitted RD5 form it may request major or minor revision. Major revision must return to the Committee for approval but minor revision may be approved by Chair's action. The date of registration is backdated to the original date of enrolment.

Guidance: *The research training support for the investigation forms an important and integral part of the application. The research-training programme comprises a centrally organised seminar series, which is mandatory for all campus based research students and a Faculty programme tailored for the needs of each individual student. The research training programme should take into account previous experience gained through taught master's programmes or relevant work experience. Faculties may wish to consider the use of e-learning for DL students. This aspect of research training support should be planned as part of the preparation for registration (RD5). The student's attendance of the centrally organised RT seminar series is monitored.*

2.5 Criteria for registration

In registering a student for a research degree of the University, the Faculty should satisfy itself on each of the following:

- (i) the topic of the independent research is academically sound and the title reflects the proposed programme of study;
- (ii) the aim and objectives of the independent research have academic integrity and are appropriately challenging in relation to the proposed award;
- (iii) the further information sets out in clear terms the rationale and the scope of the proposed independent research and the relative balance of any practice and theory components have been confirmed (See section 2.1 (ii));
- (iv) the plan of work is realistic;
- (v) the supervisory arrangements are robust and a learning contract has been agreed;
- (vi) the student is scheduled to participate in a programme of seminars or an agreed programme of modules which will strengthen her/his experience and knowledge of relevant research methods;
- (vii) full consideration has been given to all aspects of research governance including ethical considerations, risk assessment and health and safety;
- (viii) if the student is working as a member of a research team, the work to be undertaken by the student is clearly distinguishable from that of the wider team or the research worker who s/he is employed to assist. The student's IPR position must be clear and satisfactory;
- (ix) where the project is to be part of a piece of funded research, the terms on which the research is funded do not detract from the aims and requirements of the research training.
- (x) In the case of distance learning students there must be an agreed learning contract signed by the student, supervisors and dean, which schedules the first year's supervisory meetings indicating how and where they will take place.

Guidance: *Particular care is needed in the case of overseas students. If the student is to be based in Derby, it is necessary to ensure that the student is clear about the arrangements and that her/his expectations are realistic. Overseas students will need a period to settle and may need more pastoral support than some UK students. Steps must be taken to ensure frequent and substantial contact between the student and the supervisor particularly as they settle in. It is recommended that the time that a student is required to spend at the University*

should be set out in a learning contract, which is agreed between the director of studies and the student. Distance learning students should be provided with an equivalent level of support. The adequacy of the plan for delivering research training and any learning contract should be considered by the FRRDC as part of the registration process. The director of studies has the prime responsibility for ensuring that the student is aware of the remote facilities available and the support available from the Research Office and the other relevant units of the Student Support and Information Services and Learning and Information Services.

2.6 Transfer of registration

Students on the programme who initially register for the Master of Philosophy award or for the Doctor of Philosophy award may apply for a **transfer of registration** to the doctoral or master's award, as appropriate. In the case of aspiring doctoral students, such an application should be made at the time of submitting the application for Confirmation of Registration (RD7). In the case of doctoral students wishing to transfer to the Master of Philosophy award, this change may be requested at any time before the notification to submit for assessment. In addition, a student may request a transfer to registration for the Master of Philosophy after failure to satisfy the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy (Section 6.15). The master's award may not be awarded by default following an examination for the doctoral degree.

2.7 The target submission period

All research students are required to commit themselves to a **target submission date**. There is a strong expectation that students, supported by their directors of studies, will aim to complete their taught programme and submit for the award of a higher degree by the target submission date.

The target submission period for students enrolled on a Higher Degree by Peer Review registered for the PhD is three years full time and six years part time. The target submission period for students enrolled on a Higher Degree by Peer Review registered for the MPhil is two years full time and four years part time (Figure 3). Distance learning students normally enroll on a part time programme.

Guidance: Directors of studies are advised to press upon students the importance of aiming to submit for their final examination within the target submission period. The schedule for the programme of studies should take into consideration both the standards associated with the higher degree and realistic expectations of what can be achieved within the time available. The spirit of supervision should be one of firm and positive encouragement. Directors of studies are expected to provide pro-active support for their students as they engage with the programme.

All students are required to complete brief annual progress reports as well as the more substantial Application for Confirmation of Registration (RD7) to enable the FRRDC to track their progress. A faculty panel may advise FRRDC on the progress of each student. If a student exceeds, or appears likely to exceed, the target submission period, the faculty may apply a range of measures to hasten completion. The possibility of the application of any sanctions in the event of exceeding the target submission period should be known to students well in advance of implementation.

NOTE: If a full time PGR student exceeds the target submission period they cease to be classified as full time and lose their entitlement to office accommodation.

2.8 The Registration Period

The **registration period** is the maximum time that a student is permitted to undertake and complete the examination for the award. When the registration is approved, the period of registration is taken from the date of initial enrolment. The registration period is therefore defined as the time between the date of enrolment and the date of the [final] viva-voce examination. If the student has not submitted by the time that the registration period expires, the student is deemed to have failed to complete the training in research. The registration period for each student is the target submission period plus one year for full time and two years for part time (Figure 3).

The purpose of the additional time is to accommodate various circumstances that may affect the research schedule. This includes, for example, misjudgments in estimating the length of time that a particular activity may take, equipment failure or a delay in the collection of field data forced by

external events. In the event of exceptional personal circumstances for which there is sound evidence, the FRRDC has powers to approve a request for the suspension or extension of the registration period (Sections 2.11 and 2.12).

Award	Full or Part time	Target Submission Period	Registration Period
MPhil	FT	2 years	3 years
MPhil	PT	4 years	6 years
PhD	FT	3 years	4 years
PhD	PT	6 years	8 years

Figure 3: Table showing the relationship between the target submission periods and the registration periods. PGR students are expected to complete their studies and submit for their final examination within the set target submission period.

2.9 Expiry of the target submission period

PGR students are discouraged from exceeding the target submission period. Full time PGR students who have not submitted by the end of the target submission period are normally permitted to continue their studies on an agreed basis. At this point any change from full to part time study does not result in a change to the registration period. If the target submission period expires, the PGR student will be re-classified as part time/writing up and lose entitlement to any office accommodation that has been provided. The Research Office should give PGR students reasonable advanced notice of cessation of office facilities. All students remain subject to the limit of the registration period.

2.10 Changing the target submission period / mode of study (RD11)

In exceptional circumstances, a full time student may request that s/he be transferred to a part time mode with a longer target submission period and registration period. This facility is only available up to the end of the second year of FT study for a student who is unable, for compelling personal reasons, to continue on a full time basis. In this situation, any studentship held is usually terminated and the student's RD7 due date, target submission date and maximum date are revised by the Research Office. The student must submit a revised planned progress chart for approval. This is subject to FRRDC approval normally through Chair's Action. Full time students are not permitted to change the target submission period after the end of their second year. Part time students are subject to a maximum target submission period of six years. This cannot be extended. Changes should be approved by the Chair of FRRDC and reported to the next Committee meeting.

2.11 Suspension of registration (RD10)

In the event of exceptional adverse personal circumstances, a student may request that their registration be **suspended** for up to three periods totalling a maximum of **one year**. The request should be accompanied by a revised planned progress chart for approval. The student should gain the agreement of the director of studies and submit an Application for Suspension (RD10) to the Chair of the FRRDC. All suspensions of registration must be reported to the next FRRDC meeting. As a consequence of a period of suspension the end of the registration period is moved back by a period equal to the duration of the suspended registration. Suspensions cannot be backdated. For the duration of any suspension the individual suspended ceases to be classified as an active student.

Guidance: Reasonable grounds may include, for example, medical or family circumstances which in the view of the Chair of the FRDDC warrant a sympathetic response. Students cannot suspend for financial reasons. Experience has shown that it is important to keep the period of suspension to a minimum. The more distanced the student becomes from the research, the less likely it is that s/he will be able to regain momentum when the period of suspended registration is over.

2.12 The extension of the period of registration (RD8)

Students who are affected by exceptional adverse personal circumstances in the *final year* of the registration period may request that their registration period be **extended**. The student should gain the agreement of the director of studies and submit an Application for Extension (RD8) to the Chair of the FRRDC. The request should be accompanied by a revised progress chart for approval. All extensions of registration must be reported to the next FRRDC meeting. This should be done at least one month before the expiry of the registration period. The period of registration may be extended for a period of up to one year on one occasion only. The period of extension commences from the date of expiry of registration.

Guidance: *It is University policy to keep extensions to the absolute minimum necessary to allow the student to complete. There will be instances where the supervisors are satisfied that difficult circumstances relating to the research warrant an extension to the period of registration. This facility is not available for those who, for reasons which cannot be accepted as extenuating, have progressed more slowly than was planned.*

2.13 Withdrawal from registration (RD12)

Students who are contemplating **withdrawal** from registration are asked to consult with the director of studies before taking action. All reasonable avenues for the continuation of the research will be considered. PGR students who finally decide to withdraw are requested to complete the RD12 proforma and have a short exit interview with a member of staff in the Research Office.

2.14 Termination of registration

If, in the consideration of a registered student, the FRRDC decides that her/his progress is **wholly unsatisfactory**, the Committee is empowered to write to the student indicating that the registration has been **suspended** with immediate effect and may be **terminated** following further investigation. The grounds for the decision must be explained. The student shall be reminded of her/his rights to use the University Appeals Procedure.

Guidance: *It is a matter of good practice that in coming to the decision to suspend, there is evidence that there has already been at least one occasion on which the student has received written warning of FRRDC's concern. The warning should explain why the progress is considered inadequate and indicate the action which the student needs to take.*

2.15 Student Participation Policy

The University expects students who have enrolled on a programme to participate fully in the learning activities associated with the programme and, except in the case of Associate Students who have elected not to do so, to undertake the assessment attached to it. To this end the completion of the enrolment process includes a commitment to the following Participation Contract:

'Unless I have specifically elected not to do so at the time of enrolment, I undertake to participate fully in those activities which are described in the programme as essential and that I will inform my Director of Studies if circumstances oblige me to miss any of these activities. I recognise that failure to participate adequately in these essential activities may lead to termination of the enrolment of my programme of study I understand that I will be invited to explain my failure to participate before termination of the programme occurs and failure to engage in this process will be considered to be withdrawal.'

The participation contract will be considered as breached in either of the following circumstances, unless the student has negotiated alternative acceptable arrangements with their Director of Studies:

(i) The student has missed any 3 consecutive expected contacts without good cause. The student will be given 14 days to confirm their intention to continue studying on the programme. If there is a nil response, or a negative response, their enrolment on the programme will be terminated.

(ii) The student has intermittently missed 3 or more expected contacts without approved extenuating circumstances. The student will be given 14 days to contact either their Director of Studies or the Research Office. If this action is not forthcoming, registrations for the programme will be terminated.

The termination of a student's study must be approved by the relevant FRRDC.

3. The supervision of research students

3.1 The appointment of the Director of Studies and Second Supervisor

All PGR students normally have **two** supervisors, one of whom is designated director of studies (DoS), the other is designated second supervisor. It is the responsibility of the supervisors to provide academic guidance in the conduct of the research work. The director of studies (DoS) is responsible for monitoring the progress of the student, co-ordinating the supervision and providing proactive academic and pastoral support. The supervisors are expected to meet the student on an agreed regular basis.

One supervisor shall normally hold a doctorate or should have extensive successful PhD supervisory experience the other should hold a doctorate or have substantial research experience. Between them the two supervisors must have significant experience of research supervision. Normally, the two supervisors should have supervised at least **two** students to successful completion including, in the case of supervision of a doctoral student, one successful completion for the award of PhD. The director of studies should be a member (full-time or part-time) of academic staff of the University and should not be registered for a research degree. The second supervisor may be external in which case s/he is required to sign a formal written agreement to undertake this role.

Neither the director of studies nor the second supervisor should be a close relation (spouse/partner/sibling/parent) of the student and the supervisors should not be closely related to each other.

The number of concurrent supervisions [as director of studies or second supervisor] that a member of staff undertakes is assessed on a points system (see table below). The maximum number of points for any one supervisor is forty.

	Category	Director of Studies DoS	Second Supervisor SS
1	Full Time (MPhil/PhD)	4 points	2 points
2	Part Time (MPhil/PhD)	3 points	1.5 points
3	Full Time (DPr)	4 points	2 points
4	Part Time (DPr)	3 points	1.5 points

If a proposed supervisory package has satisfactory research experience but insufficient supervisory experience, the Chair of FRRDC may appoint an FRRDC approved mentor to the supervisors. This should be reported to the next meeting of FRRDC. Any proposed variation in the application of these requirements shall be submitted to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee for approval.

Guidance: In order to provide a secure supervisory arrangement, it is necessary to appoint supervisors who are

appropriately qualified. Having identified the two [or three] supervisors who have the expertise and are willing to provide support, the faculty is advised to appoint the member of staff who is most directly interested in the proposed area of research as the director of studies. A more experienced member of staff who has less knowledge of the specific field of study and who has less time to offer is more suitable for the role of second supervisor. It is recommended that within a learning contract, a written agreement is secured on the roles of the supervisors.

Extensive supervisory experience in lieu of a doctorate should consist of a minimum of four successful completions at PhD level.

In determining the suitability of staff to undertake the role of supervisors, attention should be focused on their experience of research training. All the supervisors should have experience of research training [as a student or supervisor] in a western context comparable to that at Derby. Research workers with experience only of other traditions may be invited to contribute in an advisory capacity. The completion of a taught master's award including a dissertation does not in itself constitute sufficient experience to supervise a higher degree by research. It is the total experience represented by the supervisory package that matters. It is permissible for the second supervisor to be registered for a research degree.

Where it can be demonstrated that in the context of the proposed research, there is an advantage in appointing an external second supervisor this is acceptable. The Faculty should ensure that the arrangements for any external supervisors are secure. Faculties should also ensure that the supervisory team is realistic in terms of the existing workload and availability of the proposed supervisors to provide academic guidance. If a supervisor leaves the University, the Faculty is expected to take immediate steps to maintain the continuity of supervision (see Section 3.6). The interests of the students must come first.

Supervisors should not be closely related to students because there is the possibility that such students could be advantaged by higher than normal levels of support. Although the supervisors are not participant to the final examination, they are constantly involved in formative assessment and improvement of the works for submission there is a potential problem for supervisors who are relatives in deciding when to limit their input and for examiners who need to be sure that they are assessing the work of the candidate

3.2 The supervision of Distance Learning students

Distance Learning students shall also normally have **two** supervisors. The director of studies should be based in Derby, supported by a **second supervisor**. The director of studies is expected to be proactive in the conduct of her/his responsibilities. The second supervisor may be located in the student's country of residence. If the second supervisor is external, the Faculty should appoint this person to a formal contract to provide proactive advice on an agreed regular basis over the registration period. As with on-campus students, the director of studies retains responsibility for monitoring progress, co-ordinating the supervision and providing proactive supervisory support.

Guidance: *If a local second supervisor is appointed, an agreement specifying the expectations of the role of the local supervisor in terms of the nature and level of support to the student and contact with the director of studies should be drawn up. The agreement with a local second supervisor should include 16 hours of duties each year to include contact and commenting on work received. In practice, the local supervisor may combine the pastoral and academic roles of supervisors. However, the director of studies at Derby should undertake the process side. DL students should report quarterly to the director of studies on progress made and the issues to be resolved. They should copy their reports to the second supervisors and the Faculty Office. The reports serve as the primary source of information for the director of studies to monitor progress and provide advice.*

3.3 The appointment of approved Mentors to supervisory packages

In the case of a proposed supervisory package which has sufficient research experience but insufficient supervisory experience, the Chair of FRRDC may appoint a Mentor to the supervisors. The function of the mentor is to offer advice to the supervisors on a regular and on-going basis. The mentor is not an additional supervisor. The Chair may only appoint Mentors who have been approved for this role by FRRDC. Mentors must have supervised at least two PGR students to completion at doctoral level before taking on this role.

3.4 Mandatory Staff Development for first time PGR Supervisors

Staff development for first time supervisors is mandatory. First time supervisors are *required* to

participate in the full Research Seminar Series which is organised each autumn and spring semester. The interactive seminars are led by experienced supervisors and there are new sessions each year. More experienced supervisors are expected to participate in on-going staff development on a regular basis.

3.5 The appointment of Advisers

In addition to the supervisors, the Faculty may appoint internal or external Advisers who can, for example, contribute specialised knowledge, or provide a link with an external organisation.

3.6 Changes to the supervisory arrangements (RD9)

Following enrolment and the appointment of the supervisors the student may seek, or the FRRDC may deem it necessary to make, changes to the supervisory arrangements. Any proposed change must have the agreement of the student and must be formally approved by the Chair of FRRDC and reported to the next Committee meeting. The Faculty is responsible for taking immediate steps to replace supervisors who leave the University, or if this is not possible, to take appropriate steps to ensure that the student is able to continue her/his research training through transfer if necessary. The interests of the student are paramount and disruption to the supervisory package is to be regarded as a serious matter.

***Guidance:** There are several circumstances which may necessitate a change. These include a significant change in the direction of the research which requires different expertise; long term illness on the part of one of the supervisors; the departure or the non-availability of one of the supervisors; or student dissatisfaction with the supervisory arrangement. In the event of a student complaint, students should demonstrate that they have attempted to resolve the difficulty directly with the director of studies and the Chair of the FRRDC. In highly exceptional circumstances where it becomes clear that the University is no longer able to provide a satisfactory arrangement, it may be deemed necessary to arrange for the student to be transferred to another institution.*

4. Annual Progress Reports

All research students are required to submit a brief annual progress report together with the progress chart updated with the progress actually achieved at the end of each academic year. This is pre-requisite for re-enrolment. The purpose of the Annual Progress Report is to assure FRRDC that progress is satisfactory. If there have been problems the report should indicate whether they have been addressed. The director of studies writes a separate report. In the case of distance learning students the director of studies report should set out the timing of the supervisory meetings for the following year. Both reports are considered at the FRRDC which should provide feedback expressing recommendations or concerns as appropriate. The Chair of FRRDC also considers the attendance of students at the research training seminars. The FRRDC is asked to prepare and submit a summary analysis of the annual reports to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee. Research students enrolling for the first time between the 1st May and 31st July are not required to submit an annual report for their first academic year.

If a FRRDC considers that an Annual Progress Report is unsatisfactory it should write to the student and director of studies to indicate the reason for concern and set down any requirements. This may constitute a written warning of unsatisfactory progress as a first step towards termination of registration, although every reasonable step should be taken to avoid this eventuality.

5. Confirmation of Registration

5.1 The purpose of the process

All PGR students are required to confirm their registration for a specific award, either the Master of Philosophy or the Doctor of Philosophy. They are not permitted to submit for the award of Doctor of Philosophy without having confirmed registration for that award. In order to do this all students need to submit a completed proforma (RD7), submit a confirmation report and undertake a *viva-voce* with an approved assessor.

Full time students should aim to submit for confirmation of registration 15 months after initial enrolment; part time students should aim to submit for confirmation of registration 24 months after initial enrolment. The purpose of the process is for the PGR student, the director of studies and for FRRDC to have confidence that good progress is being made and that the intended final award is an appropriate objective. FRRDC arrives at a decision based upon the recommendation of the Assessor who has read the RD7, the confirmation report and discussed the research at the *viva voce* examination.

5.2 The Confirmation Report

The purpose of the Confirmation Report is for the PGR student to demonstrate that s/he has developed a very good understanding of the field and is progressing with the research investigation in a manner which convinces the independent Assessor that the intended award is appropriate. Therefore the report should enable the Assessor to evaluate the progress achieved so far in terms of the amount of research and standard of the research. Students are required to present a summary of the progress, an introduction including the rationale, aim and objectives, together with a full and critical literature review **OR** a full discussion of the research methodology. FRRDC therefore expects that normally the report should include a draft paper which is destined to form part of the final submission. This should be followed by a discussion of any problems, a summary of the planned doctoral research and an updated progress chart.

The confirmation report should include:

- a summary which is in the range of 300 to 1,200 words (10%);
- a clear statement of the rationale, aim(s) and objectives of the research with a discussion of the progress achieved and a comment on the continuing appropriateness of the aim and objectives. Any changes to the approach, aim or objectives set out in the original registration application should be highlighted here;
- a draft paper which is destined to form part of the final submission;
- an appreciation of the originality and significance of the results in the broader field of the discipline;
- a discussion of any problems encountered and the steps taken or planned to address them
- a concluding section which sets out the programme of doctoral level research which will achieve the planned objectives
- the updated progress chart which includes the planned research schedule.

Flexibility in the organisation of the material to be submitted is permitted. It is the quality that is critical. The length of the Confirmation report should be as follows.

- in the earth, life and behavioural sciences, computing, technology and colour imaging: the length should normally be in the range of 3,000 to 4,000 words and not exceed 6,000 words. This excludes the summary, figures, tables and appendices.
- in the arts, business, humanities, social sciences, education and law: the length should normally be in the order of 4,000 to 6,000 words and not exceed 12,000 words. This excludes the summary, figures, tables and appendices.

5.3 The appointment of an Assessor

The director of studies should recommend the name of a researcher who can serve as an independent Assessor. This researcher may be internal or external to the University but must not be a member of the supervisory team. It is acceptable to ask an Adviser or Mentor. The appointment of the Assessor should be approved by the Chair of the FRRDC. Faculty approval may be required if a fee is payable to an external researcher. The director of studies is responsible for informing the Assessor of the requirements and of these regulations. The director of studies is responsible for sending the Completed RD7 and Confirmation Report to the Assessor at a mutually agreed time.

5.4 The *viva voce* assessment

The director of studies is responsible for negotiating a mutually convenient date for the *viva voce* examination between the PGR student and the Assessor. The supervisors should normally be present. The purpose of the *viva voce* examination is for the Assessor to question the PGR student on her/his knowledge of the research field and reported progress in the research. It is an early opportunity for the PGR student to experience deeper questions in a manner that can be expected in the final examination. The student is expected to learn how to deal with questions which may challenge the approach, the methods and some interpretations. S/he is permitted to take a copy of the report into the *viva-voce* examination.

5.5 The value of presenting a seminar as well

There is normally considerable benefit to the candidate if s/he arranges to present a departmental seminar on the progress of the research at about the same time as the *viva-voce*. A faculty based PGR conference may be a suitable occasion. The experience of the *viva* together with the experience of handling questions from an interested audience adds value to the confirmation process.

5.6 The Assessor's recommendation to FRRDC

The Assessor is asked to decide whether on the basis of the evidence presented in the report and the responses to questions posed in the *viva voce*, there are good prospects of the student satisfying the requirements for the intended award. The Assessor should consider whether the actual research accomplished to date is in accord with that which was set out in the registration form (RD5). If there are significant variations the PGR student should be advised whether the direction of the research is valid and acceptable. In the case of theory and practice elements it may be advisable to reconsider the balance. The recommendation should be one of the following:

- (i) The student has made good/excellent progress in the independent research and FRRDC is recommended to confirm registration for the award stated in the RD7 application. Suggestions have been offered to assist the student as s/he continues the research.
- (ii) The student has made sound progress, however the student is asked to address some significant matters and submit a revised Confirmation Report before a final recommendation can be made.
- (iii) The student has made limited progress and there are some serious deficiencies in the Confirmation Report which are a cause for concern. The student is asked to rework and resubmit the Confirmation Report for re-assessment. There is a risk that the Confirmation Report may be unsuccessful.

Each of the above outcomes may be adapted by the Assessor for the report to FRRDC.

5.7 Attendance of the research support programme

The confirmation of registration decision is based upon the research performance to date as

evidenced by the Confirmation Report and the *viva-voce* examination. Attendance of the research training support programme is not normally considered. However, if there are concerns about the progress of a student evidenced by serious deficiencies in the Confirmation Report, the FRRDC may review the attendance of the research training support seminars. If this is poor, questions may be asked about the research engagement. This may help inform any action plan which is agreed.

5.8 The FRRDC decision

FRRDC considers the submitted RD7 together with the Assessor's Report and recommendation. A positive recommendation (category (i)) should enable FRRDC to confirm the registration. Any suggested minor amendments can be noted by the student for the future work. Outcomes in categories (ii) and (iii) should lead to referral. FRRDC may wish to indicate the timescale which is acceptable. This may be best expressed as the meeting [date] at which FRRDC expects to consider the recommendation arising from the assessed further work.

If the Assessor is not satisfied following a referral opportunity, FRRDC has the option of either recommending a lower target award [if applicable] or concluding that the registration cannot be confirmed. The director of studies should warn the student informally that this outcome is probable. It may be advisable for the director of studies and the Chair of FRRDC to hold a meeting with the student to consider the implications of an unsuccessful outcome. They may also wish to check the PGR database whether the PGR student has participated in the research training seminar programme as agreed. In the exceptional circumstance of very unsatisfactory progress FRRDC has the authority to terminate the registration.

5.9 The location of the *viva voce* event

The confirmation of registration *viva voce* event is normally held at one of the campuses of the University of Derby. The *viva voce* may be held at another location, but only if this reduces the cost to the University and is acceptable to all parties. Distance Learning students are expected to travel to Derby or Buxton for the event.

5.10 The transfer of registration to Doctor of Philosophy

Students who initially register for a Master of Philosophy may, with the approval of the director of studies, submit an RD7 proforma and Confirmation Report requesting transfer to registration for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The process proceeds as described above. Any change from Master of Philosophy to Doctor of Philosophy will have tuition fee and registration period implications. These would be confirmed by the Research Office. If in the opinion of the Assessor, the student's progress and performance provide clear evidence of the potential to accomplish research at a doctoral standard, FRRDC will normally permit the student to transfer registration to the higher award.

5.11 The transfer of registration to Master of Philosophy

Students who initially register for a Doctor of Philosophy may, with the approval of the Director of Studies, submit an RD7 proforma and Confirmation Report requesting transfer to registration for the degree of Master of Philosophy. Students may still request such a transfer at any time up to the notification to submit for assessment and after full consultation with their director of studies. This may be approved by the Chair of FRRDC and shall be reported to the FRRDC. Exceptionally, a student may request a transfer to the Master of Philosophy after failing to achieve the doctoral award. FRRDC may also recommend the transfer to this award in the event of an RD7 submission which has only been partially successful (Section 5.8).

6. Final examination for a higher degree

6.1 The two stages of assessment

Candidates for the final examination for the higher degree by research must have satisfied the requirements for the confirmation of registration. The final examination for the Master of Philosophy and the Doctor of Philosophy has two stages. Firstly, the submitted works are formally examined. Secondly, the candidate is examined through a discussion of the principal outcomes of the research. The candidate is expected to be able to defend the validity of any contribution which is judged to be original. This constitutes a *viva-voce* examination.

6.2.1 Content of the submission for examination

The Candidate will be required to submit to the Research Office four sets of the documentation. **On no account should the works be submitted directly to the examiners.** Each copy shall include:

- (i) a **contents page and title page**. The title page shall include in the following order; the approved title; the full name of the Candidate and the following statement

“A submission in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the University of Derby for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy or Master of Philosophy by Peer Reviewed Works”

The title should be followed by the name of the Faculty in which the programme was undertaken and the month and year of submission;

- (ii) an **abstract**, not normally exceeding 300 words, providing a statement of the nature and scope of the work undertaken and the contribution made to the knowledge or development of the subject;
- (iii) a **critical appraisal** of the cited published/accepted works (all works submitted must be either published or accepted for publication) which states the aims and provides a description of the research programme, an analysis of its component parts and a synthesis of the works as a coherent study. The length is normally between 3,000 and 5,000 words but exceptionally, if the word limit seems unduly restrictive because there are a number of major issues to be addressed, FRRDC may approve an extension to 8,000 words. The contribution of the original works to the advancement of the field of study shall be noted and an account given of its significance. Where the Candidate's own creative or scholarly work has formed a significant part or the whole of the intellectual enquiry, the critical appraisal shall clearly set the creative work, including scholarly text(s), in its relevant theoretical, historical, critical or design context. A full list of the references cited should be included. The critical appraisal should be softbound with thin card covers.

Candidates shall include an annex to the critical appraisal which sets out concisely the following information:

- (a) an explanation of the candidate's intellectual and written contribution to any co-authored works;
- (b) a brief explanation of the status and referee arrangements for each journal in which the candidate's submitted works have appeared. In the case of unpublished reports the candidate should explain the review and editing arrangements that have applied to each work.

It should be noted that a submission that is substantially based on non-refereed works may not be deemed acceptable by the examiners.

Critical appraisal format

- (i) the paper should be A4 size, white and within the range of 70 g m² to 100 g m².
- (ii) the text should be clear and legible using a standard font such as Times Roman or CG Times. The print size for standard text should be 12 point although a smaller size down to 10 point may be used in specific situations such as tables where this is appropriate.
- (iii) the text should be printed with one and a half line spacing.
- (iv) the text should normally be printed on **both sides** of the paper but if there are reasons why this would be unsatisfactory, the printing may be on the right hand page [recto] only. Margins should not be less than 20mm unless printed on one side only then the left hand margin [bound side] should not be less than 20 mm.
- (v) the pages shall be consecutively numbered through the main body of the critical appraisal and the bibliography/references. The pagination should apply to diagrams or charts that occupy a whole page. The appendices should have a separate pagination.
- (vi) in the case of journal articles, an offprint or high quality reproduction or representation of all the published, creative or scholarly works should be provided giving proof of authenticity. In the case of creative work, the representation may be in other than written form (for example Compact Disc, video, photographic record, musical score, diagrammatic representation);
- (vii) an original copy of any books must be included with the submission for examination.
- (viii) see appendix 3 for an example of the hardbound cover layout

6.2.2 The language of communication

Normally, the submitted works shall be written in English and the *viva-voce* examination shall also be conducted in English. Exceptionally, the nature of the study may necessitate a variation of this norm in which case the candidate should seek approval from the FRRDC.

Guidance: *A FRRDC may consider approval of the use of a language other than English for substantial parts of a submission, if the work is engaged on a topic in which the use of a modern or ancient language is an integral part of the study. It is not sufficient reason that a language other than English is the native language of the candidate. However, where it is expected that the submission will be consulted to a significant extent by a non-English speaking audience, the candidate may elect to write the Abstract in English and the other language.*

6.3 The examination of creative works and inventions

The examiners must have the opportunity to view any creative works in an exhibition format. It is not sufficient to present images of the works within the theory element. The exhibition should normally be mounted in Derby. Alternative venues in England or overseas are only permitted with the express approval of the dean of faculty and the Research Office.

Guidance: *Normally this will be when the alternative location is cost neutral or some other compelling reason.*

6.4 Waiving the *viva-voce* examination in highly exceptional circumstances

The *viva-voce* examination is a critically important part of the examination. However, if as the result of serious illness or disability or other extreme circumstance, the candidate is unable, or would be seriously disadvantaged if s/he was required to undergo a *viva-voce* examination, the University Research and Research Degrees Committee may decide that the *viva-voce* is not required.

Guidance: *This decision should only be taken in the most extreme of circumstances. All candidates are expected to have sufficient knowledge of the English Language to be able to undertake a *viva-voce* examination in English. A weakness in the command of English does **not** constitute adequate grounds to waive the *viva*. Furthermore, the departure of the candidate to an overseas location for the purpose of taking up employment, or*

to attend to a family problem is **not** sufficient reason. In these situations, the viva should be deferred or other arrangements made for the conduct of the viva.

6.5 The location of the *viva-voce* examination

The *viva-voce* examination is normally held in the UK. In very exceptional circumstances, the University Research and Research Degrees Committee may give approval for the examination to be held abroad or via video conferencing.

Guidance: *Distance Learners should normally undertake the viva-voce examination in the UK and it is advised that they allow for adequate time prior to the examination (approximately 2 – 4 weeks) to hold a mock viva and after the examination to discuss with the Director of Studies any amendments that need to be undertaken.*

6.6 Notification of the intention to submit for examination (RD13)

The decision to submit works for examination is the responsibility and right of the candidate. The candidate is, however, *required* to seek the signed agreement of the Director of Studies and should ensure that s/he has satisfied any outstanding requirements relating to research methods training. Notification of the **intention to submit** should be submitted to the Research Office, on the appropriate form, **three months** in advance of the proposed date of submission. Following submission of the RD13 if the works are not submitted within 6 months the RD13 becomes void and a new RD13 must be submitted.

If the director of studies does not support the submission, s/he must indicate this view in the space provided on the form and should submit separately a *confidential* statement to the Research Office explaining why s/he does not support the candidate's decision to submit at this time. This statement should be made known to the Chair of the Faculty Research and Research Degrees Committee before the examination, but must **not** be conveyed to the examiners. The information is made known to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee when it receives the recommendations of the examiners (Section 6.15).

6.7 The appointment of the examiners

- (i) It is the responsibility of the director of studies to recommend to the Chair of FRRDC the names of the examiners to be appointed.
- (ii) The Chair of FRRDC considers the suitability of the proposed examiners and makes recommendations for appointment to be reported to the next Committee meeting. The University Research and Research Degrees Committee considers the recommendations for approval.

Following the approval of the proposed examiners, responsibility for making the arrangements for the *viva-voce* examination rests with the **Research Office** in consultation with the Director of Studies and the candidate.

Guidance: *The appointment of all examiners is formally undertaken by the Registrar on behalf of the Academic Board of the University. The director of studies should confirm informally the willingness of the proposed examiner to act in this capacity but under no circumstances should s/he attempt to appoint the examiner or make arrangements for the examination.*

6.8 The examiners: qualifications and requirements for appointment

- (i) There shall normally be **two** examiners; one external and one internal. An *internal* examiner is defined as a member of academic staff of the University. The Research Office appoints the Chair of the proceedings. (See Appendix 2 for guidance on the role of the Chair)

- (ii) When the candidate is a permanent member of staff at the University, both examiners appointed should be external.
- (iii) Examiners should be experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's work and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined. They must not be registered for a research degree.
- (iv) The examiners should normally have, between them, experience of **at least three** previous examiner ships. In the case of an examination of a doctoral candidate, the three examiner ships should be at this award level. In the case of an examination of a candidate for the Master of Philosophy, the examiner ships must be at least at this award level. Any exception to this normal requirement shall be subject to the approval of the University Research and Research Degrees Committee.
- (v) Exceptionally, where there is doubt about the adequacy of the two examiners to fulfill the objectives of the examination, a third examiner (external or internal) may be appointed.
- (vi) The supervisors of the candidate are **not** permitted to serve as examiners of the candidate.
- (vii) It is permissible for a researcher who has served as an Assessor of a submission for the confirmation of registration to be appointed as an Internal Examiner. However, it is **not** acceptable for a researcher who has served as an Assessor of a submission for the confirmation of registration to be appointed as an External Examiner.
- (viii) The External Examiner must be independent of both the University and any collaborating institution, and should **not** have acted previously as a supervisor of the candidate or another candidate in the same department *within the last three years*. Former members of staff of the University should not be approved as external examiners until three years after the termination of their employment at the University.
- (ix) An external examiner should not be appointed so frequently that her/his familiarity with the department might prejudice objective judgement. A researcher should not normally be appointed as external examiner on more than three occasions in three years without compelling reason.

6.9 The examination process: the submission

- (i) Candidates must take no part in making the arrangements for the examination and should have no formal contact with the external examiners between the appointment of the examiners and the *viva voce* examination. Candidates must not discuss their submission with their appointed examiners prior to the *viva-voce* examination.
- (ii) Candidates should hand-in to the Research Office **four copies** of the works [soft bound] which are to be assessed, within three months of submitting the notification to submit (Section 6.6). S/he must also complete the submission checklist provided by the Research Office. When there are three examiners, an extra copy will be required at submission. Under no circumstances should the candidate or supervisors send the submission directly to the examiners.
- (iii) Candidates should submit those works or materials which have been agreed with the Director of Studies and set down in the notification to submit.
- (iv) Candidates should ensure that any materials which provide evidence of the source of data

cited in the printed works are available for the scrutiny of the examiners.

- (v) If the candidate has elected to submit works for examination against the advice of the Director of Studies, the latter should submit a report on the preparedness of the candidate for the examination to the Research Office. This report is not made known to the examiners but is passed to the Chair of the FRRDC (Section 6.6). The director of studies' report is conveyed to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee when it considers the recommendations of the examiners.

Guidance: *While candidates would be unwise to submit works for examination against the advice of their Director of Studies, they have the right to do so. Equally, candidates should not assume that a Director of Studies' agreement to the submission of works guarantees the award of a degree.*

- (vi) Candidates must ensure that the format of the critical appraisal and other works is in accordance with the regulations.
- (vii) The Research Office is responsible for ensuring that the materials for examination reach the examiners safely.

6.10 The examination process: the reports

Each examiner examines the critical appraisal and the other submitted works and decides provisionally whether the works satisfy the requirements of the degree. S/he then completes a **preliminary report** setting out the provisional recommendations for the outcome of the examination and explaining the reasons for these recommendations.

The preliminary reports must be completed independently, without consultation with the supervisors or the other examiner, and submitted on the designated forms to the Research Office. The examiners should submit the preliminary reports to the Research Office at least five working days before the *viva-voce* examination. The provisional recommendation may be revised following the *viva-voce* examination. Copies of the preliminary reports will be exchanged between the examiners once they have all been received and copies will be sent to the Chair.

Normally, the examiners are expected to proceed to a *viva-voce* examination. However, in exceptional circumstances where the examiners are of the opinion that the submitted works are so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting a *viva-voce* examination, they may recommend referral of the submitted works for major revision without holding the *viva-voce* examination. This referral constitutes the outcome of the first examination. A recommendation to cancel the *viva-voce* examination must be received at least seven days before the scheduled date. It is deemed unacceptable to cancel the *viva-voce* examination after that point.

Guidance: *It is considered very important that there should be an independence of view on the part of the examiners when they prepare their pre-examination reports. After they have submitted their reports they may confer on matters relating to the examination and the conduct of the viva-voce examination. If they judge the submission to be grossly inadequate, they may recommend the cancellation of the viva-voce examination providing there are at least seven days remaining before the scheduled event. A cancellation closer to the event is considered unfair to the candidate. The University much prefers that the viva-voce examination should take place so that the examiners can interact with the candidate and advise as to the prospects of meeting the requirements for the registered award. The examiners may, for example, wish to recommend that the candidate transfers to the Master of Philosophy award. There is a further opportunity for the examiners to influence each other's thinking in the deliberations following the viva-voce examination. Any convergence or divergence in thinking will become evident in the post-examination report which is a joint report containing the formal recommendations following the viva.*

6.11.1 The assessment criteria for the award of the Doctor of Philosophy [PhD]

The underlying principle

It is a fundamental principle that the route by which University staff may gain a research degree through the assessment of their peer reviewed works is closely comparable in terms of academic demand to the acquisition of a research degree through the assessment of a traditional thesis. The Research Degree by Peer Reviewed Works is equal in terms of academic accomplishment requiring evidence of an original contribution to the chosen discipline.

(i) The originality of the contribution of the creative work and the advancement of the subject.

Guidance: *The originality of the contribution is of fundamental importance in the consideration of the doctoral submission. The assessment of originality can only be made in the context of the subject of enquiry but in general terms the plain addition of information [adding knowledge] may not be deemed sufficient. The development and refinement of concepts, theories or models [deepening understanding] is generally regarded as more significant. Translation from one language to another may be deemed to making an original contribution only if the candidate can demonstrate further analysis, interpretation or other significant contribution in the critical appraisal. Translation may form a substantial part of the work but there must be a further contribution.*

(ii) Powers of critical analysis and/or synthesis

Guidance: *Examiners will consider the intellectual rigour of the study, in particular, they will consider the depth of the critical analysis and the effectiveness of any synthesis contained in the submission.*

(iii) Understanding of the context

Guidance: *The candidate must demonstrate that they have an appreciation and understanding of the historical, conceptual and theoretical context of the research which has been undertaken.*

(iv) Command of the relevant research methodology

Guidance: *An important part of research training is the development of research skills and knowledge of the research methodology in the field. This should be evident in the submission.*

(v) Coherence of the overall submission

Guidance: *It is a requirement of the University that there should be a demonstrable coherence to the submission. The candidate should develop the theme of coherence through the critical appraisal and should explain the relationships between the works that comprise the submission. Examiners are advised to assess the coherence on the strength of the arguments presented rather than with reference to pre-determined expectations. Coherence is to be recognised in a broad sense rather than in a very restricted way.*

(vi) Critical reflection by the researcher

Guidance: *The candidate should use the critical appraisal to reflect upon the qualities of the works being submitted and make some evaluation of the extent of the contribution that each work makes. This evaluation may extend to the candidate's own developing understanding of the research methodology. The examiner should find evidence of a critical and objective assessment on the part of the candidate.*

(vii) The quality of presentation

Guidance: *The examiner should assess the submitted works for their structure, design, cogency of argument and literary style. They should also assess the quality of illustrations and charts, within the limitations imposed by the journal or book in which they are published. Examiners are asked to take into consideration the external constraints that may have been imposed through editorial control.*

(viii) Sufficiency of materials

Guidance: In so far as it is possible, the examiner is asked to assess whether the magnitude of the collective works compares satisfactorily with a traditional thesis and associated papers in the same discipline. It is not appropriate to express this criterion of sufficiency in terms of number of words because in some disciplines, journals impose a strict word limitation.

6.11.2 The application of the criteria

Each criterion should be considered and applied in context rather than defined in absolute terms.

6.12.1 The assessment criteria for the award of the Master of Philosophy [MPhil]

- (i) A contribution to the understanding and advancement of the subject.

Guidance: The submitted works should make a contribution to the understanding and advancement of the subject. The plain addition of information [adding knowledge] may not be deemed sufficient. The development and refinement of concepts, theories or models [deepening understanding] is generally regarded as more significant. Translation from one language to another may be deemed to making an advancement only if the candidate can demonstrate further analysis and interpretation or other significant contribution in the critical appraisal. Translation may form a substantial part of the work but there must be a further contribution.

- (ii) Powers of critical analysis and/or synthesis

Guidance: Examiners will consider the intellectual rigour of the study, in particular, they will consider the depth of the critical analysis and the effectiveness of any synthesis contained in the submission.

- (iii) Understanding of the context

Guidance: The candidates must demonstrate that they have an appreciation and understanding of the historical, conceptual and theoretical context of the research which has been undertaken.

- (iv) Command of the relevant research methodology

Guidance: An important part of research training is the development of research skills and knowledge of the research methodology in the field. This should be evident in the submission.

- (v) Coherence of the overall submission

Guidance: It is a requirement of the University that there should be a demonstrable coherence to the collective submission. The candidate should develop the theme of coherence through the critical appraisal and should explain the relationships between the works that comprise the submission. Examiners are advised to assess the coherence on the strength of the arguments presented rather than with reference to pre-determined expectations. Coherence is to be recognised in a broad sense rather than in a very restricted way.

- (vi) Critical reflection by the researcher

Guidance: The candidate should use the critical appraisal to reflect upon the qualities of the works being submitted and make some evaluation of the extent of the contribution that each work makes. This evaluation may extend to the candidate's own developing understanding of the research methodology. The examiner should find evidence of a critical and objective assessment on the part of the candidate.

- (vii) The quality of presentation

Guidance: The examiner should assess the submitted works for their structure, design, cogency of argument and literary style. They should also assess the quality of illustrations and charts, within the limitations imposed by the journal or book in which they are published. Examiners are asked to take into consideration the external

constraints that may have been imposed through editorial control.

(viii) Sufficiency of materials

Guidance: *In so far as it is possible, the examiner is asked to assess whether the magnitude of the collective works compares satisfactorily with a traditional thesis and associated papers in the same discipline. It is not appropriate to express this criterion of sufficiency in terms of number of words because in some disciplines, journals impose a strict word limitation.*

6.12.2 The application of the criteria

Each criterion should be considered and applied in context rather than defined in absolute terms.

6.13 The examination of submissions with theory and practice elements

- The examiners should be informed of the following prior to agreeing to serve:
 - (i) The title and purpose of the doctoral study;
 - (ii) The balance of weighting between the practice and theory elements as agreed at the confirmation of registration stage;
 - (iii) The planned location of the exhibition of the artworks;
 - (iv) The expected timing of the submission and the exhibition. If the timing subsequently changes, it is the responsibility of the director of studies to ensure that both of the examiners and the Research Office are informed.
- The examiner should examine the submitted works as an integrated whole. The quantified weighting, agreed at the RD7 stage, should serve as a guide to the respective magnitude and importance of the elements.
- The examiner should have regard to the totality of the works submitted in order to judge the sufficiency of the submission. For example, s/he should not expect or require a series of major artworks and major written work which might together equate to two doctoral theses. However, while the theory element will normally be smaller in magnitude than a standard doctoral submission, the *standard* of scholarship should be high and commensurate with the doctoral [or master's] standard. The quality of written English and presentation including referencing should be high.
- The *viva-voce* examination should follow both examination of the exhibited artworks, any sketchbook(s) and the theory element. The *viva* should be concerned with the overall study and not just the artworks or the dissertation.
- Following the *viva-voce* examination, the examiners should come to a decision. They should comment on the artworks, the theory element and the performance in the *viva*. All three elements must be satisfactory for the award to be made. Examiners may refer the theory element for revision, as necessary, even if the artworks which form the major element are considered satisfactory. If the artworks are considered unsatisfactory, the candidate should be referred and invited to resubmit. If the *viva* is unsatisfactory, the candidate may be asked to retake the *viva*.

6.14 The *viva-voce* examination

6.14.1 The purpose of the *viva voce* examination

Normally the *viva-voce* examination for all PGR students, including distance learners, takes place in Derby or Buxton. The task of the examiners is to establish that the candidate is able to demonstrate powers of critical thinking in discussion, showing a command of the discipline and articulating her/his views with clarity. It may be appropriate to consider further aspects discussed in the submission such

as the coherence of the collective work and the critical reflection on the development of the research and the contribution to the discipline. Examiners may also wish to satisfy themselves with regard to the specific contribution made by the candidate in the case of collaborative multi-authored research.

The *viva-voce* examination is concerned with the content of the submitted documentation and any other matters the examiners deem to be relevant to the assessment. The examiners should aim to confirm that the contribution made by the candidate is consistent with the claims made in the submitted works. This applies particularly in the context of collaborative research, where the extent of the contribution may be in doubt. If the examiners remain uncertain on this matter, they may request an additional written statement from the candidate before coming to their decision as to the outcome of the submission.

6.14.2 The *viva-voce* process and the appointment of a Chair

- (i) A non-examining Chair is appointed for every *viva-voce* examination. The Research Office appoints the Chair for each *viva-voce* examination from a pool of suitably qualified persons. This pool is drawn up from lists of suitable academic staff drawn up by the faculty heads of research. The function of the Chair is to conduct the examination and to ensure that the examiners are informed of the relevant University regulations during the examination process (see Appendix 2). The examiners are expected to plan and structure the *viva-voce* examination in a private meeting immediately before the *viva-voce* examination. At least one of the supervisors is normally recommended to attend the *viva-voce* examination providing there is agreement from the candidate and the examiners. In this situation, the supervisors are strictly non-participatory unless the examiners choose to ask them questions.

Guidance: *The director of studies (or second supervisor) is recommended to attend the viva voce examination but this must be with the agreement of the candidate and the examiners. Careful thought should be given to the matter before deciding to attend. The supervisors' observations may be helpful to the candidate in understanding the exact requirements in the case of any revision. However, in some instances the candidate or the examiners may feel that the presence of the supervisors would affect the interaction between the examiners and the candidate and so they may request that the supervisors do not attend. If supervisors do attend a viva-voce examination, they do so as observers who may only comment if invited to do so by the examiners. The examiners have the right to ask supervisors to withdraw from the exam if they deem it necessary. However they must be invited to return for the post viva feedback.*

- (ii) The Chair of the FRRDC (or a designated senior member of Committee) may attend a *viva-voce* examination **by right** for the purpose of monitoring the process and reporting to the FRRDC.
- (iii) The *viva-voce* examination forms part of the formal examination of the candidate and so it is not appropriate for the examiners to convey information regarding their overall assessment of the submitted works with regard to whether it is satisfactory or not. The examiners may make opening remarks about (any) positive qualities of the submission and they are recommended to indicate the major areas that they will wish to discuss with the candidate. The discussion should be structured and constructive in spirit. (See the full guidelines on the conduct of *viva-voce* examinations in Appendix 1).
- (iv) Following the *viva-voce* examination the examiners are expected to decide their recommendations and to prepare and submit a joint post-examination report to the Research Office. The preliminary and the joint reports together should provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope of the work and the quality of the performance to enable the University Research and Research Degrees Committee to understand the basis for the examiners' recommendations.
- (v) Where the examiners are not in agreement, they should submit separate reports with their recommendations.
- (vi) The examiners' post-examination report(s) should be completed, signed and submitted to the

Chair for forwarding to the Research Office before they depart from the site where the *viva-voce* examination has been held. In addition, the examiners should also submit the list of any significant requirements for a resubmission and a copy of any minor corrections and minor amendments given directly to the candidate. A detailed list of minor corrections and very minor amendments can be given directly to the candidate.

6.15 The recommendations of the examiners

Following completion of the first examination the examiners shall recommend one of the outcomes listed below to the URRDC:

- (i) the candidate should be awarded the degree;
- (ii) the candidate is asked to undertake minor revision of the critical appraisal;
- (iii) the candidate is asked to undertake major revision. If the performance in the *viva-voce* examination was unsatisfactory s/he should also be required to retake the *viva-voce* examination.
- (iv) the student has committed a serious academic offence which has been proven beyond reasonable doubt or admitted. As a consequence the student is deemed to have failed to satisfy the doctoral requirements. There may or may not be a further opportunity to gain a Master of Philosophy through referral and transfer of registration.
- (v) doctoral award only: The submission is judged to be well below the standard required for the award of the doctoral degree. The candidate is *advised* to **transfer registration** to the Master of Philosophy and submit a revised submission for that degree, with *or* without a second *viva voce* examination. The examiners are not permitted to award the Master of Philosophy as a default award. The candidate may choose not to act on this advice and may decide to undertake major revision of the submitted works for resubmission for the PhD, normally with a second *viva voce* examination.

Guidance: *The term minor revision is appropriate when the candidate is required to amend sections such as the abstract, introduction or the conclusions or make other similar changes. Confirmation of the award is not made until the examiners have informed the Research Office in writing that they are satisfied with the revised submission.*

*The term major revision is appropriate when the candidate is required to undertake new work gathering and presenting additional data, to re-consider the interpretation of an important aspect of the work or add to the submitted works. Normally, both examiners consider and approve the changes. If the *viva voce* performance was satisfactory there is no need to hold a second *viva-voce* examination.*

If the submission is judged to be well below the necessary standard for the doctoral award, the situation must be treated very carefully. The examiners should make the recommendation to transfer to the Master of Philosophy when they have deep concerns about the ability of the candidate to respond to the revision that is required to achieve a Doctor of Philosophy. However, it remains the right of the candidate to choose the award for which s/he is re-submitting. The candidate may seek a further meeting with the internal examiners, for the purposes of any clarification which is necessary, and s/he is advised to have a full discussion with the supervisors. The Research Office should allow reasonable time for the decision. In making the recommendation to transfer registration to the MPhil, the examiners should still outline the major revision which it is necessary for the candidate to undertake in order to achieve the doctoral award.

6.16 The referral opportunity

Candidates for a higher degree who are unsuccessful at the first attempt shall normally be offered **one** further opportunity only for resubmission. However, in the case of a candidate who has committed an academic offence which has been proven or admitted, s/he shall not be awarded a doctoral degree and shall not be permitted to resubmit for doctoral examination. If the resubmission

for an award is not successful, then the candidate is deemed to have failed that award. A candidate who transfers registration to the MPhil following failure at the doctoral level, is only permitted to make **one** submission. If this is unsuccessful, then no degree is awarded.

6.17 Feedback to candidates following the *viva voce* examination

Following the *viva-voce* examination, examiners should inform the candidate of the outcomes of the examination. The supervisors are entitled to be present at this feedback meeting and should not be excluded by the examiners. There should be sufficient explanation given for the candidate to understand fully the basis for the recommendation. However, the examiners must make it clear that their recommendations are informal and are subject to confirmation in writing by the Research Office. No recommendation is made for an award until there has been satisfactory completion of all revision. All recommendations are subject to confirmation by URRDC. .

6.18 The approval of recommendations for the award of higher degrees

Recommendations for the award of higher degrees are considered by the University Research and Research Degrees Committee. The URRDC must be satisfied that the examiners are in agreement and that any change in opinion on the part of an examiner is explained in the post-examination report. URRDC must also be satisfied that the process has been conducted in accordance with these regulations. The URRDC may authorise the chair of URRDC to act on its behalf, providing that the URRDC is presented with examination reports for every successful candidate.

6.19 In the event of the examiners failing to agree a recommendation

When the examiners are not in agreement, the examiners should submit separate post-examination reports in place of a joint post-examination report. The Research Office forwards the conflicting recommendations to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee for consideration. URRDC may normally take one of the following actions:

- (i) accept the recommendation of the external examiner;
- (ii) accept the majority recommendation in the event of an examination undertaken by three examiners providing at least one external examiner is in accord with the majority view;
- (iii) instruct that an additional external examiner should be appointed.

When an additional external examiner is appointed, s/he shall prepare an *independent* preliminary report on the basis of the submitted works and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further *viva voce* examination. The new examiner should not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners.

The Research Office will present all the examiners' reports and recommendations to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee. URRDC must decide whether it will accept the recommendation of the additional external examiner. It must also confirm that the examination process has been conducted in accordance with the University regulations. If URRDC is not satisfied on both of these points it may order a full re-examination with new examiners.

6.20 The communication of recommendations for re-examination

In the event of a recommendation for minor or major **referral**, the information must be communicated as follows.

Immediately, following the *viva-voce* examination, the examiners should complete the joint **post-examination report** appending a list of the main points to be addressed in the revision. This should be sufficiently detailed to leave no doubt on the part of the candidate as to the course of action s/he should pursue. The post-examination report, together with any list, should be submitted **immediately** following the viva to the Research Office, which is responsible for forwarding **promptly** a letter carefully explaining the outcome of the viva and the options for the way forward to the candidate, the director of studies and the Faculty Administrator. If the examiners have compiled a list of minor errors for correction and other informal notes, this information should be given directly to the candidate and a copy appended to the post exam report.

The outcome of the examination is confirmed by written communication from the Research Office.

Guidance: *The purpose of this regulation is to ensure that the candidate, Director of Studies and the Faculty Office are in receipt of the same information. It is recommended that the outcome and the options for the way forward are discussed at a meeting of the candidate with the supervisors. The candidate is **not** given the pre-examination reports because examiners may have modified their views following the candidate's performance in the viva voce examination. The outcome of the viva and the options for the way forward are conveyed to the candidate and supervisors as soon as possible after the viva voce examination so that s/he can commence the further work without delay.*

7. Re-examination for a higher degree

7.1 The forms of re-examination

A candidate who has been referred may be re-examined **once** only. If the candidate has transferred registration from the Doctor of Philosophy to the Master of Philosophy following the first examination, the candidate has just one opportunity. Re-examination may take any one of the following ways:

- (i) re-examination of the submission only;
- (ii) re-examination of the submission and a *viva voce* examination;
- (iii) re-examination through a *viva voce* examination only.

The candidate should not have any direct contact with the examiners following the formal feedback meeting. If there are queries, these must be communicated through the Research Office to the examiners.

Guidance: *The candidate does not need to give a further notification to submit as a deadline is set by the examiners.*

7.2 The period permitted for preparing for re-examination

The examiners should set a date by which a candidate who is required to revise a submission must resubmit the work. The period should be reasonable and sufficient. The maximum time allowed is one calendar year from the date of the formal outcome of the first examination. In exceptional circumstances the chair of the University Research and Research Degrees Committee, advised by the chair of the FRRDC in consultation with the examiners, may approve a request for an extension of this period.

Guidance: *The examiners are recommended to check the feasibility of meeting a proposed deadline with the candidate. The time period allowed should take into account the candidate's circumstances and not impose undue pressure.*

7.3 The action required when it is necessary to appoint a new examiner

Normally, the original examiners are expected to conduct the re-examination. This arrangement is intended to ensure continuity and consistency in the application of the standard for the award of a higher degree. In certain circumstances such as long term illness or sabbatical overseas, an examiner may not be available for the re-examination. In this situation it is necessary for the Research Office to request the Chair of FRRDC to propose a replacement examiner.

- (i) The process of further appointment follows the normal procedure which requires consideration of the suitability of the examiner package.
- (ii) Following approval of the revised examination package, the Research Office will send a letter to the new examiner(s) confirming that the assessment is a re-examination. The letter shall be accompanied by a copy of the completed post-examination form from the first examination and a list of the requirements. The examiner is advised that the candidate has been asked to satisfy these requirements.
- (iii) The candidate should be prepared to defend the entire work and not just those sections which relate to the recommendations for revision.
- (iv) Although the examiners may expect a sound defence of the entire submission, they are asked to operate in continuity with the first examination and recognise that it would not be reasonable to make judgements which are discordant with the original views and requirements. The candidate should not be disadvantaged by the change in examiner(s).

Guidance: *It is hoped that where it is necessary to change an examiner, the new examiners will normally concur with the views of the first set of examiners. Nevertheless it is conceivable that there could be a difference of view. While, it would be an infringement of the academic integrity of an examiner to oblige him/her to accept the judgments and recommendations of the previous examiner, there is a necessity to ensure consistency of treatment and examiners' judgements for candidates for higher degrees. Where there is a conflict in view between the original and the replacement examiners, the new examiners are requested to record their views but to act in continuity with the requirements of the first examination*

7.4 The recommendations following re-examination

The examiners may make the following recommendations following re-examination:

- (i) the candidate be awarded the degree for which s/he is registered;
- (ii) the candidate fails the degree and no further examination is permitted.
- (iii) the candidate has failed the doctoral degree and is permitted to transfer registration to the Master of Philosophy award.

Following the resubmission, both [or all] of the examiners must be satisfied that the revision has been carried out to a satisfactory standard if a positive recommendation is to go forward. If one of the examiners has indicated that the revised work does not in his/her opinion meet the standard for the award, then the award cannot be made. In these circumstances in which the examiners are considering the candidate's responses to their specific requirements, it is not appropriate to appoint a further examiner to determine the outcome. However, the Research Office may seek clarification on an examiner's position if a recommendation is not entirely clear or there is some element of equivocation. The recommendation is forwarded to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee which receives examination reports with written confirmation of the final outcome.

In the event of a recommendation from the examiners that the candidate should fail, this recommendation is subject to confirmation by URRDC. The Committee may request a report from the

FRRDC which sets out the circumstances, identifies the causative factors, draws attention to any lessons which the faculty has learned and draws attention to changes which URRDC may wish to consider.

7.5 Registration for the Master of Philosophy following unsuccessful referral

In the event of failure of a referral for a doctorate, the examiners may advise the candidate to register for the Master of Philosophy or the candidate may decide to register for the Master of Philosophy. In these circumstances the registration must be lodged within one month of the outcome of the referral and the period of registration is limited to a maximum of three months. The candidate must submit before the expiry of the registration period.

If the examiners both indicate that the criteria for the Master of Philosophy have already be met then they will be asked to confirm this in writing so that the degree can be awarded. If they believe that further work on the submission is required and re-examination is necessary then the candidate has the duration of the registration period to complete the final revision. If a further examination is deemed necessary the candidate will be required to pay an examination fee, to be determined by the Research Office, at the time of resubmission.

The outcome of this assessment is final. No further opportunity can be given to the PGR student.

8. Academic Appeals: requesting a review of an examination decision

8.1 Grounds for an appeal

The Candidate may request a review of the examiners' recommendations. Such an appeal may only be made on the following grounds:

- (i) The Candidate's performance in the *viva voce* examination suffered through illness or other compelling personal circumstances that the Candidate was unable or, for valid reasons, unwilling to divulge to the examiners or the Research Office before the URRDC reached its decision;
- (ii) There was a material error in the conduct of the examination of such a nature as to raise a question as to whether the result would have been different had there not been such an irregularity;
- (iii) The examiners or the URRDC failed to consider a known material circumstance which adversely affected the candidate's performance. This ground is only deemed acceptable if:
 - (a) the circumstances have been the subject of a prior formal complaint which has been submitted to Student Support and Information Services.
 - (b) the complaint has been upheld or the final response has not yet been communicated;
 - (c) In the case of a complaint that has been upheld, steps have not been taken to mitigate the effects of the circumstances

8.2 Time-scale for requesting an appeal

A Candidate seeking an appeal should submit the request to the University Registrar within **two weeks** of the receipt of the formal recommendation of the examiners. The University Registrar will consider the request. If the Academic Registrar in consultation with the Chair of the URRDC considers that there is a case for review, then an independent review shall commence.

8.3 The Appeal process

- (i) The Academic Registrar shall gather such evidence as is considered appropriate and likely to assist a panel in reviewing the case. This may include seeking testimony from the academic advisors and further statements from the candidate.
- (ii) A panel constituted by the Academic Registrar shall undertake the review. The Appeal Panel will comprise **three** persons who have experience in the conduct of research training and who have no previous formal involvement in the case. Candidates for higher degrees may not act as members of the Appeal Panel. If the Appeal Panel decides that the candidate's grounds for requesting the review are upheld, it shall recommend that the URRDC:
 - (a) invites the examiners to reconsider their recommendation in light of the new information, or
 - (b) appoints new examiners to undertake a full re- examination (this will not be deemed a second attempt).

The Appeal Panel does not have the authority to set aside the recommendation of the examiners or to recommend the award of a degree. The Appeal Panel meeting will be minuted.

The Candidate and all interested parties will normally be informed of the Appeal Panel outcome immediately after the meeting, to be subsequently confirmed in writing.

There shall be no appeal against the decision of the Appeal Panel. The recommendations of the new examiners are accepted as final. Candidates may not otherwise challenge the academic judgement of the examiners.

In the event that the Candidate is not reasonably satisfied with the outcome of the Appeal Panel s/he may request an independent review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). In such circumstances, the Candidate should forward a completed Scheme Application Form to the OIA, who will review the Appeal independently in due course. Scheme Application Forms are available from the OIA at:

Office of the Independent Adjudicator,
5th Floor, Thames Tower,
Station Road, Reading, RG1 1LX.
Telephone: 01189 599813
Email: enquiries@oiahe.org.uk
Website: www.oiahe.org.uk .

9. Lodging materials and confidentiality

9.1 Lodging written works and related materials

Following the approval of the award of a degree the student shall lodge **two** hard bound copies of the submission with the Research Office for distribution to the Library and the Faculty. The Research Office will not authorise the Certificate of Award until it has received two hard bound copies of the submission. Key materials which have been used as evidence in support of the submission should be lodged with the Faculty or with another suitable body as agreed with the Director of Studies. The University's regulations on the Intellectual Property Rights of students apply (Section 10).

9.2 Confidential materials

If the research student, or the Director of Studies, wishes the submission to remain confidential for a period of time after the completion of the work, application for approval should be sought from the FRRDC prior to the submission of the works for examination. The period of confidentiality shall normally not exceed **two years** from the date of the *viva voce* examination.

If the FRRDC has agreed that the confidential nature of the candidate's work is such as to preclude the submission being made freely available in the Library of the University, the submission shall, immediately on completion of the work, be retained by the Research Office on restricted access for the duration of the approved period.

Guidance: *The FRRDC shall normally only approve an application for confidentiality in order to enable a patent application to be lodged or to protect commercially or politically sensitive material. This mechanism is not available to protect research leads. In exceptional circumstances the FRRDC may approve a period in excess of two years.*

10 Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)

10.1 Introduction

These Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) regulations set out the University's position in relation to **all** students of the University. The regulations apply to students on taught programmes as well as those enrolled for research awards. The regulations apply to students, irrespective of whether they study on-campus or at home, outreach centre or workplace. They also apply to students registered for University awards under collaborative arrangements and to University students registered for awards accredited by other bodies.

Guidance: *If students agree to undertake teaching or research under a formal University staff contract, their IPR in respect of the works carried out under that contract are set out in the University of Derby IPR Staff Regulations. However, in the absence of a staff contract, the University does not possess IPR ownership and their contributions remain subject to these IPR Student Regulations.*

10.2 The definition of Intellectual property rights

The ownership of the products of creative thought is hereon referred to as Intellectual Property Rights. IPR encompasses a very wide range of intellectual products. There are four general categories listed below with examples:

Copyright: essays, reports, creative writing, computer programs, music, drawings, images, independent studies and any other creative works undertaken for assessment.

Design Rights and Registered Designs: Patterns and shapes.

Trade Marks: For example, logos and signs. Trade Marks may be registered.

Patents: Invented products and processes that may be patented.

Guidance: *These regulations are primarily concerned with copyright. Copyright signifies that the work may not in any way be reproduced, adapted (eg translated), exhibited or published without explicit permission of the student. Guidance on all aspects of IPR is available from the IPR Co-ordinator located in the Business Development Unit. Programme Leaders, Directors of Studies and students are welcome to consult the IPR Co-ordinator on confidential non-disclosure agreements, the registration of designs and patents and any other matters relating to IPR.*

10.3 The general position on the IPR of students

Students of the University have Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) over that which they create. Except where transfer of copyright has been agreed, the copyright for all student works, as listed in Section 10.2 above, **belongs to the student** who originated the works. However, the University has license to copy and use the works for the purposes of assessment as set out in Section 10.5 below. There are also circumstances in which the student may agree to **share** copyright or to **transfer** copyright to another party (Section 10.7).

If students have concerns regarding the protection of IPR during the preparation and development of works for assessment, the Programme Leader or the Director of Studies (as appropriate) may ask the relevant parties, for example external examiners, to sign a **confidential non-disclosure agreement**.

***Guidance:** Students who are in receipt of a University of Derby Research Studentship have the same IPR as other students. The studentship is a grant and not a salary, so the University does **not** have statutory IPR on the creative works as it does on the works of its employees. Similarly, students who are in receipt of research council studentships have normal IP Rights. In any case the University automatically grants IPR to authors of scholarly works. However, if a sponsoring or commissioning organisation stipulates IPR requirements, the student is advised to give careful consideration as to whether these stipulations are reasonable and acceptable before proceeding with the study. The Business Development Unit is pleased to advise Programme Leaders, Directors of Studies and students on IPR matters and the preparation of confidential non-disclosure agreements.*

10.4 The ownership of physical artefacts

Except in the circumstances set out in Section 9.5, students are the owners of the physical artefacts that they create for assessment. This includes essays, reports, dissertations and other creative works such as paintings, sculptures, photographs, films, videos, prototypes and designs for fabrics. However, students may be required to lodge a good copy of their work with the University on a temporary or permanent basis.

Sponsoring or commissioning organisations, such as the University or external bodies may make contractual agreements relating to the provision of materials and the ownership of the creative works.

10.5 The University's rights to hold works submitted for assessment

The University has rights to hold work submitted for assessment until the assessment has been completed. The work is normally returned on the understanding that it may need to be re-submitted for the purpose of moderation or scrutiny by external examiners or for evaluation by external quality assessors/auditors. Copies of work may be passed to external agencies to help with the identification of plagiarism. In the case of major written works such as dissertations and theses the University may require that good copies be lodged in a reference collection. Theses that have satisfied the examiners for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy and Doctor of Philosophy must be lodged in the University Library.

If there are concerns about the protection of the IPR of works which have been submitted for assessment, the Programme leader or the Director of Studies may draw up a **confidential non-disclosure agreement** with the help of the Business Development Unit. This should state the name(s) of the students, the titles of their works and it should be signed by the examiners.

The IPR of all submitted assessments remains the property of the student. Works submitted only for assessment may not be copied or used by any other person, except in connection with the assessment of that work. Members of staff must ask the permission of a student if they wish to use the assessed work (anonymously) for the purpose of teaching and learning. Works that are lodged in reference collections are available for consultation by researchers on the understanding that the

contents may only be used if a full acknowledgement is made by the researcher in any written work, published or non-published, that s/he may write.

10.6 Publication of research works

In the case of postgraduate students preparing a research submission, the student is normally expected to prepare the work for publication at the earliest opportunity. If the student has not submitted works for publication or has not made substantial progress towards the preparation of a major work within a period of one year from the date of acceptance of the submission, the Director of Studies may prepare a joint paper for publication.

Normally, the student should be indicated as the principal author or originator of the work. The Director of Studies must inform the student of this action and s/he should seek the co-operation of the student. All reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that the interpretations expressed in the paper(s) represent the views of the principal author. The Director of Studies is responsible for giving due consideration to any sensitivity that the data may have.

Guidance: *This is a matter of some sensitivity. Pro-active communications and good-will should prevail. It is important to protect the interests of both the student whose IPR are extremely vulnerable at this stage of their research career and the supervisor(s) who may have made a significant contribution in terms of ideas and information (IP). The supervisor(s) are expected to advise the students throughout the period of the preparation of the submission and the preparation of any publications during the period of registration. The research student should acknowledge the advice provided by the supervisor(s) in the submission and in any published works. This may include ideas and suggestions for development and alternative interpretations. However, if a supervisor has made a greater contribution, for example in the collection or analysis of the data, then this should be fully acknowledged in the submission and the student should consider inviting the supervisor to be a co-author of the paper. A supervisor should not assume an automatic right to be included as a co-author of publications prepared by a research student. Research students who are uncertain of the action that they should take should consult the Chair of the FRRDC or contact the Research Office for independent and impartial advice.*

10.7 The transfer of IPR

A student may agree to the transfer of copyright to the University or to a named body on terms which are agreeable to the student, for example, on payment of a fee or acceptance of a commission. Such a transfer may be made providing there is no adverse affect on a collaborative project. (See Section 9.8).

10.8 Collaborative work on a project

If a student is engaged in a joint study with staff or other students, it is essential that the IPR are discussed, agreed and recorded in writing at the planning stage of the work. A student may agree to share the copyright with other named persons, staff or students, or s/he may agree to transfer copyright to the University or an external body, which has commissioned the work in return for remuneration. A student who participates in a collaborative project must not transfer copyright without the agreement of others engaged in the project or take any action, which might jeopardise the continuation of the project.

Guidance: *If the project is commercially sensitive the student should expect to be bound by the conditions which apply to the University. The student will normally be entitled to a share in any financial benefits arising from the project, providing these have been formally agreed as part of the contract engaging the student in the research. If the student is employed as an assistant on the project then the IPR belongs to the University, although the student should be credited with the author of any report s/he has written. Where a student participates in a research project being conducted by members of academic staff, the research staff concerned have the right to the results of the student's research and have the right to publish such results, subject to acknowledgement of the student's contribution.*

11. Research Ethics: code of practice

11.1 University policy

As a reflection of its five core organisational values the University is concerned to protect the rights, dignity, safety and privacy of research subjects, the welfare of animals and the integrity of the environment. The University is also concerned to protect the health, safety and academic freedom of researchers and the reputation of the University as a centre for appropriately conducted high quality research. Underpinning the standards are the ethical imperatives of Do No Harm (non-maleficence) and Do Good (beneficence).

11.2 Definition of research and scope of research ethics

The definition of research employed by the HEFCE in research assessment is based on the Frascati definition of research. The definition is as follows:

“Research’ is understood as original investigation undertaken in order to gain knowledge and understanding. It includes work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce and industry, as well as to the public and voluntary sectors; scholarship*; the invention and generation of ideas, images, performances and artefacts including design, where these lead to new or substantially improved insights; and the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products and processes, including design and construction. It excludes routine testing and analysis of materials, components and processes, e.g. for the maintenance of national standards, as distinct from the development of new analytical techniques. It also excludes the development of teaching materials that do not embody original research.”

Scholarship is defined as the creation, development and maintenance of the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines, in forms such as dictionaries, scholarly editions, catalogues and contributions to major research databases.

This code of practice encompasses:

Scholarship: the analysis, synthesis and interpretation of ideas and information. (Boyer’s definition of scholarship (1990) includes: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching).

Basic research: work undertaken to acquire new knowledge without a particular application in view

Strategic research: work which is carried out to discover new knowledge which might provide for future application

Applied research: work which is undertaken to discover new applications of existing or new knowledge

Consultancy: the development and interpretation of existing knowledge for specific applications

Professional practice: the interpretation and application of knowledge within a professional setting.

A **researcher** is normally defined as a student or member of staff or who is undertaking an independent study for UG, PGT or PGR awards or is a visiting research worker.

11.3 The Guiding Principles

The guiding principles of this Code of Research Ethics are **non-maleficance** and **beneficence**, indicating a systematic regard for the rights and interests of others in the full range of academic relationships and activities.

Non-maleficance is the principle of doing, or permitting, no official misconduct. It is the principle of doing no harm in the widest sense. **Beneficence** is the requirement to serve the interests and well being of others, including respect for their rights. It is the principle of doing good in the widest sense.

11.4 Obligations, Rights and Responsibilities

Researchers are required to comply with the University of Derby Code of Practice on Research Ethics. Research should conform to the University's policies on Health and Safety and Equal Opportunities. Where appropriate a risk assessment should be conducted at an early stage to ensure the protection of all participants in the research on the advice of the Faculty or Departmental Health and Safety Advisor.

Acts including the Data Protection Act, the Computer Misuse Act, the Equal Opportunities Act, the Race Discrimination Act, the Obscene Publications Act, Employment Rights Act and the Human Rights Act are likely to be relevant, along with relevant legislation on Disabilities, Health and Safety, Animal Rights and the Environmental Protection Act.

Researchers should abide by the Code of Ethics of any professional body or subject association of which they are members. They should also be aware of any Code of Ethics which applies to potential and actual collaborators on the project and/or other participants. Where the location of the research is external to the University it is essential that the regulations, procedures, practices and guidelines which are relevant in these situations are taken into account.

11.5 General principles

- (i) Researchers must not compromise the overriding principles of non-maleficance and beneficence, legal obligations and any pre-existing rights in the conduct of research.
- (ii) Researchers must weigh up the potentially conflicting risks and benefits of a particular piece of research, for instance the potential conflict between human and animal welfare.
- (iii) Researchers should consider the principle of justice and the fair treatment of participants in research. Thus the researcher, supervisor or IS tutor may be required to make judgements about the essential fairness of the activity and to ensure that the interests of all participants, whether directly or indirectly involved, are taken into account.
- (iv) Researchers should consider the ethical implications of the research and the physiological, psychological, social, political, religious, environmental, cultural and economic consequences of the work for the participants. Researchers should be sensitive to the possibility of blasphemy or giving offence to followers of faiths or beliefs arising from a piece of work.
- (v) Where the researcher is not fully competent or sufficiently informed to make a fair judgement about the conflicting needs and interests of direct and indirect participants, it is essential that specialist advice is sought. (see procedures below).

11.5.1 Informed consent

- (i) Ethical conduct in research demands respect for the rights of others who are directly or indirectly affected by the research. For human participants, both their physical and personal autonomy should be respected. Participation in the research should be on the basis of fully informed consent and participants' rights of privacy should be guaranteed. Informed consent is a legal condition whereby a person can be said to have given consent based upon an appreciation and understanding of the facts and implications of any actions. Written consent should be obtained where appropriate. There should be no coercion of any kind. Equally, the means by which participants are recruited should be carefully assessed in relation to possible rewards for participation. Participants will have the right to withdraw at any time and are not obliged to continue if they do not wish to.
- (ii) Prior to gaining informed consent the researcher should ensure that participants are fully informed of the nature and the purpose of the research well in advance of the work to be carried out. Where there are third parties marginally involved in the research, for example as members of the public in an observer capacity, or where groups of people are involved, informal consent might be more appropriate than formal consent.
- (iii) Where participants are not in a position to give informed consent the researcher should have regard to the advice of the Royal College of Physicians <http://hiu.rcplondon.ac.uk/> the Economic and Social Research Council <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/index.aspx> and the Royal College of Psychiatrists <http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/>. English law may not currently permit guardians/parents to give consent on behalf of mentally incapacitated adults in certain matters. Care must be taken to ensure compliance with the mental Capacities Act (2005) which came into force in October 2007. Researchers should seek advice as to whether they need to obtain a declaration from the court that the proposed research procedures are lawful.
- (iv) Young persons over the age of 16 are generally thought to be able to give informed consent but it might be appropriate to seek advice depending on the nature of the work. Research involving children under 16 will require the informed consent of parents, carers or guardians. Notwithstanding the fact that parental consent has been obtained, primary responsibility for safeguarding the rights of the child remains with the researcher.
- (iv) Where the nature of the research is such that informing participants before the work is carried out might render the results invalid, for example within aspects of the social and cognitive sciences such as perception, there must be appropriate explanations following the study. In these circumstances, justification for this course of action should be submitted for approval to the Faculty Research & Research Degrees Committee. Researchers must provide convincing reasons why such research should proceed without the necessary informed consent. Researchers should not mislead participants if it is thought that prior permission will not be obtained. It is essential that researchers should be aware of any professional guidelines pertaining to their field of study.

Where the research projects of University staff or students involves other staff or students acting as subjects, particular care needs to be taken to ensure valid consent is given. A fundamental aspect of valid consent is voluntariness which is undermined by power issues, coercion and inducements. Consent which lacks voluntariness cannot be relied upon to protect the subject's welfare. Therefore it would fail to legitimise any imposition of risks or harms on the research subject. It is essential that research involving fellow University staff or students ensure voluntariness.

11.5.2 Confidentiality and data protection

- (i) Participants' confidentiality and anonymity should be maintained, and their personal privacy protected. The identity of participants should not be revealed unless written permission is obtained prior to the research being carried out.

- (ii) The collection, storage, disclosure and use of research data by researchers must comply with the Data Protection Act 1998. Researchers should be aware of the risks of identification and breach of privacy and confidentiality posed by all kinds of information storage and processing, including computer and paper files, email records, photographic material, audio and videotapes and any other information in which an individual is named or can be identified.

11.5.3 Animal rights

- (i) Research which might involve animals should not involve unnecessarily intrusive or invasive procedures and should abide by relevant legislation

11.5.4 Research undertaken in public places

- (i) Researchers should pay particular attention to the implications of research undertaken in public places. The impact on the environment will be a key issue. Researchers must observe the laws of obscenity and public decency. Those engaged in research should also have due regard to religious and cultural sensitivities.
- (ii) The researcher will need to balance the parameters of academic freedom and free speech with their responsibilities to the community.

11.5.5 Academic Integrity

- (i) The general principle of integrity should inform all research activities. Honesty should be central to the relationship between researcher, participant and other interested parties. Research outputs should contain acknowledgements of the work of others as appropriate. Plagiarism is deemed to have occurred if a researcher does not acknowledge the work of another person or persons eg, when the source or cited quotations are not identified. Particular care should be exercised in acknowledging the work of research students. Normally, joint ownership of work by students and supervisors would pertain. For detailed advice on IPR see Section 9. Issues arising from industrial placements and the protection/registration of materials should also be considered.
- (ii) Participants and other relevant stakeholders should be offered access where appropriate to a summary of the research findings. Research reports should be truthful, accurate and demonstrably the work of the author concerned.

11.5.6 Contractual responsibilities

- (i) The terms of any contract relating to research must not compromise the overriding principles of non-maleficence and beneficence, legal obligations and any pre-existing rights.
- (ii) The terms of research undertaken on behalf of a sponsor must be agreed in advance. Terms will include the specification of the research project, the roles and responsibilities of the researchers, the University and the sponsor and agreement on the dissemination and exploitation of the research outputs. The need for confidentiality or non-disclosure agreements must be negotiated in advance. Issues of pre-existing rights and other legal issues should be clarified in advance with the Company Secretary.
- (iii) There should be a clear agreement on intellectual property rights.
- (iv) Terms and conditions of research contracts should be clarified with all participants with particular regard to copyright, rights to publications, prior disclosure and disclosure of information, remuneration and any other benefits.
- (v) The researcher should furnish the sponsor with research reports and other deliverables as agreed in the original contract.

11.6 Procedures for Implementation

- (i) The procedure identified in the Guidance Notes for Implementation of Research Ethics Code of Practice, Monitoring and Approval Process available on the University's Research Ethics and Governance website <http://www.derby.ac.uk/about-the-university/ethics-and-governance>. The Research Ethics Implementation Guide is intended to ensure complete application of the Code whilst at a minimal level of bureaucracy. On enrolment students will be required to be aware of the Code of Ethics and to understand that they are obliged to abide by the code. All staff on appointment must sign an agreement indicating that they have read and will comply with the University's Code of Practice on Research Ethics. It is the responsibility of the researcher or principal researcher in that team to ensure that the research undertaken meets the requirements of the Research Ethics Code and is not in breach of it at any stage. Before any practical research work can be undertaken ethical approval for the project must be given by the appropriate Subject Research Ethics Committee (Subject REC). Approval should be sought using the Ethics Approval Request form which is available on the University's Research Ethics and Governance website. However, unlike the RD5 there is no formal timeline associated with ethical approval in terms of a research student's registration. For projects with more complex ethical issues, especially those involving human participants, the submission of a series of requests for ethical approval over the period of the project may be appropriate.
- (ii) PGR students are required to complete the Ethics Approval Request form and as necessary supporting documents to the appropriate Subject REC. Approval will have to be given by the Subject REC before any practical research can be undertaken.
- (iii) If information about their research should come to light at a later stage which was not disclosed to the Subject REC, FRRDC or their Chairs, this may have a deleterious impact on the student's progression or the member of staff's ability to continue with the identified research programme.
- (iv) The researcher should explain how confidentiality, anonymity and privacy will be maintained.
- (v) The RD5 is forwarded to the appropriate Subject REC for approval, revision or rejection.
- (vi) In cases where approval is not granted, researchers may be asked to amend the research project for re-submission.
- (vii) The above Code of Practice applies equally to staff, students and visiting research workers. Where students or visiting research workers or appropriate members of staff are the primary researchers, they should seek advice from their Director of Studies before applying for approval by the Subject REC.
- (viii) All primary researchers should seek advice, in the first instance, from the senior member of staff in their faculty who has overall responsibility for research leadership.
- (ix) In cases of possible doubt, interviews will be conducted by members of the Subject REC with proposed researchers/interested parties in order to provide further clarification.

11.7 National Health Service-related procedures

Any projects which fall under the following categories requires approval from the National Health Service Local Research Ethics Committee. Contact should be made through the Chair of the University Research Ethics Committee.

- (i) Patients and users of the NHS. This includes all potential research participants recruited by virtue of the patient or user's past or present treatment by, or use of, the NHS. It includes NHS patients treated under contracts with private sector institutions.

- (ii) Individuals identified as potential research participants because of their status as relatives or carers of patients and users of the NHS, as defined above.
- (iii) Access to data, organs or other bodily material of past and present NHS patients.
- (iv) Fetal material and IVF involving NHS patients.
- (v) The recently dead in NHS premises.
- (vi) The use of, or potential access to, NHS premises or facilities.
- (vii) NHS staff - recruited as research participants by virtue of their professional role.

It should be noted that until all appropriate ethical considerations/approval of a project has been undertaken/received, no aspects of a project for which there are ethical concerns should be undertaken

Guidance on potential areas of breach of the code:

Researchers should consider the parameters of their intended research and its potential impact. Should any of the following elements be involved, then the ethical aspects will need consideration by the Subject REC for approval. It is in the interest of all involved in the research project that this form is completed in full and submitted. An indicative list of potential risks is as follows:

- Active involvement of other participants
- Passive involvement of other participants
- Colleagues and staff within other organisations
- Members of the public
- Children and young persons
- Animals
- External bodies
- Potential adverse impact on the environment

12. Academic Offences

12.1 Types of Academic Offence

The University regards academic offences very seriously and postgraduate research students are urged to ensure that they do not deliberately or inadvertently commit academic offences. The reader is also referred to the policy and procedures on the *Investigation of Alleged Misconduct in Research* (2009). An academic offence is defined as an action by which a person misleads or deceives another person into believing that intellectual material is their own when it has been obtained from a third party or invented without supporting data. There are several types of possible academic offence in the context of postgraduate research. These are:

- a. Plagiarism
- b. Inventing data
- c. Collusion and other forms of deception

12.2 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined here as the act of incorporating a body of text obtained from another source and making it appear as if it is the author's own. Thus the text appears to be original but is in fact taken from a source which has not been acknowledged. The plagiarised material may have been taken from a website, a thesis, journal, book or any source. The offence of plagiarism has taken place irrespective of whether it was done with the intention to deceive or not. However, it is regarded as a more serious offence if it is believed that the student has made a calculated attempt to gain undue credit or advantage.

12.3 Inventing data

Invention of data occurs where a researcher effectively makes up data to make it appear that the data has been derived by appropriate measurement in the field or in experiment or other setting. Thus the reader is deceived with regard to the true information and the researcher may use the invented data to substantiate a favoured hypothesis. This is regarded as deception and is a very serious academic offence.

12.4 Collusion and other forms of deception

If the PGR student consorts with others who may be PGR students or members of staff or external contacts, in order to deceive the reader as to the true origin of information given in a submitted work, then this is an act of collusion. Collusion is an academic offence and as such is unacceptable. Another example of a serious academic offence is committed when a PGR student allows another person to write material on his/her behalf and submits the material as if it is his/her own.

12.5 Action in the event of a suspected academic offence

If a student formally submits written material for registration, confirmation of registration or examination and an academic offence is suspected, then the work will be subject to further analysis to establish whether or not an offence has been committed. This investigation should be conducted by the Faculty Research Manager or by a disinterested person invited by the Faculty Research Manager to advise the Faculty Research and Research Degrees Committee.

If the disinterested investigator concludes that an academic offence has been committed, s/he may also advise as to whether it is considered that the offence was intended or not. The FRRDC is then able to take appropriate action. The penalty should take into consideration the previous experience of the student and the stage reached in progression. Penalties may range from a severe censure and final warning to suspension of registration or termination of registration with no award.

***Guidance:** The Faculty Research and Research Degrees Committee is advised to take full account of the experience of the student. International students may be less familiar with the strong position taken on academic offences in the United Kingdom. If the student is at the early stages of research it may be more appropriate to issue a censure and final warning than to suspend or terminate enrolment. However, if the offence is committed at an assessed stage it will normally be regarded as more serious.*

12.6 The duty of the director of studies

It is the duty of the director of studies to ensure that all students for which s/he is responsible have a clear understanding of what constitutes an academic offence and the importance of ensuring that no such offence is committed. PGR students should be advised that if they commit an academic offence, there are likely to be severe consequences which may include termination of registration and enrolment.

***Guidance :** If a director of studies suspects that material submitted has originated through an offence then it is essential to confront the student immediately and ensure that the offending material is removed or rewritten. On no account should the director of studies be tempted to write the section for the student in a mistaken attempt to support the student in the wrong way. Directors of studies are advised to keep a careful watch for plagiarised or invented data. FRRDC expects directors of studies to identify such material before final submission for assessment.*

13. The Universities Complaints Procedure: how to lodge a complaint

THE UNIVERSITY OF DERBY COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE AIMS TO:

- 1.1. Support students with a straightforward, appropriate and effective process for resolving complaints;
- 1.2. Take complaints seriously, but also to deal with them in a way that is appropriate to the issue complained about;
- 1.3. Guarantee that complaints are dealt with on the basis of evidence and proper investigation;
- 1.4. Ensure that every issue raised in a complaint receives an appropriate explanation;
- 1.5. Ensure that all people directly involved in a complaint have the opportunity for a fair hearing and understand each step of the process;
- 1.6. Be operated in a respectful and sensitive way, value people's point of view, having due respect for confidentiality;
- 1.7. Provide appropriate remedies when a complaint is upheld;
- 1.8. Help us to keep on improving the quality of what we do.

A copy of the complaints guide for PGR students can be found at:

<http://www.derby.ac.uk/research/research-degrees/current-students/student-guide-charter-and-complaints-guidance>

Approved by Academic Board October 2010
Guidance updated Aug 2011

APPENDIX 1

University of Derby
University Research & Research Degrees Committee
Higher Degrees by Research
Guide for the conduct of viva-voce examinations

This short guide is designed to accompany the University regulations for candidates taking a higher degree by research. The viva-voce examination normally takes place after the assessment of the written works and any creative works have been completed. This document is advisory in status.

1. The purpose of a viva-voce examination

There are two primary reasons for conducting *viva-voce* examinations. The first is to establish that the candidate is the owner of the intellectual property contained in the submission. The second reason is that the *viva-voce* examination has a major role to play in establishing the ability of the candidate to contextualise their practice. In the studio arts there is rather less concern about intellectual ownership and more concern about the candidate's ability to contextualise their creative work. Through a structured discussion the *viva-voce* examination is expected to test the candidate's command of the methodological and conceptual issues explored in the submission. The *viva-voce* is a significant part of the examination and is not a mere formality.

2. General principles

- It is the responsibility of the University Research Office, having consulted the Director of Studies and the candidate, to fix the date of the *viva-voce* examination. The Research Office requires a minimum of four weeks to arrange a *viva voce* examination. The candidate should have maximum possible advanced warning of the date and time of the *viva-voce* examination. In practice the Research Office should confirm the precise date, time and location in writing at least two weeks before the event.
- Normally, two examiners, one external and one internal, should conduct the *viva-voce* examination for a research degree. In certain circumstances, three examiners may be approved by the University Research and Research Degrees Committee. In this situation all three examiners participate in the *viva-voce*. The maximum number of examiners who may examine a candidate in a *viva-voce* is three.
- In the case of candidates who are members of staff of the University the regulations require that there should be two External Examiners.
- An internal member of staff should be appointed by the Research Office as a Chair of the Examination Panel. The Chair should be experienced in research but s/he does not require a close knowledge of the field to be examined. The Chair has a neutral role in the *viva-voce* and is not an examiner. They will help to ensure that all the necessary arrangements are in place and that the University's Regulations are understood and followed. The Chair will attend the *viva-voce* examination, and should be present at the agenda setting part of the examiner's pre-meeting (see appendix 2 for full guidance on the role of the Chair).
- Examiners are required to forward their completed pre-examination reports to the Research Office one week prior to the *viva-voce* examination. The Director of Studies, supervisor/s and the candidate are not permitted to see these reports. Copies of the preliminary reports will be exchanged between the examiners once they have all been received and copies will be sent to the Chair.
- If examiners deem the work so unsatisfactory that a *viva-voce* would not serve any benefit, they can refer the work without holding a *viva-voce*. Any recommendation by the examiners to cancel the *viva-voce* examination must be received by the Research Office at least seven days before the scheduled date.
- Directors of Study should organise a mock viva for the candidate at least two weeks before the *viva*, during which the candidate should be advised as to the general format of the *viva*.

- The examination room for the *viva* should be set out so that the candidate has equal space and facility to the examiners. An arrangement of furniture with tables and chairs for both the examiners and the candidate will enable all parties to organise their reference materials. However, it may be decided that a less formal arrangement is preferable.
- The candidate should be advised of the approximate time envelope for the *viva-voce* examination (the average time for *viva-voce* examinations is 1hr 40mins).

3. Conduct of the viva-voce examination

- It is advisable to allow at least 30 minutes for a pre-*viva* meeting of the examiners to identify the issues to be raised.
- The code for the use of names should also be established at the beginning of the *viva*. Some examiners like to use first names to convey some sense of informality but it should be borne in mind that some older candidates may be offended by the assumption of first name terms. It is recommended that formal titles are normally used for both the candidates and examiners.
- Supervisors are encouraged to be present as observers subject to the agreement of the candidate and the examiners.
- Examiners may wish to use the introductions to gauge the state of confidence of the candidate. This may help in deciding the approach to be taken in the opening question.
- It may be helpful to offer some favourable comments on positive elements of the academic performance at the beginning of the *viva* if much of the *viva* is to be focused on concerns. The positive comments provide an appropriate balance. NOTE: It is important that the candidate should not know the formal outcome until after the *viva* is complete. The *viva-voce* examination is an important part of the overall assessment.
- It is good practice at the beginning of the *viva-voce* examination for one of the examiners to outline the main headings that they will follow in asking questions of the candidate. Naturally, it may prove necessary to adjust the provisional timing of the different sections depending on the responses.
- The candidate may ask to make an opening presentation. This is permitted subject to the approval of the examiners but it is not a University requirement and neither is it recommended practice. It is recommended that if a presentation is agreed that it should normally be no more than ten minutes in length and it should be used to highlight one or two critical points and updates rather than to summarise the content of the thesis which the examiners will have read. The primary purpose of the *viva voce* examination is to enable the examiners to ask questions and see how well the candidate understands the field and can defend the findings of the research.

4. The atmosphere in the viva-voce examination

- The atmosphere of the *viva-voce* examination is very important. Ideally, the overall spirit of a *viva-voce* examination should be intellectually stimulating. The examiners are expected to provide an environment in which the candidate is able to do justice to her/his knowledge and understanding. Examiners are asked to be rigorous but to avoid seeming aggressive in their questioning. Questions should be clear, firm and carefully designed to enable the candidate to demonstrate their depth of understanding [or lack of it]. The candidate should be given ample time to respond and not be subjected to undue pressure through rapid-fire questions. From time to time the examiners may wish to make complimentary comments or criticisms. At all times the discussion should be constructive.
- Examiners are advised to focus their questions on concerns or areas of interest, which they consider to be first and second order in importance. Minor errors can be communicated through notes given to the candidate after the *viva-voce* examination.
- Some discussion of the future work, which the candidate would like to undertake, may well be appreciated by the candidate.

5. After the viva-voce examination

- The examiners will require a private discussion before deciding their recommendations.

- After the private discussion, the examiners should draft the post-examination report. In the event of revision being necessary, the examiners are asked to describe the revision required and indicate their recommended deadline. One year is the maximum time permitted but normally the revision should be completed much more quickly (the post-examination proforma gives guidance on timescales in relation to amendments). If the examiners cannot reach an agreement on the recommendation, they may submit separate post-examination reports. The report must be submitted to the Research Office on the same day as the *viva*.
- The examiners convey the outcome to the candidate and the supervisors if they are present. The examiners are asked to make clear that their recommendation is subject to confirmation and ratification by the University Research and Research Degrees Committee.
- The examiners may give a list of any minor corrections which are required directly to the candidate (a copy must also be supplied to the Research Office for the candidate's examination records).
- If the candidate needs to undertake minor or major revision, the action required should be set out clearly on a sheet of paper and summarised in the Post-examination Report. The examiners should complete the Post-examination Report immediately after they have conveyed the outcome to the candidate. A copy of the sheet detailing the revision required should be attached to the Post-examination Report and these together should be submitted to the Research Office.
- The Research Office sends an examination outcome letter (based on the information in the post-examination report), along with any sheet setting out the revisions, to the candidate. This is also copied to the supervisors and to the Faculty. The examination outcome and recommendations are also reported to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee. [The Pre-examination Reports are not available to the candidate or the supervisors because these provisional views are commonly amended in the light of the further evidence, which is forthcoming at the *viva-voce* examination]

APPENDIX 2
University of Derby
University Research and Research Degrees Committee
Higher Degrees by Research

Guidance for Chairs of viva-voce examinations

1. Background

Experience gained over the past four years has demonstrated that there can be considerable benefits for the examination process if an experienced researcher is appointed as a Chair of the *viva voce* examination. In situations where there are two external examiners who are unfamiliar with the regulations, the assistance of a senior researcher can be valuable and may on occasions prevent inappropriate recommendations. On other occasions where there is a particular tension, for example, in a re-examination, the presence of a Chair can be critically important.

2. Policy

With effect from August 2008, it is University policy that a non-examining Chair is appointed for every *viva-voce* examination. The Research Office appoints the Chair for each *viva-voce* examination from a pool of suitably qualified persons. This pool is drawn up from lists of suitable academic staff drawn up by the faculty heads of research. The function of the Chair is to conduct the examination and to ensure that the examiners are informed of the relevant University regulations during the examination process (see Appendix 2).

3. Roles and responsibilities of the Chair

It is important to emphasise that, although the Chair has a proactive role in the *viva voce* examination, s/he is not an examiner and plays no part in making the judgements on the performance of the candidate. However, the Chair may assist in recording and communicating the judgements.

The Chair should be an experienced researcher with some examination experience. A supervisor of the candidate cannot serve as Chair. The Chair does not need to be expert in the field of the research to be examined.

- (i) To ensure that all the arrangements are in place and satisfactory. *(The Research Office is responsible for confirming the date, time and venue of the examination.)*
- (ii) To be familiar with the content of the examiners' pre-reports prior to the *viva voce* examination. *(The Research Office sends these to the Chair prior to the viva voce.)*
- (iii) To meet and welcome the examiners and to join them in the agenda setting meeting prior to the *viva voce* examination. The Chair needs to be acquainted with the structure and general content of the thesis but is not expected to have a detailed knowledge of the thesis. *(A copy of the thesis is available to the Chair prior to/for the examination, if required).*
- (iv) To Chair the *viva-voce* examination, making sure that this is conducted in accordance with the University's regulations and guidelines on *viva-voce* examinations.
- (v) To assist the examiners with any advice required with regard to the University's regulations that apply in arriving at the examiners' recommendations. The examiners must be made aware of the candidate's rights in the event of any recommendation to transfer registration.

- (vi) To ensure that the post examination report is written up immediately after the examination. In addition, to also ensure that, in the event of any revision (major or minor), a list of the significant shortcomings and the actions required is prepared on the day of the examination and made available to the candidate and the Research Office. The post examination report, along with the list of amendments (if applicable) must be submitted to the Research Office - this should not be deferred to the next day
 - (vii) To ensure that the candidate is given an oral report on the day, immediately after the completion of the post-examination report has been prepared. The Chair should also ensure that if the supervisors are present and wish to accompany the candidate, they are permitted to do so. Candidate and supervisors should normally receive feedback together. This helps the candidate after the examination. It is also much more satisfying for the supervisors. It must be made clear to the candidate that any outcome given is subject to ratification by URRDC.
 - (viii) To ensure that the examiners are content that the examination process has proceeded properly and satisfactorily.
 - (ix) In the event of all of the examiners being external to the university the Chair may if s/he wishes offer to check the re-submission following very minor amendments (i.e.typos).
-

PHB/27th February 2004
Updated August 2011

Appendix 3

1) Front cover layout for the hardbound critical appraisal

UNIVERSITY OF DERBY

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
COMMUNICATION, LISTENING AND
ACTION:
AN EXPERIENCE FROM LIFE

Peter Harrison

Doctor of Philosophy

2011

2) (Spine info for hard bound critical appraisal)

PETER HARRISON Ph.D. 2011

3) Required style/format for MPhil / PhD

- Gold writing on hard black binding
- 24 font size (above sample 24 pt) If the Title is long the font size may be adjusted to fit i.e. 20-24.
- Font Type Times New Roman (as above sample)
- Uppercase only for 'University of Derby' and 'title' on front cover - all other details upper and lower case (as above example)
- Master of Philosophy Or Doctor of Philosophy to be written in full on front cover and abbreviated on spine (as above example)
- Uppercase for Name on Spine (as above example)

Appendix 4

Policy regarding candidates making presentations at *viva voce* examinations

The principle underlying the examination process

URRDC holds to the following principles:

- (i) The purpose of the *viva-voce* examination is to assess the extent to which the candidate has command of the field of research and is able to articulate coherent and cogent argument to defend his approach, methods and research findings when faced with academic challenge.
- (ii) The examiners have the right to decide how the examination will be conducted.
- (iii) In order that the examination should be perceived as fair, the examiners should allow the candidate reasonable opportunity to articulate his findings and defend the submitted works. This should include facilities which are judged normal and fair sector practice.

University policy on candidates making presentations at *viva voce* examinations

- (i) Candidates, following discussion with their director of studies, may ask the examiners for permission to present a brief presentation at the beginning of the *viva voce* examination. This should normally be acceptable. There is a strict maximum length permitted which is 10 minutes.
- (ii) However, candidates should note that this is not an entitlement. The examiners are permitted to decline the request. The examiners have the right to decide how the examination will be conducted.
- (iii) In making their decision the examiners will take into account sector practice in their discipline.
- (iv) The advantage for the candidate in making a short presentation is that it gives her/him an opportunity to gain some confidence at the commencement of the *viva-voce* examination and ensure that the examiners are aware of the aspects which the candidate feels are important.
- (v) Making a presentation is a facility which the University permits: it is not recommended practice. The examiners will already have a good knowledge of the completed research from their thorough reading of the submitted works and it is unlikely that the presentation will clarify the aspects which they particularly wish to pursue. The examiners will have already decided on the broad questions that they wish to ask. Some examiners may regard an opening presentation as a useful facility; others may regard it as a distraction from the examination process.