

University of Derby

The Postgraduate Research Framework (PGR)  
Part C

# The Regulations for Research Degrees by Published Works

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

August 2011

# CONTENTS

## REGULATIONS

## PAGE

<b>1. Introduction</b>	
1.1 The purpose of this facility	4
1.2 The responsibilities of the University and Faculty Committees	4
1.3 The stages of gaining the degree award	4
<b>2. The eligibility of candidates for the degree by this route</b>	
2.1 Eligibility	5
<b>3. Published works: definition and authentication</b>	
3.1 Definition of published and creative works	6
3.2 Authentication of work	6
3.3 Declaration	6
3.4 Ethical considerations	6
3.5 Indicating the extent of the contribution in collaborative research	6
3.6 Details of research contribution	6
<b>4. Preparations and commencement</b>	
4.1 Commencement	7
4.2 Appointment of academic advisor(s)	7
4.3 Enrolment as a candidate for a Research Degree by Published Works	7
<b>5. Registration (PUB5)</b>	
5.1 Appointment of Assessor(s) for the application for registration	7
5.2 Preparation of the application for registration	8
5.3 Submission of the documentation for registration	8
5.4 Role of the Assessor(s)	8
5.5 Consideration of the Assessor's recommendations	9
5.6 Consideration by the Faculty Research & Research Degrees Committee	9
5.7 The Target Period	9
5.8 The Registration period and extenuating circumstances	9
<b>6. Submission for the award</b>	
6.1 Notification of the intention to submit	10
6.2 Content of the submission for examination	10
6.3 Submission of the documentation	11
<b>7. The appointment of the examiners</b>	
7.1 Initial consultation	11
7.2 Criteria for the appointment of examiners	12
7.3 The examiners	12

7.4	Initial contact with potential examiners	12
7.5	Approval of the examination arrangements	12
7.6	Notification of the appointment of the examiners	12
<b>8. Criteria for the examination of the submitted works</b>		
8.1	The underlying principle	13
8.2	The assessment criteria for the award of the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)	13
8.3	The assessment criteria for the award of the Master of Philosophy (MPhil)	14
<b>9. The viva voce examination</b>		
9.1	The preliminary reports	16
9.2	Exchange of preliminary reports	16
9.3	Attendance at the viva voce examination	16
9.4	Assessing the contribution made by the candidate	16
9.5	Assessment of creative works	16
<b>10. Examination outcomes</b>		
10.1	The recommendations following the viva voce examination	17
10.2	Disagreement on the outcome following the viva voce examination	17
10.3	Appointment of an additional examiner	18
10.4	Notification of the outcome of the examination	18
10.5	The recommendations following re-submission	18
10.6	Failure of the award following re-submission	18
10.7	Final submission of the documentation	19
<b>11. Academic Appeals: requesting a review of an examination decision</b>		
11.1	Grounds for appeal	19
11.2	Timescale for requesting an appeal	19
11.3	The appeal process	20
<b>12. Academic Offences</b>		
		20
12.1	Types of Academic Offence	21
12.2	Plagiarism	21
12.3	Inventing data	21
12.4	Collusion and other forms of deception	21
12.5	Action in the event of a suspected academic offence	21
12.6	The duty of the advisor	21
<b>13. The Complaints Procedure: how to lodge a complaint</b>		
13.1	Accessing the University complaints procedure	21
	<b>APPENDIX 1</b> – layout for the hard bound critical appraisal / submission	22
	<b>APPENDIX 2</b> - Guidance on Roles and Responsibilities of the Chair of Viva Voce Examinations	24

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 The purpose of this facility

The University of Derby may award the degrees of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) and Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in recognition of achievement in research evidenced by published and other creative works. The research degree is conferred upon individuals who have made an original contribution to their chosen discipline through the production of literature and other creative works over a period of many years. In effect, candidates make a claim for the research degree award rather than embark upon a programme of training in research. Candidates will have developed expertise in research through their own experience. This facility for gaining a research degree through the examination of published or other creative works is intended for staff of the University. It is not normally available to individuals who are external to the university or do not have a substantial prior experience of research. Staff pursuing this route are not regarded as PGR students and are not prevented from engagement in supervisory roles unless there is deemed to be a direct conflict of interest.

Candidates 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 published works 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.

Enquiries relating to the award of the Master of Philosophy or Doctor of Philosophy through published 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.

*The Master of Philosophy through published works has not been available hitherto but is introduced in this revised edition because the award may be a valued recognition of achievement for some staff. It also provides an alternative award for those who embark on the doctoral route but eventually find that for personal or academic reasons the doctoral degree is not an attainable outcome. Furthermore it would be perverse to deny to staff a facility which is available to the general public who take research degrees by thesis.*

## 1.2 The responsibilities of the University and Faculty Committees

The Faculty Research and Research Degrees Committee (FRRDC) most closely related to the field of research has the responsibility for the registration and the monitoring of progress of members of staff who undertake a Research Degree by Published Works. The University Research and Research Degrees Committee (URRDC) has responsibility for approving the examiners and approving the recommendations of the examiners after the viva voce examination. The registrar appoints the examiners.

## 1.3 The stages of gaining the degree award

### 1.3.1 Enrolment

- (i) The Candidate approaches the Chair of the FRRDC for the Faculty in which they wish to gain the award, to discuss their suitability of applying for a Research Degree by Published Works and completes an application form (PUB2).

- (ii) The Candidate consults with their line manager and the Dean to obtain support.
- (iii) The Candidate submits the application form (PUB2) to the Research Office.
- (iv) The Chair of FRRDC identifies and approaches possible academic advisors and completes a research degree application decision proforma (PUB4).
- (v) The Research Office confirms the decision of the Chair of FRRDC and where applicable makes an un/conditional offer and confirms the Academic Advisor(s).
- (vi) If successful the Candidate enrolls for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy or Master of Philosophy by Published Works and pays the fees due.
- (vii) Following registration, the Candidate will continue the process of drawing together the published/creative works, completing any further planned publications or creative works and preparing a critical appraisal. The Academic Advisor(s) will continue to provide guidance and support during this process.

### **1.3.2 Registration (PUB5)**

- (i) The Faculty appoints an Assessor(s) to consider the application for registration (PUB5).
- (ii) The application for registration (PUB5) is submitted to the Faculty Office
- (iii) The Faculty Office forwards the documentation to the Assessor(s) for consideration.
- (iv) The FRRDC considers and confirms the recommendations of the Assessor(s)
- (v) If the recommendation(s) is/are favourable the Candidate is registered for the award of Doctor of Philosophy or Master of Philosophy.

### **1.3.3 Submission for the award**

- (i) The Candidate submits notification of the intention to submit for examination. (PUB13) & the candidates declaration form (PUB17) to the Research Office.
- (ii) An examination package is recommended by the Academic Advisor/s, approved by the Chair of FRRDC then forwarded to the Research Office for approval by the Chair of URRDC. (PUB14)
- (iii) The candidate submits a critical appraisal together with the published works/ 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.

---

## **2. The eligibility of candidates for the degree by this route**

---

### **2.1 Eligibility**

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

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

The route is not available to members of staff who wish to recommence work on a referred or incomplete MPhil/PhD thesis registered here, or elsewhere, and who have not published significant works. Exceptionally, URRDC may give permission for the following people to enrol and register for the award:

- (i) former members of staff of the University;
- (ii) current or former members of staff of collaborating establishments.

---

### **3. Published works: definition and authentication**

---

#### **3.1 Definition of published and creative works**

Published work shall refer to papers in journals, chapters, monographs, research volumes and scholarly editions of textbooks. 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.

#### **3.2 Authentication of work**

For the purpose of these regulations, a work shall be regarded as published only if it is traceable through ordinary catalogues, critical reviews, abstracts, citation indices or websites. Copies must be or 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 published and are generally available. Exceptionally, unpublished works may be submitted if they have been accepted for publication and there is a long publication time.

#### **3.3 Declaration (PUB5 & PUB17)**

On the PUB5 and prior to the final viva voce examination (PUB17) a declaration is required from the candidate to the effect that the candidate is not registered at any other institution for a research degree or any other award, based upon any publication contained within the submission.

#### **3.4 Ethical considerations (PUB5)**

In all cases candidates must complete Section 8 of the PUB05 indicating the ethical status of the published work to be considered for the Research Degree by Published Works. Effectively the candidate should indicate that the work was given prior scrutiny and approval by an appropriate and identified body responsible for the maintenance of ethical standards. As the submitted publications can represent work over a number of years candidates should reflect on how the ethical view of the published work has changed and how this might influence the current view of the published work. If significant changes have occurred to the ethical views related to the published works this may be an issue which the candidate should consider in their critical review.

#### **3.5 Indicating the extent of the contribution in the case of collaborative research (PUB5)**

Where any submitted work has been generated in collaboration with other persons, the candidate must complete the relevant section of the PUB5 and have this endorsed by the co-authors and/or the candidate's relevant manager(s), indicating the approximate extent of the intellectual and practical input by the candidate into each such work. This statement should quantify the candidate's contribution to the formulation, execution, analysis and publication of the research and should be counter-signed by the candidate's co-authors and/or manager.

#### **3.6 Details of research contribution (PUB5)**

Candidates are asked to complete the section that identifies where and when the research contribution to the published/creative works was undertaken.

*NOTE A copy of the PUB5 must be submitted to the examiners for the final examination.*

---

## 4. Preparations and commencement

---

### 4.1 Commencement

Candidates considering commencement of a research degree by published work are advised to read through these regulations and procedures in full before entering into discussions with the Faculty. The Dean, Head of School and Head of Subject will normally be involved in discussions. This discussion will normally cover the career aspirations of the Candidate, career/degree routes, the Faculty resources and support and the time commitment to undertake the work in relation to Faculty and/or institutional duties. If the proposal is supported, the Dean will be requested to sign the PUB4. This signifies that the Dean is prepared to support the candidate in terms of their suitability, provision of hours and academic support.

### 4.2 Appointment of Academic Advisor(s)

Following discussions in the Faculty, the Chair of the FRRDC will appoint one or two Academic Advisor(s) and complete the relevant section of the PUB4.

***Guidance:** The appointment of two Academic Advisors is recommended but one may be considered sufficient. Normally the Academic Advisor(s) will be experienced colleagues from within the same division as the candidate. However, where the candidate is the only experienced person in the general field represented by the research, the Faculty may appoint an external academic advisor. Academic Advisors do not carry the same burden of responsibility as the supervisors of research students undertaking training in research. They have a more responsive role providing advice for the candidate when requested. They may comment on the scope and presentation of documentation submitted for registration and the critical appraisal to be submitted for the award. However, they should refrain from providing a detailed critique of the submitted documentation.*

### 4.3 Enrolment as a candidate for a Research Degree by Published Works

All candidates should enrol through the Research Office. A fee is normally due at enrolment. Where fees are reduced or waived, the appropriate fee waiver/reduction forms must be completed and authorised appropriately.

---

## 5. Registration

---

### 5.1 Appointment of Assessor(s) for the application for registration

Following discussion at Faculty level, the Chair of the FRRDC will appoint a suitably qualified and experienced individual to act as an Assessor of the application for registration. The Assessor may be internal or external to the University but may not be one of the appointed Academic Advisors of the candidate. The Faculty may appoint a second Assessor where there is a strong element of uncertainty with regard to the suitability of the published (or other) materials. The Faculty Office should send the PUB5 to the assessor(s) for completion of the assessors report and a recommendation.

***Guidance:** Normally, one assessor will be sufficient. However, if the Chair of FRRDC has concerns about the breadth of the field of research or the types of published works undertaken by the candidate, s/he may seek to appoint two assessors. In the case of an external Assessor being appointed, a fee will be paid. A fee of approximately one-half of the current standard examination fee is recommended.*

## 5.2 Preparation of the application for registration (PUB5)

The candidate prepares the application for registration (PUB5) in consultation with the Academic Advisors. The purpose of the application for registration is to demonstrate that there is a sound basis for proceeding to a formal examination of materials in about nine months time. Acceptance of the application for registration is necessary for registration. **A positive outcome should not be seen as a guarantee of a successful submission for the research degree in due course.** The application for registration should include the following:

- (i) details of the current position and period of employment;
- (ii) a brief summary of post-secondary educational background and employment history;
- (iii) a list of all the published works on which the application is based and which will be submitted in the final body of work  
*and/or*  
a list of the cited creative works which are or have been in the public domain (eg: public exhibitions with published catalogues) together with independent critical reviews of the work  
*and/or*  
a list of the edited text(s) or collection or artefacts which are or have been in the public domain together with appropriate textual and explanatory annotations;
- (iv) a **Summary**, not exceeding 1000 words, of the contribution to knowledge represented by the published works establishing how the works constitute a coherent study;
- (v) a declaration referred to in 3.3 to confirm that the works have not been submitted for any other award or at any other institution;
- (vi) a declaration referred to in 3.4 to confirm that ethical clearance has been obtained where appropriate;
- (vii) a statement referred to in 3.5 to confirm the relative contribution made by the candidate in the case of collaborative works;
- (viii) a statement referred to in 3.6 to confirm when and where the work was carried out. The statement should also indicate any further work intended to complete the proposed submission of publications/creative works.

## 5.3 Submission of the documentation for registration

The candidate should submit two /three copies of the entire documentation including a completed PUB5 to the Faculty Office. The Faculty Office will forward the documentation to the Assessor(s) as soon as possible following receipt.

**Guidance:** *The assessor will not be able to provide a sound recommendation on the basis of the titles of the works alone. Three copies are required if there are two assessors.*

## 5.4 Role of the Assessor(s)

The Assessor(s) is requested to comment on the coherence, quality and quantity of the published works, their potential suitability for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy/Master of Philosophy. S/he considers the quality of evidence in the context of the field of research and also considers the candidate's contribution to multi-authored works where this is necessary. The Assessor receives a copy of these regulations and attention is drawn to the criteria used for the award of the Research Degree by Published Works.

**Guidance** *The purpose of the assessment is to decide whether there is a reasonable case for proceeding to registration. There is no process that is equivalent to the Confirmation of Registration stage (RD7) for PhD or MPhil by Published Works. The candidate is expected to be at the last stages of preparing the final submission within a few months.*

## **5.5 Consideration of the Assessor's recommendations**

Following scrutiny of the documentation, the Assessor(s) completes the Assessor's Report section of the PUB5 and returns the PUB5 and the supporting documentation to the Faculty Office. The Assessor(s) may make one of the following recommendations:

- (i) acceptance of the case for registration for the award applied for;
- (ii) acceptance of the case, subject to minor amendments;
- (iii) referral of the case and an indication of the revision/further work to be carried out;
- (iv) rejection of the case for registration for PhD with a recommendation for registration for MPhil
- (v) rejection of the case for registration.

Where there is more than one Assessor if the reports of the Assessors are not in agreement, the Chair of FRRDC should seek the advice of the Research Office and the Chair of URRDC.

## **5.6 Consideration by the Faculty Research and Research Degrees Committee**

The FRRDC will receive and consider the PUB5. If the FRRDC approves a positive recommendation from the Assessor the Research Office informs the Candidate that s/he is registered. If minor amendments are required or revision is needed, this must be to the satisfaction of the Assessor. Where revisions are required, the Chair of FRRDC will normally indicate the time period available after consulting the Candidate and the Assessor. The FRDDC should aim to provide the candidate with constructive advice for further action. The FRRDC may give the Chair of FRRDC powers to take Chair's action on the recommendations of the Assessor following such changes. In the case of a rejection, FRRDC should give careful consideration to the advice it wishes to convey to the Candidate. The Chair of FRRDC must provide a full written and oral feedback for the Candidate. If the FRRDC is not satisfied with the recommendation of the Assessor(s), it may request a report from a further Assessor. The Chair of FRRDC is advised to discuss the circumstance with the Chair of URRDC.

**Guidance** *In the case of rejection, the Chair of FRRDC should describe and explain a recommended course of action to the candidate. The candidate should not normally re-apply for registration in less than two years unless the Chair of FRRDC encourages an earlier re-application. In this instance 50% of any fee paid will be refunded.*

## **5.7 The Target Period**

The target period for submission is 18 months. If the candidate has **not** given notification of the intention to submit by the end of the target period, the FRRDC will request a short Progress Report (100-500 words) to be submitted within one month. This Progress Report should be written by the candidate and endorsed by the Academic Advisors. The Report should indicate the cause of the delay and the expected date of submission.

## **5.8 The Registration period and extenuating circumstances**

The registration period is **two years**. It extends from the date of enrolment to the date of the examination. In the event that the candidate encounters exceptional and compelling extenuating circumstances that make completion within the registration period unlikely FRRDC is authorised to extend the period of registration for up to twelve months giving a maximum total registration period of three years. Completion is deemed to be the date of approval of the award. After three years the registration period expires and the candidate will have to re-register for the award. Any re-registration will incur a further full award fee.

---

## 6. Submission for the award

---

### 6.1 Notification of the intention to submit (PUB13)

The Candidate should submit the proforma indicating her/his intention to submit the documentation for examination three months before the intended date of submission. This step is to help ensure that the examiners have been appointed. Following submission of the PUB13 if the critical appraisal and published works are not submitted within 6 months the PUB13 becomes void and a new PUB13 must be submitted. The title of the submission should be the same or similar to the title given on the PUB5 application for registration.

*Guidance: Although it is desirable that the title of the final works to be submitted should be the same as the title indicated at the time of registration it is recognised that, in practice, some refinements may be deemed necessary. There is no problem with this. However, if the Candidate or the Academic Advisors think that the changes are more significant, it is advisable to secure the approval of FRRDC. The title given on the proforma for the notification to submit should be definitive.*

### 6.2 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 based upon Published 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 works 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, FRRDC may approve an extension to 8,000 words (see guidance). 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. 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.

**Guidance:** *The critical appraisal should be produced on an A4 format using Times New Roman or a similar font. The lines should be double-spaced with a margin of at least 3 cm on the left and at least 2 cm on the right. The main text should be in 12-point lettering. Smaller lettering down to 10-point is acceptable in tables and figures. The critical appraisal should include a list of contents and a full list of the references cited. A great deal rides on the adequacy of the critical appraisal. If the word limit seems unduly restrictive because there are a number of major issues to be addressed, it is recommended that the candidate requests approval from the FRRDC for an extension of the word limit from 5000 to 8000 words.*

- (iv) 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);
- (v) an original copy of any books must be included with the submission for examination.

The works shall be numbered and correspond with the list cited in the documentation submitted for the consideration of the application for registration, except where there has been a more recent publication which was not anticipated at the time of registration;

- (vi) a copy of the PUB5 application for registration.

### **6.3 Submission for examination**

The decision to submit rests entirely with the Candidate but s/he is recommended to consult the Academic Advisors on the matter. The Candidate shall submit **four** copies of the documentation and the published/creative works to the Research Office and shall be issued with a receipt of submission. These will be sent to the two examiners and the Chair of the examination panel together with the Pre-Examination report forms. Under no circumstances should anything be forwarded directly to the examiners by the candidate or advisors.

Where the works are not bound into the document, copies of books and papers will where possible be returned to the candidate after completion of the award.

---

## **7. The appointment of the examiners**

---

### **7.1 Initial consultation**

When the candidate has given the Research Office notification of the intention to submit, the Chair of FRRDC consults with the Candidate and the Academic Advisors to identify appropriate examiners. The examination team will include:

- (i) two external examiners. Staff of the University and institutions where the candidate has worked or undertaken much of the research are not eligible to act as external examiners.
- (ii) an internal member of staff to act as Chair of the panel, to advise on regulations and maintain good practice. The chair is nominated by the Research Office.

### **7.2 Criteria for the appointment of the examiners**

- (i) examiners should be experienced in research in the general area of the Candidate's work and, where practicable, have experience in the topic(s) to be examined. They must not be registered for a research degree;
- (ii) the examiners should normally have, between them, experience of at least three previous examinerships at doctoral level. Any exception to this requirement is subject to the approval of the URRDC;
- (iii) 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;
- (iv) the candidate's Academic Advisor(s) are **not** permitted to serve as examiners;
- (v) the Assessor of the application for registration is **not** eligible to serve as an examiner.

### **7.3 The examiners**

The examiners must fulfil the following requirements:

- (i) they must be independent of the University and institutions where the research was undertaken;
- (ii) they must not have served as a supervisor of the candidate or another candidate in the same department at Derby within the last three years;
- (iii) they should not be former members of staff of the University;
- (iv) they should not be appointed so frequently that their 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.

### **7.4 Initial contact with potential examiners**

The Academic Advisor/s should confirm with the proposed examiners that they are content to act as examiners. The Research Office is responsible for officially appointing the examiners and arranging dates for the viva.

### **7.5 Approval of the examination arrangements**

The **Application for the Approval of Examination Arrangements** (PUB14) should be completed by the Chair of FRRDC and forwarded to the Chair of URRDC (via the Research Office) for approval as soon as possible after the Research Office has received the notification to submit. The final title of the submission must correspond exactly with the title set out on the proforma indicating the notification of intention to submit.

### **7.6 Notification of the appointment of the examiners**

Following approval by the Chair of URRDC, the Research Office will write to the examiners to confirm their appointment and will forward a copy of these regulations. The candidate, Academic Advisors, Faculty Office and Chair of FRRDC will be notified of the confirmation of the appointments.

**Guidance: Arrangements for the day of the viva voce examination:** *The date and time of the viva voce examination will not be arranged until the Research Office has received all of the documentation. The Research Office will liaise with the Chair of the examination panel, examiners and candidate to identify a date for the*

examination. A suitable room will be sought for the viva voce. Where it is appropriate reception desks at the relevant site will be notified of the forthcoming examination. The Faculty Office will make the arrangements around exhibition and performance art events as appropriate. The Research Office will confirm the examination arrangements in writing. All persons involved in the examination will receive confirmation of the arrangements.

---

## **8. Criteria for the examination of the submitted works**

---

### **8.1 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 published/creative 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 Published Works is equal in terms of academic accomplishment requiring evidence of an original contribution to the chosen discipline.

### **8.2 The assessment criteria for the award of the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)**

#### **8.2.1. The published works:**

- (i) 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 submitted works. 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 published works and in the critical appraisal.*

- (iii) Understanding of the context.

**Guidance:** *The candidate must demonstrate, through the individual published works and the critical appraisal, 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 published works, but where this has not been developed sufficiently, an understanding of research methodology should be evident from the critical appraisal.*

- (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.

(ix) Ethical Considerations.

**Guidance:** The examiners should consider the ethical statements made by the candidate in the PUB05 document (Section 8) and if necessary discuss with the candidate the ethical context of their work, evidenced by published work and the critical appraisal during the viva. This may be of particular significance where the ethical view of the published work has changed during the overall publication period.

## 8.2.2 The viva voce examination

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 critical appraisal such as the coherence of the collective works 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.

## 8.2.3 The application of the criteria

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

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

### 8.3.1. The published works:

(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 published works and in the critical appraisal.

(iii) Understanding of the context.

**Guidance:** The candidate must demonstrate, through the individual published works and the critical appraisal, 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 published works, but where this has not been developed sufficiently, an understanding of research methodology should be evident from the critical appraisal.*

(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.*

(ix) Ethical Considerations

**Guidance:** *The examiners should consider the ethical statements made by the candidate in the PUB05 document (Section 8) and if necessary discuss with the candidate the ethical context of their work, evidenced by published work and the critical appraisal during the viva. This may be of particular significance where the ethical view of the published work has changed during the overall publication period.*

### **8.3.2 The viva voce examination**

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 critical appraisal such as the coherence of the collective works 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.

### **8.3.3 The application of the criteria**

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

---

## **9. The viva voce examination**

---

### **9.1 The preliminary reports**

Each appointed examiner considers independently the documentation submitted by the Candidate and sends a preliminary report and recommendation to the Research Office. The Research Office should receive this report not less than one week before the date of the viva voce examination.

### **9.2 Exchange of preliminary reports**

When all the examiners' preliminary reports have been received, the Research Office exchanges the reports to ensure that the examiners are aware of their co-examiner's views and copies both reports to the Chair. This exchange of preliminary reports and recommendations assists the examiners in the preparation for the viva voce examination. The examiners and chair are expected to meet immediately prior to the viva voce examination to consider any areas of concern to be evaluated during the examination. The examiners may only discuss the examination together after all preliminary reports have been submitted. The preliminary reports are confidential and are not available to the Candidate or the Academic Advisors or to any representative of the Faculty.

### **9.3 Attendance at the viva voce examination**

- (i) The Academic Advisor(s) may attend the viva voce examination in a non-participatory role, subject to the consent of both the Candidate and the examiners. Normally, the presence of the Academic Advisor will be purely observational and non-participatory. The examiners have the right to ask the Academic Advisor to withdraw if they deem it necessary. However they must be invited to return for the post viva feedback.
- (ii) The Chair of the URRDC (or his/her nominee) may attend by right a viva voce examination for the purpose of monitoring the process and reporting to the URRDC.

### **9.4 Assessing the contribution made by the candidate**

The viva voce examination is concerned with the content of the submission 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 documentation. This applies particularly in the context of multi-authored works, 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.

### **9.5 Assessment of creative works**

In the case of a Candidate whose own creative works form a significant or total part of their published works, the examiners will be required to assess the submitted documentation and, wherever possible, the creative work. To this end, the Candidate shall, where possible, make available on the appointed day of the viva voce examination or earlier if appropriate, the cited creative work so that the examiners can view and discuss it with the Candidate as part of the examination process.

The organisation of exhibitions, theatrical displays or concerts is a matter for the candidate, the Academic Advisor(s) and the Faculty. The Research Office should be informed of the arrangements so that the external examiners can be informed in good time.

---

## 10. Examination Outcomes

---

### 10.1 The recommendations following the viva voce examination

Following the completion of the examination the examiners may recommend that:

- (i) the Degree should be awarded;
- (ii) the submission is referred for revision of the critical appraisal (the published/exhibited works cannot be revised);
- (iii) failed - the Degree shall not be awarded because the examiners are not satisfied with regard to the specified criteria.
- (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 submission only: The submitted works are 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 version of the critical appraisal for that degree, for which the candidate may be examined only once, 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 revisions of the critical appraisal for resubmission for PhD.

#### **Guidance:**

*If (ii) is selected, the examiners shall, at the end of the examination, give the candidate guidance on the revision to be made and shall agree which examiner(s) is authorised to approve the revision. In the event of substantial revision they may decide that both examiners should check the resubmitted critical appraisal. Candidates will normally have up to **two months** from the date of the viva-voce examination to complete the revision of the critical appraisal and submit two/three copies of the revised documentation to the Research Office. The candidate may negotiate a longer period in the event of extenuating personal circumstances.*

*If (iii) is selected, and the recommendation from the examiners is that the candidate should fail, this recommendation is subject to confirmation by URRDC. The Research Office may only forward the recommendation and statement to the candidate after full consideration and approval by URRDC. If the examiners recommend that the Degree should not be awarded, they shall prepare an agreed statement of the reasons for their recommendation. 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*

*If (v) is selected, and the submission is judged to be well below the necessary standard for the doctoral award, the situation must be treated very carefully. 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 the examiners should make the recommendation to transfer to the Master of Philosophy. However, it remains the right of the candidate to choose the award for which s/he is submitting the revised critical appraisal. The candidate 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.*

## **10.2 Disagreement on the outcome following the viva voce examination**

When, following the *viva-voce* examination, the examiners are not in agreement, separate post-examination reports (PUB21) and recommendations must be submitted. The URRDC will normally appoint an additional external examiner.

## **10.3 Appointment of an additional examiner**

Where an additional examiner is appointed under Regulation 10.2 the examiner shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the submitted documentation and shall conduct a further viva voce examination normally within three months of the first examination. The additional examiner shall not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. The Academic Advisor/s and Chair of FRRDC may attend the viva voce by invitation. On receipt of the preliminary report and final recommendation of the additional examiner, the URRDC will consider the recommendations of all the examiners involved and take a final decision to award or not to award the Degree.

## **10.4 Notification of the outcome of the examination**

The examiners may indicate their recommendation to the candidate after the viva voce examination, but they must make it clear that the recommendation is subject to approval by the Chair of URRDC.

## **10.5 The recommendations following re-submission**

Following the resubmission of a critical appraisal where two [or all] examiners have agreed to examine 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.

## **10.6 Failure of the award following re-submission**

In the event of a recommendation from the examiners that the candidate should fail, this recommendation is subject to confirmation by URRDC. The Research Office may only forward the recommendation and statement to the candidate after full consideration and approval by URRDC. If the examiners recommend that the Degree should not be awarded, they shall prepare an agreed statement of the reasons for their recommendation. The examiners are not permitted to award the Master of Philosophy as a default award. However, they may recommend transfer of registration to the Master of Philosophy for which the Candidate may be examined once only. The Candidate must make this decision within one month of the formal letter reporting the outcome of the examination. The Candidate then has three months to make the submission for the Master of Philosophy. The same examiners should be re-appointed and decide whether they need a further viva-voce examination as well as the opportunity to examine the revised critical appraisal. URRDC may request a report from the FRRDC which sets out the circumstances, identifies the causative factors, draws attention to any lessons which the school has learned and draws attention to changes which URRDC may wish to consider.

Unsuccessful candidates may make a new application for registration when they have grounds to believe that their case has been substantially strengthened by the publication/exhibition of new works.

**Guidance:** *An unsuccessful Candidate is recommended to consider the examiners' recommendations. If the*

research is regarded as of good quality but insufficient in volume, the publication of further works will make a new application for registration, in due course, a reasonable prospect. If, however, there is a question over the suitability of the works for a research degree, it is possible that it may not be appropriate to re-apply. This may be no criticism of the scholarship accomplished by the candidate. Some works will be valued in the sector as fine scholarship but may not satisfy the criterion of making an original contribution through research. The Academic Advisor/s may be in a position to offer further guidance on this matter.

## **10.7 Final submission of the documentation**

Following the approval of the award by URRDC, two copies of the final version of the submission must be deposited at the Research Office. The Research Office lodges one copy in the University Library and one copy in the relevant Faculty.

### **Critical appraisal format**

- (i) The paper should be A4 size, white and within the range of 70 g m<sup>2</sup> to 100 g m<sup>2</sup>.
- (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) See appendix 1 for an example of the hardbound cover layout.

---

## **11. Academic Appeals: requesting a review of an examination decision**

---

### **11.1 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 the Departmental Services Unit in Student Support & 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.

### **11.2 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.

### 11.3 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 research 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](mailto:enquiries@oiahe.org.uk)  
Website: [www.oiahe.org.uk](http://www.oiahe.org.uk) .

---

## 12. Academic Offences

---

### 12.1 Types of Academic Offence

The University regards academic offences very seriously and candidates for a Research Degree by Published Works 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 candidate 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 candidate consorts with others 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 candidate 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 candidate formally submits written material for 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 candidate 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.

## **12.6 The duty of the advisor**

It is the duty of the advisor to ensure that candidates have a clear understanding of what constitutes an academic offence and the importance of ensuring that no such offence is committed. Candidates 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 an advisor suspects that material submitted has originated through an offence then it is essential to confront the candidate immediately and ensure that the offending material is removed or rewritten. On no account should the advisor be tempted to write the section for the candidate in a mistaken attempt to support the candidate in the wrong way. Advisors are advised to keep a careful watch for plagiarised or invented data. FRRDC expects advisors to identify such material before final submission for assessment.*

---

# **13. The Complaints Procedure: how to lodge a complaint**

---

## **13.1 Accessing the University complaints procedure**

For full details of the University of Derby complaints procedure please refer to the University of Derby Rights, Regulations and Responsibilities document. This can be found at [www.derby.ac.uk/academic-regulations](http://www.derby.ac.uk/academic-regulations) or alternatively contact the Research Office.

1) Front cover

APPENDIX 1

UNIVERSITY OF DERBY

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

Peter Harrison

Doctor of Philosophy

2010

## 2) Spine info

**PETER HARRISON**

**Ph.D.**

**2010**

## 3) Required style/format for MPhil / PhD

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

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/27<sup>th</sup> February 2004  
Updated August 2011