Research Degree and Higher Doctorate Regulations

De Montfort University

2023

Contents

1. Research Degree Provision 2
2. Admission Requirements and Processes 3
3. Registration and Payment of Tuition Fees 7
4. Registration of Members of Staff as Research Students 9
5. Monitoring of Student Progress 9
6. Research Ethics 9
7. Research Degree Procedures (Forms) 10
8. First Project Review, Confidentiality, IPR 11
9. Nomination and Appointment of Supervisors 14
10. Responsibilities of Supervisors and of Students 16
11. The Probation Review 22
12. Lengths of Registration and Maximum Periods of Time Before Submission 27
13. Extension of Period of Registration 28
14. Interruption of Registration 29
15. Change in Approved Mode of Study 30
16. Change in Approved Arrangements for Supervision 30
17. Continuation and Closure of Registration 31
18. Notification of Withdrawal of Registration 32
19. Variations from the Standard Research Programme 32
20. Monitoring of Research Student Progress and Feedback 37
21. Submission of Thesis and Any Other Work 38
22. Presentation of Thesis 40
23. Selection and Appointment of Examiners and Examiners' Duties 43
24. Oral Examination (Viva Voce) 48
25. Examination Outcomes 50
26. Disagreement Amongst Examiners 53
27. Amendment to Theses 53
28. Examination of an Amended Thesis 53
29. Lodging of Thesis 54
30. Conferment of the Research Degree 54
31. Students' Rights of Appeal 54
32. Academic Offences Panel 54
33. Misconduct in Research Policy 55

34. Fieldwork Process 55
35. Higher Doctorates 55

Research Degree and Higher Doctorate Regulations

Introduction

These Regulations come into force on 1st October 2023, and their provisions replace all Research Degree Regulations and Procedures in force up to that date, and constitute the regulations for all students starting as of 1 October 2023 or thereafter.

The University's Doctoral College has oversight of all research degrees. It provides an information point for both staff and students on the regulations and procedures involved from admission to graduation.

The Doctoral College services the Research Degrees Committee (RDC) which authorises the registration of research degree students and monitors their progress through the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panels. RDC is chaired by the Associate Pro Vice Chancellor for Research (APVCR).

The Doctoral College can be contacted as detailed below and are happy to answer your queries:

The Doctoral College
Room 0.02, Portland Building
De Montfort University
The Gateway
Leicester
LE1 9BH

Tel: (0116) 250 6309
Email: researchstudents@dmu.ac.uk

1. Research Degree Provision

1.1 The Regulations prescribe the conditions under which applicants are able to qualify for the award of the research degrees of Master by Research (MA/MSc), Master of Philosophy (MPhil), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and Professional Doctorates of De Montfort University.

1.1.1 students studying for these awards have a legal commitment to all relevant De Montfort University research degree student regulations;

1.1.2 research degree students will only be accepted into an environment that provides support for doing and learning about research and where high-quality research is occurring;

1.1.3 research degree students will be registered in a subject area which supports a critical mass of research activity;

1.1.4 sufficient facilities for the research project, including library and IT facilities will be available;

1.1.5 the award of the degree will be based on work conducted during a period of registration under an approved supervisory team, under such conditions as prescribed by the Regulations (except for students registered under Regulation 19.8).

The Degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) and the Degree of MA/MSc by Research

1.2 The degrees of MPhil and MA/MSc by Research are awarded to recognise the successful completion of a supervised programme of individual research, the results of which have been satisfactorily embodied in a thesis (together, under certain circumstances, with another form of presentation as defined in Regulation 19), and which:

1.2.1 demonstrates an understanding of research methods appropriate to the field of study; and

1.2.2 demonstrates critical investigation and evaluation of the topic of research.

1.3 The University adheres to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awards in describing the qualification outcomes and attributes for research degrees.

The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

1.4 The degree of PhD is awarded to recognise the successful completion of a supervised programme of individual research, the results of which have been satisfactorily embodied in a thesis (or other presentation as defined in 19), and which:

1.4.1 demonstrates an understanding of research methods appropriate to the field of

study;

1.4.2 demonstrates critical investigation and evaluation of the topic of research;

1.4.3 constitutes an independent and original contribution to knowledge; and

1.4.4 demonstrates the student's ability to undertake further research without supervision.

Professional Doctorates

1.5 A professional doctorate degree is awarded to recognise the successful completion of a programme of study which:

1.5.1 incorporates a substantial component which focuses upon appropriate research methods and provides instruction of a specialised vocational nature; and

1.5.2 includes a thesis component which demonstrates:

1.5.2.1 an understanding of research methods appropriate to the vocational area of the named award;

1.5.2.2 critical investigation and evaluation of the area of study; and

1.5.2.3 originality either in the development or application of knowledge.

1.6 A student who is registered for a PhD may, in consultation with their supervisory team, at any time prior to submission of the thesis for examination, apply to the Doctoral College for the registration to be transferred to an MPhil. This will be subject to the approval of the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review panel.

2. Admission Requirements and Processes

2.1 Students can be admitted for the following research degree programmes:

2.1.1 PhD
2.1.2 PhD by Concurrent Publication
2.1.3 PhD by Published Works
2.1.4 Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)
2.1.5 MA /MSc by Research
2.1.6 PhD through Extended Professional Practice

2.2 An offer of admission to a programme of supervised research must be linked to a specified research topic and to a minimum of 2 named supervisors for the probationary period from registration. These can be changed at First Project Review. Research degree students will only be accepted into an environment that provides support for doing and learning about research and where high-quality research is occurring.

2.3 Any offer of admission made by the Doctoral College on behalf of the Associate Pro Vice Chancellor for Research (APVCR), must bear the recommendation of the relevant Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee), who thereby undertakes to arrange the necessary facilities and supervision if the offer is accepted. Such recommendation must also make clear which aspects of the programme, if any, will be undertaken outside University premises.

2.4 An offer of admission for PhD or DBA shall be made on fixed entry points agreed by the University. These are: 1st October; 1st January; 1st April. An offer for admission for MA or MSc by Research shall be made for the 1st October only.

2.5 Students registered at another institution to study for a research degree are not eligible for admission or registration for a research degree at De Montfort University, unless their registration elsewhere is closed.

2.6 Applicants must declare if they have previously been excluded/failed/examined at research degree level at either DMU or at another institution. The discovery of untrue statements and omissions, however belated, will result in the withdrawal of any offer of a place or registration.

2.7 The maximum period of probation is 12 months for full-time students and 24 months for part-time students. For students following the MA/MSc by Research programme, the maximum period of probation is 3 months for full-time and 6 months for part-time. The University has the right to close a student's registration if they fail to attend (see 11.2) or fail their Probation Review. Exceptionally, the Probation Review Panel may extend the probationary period by up to six months.

2.8 In order to be admitted as a student for a research degree programme, an applicant shall normally:

2.8.1 possess a UK Honours degree with at least an upper second-class honours, or a Master's degree, or an academic or professional qualification plus experience in their sector or industry which the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel deems to be equivalent; and

2.8.2 demonstrate competence in the use of the English language. A minimum score of 6.5 in an International English Language Test Score (IELTS Academic or IELTS for UKVI Academic) or equivalent test is normally required. This includes a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the test components. Tests used for English Language competence must have been successfully completed no more than two years prior to entry.

2.8.3 Degrees obtained from English speaking institutions (as defined by UKVI) used for English Language competence must be undertaken no more than five years prior to entry.

2.9 A condition of admission for applicants is the provision of at least 2 references, demonstrating the applicant's academic ability and fitness to conduct research. One of these references can come from industry/practice should the application be for a professional doctorate.

2.10 Applicants wishing to pursue a PhD by Published Works are subject to the same admission protocols and procedures as for any doctorate.

2.11 Students admitted onto the MA/MSc by Research cannot transfer to an MPhil or PhD.

2.12 An applicant whose work forms part of a group project may be registered for a Research Degree, provided that the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel is satisfied that the applicant's part of the project is distinguishable for the purposes of assessment, and is appropriate for the award sought. In such a case, the application for admission must indicate clearly the individual's contribution and its relationship to the group project.

2.13 The Pre-Sessional English (Level 8) programme is a conditional entry route onto the PhD and DBA. Applicants are required to have a minimum IELTS score of 6 to be eligible for entry into the Pre-Sessional English programme, and must attain an overall score of 6.5 with 6.0 across all components for entry into a PhD programme thereafter. The IELTS score provided must be an UKVI IELTS.

2.14 Where a student is seeking to transfer to De Montfort University from another institution, they will be required to complete the full application process. As part of the admissions process the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role will consider the application in order to approve or reject the application.

2.15 Research conducted previously at another Higher Education Institution (HEI) will be taken into account in assigning a transferring student to an appropriate pathway. As for all students, the application process will serve to confirm the availability of appropriate supervision and suitable technical and/or information resources for continuation of the research. This process also applies to students transferring from another HEI in order to follow a supervisor newly appointed to DMU. At application stage, students should present a portfolio documenting and demonstrating their research progress to date, including copies of any official notification of progression milestones achieved at their previous institution. This will be assessed by the designated supervision team who will make a recommendation as to the appropriate entry pathway for the student, taking into account the achievements, timeliness and intended trajectory of the research. The Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role will review this recommendation in approving an appropriate pathway for the student, ensuring satisfactory alignment between DMU's review and monitoring requirements and those met at the previous institution.

2.16 For students applying to the PhD programme, transfer will not normally be accepted where students have completed more than 24 months of full-time study or 48 months of part-time study at another UK HEI. Following registration and irrespective of any prior period of research conducted, the student must complete the Probation Review process (as described in Regulation 11) and the student will also be required to obtain ethical approval as designated by their Faculty.

2.17 Applicants who do not have Home status and who are proposing to be substantively based at a location outside the UK are eligible for consideration for admission and subsequent registration on the International PhD (IPhD) programme, provided the following conditions are met:

2.17.1 In addition to Regulation 9 regarding the appointment of the supervisory team, only persons who are members of academic staff of the University with relevant research expertise for the applicant's research programme are eligible to be First and Second Supervisors;

2.17.2 There must be evidence that appropriate and adequate facilities are available for the student to conduct their research in the remote location and at DMU;

2.17.3 The arrangements proposed for supervision must enable frequent and substantial contact between the student and the UK-based supervisor(s); these arrangements should be approved during completion of a Study Protocol document which must be submitted to the Doctoral College within 3 months of registration for full-time students and 6 months for part-time; this contact should be by the most appropriate means such as face-to-face and/or email and/or video-conferencing; the student should normally prepare for and undergo the final oral examination at the University;

2.17.4 Students on the International PhD Programme cannot attend the DMU Leicester campus for more than 8 weeks in a block in any one year; if they do, they will be transferred to full-time based in the UK status, and the appropriate terms and conditions and fee changes will apply.

2.18 The University prohibits direct teaching, examining or supervising of one family member by another. Whilst there is an expectation that the member of staff will ensure the University is aware of any such case, students also have a responsibility to inform their Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role or Faculty Associate Dean of Research and Innovation if this situation arises.

2.19 If a student is aware that any member of their family is, or becomes, a member of Professional Services (i.e. non-academic) staff, they must inform the APVC Research, who will ensure appropriate measures are in place to protect confidentiality and integrity of data.

2.20 Faculties must ensure that their procedures for the selection and admission of research students show the ability to demonstrate that:

2.20.1 admissions procedures are clear and consistently applied;

2.20.2 only appropriately qualified and/or prepared applicants are admitted after a scrutiny of the appropriate references;

2.20.3 admissions decisions involve the judgement of more than one of the institution's staff with relevant expertise and appropriate training;

2.20.4 admissions procedures promote equality of opportunity;

2.20.5 appropriate supervision in the prospective candidate's research area is available;

2.20.6 language proficiency has been appropriately assessed and, if not yet at the required institutional level, admission will be conditional on reaching that level;

2.20.7 applicants are interviewed and that appropriate measures and records are put in place for overseas students who may be unable to attend an interview at the institution. The Faculty Decision Form must be completed and returned to the Doctoral College by the academic responsible for interviewing the applicant;

2.20.8 confidentiality is maintained throughout the process;

2.20.9 the applicant is aware of facilities and space to be made available to them;

2.20.10 the applicant is aware of the choice of supervisory team, nature of the supervisory arrangements and 'contract', and that the supervisors have attended the Research Supervision Recognition Programme;

2.20.11 the expectations of the applicant in relation to academic and social conduct and performance are clear;

2.20.12 the applicant is aware of the requirements and availability of training;

2.20.13 applicants have been made aware of any relevant institutional funds/bursaries to support students;

2.20.14 the institution can be assured that the applicant has sufficient financial support to complete the Research Degree Programme.

2.21 These criteria must be capable of being demonstrated at audit by appropriate Faculty records. The procedures are to be applied to all prospective research students, including those who are self-funded.

2.22 An applicant who has been granted admission becomes a student.

2.23 If an applicant submits a research proposal which the Faculty considers to be 'sensitive', under the definitions of the University's Policy on Conducting Sensitive Research, then the applicant and research supervisor will be required to comply with the admissions procedures outlined in the policy. No offer of admission can be processed without full adherence to the Conducting Sensitive Research policy. The policy for Conducting Sensitive Research can be located on the University's research website pages.

3. Registration and Payment of Tuition Fees

3.1 An applicant cannot commence their programme of study until they have formally registered as a student studying for a Research Degree. The applicant is expected to register at one of the agreed fixed entry points: 1st October, 1st January or 1st April. Students will be required to re-register on the anniversary of their registration throughout the programme. This means that, unless good reason has been provided for registration to be interrupted or closed, fees will

continue to be charged. Continued registration is subject to the payment of annual fees, their level to be defined by the University.

3.2 Once the applicant has registered and the arrangements to pay fees have been agreed, applicants will be issued a student ID card, which allows access to University buildings. The ID card is also the library card and this will need to be shown for access to Library facilities or to borrow books. The ID card must be kept safe, as this contains the Student Number, which remains the same throughout the period of registration. Students may also be asked to show their card at any time in any of the University buildings.

3.3 Following admission, the student will be assigned a minimum of 2 supervisors, who will be responsible for arranging the student's induction to the University, and help the student complete the Development Needs Analysis, organising their programme of study and working with the student to develop their research proposal.

3.4 Students registering for a doctorate and based in the UK are required to attend the physical induction on campus. All registered degree students are mandated to complete the online Doctoral College Induction Programme within 6 months of registration together with Research Ethics and Integrity, Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) and General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) training. Students whose first language is not English as per UKVI Government Student Visa requirements, will also need to complete English language in-sessional training. The Faculty might mandate other training for the student (including, for instance, a faculty induction event), which the student will need to complete.

3.5 Research degree students are required to use their university email address (e.g. P00000076@my365.dmu.ac.uk). This will be the main form of communication between the institution and the student, with key information coming to the student from the Doctoral College and Faculties. All information will be sent to this account and/or posted on Learning Zone, and so students will be required to check this account regularly. Students who persistently do not respond to formal communications from the Doctoral College by specified deadlines may be at risk of closure of registration.

3.6 At the end of a student's 3-year registration period (for full-time students) or 5-year registration period (for part-time students), excluding interruptions, they will be automatically placed in a 12-month Thesis Pending Period during which no fees are paid. Should a student fail to submit their examinable thesis after the Thesis Pending Period ends, and after an extension has been agreed, liability for a continuation fee will apply until the thesis is submitted to the Doctoral College for examination.

3.7 MA/MSc by Research students are entitled to enter the Thesis Pending Period following 1 year of registration (for full-time students) or 2 years of registration (for part-time students). The period is for 3 months for full-time and 6 months for part-time.

3.8 If the outcome of the viva voce examination is 25.2.4 that the student is required to re-submit for the degree within a period not exceeding 12 months, the student will be liable to pay continuation fees until the revised thesis is submitted for examination to the Doctoral College.

4. Registration of Members of Staff as Research Students

4.1 Members of University staff undertaking a research degree of this University must register as research students every year under the same conditions as above. Tuition fees are not waived automatically for DMU staff registered as students but are charged at the standard approved rate for students on similar programmes.

4.2 Staff however may apply for their fees to be waived through the process as specified by People Services (further information can be found on DMUConnect).

5. Monitoring of Student Progress

5.1 All students registered for research degrees are subject to annual monitoring to ensure that their progress is satisfactory and that the arrangements for supervision, which include the relationships between the research degree students and their supervisors, are working well.

5.2 Progress is subject to annual review, excluding MA/MSc by Research, as outlined in Regulation 20.

5.3 Progress is regularly monitored by progress meetings as outlined in Regulations 10.6-10.11. It is expected that such formal discussions will be recorded (normally at least once per month for full-time students and at least once every 2 months for part-time students).

5.4 Where the outcome of a First Project Review, Probation Review or Annual Review recommends the downgrading of a PhD student to the award of MPhil, students will have 6 months (FT) and 9 months (PT) from the date of notification to submit their examinable thesis for the award of MPhil. If the revised submission deadline is shorter than the maximum registration period for an MPhil, students will be given the longer timeframe.

6. Research Ethics

6.1 DMU's Research Ethics Code of Practice (RECoP) requires that all research is subject to ethical consideration. If ethical approval is needed, it must be obtained prior to the commencement of research. This includes internal ethical approval as well as external approval where necessary (e.g. external approval for research with the NHS). Research that falls within the scope of the RECoP requires approval either by a Faculty Research Ethics Committee or the Animal Welfare and Ethics Review Body (AWERB).

6.2 Without such formal approval, the research must not proceed. Failure to conduct research in accordance with the RECoP may result in the loss of funding support, withdrawal, or failure of degree assessments or awards, and personal disciplinary or legal action taken against the researcher, supervisors or the University. Research data collected in contravention of ethical and governance requirements cannot be used in the research degree thesis.

6.3 There are many related legal and governance issues that may apply to research for which you may need to seek specialist advice from Research Services or other support teams within DMU,

such as:

6.3.1 Research involving human tissues governed by the Human Tissue Act (2004).
6.3.2 Research into security sensitive topics, such as extremism and terrorism.
6.3.3 High risk research as defined by the Research Ethics Code of Practice.
6.3.4 Research collecting personal identifying information requiring a Data Protection and Impact Assessment.
6.3.5 Research utilising genetic resources obtained from overseas.
6.3.6 Research on topics requiring an export licence.

6.4 Research degree students must discuss ethical and governance requirements with their supervisor, and where necessary seek specialist advice from their Faculty Research Ethics Committee (FREC) or Research Services. Further support is available for supervisors on DMU's Connect pages.

6.5 All research degree students must have at least commenced applying for ethical review with their designated Faculty Research Ethics Committee before submitting for Probation Review. The application must be made via WorkTribe. All research students should have documented evidence that the requirement for FREC review has been considered.

6.6 The above requirements and procedures must also be upheld by DMU staff and their students for collaborative work overseas.

7. Research Degree Procedures (Forms)

7.1 The procedures for research degrees are governed by information given on a number of forms, each of which relates to a different stage in the student's progression from the First Project Review through to the final examination, as appropriate. These forms are to be found in the relevant milestone on the PGR records management system as below:

7.1.1 First Project Review
7.1.2 Probation Review
7.1.3 Annual Review
7.1.4 Change in Mode Request
7.1.5 Change in Supervision Request
7.1.6 Extension to Registration Request
7.1.7 Interruption to Registration Request
7.1.8 Withdrawal Request
7.1.9 Examination Arrangements

7.2 All forms are submitted to the Doctoral College via the PGR records management system and will be considered by the relevant Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel.

7.3 All forms must be completed on the PGR records management system. No additional papers or attachments other than, where appropriate, curriculum vitae of supervisors or examiners, can be submitted.

7.4 It is important to ensure that all forms are authorised by the student and the supervisors as appropriate. The Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panels will not consider forms which do not have the appropriate authorisation.

7.5 Procedures for the examination of students involve the completion of a number of forms, prior to and at the end of, the oral (viva voce) examination. Where applicable, forms must be completed via the PGR records management system upon completion of the examination, or, in the case of the pre-viva forms by the examiners, 5 days prior to the viva voce. These forms are:

7.5.1 Pre Viva: Examiners' pre-viva assessments and reports (completed by each examiner prior to the viva voce);

7.5.2 Examiners' Report Form for students of Research Degrees; and

7.5.3 A Student Declaration Form to be completed by the student in the PGR records management system.

7.6 The Doctoral College will dispatch copies of the thesis, together with copies of the 'Guidance Notes for Examiners' to all examiners as soon as the thesis has been formally submitted by the student and Examination Arrangements have been approved.

8. First Project Review, Confidentiality, Intellectual Property Rights

8.1 Once registered on the research degree, probationary research degree students must complete the First Project Review. The First Project Review is a separate procedure from registration and needs to be completed only once. DBA students are not required to complete First Project Review due to the first year of the course being a taught programme.

8.2 Application for approval of First Project Review must be made to the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel, within 4 months of registration for full-time students and within 8 months for part-time students. Those proposing to study for the MA/MSc by Research must complete their applications within 3 months of registration for full-time students and within 6 months of registration for part-time students. If an application is not made to the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel, within these periods, the student's progress is deemed to be unsatisfactory and the University has the right to close the registration, unless a case for extending the First Project Review deadline is approved by the relevant Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role.

8.3 The First Project Review form on the PGR records management system must be completed in collaboration with the assigned supervisors. It is important to ensure full and accurate completion of all parts of this form. The information contained on the form is the sole basis on which the relevant Faculty Review Panel decides whether or not to approve the First Project Review. Please note that the Faculty Review is an electronic procedure and does not involve a face-to-face meeting. The Review will be conducted by either the relevant Institute Head of Research Students (IHRS) or the relevant Faculty Head of Research Students (FHRS) or equivalent role (or nominee). The form requires the following:

8.3.1 information about the student applying for First Project Review for a research degree;

8.3.2 information about the proposed topic of research, its aims, methods and intellectual content. When proposing the working or final title of a thesis, acronyms must not be used;

8.3.3 information about the proposed supervision arrangements for the student;

8.3.4 information regarding ethical and other approval required (see Regulation 6);

8.3.5 a completed Development Needs Analysis indicating areas requiring development in the first phase of the PhD;

8.3.6 a statement from the supervisors on discipline-based expectations of the research student for the Probation Review (to be initiated at 9 months full- time/18 months part-time, and completed by 12 months full-time/24 months part-time).

8.4 The information given will indicate the adequacy of the proposed supervision arrangements. The supervision team proposed must have the expertise to cover all aspects of the research project and must include experience of successful supervision of previous research degrees.

8.5 The First Project Review is dependent essentially on the research topic chosen and the nature, level and appropriateness of the methods to be followed. It is vital, therefore, that the proposed programme of research is fully and clearly described.

8.6 The aims of the research need to be formulated precisely, stating clearly what the programme of research sets out to achieve. The proposed research must be placed in the context of other work in the field, specifying its relationship to previous research, in terms of theories and empirical work. It is important to cite key texts and indicate how the proposed research builds upon earlier work in the field.

8.7 The methods of investigation to be pursued need to be described and details must be provided, as appropriate, of:

8.7.1 the location of the proposed research (e.g. when, where, etc.);

8.7.2 the methods to be used in the investigation (e.g. descriptive, experimental, etc.);

8.7.3 the instruments to be used or devised (e.g. computer equipment, questionnaires, etc.);

8.7.4 the techniques of analysis to be used;

8.7.5 the rationale for the selection of the particular methods, instruments and techniques.

8.8 It is also important that the expected outcomes of the research are outlined in terms of, for example, the construction of prototypes, the generation of principles or the formulation of theories and how these might contribute to the discipline. If applicable there must be an indication of the progress expected to be made by the Probation Review.

8.9 If the research is to be conducted by other than the standard form, such as through Exhibition, Performance, Creative Writing or other similar work, the form in which the outcomes of the research are to be presented and the ways in which it might be assessed must be indicated with the First Project Review.

8.10 Exceptionally, the thesis may need to be classified as confidential for a period of up to 3 years from the conferment date. Approval of such restriction must, whenever possible, be sought at the time of the First Project Review. Approval at a later stage is possible if change in circumstances or research direction dictate such a need.

8.11 Applications must give precise and relevant reasons for seeking restriction of access. The Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel will normally only approve an application for confidentiality in order to enable a patent application or similar protection of Intellectual Property to be lodged or to protect commercially sensitive material. For information relating to Intellectual Property Rights, refer to the General Regulations and Procedures affecting students.

8.12 The copyright and other intellectual property rights in relation to theses and other work prepared and submitted by students in the course of their studies shall belong to the University, except where specifically agreed otherwise by the University in writing. However, nothing in the Regulations shall be considered to be a waiver of the moral rights of the students.

8.13 Material such as laboratory notebooks, computer coding and studio maquettes produced as a necessary part of the project remain the property of the University and must be passed to the First Supervisor at the end of the examination procedures and before graduation. If appropriate, the supervisor may authorise, on behalf of the University, the production of copies of such material for the student's subsequent use.

8.14 Unless approval for restriction is given, the thesis will be lodged electronically with the De Montfort University Library. Through the British Library Electronic Theses On-line System (EThOS) information is automatically passed onto the British Library.

8.15 On receipt and consideration of an application for First Project Review, the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel, shall seek to satisfy itself that:

8.15.1 a Development Needs Analysis has been satisfactorily completed and consideration has been given to research skills as well as professional development skills that will support the overall development of the candidate;

8.15.2 the area of study can be investigated to the depth required to obtain the degree which the student seeks;

8.15.3 it might reasonably be expected that the work can be completed within the designated time scale;

8.15.4 the necessary resources (e.g. library, computing, laboratory facilities, technical assistance) will be available;

8.15.5 any requested confidentiality will be considered;

8.15.6 there is provision for a supervisory team consisting of at least 2 members of academic staff, one of who shall be designated as the First Supervisor with overall responsibility for the student and that this can be maintained throughout the research period;

8.15.7 at least 2 members of the supervision team are demonstrably research active academics with relevant knowledge and skills to supervise;

8.15.8 the proposed working title does not include acronyms;

8.15.9 students registered for the award of PhD have been given a clear indication of the extent of progress expected by the time the student submits their Probation Review.

8.16 The Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel shall:

8.16.1 confirm First Project Review; or

8.16.2 confirm First Project Review on condition that certain requirements as requested by the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel are met. If conditions of First Project Review are not met within the specified deadline of 1 month, this may lead to closure of registration; or

8.16.3 dismiss the application, in which case the First Project Review of the student shall not be approved, and the student's registration shall end. If the decision to dismiss the application is on academic grounds, evidence of monitoring as detailed in Regulation 10.2.13, including evidence of due warnings to the student, is required.

9. Nomination and Appointment of Supervisors

9.1 When a student is admitted for a research degree and enters the probationary period, the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee) shall approve the nomination of a minimum of 2 supervisors. Supervisory arrangements are approved by the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel at First Project Review. Any future changes to supervisory arrangements must be submitted by the First Supervisor (or nominee) for approval by the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee).

9.2 The University will require the supervisory team to have a combined experience of supervising at least 2 research degree students to successful completion. The completions should be at the

level at which the student is registered.

9.3 Staff new to the University but experienced in supervising at least 1 student to completion are also required to complete the Self-Certification of Supervision form.

9.4 All decisions of the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel at First Project Review are sent to the student and the First Supervisor.

9.5 A person who is registered for a research degree is ineligible to act as a supervisor for another research degree student. This restriction does not apply to staff registered for PhD by Published Works, who can be third supervisor for another research degree student.

9.6 Only persons who are members of academic staff of the University are eligible for appointment as First Supervisor. The First Supervisor will always be a DMU employee. The definition of a DMU employee is anyone who has a contract of employment which can be full or part-time, permanent or fixed-term. We would not normally expect a part-time hourly paid lecturer to perform supervisory duties. Those with Honorary Contracts are not employees.

9.7 The Second Supervisor will also normally be a DMU employee. However, when there is a justification, we will consider engaging a Second Supervisor who is not an employee. In such an instance, an honorary contract will be requested by the First Supervisor, which will include the rationale for engagement. The First Supervisor will also be required to provide a copy of the CV of the proposed Second Supervisor. The appointment will need to be supported by the Associate Dean of Research and approved by the Faculty PVC and Dean.

9.8 An external Second Supervisor might be required as part of a doctoral training consortium arrangement where supervision is managed across educational or healthcare institutions. In these circumstances, the partnership will be considered on its individual merits and a suitable contractual arrangement agreed.

9.9 Emeritus Professors at DMU will normally be covered with an existing arrangement so they are unlikely to require an Honorary Contract.

9.10 A separate advisor can be involved to provide ad hoc input to a project, providing expertise or input is not available from the rest of the supervisory team, for example, input from industry or knowledge of esoteric/specialist information. However, an advisor is not expected to provide regular general supervisory support or engage with DMU administration systems or processes, such as the PGR records management system.

9.11 A member of academic staff should normally be supervisor to no more than 7 FTEs and 12 students (head count) for a research degree at any one time. In exceptional circumstances a supervisor may submit a request to supervise up to 10 FTEs and 15 students. The application can be made with the approval of the Dean of Faculty for an individual to take on an additional supervisory load for a specified period.

9.12 The calculation for FTEs is based on student mode of study and supervisory roleas follows: FT First Supervision = 1 FTE, PT First Supervision = 0.5 FTE, FT Second Supervision = 0.5 FTE, PT Second Supervision = 0.25 FTE.

9.13 All nominated supervisors must have attended the Research Supervision Recognition Programme.

10. Responsibilities of Supervisors and of Students

10.1 The principal responsibilities of the Supervisors are:

10.1.1 to read and comply with the current version of the Research Degree and Higher Doctorate Regulations and such University documents as are relevant to the work including those dealing with ethics, intellectual property rights and health and safety. They must ensure that the student is aware of regulations which affect their conduct and/or work;

10.1.2 to ensure that a student on initial registration, i.e. during the probationary period, is introduced to staff and the local environment; local facilities, both technical and social; other University facilities such as the library, the Student's Union and the Health Centre, and is made aware of safety procedures and fire evacuation routes;

10.1.3 to give assistance to students in defining and planning the research topic and the associated timetable. Be part of the probationary supervisory team which undertakes the Development Needs Analysis with the student, within 4 months of registration for full-time probationary students and 8 months for a part-time probationary student. This will help determine the content of the individual student's training programme;

10.1.4 to reinforce advice and guidance on key aspects of the PhD process in the Researcher Development Programme, including: research design and planning; research methods, literature searches, sources and referencing; the presentation of academic work; ethical and legal matters including plagiarism and intellectual property rights;

10.1.5 to ensure that the student attends and fulfils any requirements in terms of training mandated by the Faculty;

10.1.6 to assist students in the preparation of First Project Review and Probation Review;

10.1.7 to maintain regular contact through formal, scheduled meetings held with students which should be set at the start of each academic year. The whole supervision team should meet with the student at least once a quarter;

10.1.8 to attend the University supervisor-training course leading to the Research Supervision Recognition Programme. Details of this can be gained from the Doctoral College. It is expected that all research supervisors in the University will have attended the course. No supervision team will be approved unless at least one member has successfully completed the course.

Distinct Responsibilities of the First Supervisor

10.2 The distinct responsibilities of the First Supervisor include:

10.2.1 prior to admission, to liaise with the Faculty staff member responsible for the commitment of funds to research projects to ensure that appropriate funding is available for the research project;

10.2.2 to make certain that all the necessary documentation and procedures concerning the approval of successive stages of the student's progress from registration to the final degree are dealt with. The First Supervisor must confirm that all documentation is accurate and complete and ensure that it is submitted to the Doctoral College in good time for onward processing;

10.2.3 to liaise with the student to ensure that the Doctoral College is kept informed of any changes to a student's registration details;

10.2.4 to take overall responsibility for providing academic leadership for the student's programme of research work, via constructive criticism, at the appropriate stages in the work, with an overall objective of attempting to instil progressively greater independence in the student as the project progresses. The First Supervisor must ensure that any weaknesses are drawn to the student's attention in a timely manner and that the student is given the opportunity to take remedial action with guidance (see regulation 10.2.13);

10.2.5 to keep any external sponsors of a research student informed of the progress made by the student on their project on a regular basis as requested by the sponsor or the Doctoral College;

10.2.6 to take an active role in introducing the student not only to fellow workers and staff in the institution but also to external researchers in the field and to the appropriate academic bodies and societies;

10.2.7 to ensure the continuity of supervision for their students. This will include co-ordinating the contributions to the supervision by Second Supervisors and advisors. To make alternative arrangements if any member of the supervisory team is unavailable for a significant period of time;

10.2.8 to maintain regular, and appropriately frequent contact, with the student. This should be both by an established schedule of formal meetings and via ad hoc and informal interactions. The scheduled meetings must be largely free of interruptions and of sufficient duration to allow for detailed discussion of the student's work. Their frequency should be tailored to suit the current stage of the research programme but normally be once per month for full-time students, and once every 2 months, for part-time students;

10.2.9 to ensure an Annual Review Panel is held to monitor the progress of the student on their research and to monitor development needs each year following the

Probation Review in the first year (for full-time students, and 2 years for part-time). This will be organised by the First Supervisor (or nominee).

10.2.10 to seek independent advice, as appropriate, from the Faculty Head of Research Students, or equivalent role, or the APVC Research on supervisory issues. This is likely to be especially relevant where the supervisor has concerns about a student's ability or application to the research programme;

10.2.11 to ensure the student makes notes of scheduled formal meetings via the 'Progress Report' form. This process must be completed via the PGR records management system. These will contribute to monitoring and assessing a student's progress in relation to the agreed schedule of work. It is also expected that Second Supervisors would contribute to these scheduled meetings on a regular basis to ensure that Second Supervisors provide support as appropriate, and it is the responsibility of the First Supervisor to ensure the inclusion of the Second Supervisor throughout the process. A joint meeting of the whole supervision team must take place at least once a quarter;

10.2.12 to ensure that the student is aware of the need to exercise probity in the conduct of research, and of the implications of research misconduct;

10.2.13 to make the student aware of any unsatisfactory work or progress and as appropriate to suggest such action as might be taken on a remedial basis;

10.2.14 to ensure the participation of their students in internal research seminars. This will include the presentation to research colleagues of their current research findings;

10.2.15 to encourage students to submit papers for publication when appropriate parts of the research are completed;

10.2.16 to keep the student informed of the necessary completion dates of various stages of their work, particularly the Probation Review and Annual Reviews thereafter, in order to ensure timely completion;

10.2.17 to provide relevant advice for students whose first language is not English. This should include arranging a referral to appropriate support services, so that the student can continue to improve their spoken English throughout the programme in order to write and defend the thesis effectively in English;

10.2.18 to comment on the material in the final draft of the thesis or practice-based evidence within 2 months of submission. Guidance on preparation for the oral examination must be given and the desirability of a practice examination discussed with the student;

10.3 Whilst it is the Doctoral College that coordinates the examination process, the First Supervisor must co-ordinate the below elements of the examination process (with delegation to the Second Supervisor where necessary):

10.3.1 complete the “Exam Arrangements” form on the PGR records management system at least three months prior to the student entering the Thesis Pending Period and to submit the form to the Doctoral College for approval by the relevant Faculty Head of Research Students (or equivalent role) and the APVC Research;

10.3.2 enable the student to comment on the choice of examiners;

10.3.3 inform the examination team of their nomination;

10.3.4 normally, if the student requests, to hold a mock viva.

10.4 The distinct responsibilities of the Second Supervisor include:

10.4.1 to read and comply with the current version of the Research Degree and Higher Doctorate Regulations and such University documents as are relevant to the work including those dealing with ethics, intellectual property rights and health and safety. They must ensure that the student is aware of regulations which affect their conduct and/or work;

10.4.2 To meet with the supervisees regularly (at least once a quarter, together with the First Supervisor);

10.4.3 To support students in defining and planning their research and the associated timetable. To be part of the probationary supervisory team which undertakes the Development Needs Analysis with the student, within 4 months of registration for full-time probationary students and 8 months for a part-time probationary student. This will help determine the content of the individual student’s training programme;

10.4.4 To provide constructive oral and written feedback on submitted drafts and chapters, and supporting supervision with complementary expertise (as required);

10.4.5 To contribute to progress reporting on the research student record management system;

10.4.6 To support all milestone activities with First Supervisor (e.g., Probation Review and Annual Reviews);

10.4.7 To take over as First Supervisor (in absence or departure of First Supervisor).

Principal Responsibilities of the Student

10.5 The principal responsibilities of the student are:

10.5.1 to familiarise themselves with the current version of the Research Degree and Higher Doctorate Regulations and such University documents as are relevant to their work including those dealing with ethics, intellectual property rights and

health and safety. Students must comply with these documents;

10.5.2 as soon as possible after registration, to discuss and agree with their First and Second Supervisors (who are allocated to the student by the Dean of Faculty or nominee, subject to approval by the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel, on First Project Review) the following aspects of their work:

10.5.2.1 the general area and specific topic or focus of the proposed work and its aims and objectives;

10.5.2.2 the schedule of work and associated broad timetable, taking into account holidays and any proposed times of absence from the institution. In particular paying attention to the timing of the Probation Review in line with Regulation 11;

10.5.2.3 the methodology to be employed for the work recognising the need for this to be kept under review as the project proceeds;

10.5.2.4 completion of the Development Needs Analysis/Statement as part of the First Project Review, completing induction and ethics and integrity training, and any other training mandated by the supervisor/Faculty;

10.5.2.5 the broad programme of attendance required at internal seminars as well as external conferences, which are relevant to the area of work;

10.5.2.6 the constitution of the supervisory team for the research degree programme, identifying the First Supervisor, Second Supervisor(s) and any advisors;

10.5.2.7 the completion of the First Project Review form on the PGR records management system within the time stipulated in the regulations.

10.5.3 to inform the Doctoral College of any alterations or amendments to the registration or First Project Review details in consultation with the First Supervisor;

10.5.4 to ensure that the institution through the Doctoral College and First Supervisor is able to make contact when the student is not on campus;

10.5.5 to take ultimate responsibility for their research activity and candidacy for the degree and to appreciate that this will require a commitment to give sufficient time and effort to the research programme until it is completed. The student must maintain the progress of the work in accordance with the stages agreed with supervisors, including, in particular, the presentation of written material, as required, in sufficient time to allow for comments and discussion before proceeding to the next stage. This will include providing reports on their work as required. Failure to take ultimate responsibility and engage with their studies will trigger the Doctoral College Non-Engagement Procedure which may result in the closure of registration.

10.5.6 to work to the highest professional and ethical standards, seeking guidance from ethical codes if appropriate via the First Supervisor (Regulation 10.2.12);

10.5.7 to have regular interactions with the supervisors (especially with the First Supervisor) throughout the programme of work, having established at the outset a schedule of formal meetings. The frequency of these should be in accordance with the stipulated University minimum values (normally at least once per month for full-time students and at least once every 2 months for part-time students). They should heed the advice on any matters which arise from such meetings and accept the importance of being frank and honest about perceived difficulties as and when they occur. One of the objectives of such meetings is to prevent more serious problems from arising later in the research programme. Students must therefore take the initiative in raising problems or difficulties, however elementary they seem;

10.5.8 to also engage with the supervisor on ad hoc and informal discussions as the need arises;

10.5.9 to maintain detailed, full records of their academic progress via the regular submission of 'Progress Reports'. It is a requirement that full-time students submit such reports monthly and part-time students at least every other month. This process must be completed via the PGR records management system. Supervisors will require these records as part of their monitoring of the student's progress. The Doctoral College, UKVI and/or any funding body can require to see such records;

10.5.10 to continue to submit progress reports at all times until the submission of their thesis and when in the post-viva corrections stage. The Doctoral College monitors the submission of regular progress reports. Any full-time student who has not submitted a progress report for 3 consecutive months and any part-time student who has not submitted a progress report for 5 consecutive months will be deemed non-compliant and persistent non-compliance of progress report submission may lead to the closure of registration;

10.5.11 to undertake a minimum of at least 35 hours of study per week throughout the year (pro rata for part-time students). Students are normally not expected to take more than 8 weeks' leave each year (including statutory holidays and the period when the University is closed over Christmas & New Year). Students are expected to schedule leave so that it does not conflict with your research. All leave should be notified to a member of the supervisory team;

10.5.12 to complete the Probation Review at the appropriate time ensuring documentation on the PGR records management system is prepared in accordance with the regulations and in consultation with the First Supervisor;

10.5.13 to decide the time for the submission of the thesis for examination in consultation with the First Supervisor within the time stipulated by the regulations;

10.5.14 to pass to the First Supervisor by the end of the examination procedures and before graduation, material such as laboratory notebooks, computer codingand studio maquettes produced as a necessary part of the project, which remain the property of the institution. If appropriate, the supervisor may authorise, on behalf of the University, the production of copies of such material for the student's subsequent use.

Progress Meetings Between Research Students and Supervisors

10.6 Research students and their supervisors must discuss their work regularly as an essential part of the teaching and learning contract between the student and the University as per regulation 5.3, with meetings and progress recorded at least once a month for full-time students, and at least once every 2 months for part-time students;

10.7 Research supervisors must be able to show evidence that not only have regular progress meetings taken place, but also that the main points of discussion have identified the present stage of a student's research programme and advice has been given upon how to proceed.

10.8 Progress reports are still required when students are in the Thesis Pending Period of their research and up to submission of their thesis and when in the post-viva corrections stage. The Doctoral College monitors the submission of regular progress reports. Persistent non-compliance of progress report submission may lead to the closure of registration.

10.9 The progress report form identifies the important parameters for such discussion. Such formal discussions should occur normally at intervals no longer than 1 month for full-time research students and normally no longer than 2 months for part-time students.

10.10 A progress report must be completed by the student and signed off by a member of the supervisory team. The supervisor has an opportunity to amend/update the record. This process must be completed via the PGR records management system.

10.11 The Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role will review the progress of the research students and check that regular discussion between supervisors and their students have been taking place.

11. The Probation Review

11.1 All doctoral students registered on or after 1st October 2019 shall submit a Probation Review between 9 and 12 months of full-time registration or 18 and 24 months of part-time registration. These deadlines are calculated from the original registration date.

11.2 It is imperative that the 12-month full-time or 24-month part-time deadline is adhered to. Failure to do so will result in the closure of registration. Students may exceptionally apply for an extension to the Doctoral College in advance of the deadline. Extensions will be granted only (by a panel chaired by the APVC Research) for reasons of health, bereavement or a prolonged absence of the supervisory team.

11.3 DBA students are to complete their Probation Review between 12-24 months.

11.4 The purpose of the Probation Review is:

11.4.1 To assess the capability of the student to conduct research, including indication of sufficient progress to date;

11.4.2 To assess the viability/feasibility of the proposed research plan;

11.4.3 To recommend any further training required.

11.5 The Probation Review paperwork will include:

11.5.1 The student's Probation Review report of 5,000 to 10,000 words (or practice based equivalent) (PhD and DBA). Requirements for other routes vary as outlined in Section 12;

11.5.2 An independent report on the progress and capability of the student, identifying any areas of concern, from the supervisory team. At least 1 of whom must be in attendance at the review meeting;

11.5.3 A work plan, with key milestones, on how the student proposes to complete their degree on time;

11.5.4 A record of training completed (including any mandatory requirements identified by the Faculty or the supervisory team).

11.6 Students and supervisors are required to complete the Probation Review Form on the PGR records management system. To support the application, students must provide a Probation Review Report of between 5,000 and 10,000 words. The report should describe the work done and outcomes and conclusions reached. On the form, the student must provide a summary of the progress made in the research, which is an abstract of the Probation Review, of no more than 500 words. In addition to the abstract, the student will also need to provide an outline showing how the work already completed will be extended to meet the requirements of the PhD. This will include a work plan with key milestones, which might be supported with Gantt charts.

11.7 The Probation Review report submitted by the student should include:

11.7.1 a brief review and discussion of the work already undertaken including a review of relevant sources and methodologies as well as a plan of further work; and

11.7.2 an annotated list of chapter headings, indicating the overall thesis structure; a provisional timetable for the completion of each draft chapter; one or two draft chapters, or, in the case an exhibition, performance or other creative work, a presentation of work, recorded or live; a statement outlining the rationale, methodology and theoretical perspectives of the thesis, including details of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.

11.8 Students will also be required to submit their Probation Review Report via Turnitin.

11.9 Students registered for a research degree by Exhibition, Performance, Creative Writing or similar work (Regulation 19) should also present examples of the work completed to support the Probation Review, which in this case will be within the range of 3,000 - 5,000 words. The form in which the work is presented must be appropriate to the nature of the work, such as an exhibition or a performance. Students must also be prepared to discuss the work presented with the Internal Assessor(s).

11.10 As part of the Probation Review, students registered for the PhD by Concurrent Publication shall also present an outline of the projected focus, research aims and methods relevant to each paper planned for the submission as an indication of the way the papers will reflect to the proposed stages of the research. This should normally constitute no more than 2,000 words within the overall word count. This element of the Probation Review report should satisfy the Internal Assessor of the coherence of the student's research trajectory.

11.11 The Probation Review process requires supervisors to report on 2 aspects of the research programme. First, they need to comment on the student's progress on the programme of research as approved at First Project Review, which refers not only to the research project itself but also to the programme of related studies, including the training programme. Secondly, they need to report on the quality and suitability of the plan for the future work with regard to its potential for achieving PhD level.

11.12 The supervision team will nominate one Internal Assessor. The Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee) will approve the proposed appointment**.** The Doctoral College will dispatch all documentation to the assessor. The Institute of Head of Research Students or equivalent will act as Chair for the Probation Review to ensure due process is followed, and there is consistency in review processes across the institute/school.

11.13 The assessor should be able to assess the quality of the specific content of the Probation Review and give guidance on the overall suitability of the project in terms of achieving research degree standards.

11.14 As part of the assessment, the assessor will be responsible for checking the Turnitin Similarity Report for the Probation Review, providing feedback and raising concerns as required. Where the student is making a partial practice-based submission (as opposed to a fully written report), the assessor should make sure the submission demonstrates good academic practice.

11.15 A member of staff registered for a research degree cannot be nominated to be the internal assessor for a Probation Review.

11.16 Where, exceptionally, a Probation Review has been referred for revision, it is expected that the student, with guidance from the supervisor, will spend an intensive period putting together the revised document so that re-submission can take place within 6 months**.**

11.17 The Probation Review Panel can make the following recommendations:

11.17.1 The research student has successfully completed probation for the degree for which they are registered and should be permitted to continue as a registered student;

11.17.2 The student has not successfully completed probation and will be required to remain on probation for a period of no more than 6 months and complete a further and final Probation Review at the end of that period (only to be used in exceptional circumstances);

11.17.3 The student has not successfully completed probation for the degree for which they are registered and should be permitted to register for a lower award (only in the case of research students registered for the degree of PhD or equivalent);

11.17.4 The student has not successfully completed probation and should have their registration closed.

11.18 Students submitting their Probation Review will be required to undergo a formal interview with the assessor. The student will be informed of the arrangements for the interview by the supervisor. Where a Probation Review has been referred for re-submission, a second interview with the assessor is at their discretion.

11.19 Before approving the Probation Review to confirm doctoral status, the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel must be satisfied that the student has made sufficient progress and that the proposed programme provides a suitable basis for work at doctoral standard which the student is capable of pursuing to completion. All students will be required to undertake an oral assessment as part of the Probation Review process.

11.20 In the case of a student registered for PhD by Concurrent Publication, a further possible outcome is the requirement that the student revert to the conventional dissertation route. If the Probation Review is declined by the Faculty Review Panel this will result in the registration reverting to that of Master of Philosophy. In that case, a student registered to complete the PhD by Concurrent Publication will be required to submit a conventional MPhil thesis.

11.21 Ethical Review shall be an obligatory part of the Probation Review process for all research degree students.

11.22 All research undertaken towards the completion of a research degree at De Montfort University should be conducted:

11.22.1 within the law;

11.22.2 with academic integrity;

11.22.3 in accord with a relevant code of research ethics.

11.23 Research students and their supervisor must seek ethical or statutory approval for research involving human or animal subjects, lasers, biological and/or radiological hazards prior to commencement of work that falls within such approvals.

11.24 The responsibilities of students are detailed below:

11.24.1 research degree students have personal responsibility for the maintenance of high standards of ethics in the conduct of their research;

11.24.2 research degree students must familiarize themselves with a relevant code of research ethics and conduct their enquiry in accord with the recommendations and requirements of that code;

11.24.3 where research is given approval by a relevant Research Ethics Committee of De Montfort University, this does not absolve the student from personal responsibility with regard to the continued observance of high standards of research ethics throughout the duration of the research;

11.24.4 codes of ethics do not provide researchers with rules that cover all circumstances. Sometimes decisions need to be made that involve matters of academic, professional and moral judgement. In such circumstances, there needs to be a conscious consideration of the issues and explicit justification for the decisions taken;

11.24.5 responsibilities of the University with regard to the ethical approval of research undertaken as part of a research degree are specified in Section 6 of the University's Research Degrees Regulations.

Nomination of Internal Assessor and Guidelines

11.25 In putting forward an application for Probation Review, the supervisor will be asked to nominate one member of university staff as a potential Internal Assessor. The supervisor shall obtain the consent of the Internal Assessor prior to their possible appointment and in advance of submission of the Probation Review Form. The Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee) approves the nomination for appointment as the Internal Assessor.

11.26 The Probation Review should include a brief review and discussion of the work already undertaken and a statement of the intended further work, including details of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.

11.27 In order to assess the suitability of a Probation Review, Internal Assessor should take note that:

11.27.1 the MPhil is awarded for a critical investigation and evaluation of an approved topic and a demonstration of an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field;

11.27.2 the PhD is awarded for a critical investigation and evaluation of an approved topic which results in an independent and original contribution to knowledge and an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field;

11.28 After scrutinising the Probation Review and conducting the formal interview with the student, the Internal Assessor submits a report to recommend or not recommend that the Probation Review be approved by the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee). This approval also includes a moderation of the report submitted by the Internal Assessor to ensure there is consistency in review processes across the institute/school.

12. Lengths of Registration and Maximum Periods of Time Before Submission

12.1 The minimum and maximum periods of registration, shown both in months and calendar years, are normally as follows:

	Minimum	Maximum
MPhil		
Full-time	12 months (1 year)	24 months (2 years)
Part-time	24 months (2 years)	48 months (4 years)
PhD		
Full-time	36 months (3 years)	48 months (4 years)
Part-time	48 months (4 years)	72 months (6 years)
PhD by Concurrent Publication		
Full-time	36 months (3 years)	48 months (4 years)
Part-time	48 months (4 years)	72 months (6 years)
PhD by Published Works		
Part-time	12 months (1 year)	24 months (2 years)
PhD through Extended Professional Practice		
Full-time	12 months (1 year)	24 months (2 years)
Part-time	24 months (2 years)	48 months (4 years)
MA/MSc by Research		
Full-time	12 months (1 year)	15 months (1 ¼ years)
Part-time	24 months (2 years)	30 months (2 ½ years)
DBA		
Full-time	36 months (3 years)	48 months (4 years)
Part-time	48 months (4 years)	72 months (6 years)

12.2 Extensions beyond the maximum period are solely at the discretion of the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee) and APVC Research. Application for an extension must be made to the Panel, on the PGR records management system and with the support of the student's First Supervisor, before the approved period of registration has expired.

12.3 Approved interruptions will be taken into account when a student submits an Extension Form on the PGR records management system.

12.4 Submissions after the approved period of registration are not permitted, unless with the approval of the Faculty Head of Research Students, or equivalent role, on exceptional grounds.

13. Extension of Period of Registration

13.1 Where a student may need to go beyond their maximum registration period, normally they can apply once for a period of registration to be extended to take account of the changed circumstances. The maximum period of time for which an extension can be considered is 12 months. Students should note that they will continue to be liable for fees during an extension period.

13.2 When submitting an Extension Form on the PGR records management system, the student must produce a thesis outline agreed with the supervisor and can present such evidence to represent the case. An interview will be held, either face-to-face, or over the telephone by the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role or nominee and they will forward the recommendation to the APVC Research for approval.

13.3 The internal assessor will assess the application on the following criteria:

13.3.1 Substantial progress already made with respect to an agreed thesis outline;

13.3.2 Whether the work is still timely;

13.3.3 Availability of time and resources to complete the work;

13.3.4 Whether there has been a significant disruption of studies sufficient to warrant the extension requested

13.3.5 The availability of supporting written evidence which where possible will need to be provided, for example:

13.3.5.1 Accidents (accompanied by a medical certificate)
13.3.5.2 Death of a close relative (accompanied by a death certificate).
13.3.5.3 Ill health (of the student, accompanied by a medical note).
13.3.5.4 Serious ill health of a close relative (accompanied by a medical certificate, especially where the student has to assume the role of carer).
13.3.5.5 Unexpected events e.g. theft (accompanied by a police report), equipment not being delivered or failing equipment.
13.3.5.6 Problems beyond the control of the student (e.g. problems originating in the school, such as the supervisor leaving the University).

13.4 Examples which are unlikely to lead to agreement on extension:

13.4.1 Where a student has been registered on a full-time basis and is making a request on the basis of pressures of work in connection with employment.

13.4.2 Where the request is based on the grounds that the student has got married or wants a honeymoon period. This should normally be taken from the student's annual leave entitlement.

13.4.3 Where there is no clear relationship between the amount of extra time being requested and the problem being encountered by the student.

14. Interruption of Registration

14.1 Where a student is prevented from carrying out all aspects of the research, by a good cause, they may apply for their registration to be interrupted. Students can normally apply for up to 2 periods of interruption to their registration. Short interruptions, for example short breaks due to illness, will not warrant the granting of an interruption.

14.2 Applications must be made to the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee), using the appropriate form on the PGR records management system and with the authority of the First Supervisor (or nominee). Interruptions of study are normally granted for not less than 6 months and no more than 1 year. The Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role, or nominee, interviews the student, if necessary, and forwards a recommendation to the APVC Research for approval.

14.3 The application will be assessed based on whether there is likely to be a significant disruption of studies sufficient to warrant the interruption requested.

14.4 The availability of supporting written evidence which where possible will need to be provided, for example for:

14.4.1 Accidents (accompanied by a medical certificate);

14.4.2 Death of a close relative (accompanied by a death certificate);

14.4.3 Ill health (of the student, accompanied by a medical note);

14.4.4 Serious ill health of a close relative (accompanied by a medical certificate, especially where the student has to assume the role of carer);

14.4.5 Unexpected events e.g. theft (accompanied by a police report), equipment not being delivered or failing equipment;

14.4.6 Parental leave (the student should make a request before the leave is due to begin);

14.4.7 Problems beyond the control of the student (e.g. problems originating in the school, such as the supervisor leaving the University).

14.5 The Panel will not consider retrospective interruptions. Exceptionally, a retrospective interruption may be granted by the APVC Research.

14.6 Fees are not payable during an interruption of registration because it is assumed that

resources, such as Library study and/or lending access and access to the supervision team are not being used. If supervision continues, then the student status reverts to active fee paying.

14.7 If interruption of registration is approved, the Doctoral College will notify relevant departments within the University to ensure that your registration is also interrupted for the same period. An extension of an equal duration to the interruption will be added to the student timeline. If an equal extension is not required, the relevant question on the interruption form should indicate this. On return to the University, the Doctoral College needs to be informed that the student is resuming studies. It is not necessary to apply for registration for the research degree to be restored but it is necessary for the student to complete the re-registration procedure with the Doctoral College (where relevant).

14.8 UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) guidelines shall be adhered to when a scholarship student interrupts due to Maternity, Paternity or Adoption leave.

15. Change in Approved Mode of Study

15.1 When the research student registers for a research degree, approval is given for the programme of research to be pursued either full-time or part-time. If, through a change of circumstances, such as a change in employment or in financial position, a student wishes to change their mode of study from full-time to part-time, or vice versa, the student must apply to the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee) for approval. A student can normally apply for up to 2 changes in mode during their registration. A change in mode of study affects the date by which the student would be expected to complete their programme of research. Guidance should be sought from the Doctoral College on the revision of expected dates of completion.

15.2 Overseas students who are studying full-time in the UK would have to prove that their visa status allows a change to part-time study.

15.3 Students will need to complete the Change in Mode Request form on the PGR records management system, clearly stating the change they wish to make, and indicating, in consultation with the Doctoral College, the date on which the change comes into effect. Students also need to indicate the main reason for wishing to change their mode of study, and their application must be supported by their supervisors to indicate that they recommend the proposed change.

15.4 Should the change be approved, the Doctoral College will ensure that relevant departments within the University are informed so that adjustment can be made to fees, where relevant.

15.5 No change of mode shall be considered following the commencement of the Thesis Pending Period. This is to ensure that University statistics accurately reflect the mode under which the work was carried out. There is no negative implication for the student with respect to fees.

16. Change in Approved Arrangements for Supervision

16.1 The supervision team approved by the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel at

First Project Review is an integral part of the research programme. If there is a change in circumstances, such as one of the supervisors leaving the employment of the University or a shift in research direction which requires different or additional subject expertise, it may be necessary to seek approval for a change in supervisors. It is important to note that, in order to avoid potential difficulties, approval for any change in supervisors needs to be sought as soon as possible. Any proposals for a change in the supervisory team can only be made with the agreement of the student, and is the responsibility of the First Supervisor (or nominee).

16.2 The First Supervisor (or nominee) will need to complete the Change in Supervision Request form on the PGR records management system. The reason for the change needs to be described and details of the proposed supervisory team given. If a new supervisor is proposed who has not been approved previously by the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel as a supervisor, the supervisor's Curriculum Vitae must be submitted with the application. The student must confirm to indicate agreement with the proposed change.

17. Continuation and Closure of Registration

17.1 Continued registration shall be subject to annual monitoring (see Regulation 20).

17.2 If a supervisor considers that a research student's academic performance or progress is unsatisfactory, the concerns should be specified in writing to the student normally using the appropriate 'Progress Report' form.

17.3 A student who is notified of unsatisfactory academic performance or progress has the right to seek advice from the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role. Supervision of the research should continue following the notification.

17.4 If a supervisor considers that a student's performance or progress continues to be unsatisfactory, after communication with the student action may be taken to close the registration. However, the action to close registration may only be taken after a period of time that allows the student to remedy the specified problems. In the case of full-time students, any action to terminate registration must be taken no sooner than 2 months and no later than 6 months following the formal notification of unsatisfactory performance or progress.

17.5 If closure is chosen as the action to be taken, the final decision to close will be taken by the APVC Research.

17.6 If the registration of a student is closed under this provision, the Doctoral College will notify the student in writing of the closure of registration, specifying the date from which this takes effect. The formal regulations concerning what to do if a student wishes to appeal against a decision to close registration are contained in Chapter Eight of the General Regulations and Procedures Affecting Students, available on the University's Academic Support Office web pages. A Student Appeal form must be submitted to the Student Appeals and Conduct Officer within 15 University working days of the date of the notification from the Doctoral College.

18. Notification of Withdrawal of Registration

18.1 A student may find that, for a variety of reasons, such as ill-health, change of employment or financial problems, they are not able to continue with their programme and that it is necessary to seek formally to withdraw registration. In exceptional cases, supervisors may consider it advisable to seek the closure of a student's registration.

18.2 A student can request withdrawal from the programme at any time. The Panel will not consider retrospective withdrawals.

18.3 The Withdrawal Request form will need to be completed on the PGR records management system. In most cases, the form is completed by the student, indicating, from the list of possibilities provided on the form, the main reason for wishing to withdraw. If the student is unavailable to complete the form, the First Supervisor may do so, giving the reasons for the student's unavailability.

18.4 The student will be subject to an exit interview which will normally be carried out by the First Supervisor. The Doctoral College will ensure that relevant departments within the University are informed so that an adjustment can be made to the fees, where relevant.

18.5 Pending formal withdrawal from the programme, the student will continue to be charged fees.

18.6 A withdrawal application will not be accepted in the instance where a student is suspected of committing an Academic Offence. In such circumstances the University shall proceed as outlined in Chapter 4 of the General Student Regulations.

19. Variations from the Standard Research Programme

19.1 The following variations from the standard research programme are permissible provided that the approval of the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel is obtained at First Project Review.

Exhibition, Performance, Creative Writing or Similar Work

19.2 A student may undertake a programme of research in which the student's exhibition, performance, creative writing or other similar work, forms as a point of origin or reference, a significant part of the intellectual enquiry. Such work may be in any field but must have been undertaken as part of the registered research programme. In such cases, the presentation or submission of work relating to exhibition, performance or other creative writing or similar work must be supported by documentation in the form of a thesis which sets the work in its relevant theoretical, historical, critical and/or design context. The thesis must itself conform to the usual scholarly requirements and be of the correct length as defined in Regulation 22.5.

19.3 The final electronic copy of the submission must be accompanied by some permanent record (for instance, video, photographic record, musical score, choreographic notation, diagrammatic representation) of the exhibition, performance or other creative work where

practicable, and this shall be submitted at the same time and be included within the electronic version of the thesis.

Concurrent Publication

19.4 In the case of PhD by Concurrent Publication the following criteria apply:

19.4.1 The intention to present a thesis via this route will be confirmed at the time of the First Project Review. The Faculty Review Panel may decline thesis submission via this route and in such cases the student will be required to complete the thesis through the conventional route. Subsequent alteration to the intended submission route must be made with the permission of the supervisors, Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role and the APVC Research. Requests to revert to a conventional dissertation submission route will not normally be considered after 2 years of full-time or 4 years of part-time study have elapsed. A request to move from a conventional PhD dissertation to PhD by Concurrent Publication will be similarly considered.

19.4.2 Students will follow a supervised programme of research. When pursuing this route, the student will write up the results of their research during the period of registration, resulting in a body of no fewer than three papers accepted by, or in a format suitable for submission to, an appropriate journal or equivalent academic publication. In this route it is expected that the papers represent an interconnected approach to the study's core research question(s). If the outcome of Probation Review is that the student will transfer to MPhil, the conventional dissertation route should be followed.

19.4.3 The papers comprising the thesis must be presented in the form in which they were published or, if not yet published, the final form to be submitted for publication. It is understood that the formatting conventions of specific journals will be retained in papers included in the thesis. A single formatting style is not required for the papers that comprise the thesis.

19.4.4 The student must be the person primarily responsible for producing the first draft of all the papers included in the thesis, and must be responsible for at least 75% of the final content of each paper included. The student is therefore considered the 'lead' author in terms of contribution (though not necessarily in terms of the order in which names appear on the paper).

19.4.5 In the case of co-authored papers, the student must include a statement clearly identifying those elements of the work in which they were not directly involved. The statement should be supported by the supervisors' written confirmation.

19.4.6 For each paper included in the thesis, all co-authors must sign a statement confirming that the student was responsible for at least 75% of the content and was primarily responsible for the first draft of each paper. The statement(s) shall be included in the thesis. Without the inclusion of this statement in the submitted thesis, the work shall not be eligible for examination. Students and supervisors

should therefore be aware of this requirement at every stage in the research process and take steps to ensure that the requirement is met in a timely fashion.

19.4.7 Submissions should demonstrate the requirements for the award of PhD, as set out in section 1.4. In addition to the papers presented in published or publishable form, the student will include a supporting critical and theoretical narrative of no more than 20,000 words articulating the originality, coherence and methodological validity of the work, which should include:

19.4.7.1 A description of the overall aims of the study and a critically focused background to the work in the context of the relevant literature;

19.4.7.2 A description of the research method(s) employed;

19.4.7.3 Discussion of the overall findings in relation to the original contribution(s) to knowledge made by the work and a conclusion. Students and supervisors should understand that, since the thesis comprises papers in a form suitable for journal publication with a separate critical and theoretical narrative, submissions made by this route are distinct from those in which chapters may comprise material initially published as journal or conference papers subsequently reworked into a conventional thesis format.

19.4.8 The student must ensure that information only briefly described in the papers, such as methodology or experimental detail, is dealt with in full in the thesis by the inclusion of additional material in the critical and theoretical narrative.

19.4.9 Where a paper may be subject to a publisher's claim on copyright, the student must ensure that permission for its inclusion in the final thesis presentation is granted prior to entering a contract for publication (bearing in mind the eventual online availability of the thesis). Where such permission is obtained, a copy of the permission statement should be included with the thesis. If it has not been possible to obtain permission for the inclusion of a paper in a thesis following successful examination, an electronic version of the thesis with the relevant paper(s) redacted and replaced by a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) may be made available on the University's Institutional Repository.

19.4.10 The entire submission will be a continuous volume.

Submission of PhD by Published Works

19.5 A member of staff may be permitted by the Research Degrees Committee Faculty Review Panel, to present published work for examination, provided that they are able to fulfil the following:

19.5.1 demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the relevant literature;

19.5.2 demonstrate a sufficient original contribution to the literature;

19.5.3 demonstrate a sustained research effort in the work represented by the publications;

19.5.4 satisfy the conditions of Regulation 1.4 in that the submitted work should:

19.5.4.1 represent a substantial, continuous and coherent body of work on a particular theme; and

19.5.4.2 demonstrate critical investigation and evaluation of the topic of research; and

19.5.4.3 constitute an independent and original contribution to knowledge; and

19.5.4.4 demonstrate the student's ability to undertake further research without supervision.

19.5.5 the applicant is either a permanent member of staff or on a fixed term contract of at least 3 years duration and is either full-time or pro-rata normally of at least 0.5 full-time equivalent. The applicant must have been a member of staff for not less than 2 years at the time of registration;

19.5.6 a student registered for PhD by Published Works must complete their First Project Review within 6 months of their registration.

19.5.7 the student must provide a declaration at the time of First Project Review that none of the material to be submitted has been used previously as part of a submission for an academic award, whether successful or otherwise;

19.5.8 students registered for a PhD by Published Works are exempt from completing the Development Needs Analysis and all elements of the Researcher Development Programme but can attend any elements of this programme;

19.5.9 the student's submission for PhD by Published Works shall include the publications presented, which shall be:

19.5.9.1 material of a suitable quality to be acceptable by the University for REF submission; and

19.5.9.2 substantial and sufficient to demonstrate an advancement of knowledge.

19.5.10 the student's submission for PhD by Published Works shall also include exposition and analysis, of approximately 10,000 words, of the work contained in the publications. The exposition document is regarded as central in enabling the student to demonstrate achievement in relation to the following criteria:

19.5.10.1 it shall identify the main problems or issues under discussion; and

19.5.10.2 it shall indicate the direction and thematic consistency of the publication(s); and

19.5.10.3 it shall provide an authoritative critique of the work; and

19.5.10.4 it shall locate the work in the context of the relevant literature; and

19.5.10.5 describe and assess the original contribution represented by the publications submitted;

19.5.10.6 in the case of conjoint publications, detail the extent and scope of the student's contribution in relation to the other authors. In the case of conjoint work, the contribution of a student will be rigorously scrutinised, particularly in the oral examination;

19.5.10.7 indicate a sustained contribution in a coherent field of research;

19.5.10.8 the criteria for assessing a student in this situation are the same as for a student submitting a conventional thesis under the Research Degree Regulations.

Submission of PhD through Extended Professional Practice

19.6 This route is available to professionals or practitioners with substantial professional experience at a senior level and who have a demonstrable portfolio of achievements that have had considerable impact on their profession, on practice or on knowledge, which would, itself, be worthy of a doctoral degree (determined at the application phase). The award would be primarily concerned with the individual contextualising and critiquing their own contributions and deriving further learning from the knowledge outcomes they have achieved within their professional practice. The PhD award through this route offers the professional equivalent to a Practice-Based PhD, focussing on the student's quality of critique of outcomes which have emerged from their professional practice in a research context. The focus is situated within the professional working environment and places the student at the centre of the enquiry

19.7 The application should be based on an extended portfolio of evidence to show how the student has contributed new knowledge to their field, how this has been over and above that to be expected from routine employment at this level and how the student has made that contribution a personal contribution, given that many professionals will not work in isolation.

19.8 The application for First Project Review must set out the form of the student's intended submission and of the proposed methods of assessment.

19.9 The submission and examination of the thesis will be of a thesis which sets the work in its relevant theoretical, historical, cultural and critical context and contextualises and critiques their own contributions, deriving further learning from the knowledge outcomes they have achieved within their professional practice. The thesis must itself conform to the usual

scholarly requirements and be of the correct length as defined in Regulation 22.

19.10 For the award to be granted, conditions of Regulation 1.5 must be satisfied.

19.11 The final electronic copy of the submission must be accompanied by some permanent record (for instance, a USB) of the portfolio of evidence where practicable, this shall be submitted at the same time as the final thesis.

20. Monitoring of Research Student Progress and Feedback

20.1 Progress for research degree students (excluding MA/MSc by Research) is subject to Annual Review by a panel of at least three research active and relevant academics, including representation of the supervisory team and at least one member who is independent of the supervisory team. Feedback shall be part of this process. If a student requires an extension at the time that Annual Review is due then this shall form part of the discussion.

20.2 Full-time students registered for the award of PhD will not be required to have an Annual Review in year one, and part-time students will not be required to have an Annual Review panel meeting in year two. In both these cases the Probation Review process will replace the annual review.

20.3 The Annual Review shall also include consideration of:

20.3.1 the student's progress with the Researcher Development Programme, as informed by the initial Development Needs Analysis;

20.3.2 any necessary change in the Development Needs Analysis consequent on the progress of the project;

20.4 All students registered for a research degree programme shall be expected to pass the Annual Review stage. Students should be aware that failure in performance at the Annual Review could result in closure of their registration or the requirement for a PhD student to submit for MPhil.

20.5 The 'Progress Report' form outlined in 10.6 to 10.11 provide an additional means by which progress can be monitored and should be used to determine whether actions agreed by supervisor(s) and the student are satisfactorily carried out.

20.6 If a student feels that the project is not proceeding satisfactorily for reasons outside of their control, or that they do not have an effective working relationship with the supervisor(s), and may feel it is inappropriate or undesirable to wait for the Annual Review. In this case, the student is advised to contact the Doctoral College for guidance. It would normally be expected that the student discusses the matter with the First Supervisor (if possible). Failing this, the student should approach the relevant Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role. Should the matter still not be resolved, the student should report their concerns to the Chair of Research Degrees Committee to make a final decision.

20.7 Supervisors must inform the Doctoral College as soon as there are concerns about a student's engagement with their programme. Where engagement concerns are noted by or raised with the Doctoral College and the period of non-engagement is under 60 days, the Doctoral College will email the students to enquire if the student has challenges preventing them from engaging and signpost them to relevant support services and processes.

20.8 Where the Doctoral College is aware of or has been informed by the Supervisor, IHRS or FHRS that the student has failed to engage with their programme for more than 60 days, the Doctoral College will write to the student via email, copying in the First Supervisor and relevant FHRS, giving 14 days to respond and address any outstanding requirements. Non-engagement may include not attending the last 2 monthly progress meetings, failing to complete any of the reviews in line with programme expectations or failing to meet local deadlines set by the supervisory team.

20.9 Should the student not respond and agree an action plan with their supervisory team within 14 days, the Doctoral College will email the student (copying in the First Supervisor and respective FHRS) once again outlining the risks of not engaging, including closure of registration, with a closure date provided 7 working days from the date of the letter.

20.10 If the Doctoral College has not heard from the student and/or the supervisory team that progress has been made within a further 7 days, the Doctoral College will close the student's registration.

21. Submission of Thesis and Any Other Work

21.1 The thesis must be presented in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 22.

21.2 Students are required to submit an Intention to Submit form to the Doctoral College, 3 months before the planned submission date.

21.3 It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that the thesis and/or any other work is submitted to the Doctoral College within the maximum period permitted to the student under Regulation 12.1.

21.4 The thesis must be the result of the student's own work. The requirement does not preclude a student obtaining limited assistance with proof reading. When such help is obtained it must be with the prior approval of the supervisor who must be satisfied that the spirit of the 'own work' requirement is not breached.

21.5 If a student employed a professional proof-reader for their research thesis the following definition applies:

21.5.1 The role of a proof-reader of a thesis is to ensure that the meaning of the text is not misrepresented due to the quality and standard of the English used. A proof-reader must not:

21.5.1.1 change the text of the thesis to clarify or develop an argument;

21.5.1.2 reduce the length of the thesis;

21.5.1.3 assist with academic referencing;

21.5.1.4 correct factual information;

21.5.1.5 or translate the thesis into English.

21.5.2 A proof-reader may correct spelling, grammar and punctuation accuracy.

21.5.3 If a student obtains the assistance of a proof-reader for the thesis, a statement must be included in the thesis declaring editorial assistance was used.

21.6 Students must submit the examinable thesis in electronic format. If the examiners request hard copies, the Doctoral College will provide these.

21.7 The student must submit an electronic copy of the thesis for analysis using Turnitin according to the procedure defined by the Doctoral College.

21.8 The submission of the thesis shall be accompanied by the submission of the Student Declaration Form in the PGR records management system, which covers the originality of the work and its compliance with the requirements regarding registration. The form confirms that:

21.8.1 the work was solely conducted during the registration for the award with the University, under University supervision; *or* the nature and extent of any exceptions must be specified;

21.8.2 no material used in the thesis was used in any other submission; *or* indicate nature and extent of any material which forms part of the submission elsewhere;

21.8.3 the work re-presented in the submission was undertaken solely by the student, except as described under Regulation 2.12.

21.9 It is the right of the student to submit their thesis for examination against the advice of their supervisory team. The APVC Research will be notified when a student submits against the advice of their supervisory team.

21.10 The Doctoral College will send copies of the thesis and the Pre-Viva Form to the Examiners along with other relevant documentation. The First Supervisor will be informed when this has taken place.

21.11 No student shall attempt to contact examiners or potential examiners concerning the examination or concerning any matter which could affect the examination.

21.12 Post-Viva students and supervisors need to ensure independence from the Examiners. Students and supervisors wishing to communicate or seek points of clarity from the

examiners will need to do so via the Doctoral College.

21.13 After successful completion of all stages of the examination, an electronic copy of the final version of the thesis must be submitted to the Doctoral College in partial fulfilment of the conferment requirements and this shall adhere to all the requirements of Regulation 22.6.

21.14 A student must include in the submission the text of any published work produced as part of the programme of work, of which they are the author, provided that:

21.14.1 the work is relevant to the submission; and

21.14.2 the text contains details of the publication.

21.15 Reports on work relevant to the submission, which had been carried out before a student's registration for the degree, can be appended to the submission, appropriately annotated, if this is necessary to make the submission complete and understandable.

22. Presentation of Thesis

22.1 The presentation of a research degree thesis may be made by one of the following routes:

22.1.1 a conventional thesis, comprising individual chapters that are not in a previously published form;

22.1.2 papers of publishable standard accompanied by a critical and theoretical narrative, as further defined in Regulation 19.4 as PhD by Concurrent Publication;

22.1.3 a substantial body of original creative work, appropriately presented or evidenced, together with a written thesis contextualising the work within an academic framework (as practice-based research);

22.1.4 a collection of published works demonstrating a significant and original contribution to research as described in Regulation 19.8 as PhD by Published Works.

22.2 The thesis must include a statement of the student's objectives and must acknowledge published or other sources of material consulted (including an appropriate bibliography and/or list of references, in an academically recognised format) and any assistance received. There must be an abstract (of approximately 300 words) within the thesis which provides a synopsis of the thesis stating the nature and scope of the work undertaken and of the contribution made to the knowledge of the subject treated.

22.3 With the exception of PhD by Published Works material produced during the PhD, DBA or MPhil and already published shall be referred to explicitly in the thesis. If desired,

copies of the published material can be included with the thesis or attached in some appropriate way. For PhD by Published works Regulation 19.4.9 applies. For the PhD by Concurrent Publication, any material published but not included in the examinable thesis shall also be explicitly referred to as above.

22.4 Theses must normally be submitted in A4 format. The Research Degrees Committee may give permission for a thesis to be submitted in another format where it is satisfied that the contents of the thesis can be better expressed in that format.

22.5 The text of the thesis should not normally exceed the following length (excluding ancillary data):

<u>PhD</u>	
Practice Based Research	40,000 words
Non-Practice Based Research	80,000 words
<u>PhD by Concurrent Publication</u>	
Minimum three journal papers	Variable according to discipline
Critical and theoretical narrative	20,000 words
<u>MPhil</u>	
Practice Based Research	20,000 words
Non-Practice Based Research	40,000 words
<u>MA/MSc by Research</u>	
Practice Based Research	20,000 words
Non-Practice Based Research	30,000 words
<u>PhD by Published Works</u>	
Practice Based Research	10,000 words
Non-Practice Based Research	20,000 words
<u>DBA</u>	55,000 words
<u>PhD through Extended Professional Practice</u>	40,000 words

22.6 The following requirements must be adhered to in the format of the thesis.

22.6.1 Students must submit the examinable thesis in electronic format;

22.6.2 the cover page shall bear the title of the work in at least 24pt type. The name and initials of the student, the qualification and the year of submission shall also be shown on the front board;

22.6.3 the recommended standard for page margins is as follows:

Left Margin:	4cm	Right Margin:	2cm
Top Margin:	2cm	Bottom Margin:	4cm

22.6.4 double or one-and-a-half spacing must be used in typescript except for indented quotations or footnotes where single spacing can be used. A further half space must be allowed between paragraphs;

22.6.5 pages shall be numbered consecutively throughout the thesis, including any appendices, photographs, and/or diagrams which are included as whole pages;

22.6.6 the title page shall give the following information:

22.6.6.1 the full title of the thesis; this must be the title approved when Examination Arrangements were made unless subsequently approved by the APVCR and the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role;

22.6.6.2 the full name of the author;

22.6.6.3 the award for which the thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of its requirements;

22.6.6.4 that the degree is awarded by De Montfort University;

22.6.6.5 sponsor of research where appropriate and Collaborating Establishment, if any;

22.6.6.6 the month and year of submission;

22.6.6.7 the number of volumes, if more than one.

22.6.7 The final thesis is required to be submitted electronically.

22.6.8 Submissions for PhD by the Concurrent Publication route should follow the above guidance for the title page and the critical and theoretical narrative element. A contents section should provide a fully referenced list of papers included in the submission (including Digital Object Identifier (DOI) where relevant). A single formatting style is not required for the papers that comprise the thesis.

22.6.9 The electronic copy of the thesis will be submitted to the Institutional Repository in the University Library.

22.7 Where the University has agreed that the confidential nature of the student's work is such as to preclude the thesis being made freely available in the Library of the University or sponsoring establishment for an agreed period as identified on the First Project Review form (and collaborating establishment, if any) then the electronic thesis shall, immediately on the completion of the programme of work, be held confidentially within the institution. After this period the thesis will be kept in the Institutional Repository in the University Library.

23. Selection and Appointment of Examiners and Examiners' Duties

23.1 Students for research degrees are examined on the basis of the submitted thesis and through the defence of the thesis in an oral examination (viva voce) by the external and Internal Examiners. The examiners are appointed for that purpose by the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role and the APVC Research on the nomination of the Supervision team. There shall be at least one External Examiner, one Internal Examiner and an independent chair who has no previous involvement with the research project or the student. For members of academic staff, please refer to regulation 23.6. An External Examiner shall be external to and independent of the University and of a Collaborating Establishment. An Internal Examiner shall be a member of the staff of the University, which can in exceptional cases include members with emeritus status.

23.2 Any one External Examiner should not be appointed with such frequency that familiarity with the University's research environment could influence, or appear to influence, their objectivity in the examination process. As a guide, an External Examiner should not be appointed more than 3 times within any 5-year period.

23.3 If an examiner is nominated who has not previously served as a research degree examiner at the University, it is necessary for a copy of their curriculum vitae to be submitted with the application.

23.4 An application for approval of Examination Arrangements must be submitted at least 3 months prior to students entering the Thesis Pending Period.

23.5 A person who is appointed as a student's supervisor cannot be appointed as an examiner of that student.

23.6 If the student is a member of academic staff of the University at the time of examination, it is a requirement that two External Examiners and an Independent Chair are nominated. This shall apply to all staff on permanent academic or professional services contracts, whether full time or part time. Staff on fixed term or hourly paid contracts may be exempt from this requirement but, in such cases, where the staff member is working in a close collegial relationship with permanent staff (for example as research and/or teaching fellow) the requirement for two examiners will normally be applied, subject to consideration by the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role and the APVC Research.

23.7 Research students who engage in no more than 6 hours per week of teaching during their research studies do not fall within the scope of this regulation.

23.8 Where the student is registered for a PhD by Published Works two External Examiners Internal Examiner shall be appointed. This regulation shall apply to all students regardless of their status at the time of examination.

23.9 In appointing examiners, the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role and

the APVC Research must ensure that the following criteria are met:

23.9.1 Normally, the examining team for a research degree consists of:

23.9.1.1 an External Examiner, who is external to and independent of the university or the collaborating establishment, and

23.9.1.2 an Internal Examiner, who is a member of staff of the university.

23.9.2 As a whole, the examining team must have:

23.9.2.1 substantial experience in examining research degree students at the level of the degree in question; and

23.9.2.2 substantial knowledge of current research relating to the subject area of the submission.

23.9.3 for PhD examinations, at least one examiner shall normally possess a PhD or equivalent qualification;

23.9.4 In order to meet these criteria, additional examiners may be appointed as necessary;

23.9.5 No person who is registered as a student for a research degree at this University or elsewhere may act as an examiner;

23.9.6 All examiners shall be independent of the student and the student's work. No examiner shall have provided any formal guidance in respect of the context or structure of the thesis, thesis project or other submitted work. Probation Review assessors are eligible to be nominated as an Internal Examiner as long as they haven't provided guidance beyond the Probation Review.

23.9.7 External Examiners must evidence their eligibility to work in the United Kingdom to the Doctoral College;

23.9.8 Former members of the staff of the University are not normally eligible for appointment as External Examiners until 3 years after the termination of their employment.

Nomination of Internal Examiners

23.10 Subject expertise is the paramount consideration in the appointment of examiners for research degrees, and proposals for Examination Arrangements will normally identify only one Internal Examiner. Where an appropriate Internal Examiner is identified, the Internal Examiner must have previously examined or observed a research degree at the level to be examined, and 'self- certified' their experience with the Doctoral College.

23.11 When two Internal Examiners are proposed, the experience of one must be certified and

additionally must, for PhD examinations, have examined at least 2 at the level of the award. A case must be made giving the reasons for the nomination of a second Internal Examiner, which normally would be relevant where two Internal Examiners are required to interrogate different aspects of a multidisciplinary thesis.

23.12 If a student is in agreement, a member of staff inexperienced in examining may attend their viva as an Observer in order to meet a staff development need. The student's agreement to this will be confirmed by supervisors prior to the submission of the Examination Arrangements form and recorded by the Doctoral College.

23.13 The Internal Observer is present solely to gain experience and will not submit any post-viva report. A thesis is not required for the Observer, only the examiners. The Doctoral College will email a copy of the thesis (at the request of the First Supervisor) to the Observer prior to the date of viva. The Observer will not communicate a view on the thesis to the student or to the examiners at any point prior to the final corrected or revised submission and the Observer will not communicate any of the deliberations of the examiners to the student at any time. Where two Internal Examiners are already appointed, an Observer may not be included in the examination process.

23.14 The 'observing' member of staff will not act as a full member of the examining team but will meet with the Internal Examiner at the point of completing the Pre-Viva Report in order to understand the purpose the report and the types of issues that would normally be recorded on it. The Observer will attend the examiners' pre-viva meeting in order to witness the process by which examination questions are formed, and will then be present for the whole of the viva examination as well as the examiners' discussion of the outcome.

23.15 Since the role is that of an Observer not formally part of the examination team, during the viva the Observer should sit outside of the student's line of vision so that the student is not distracted in any way, and the Observer must not take any active part in the questioning. The Observer may take procedural notes but should not take notes relating to the content of the student's work or to the outcome of the examination. At the conclusion of the viva the Observer will remain to witness the discussion between examiners as to their recommended outcome, but must not play any part in this discussion. At the conclusion of the examination process the Observer may then discuss the whole process with the examiners.

23.16 A Chair appointed at a research degree examination should be an experienced academic, who:

23.16.1 Has met the University's requirements for an experienced Internal Examiner;

23.16.2 In the opinion of the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role and the APVC Research, has sufficient background and experience in the administration and examination of research to deal confidently with any queries or issues arising during the examination process;

23.16.3 Has not had a role in the candidate's supervision or acted as their Probation

Review assessor.

23.17 The Chair must ensure they have familiarity with The University's Research Degrees and Higher Doctorate Regulations.

23.18 The Chair's primary roles are to:

23.18.1 Ensure that the conduct of the examination is academically rigorous, fair and consistent with the University's procedures and guidance;

23.18.2 Ensure that adequate opportunity is given to the candidate to defend their thesis and to respond to examiners' questions;

23.18.3 Provide examiners and/or the candidate with advice on the research degree regulations should queries arise in the examination process;

23.18.4 Confirm with examiners that Turnitin reports have been fully evaluated; and

23.18.5 Support a new Internal Examiner in carrying out their duties (including review of the Turnitin report).

23.19 The Chair is not expected to read the thesis, and will not take an active role in examining the student on their submission nor will they have a role in determining the outcome of the examination. The Chair should be present for the pre-examination discussion between examiners, introduce all those present at the start of the examination and remain for the entire viva voce, the examiners' post-viva deliberations and the subsequent unofficial relay of the outcome to the student. Where the outcome of the examination requires the student to undergo a second oral examination, the independent Chair should be in attendance on the same terms as above. Should the Chair no longer be employed by the University, another suitably qualified member of the academic staff will be appointed in their place.

23.20 Additional responsibilities of the Chair:

23.20.1 To clarify for the student the meanings and implications of the examiners' decision on the outcome of the examination.

23.20.2 Where there is disagreement between examiners about the outcome of the examination or the nature of any revisions or corrections required, the Chair will assist examiners in reaching an agreed position. In such cases the Chair's role is restricted to providing examiners with advice on their options, and has no casting vote. Where an agreed position cannot be reached with the Chair's assistance, Regulation 26 shall apply.

23.20.3 To be available to comment or provide relevant evidence in relation to a student's appeal against an examination outcome.

23.21 The duties of examiners shall be as follows:

23.21.1 all examiners are required to complete an independent pre-viva form and submit to the Doctoral College at least 5 days prior to the date of examination;

23.21.2 the examiners are required to hold an oral examination known as the viva voce, except in the most exceptional of circumstances, see Regulation 24.4;

23.21.3 the examiners are required to submit an Examiners Report form and recommendation on the appropriate form, unless they are in disagreement in which case separate report forms must be submitted (see Regulation 26). Also to assess material subsequent to the viva voce where appropriate;

23.21.4 examiners are expected to complete the examining process within 8 weeks of receiving the thesis. Subject to availability, resubmissions are expected to be reviewed/examined within 4 weeks of receiving the revised thesis. If this cannot be achieved, a report outlining reasons for delay must be submitted to the Doctoral College.

23.22 The Internal Examiner has particular responsibilities to ensure that:

23.22.1 An agreed recommended outcome of the examination process is stipulated (as in Regulation 25.2), paying particular attention to noting the examiners' agreement as to whether a second viva examination is required.

23.22.2 A coherent joint summative report on the thesis is completed following the examination. This should include an overall evaluation of the thesis with the examiners' view of its strengths and weaknesses. Where major revisions are required, the report should clearly set out the list of amendments. The amendments should be as unambiguous as possible with sufficient detail to allow the student to respond to the examiners' requirements. These requirements may be verbally summarised for the candidate following the viva, but should not be regarded as official notification of the result of the examination (see Regulation 24.12).

23.22.3 Where experienced and inexperienced Internal Examiners are working together it is responsibility of the experienced Internal Examiner to ensure the coherence of the report. Note that specific processes apply in situations where there is disagreement amongst examiners as to the outcome of examination (See Regulation 26).

23.22.4 The Turnitin similarity report on the thesis is evaluated in consultation with the External Examiner(s) and any additional Internal Examiner. This should be completed as soon as practicable after receipt of the thesis. Instructions for accessing the Turnitin report and its interpretation are provided by the Doctoral College. A short report giving the rationale for approval or non-approval of the thesis should then be recorded in the PGR records management system. If, in the view of the Internal Examiner, the Turnitin report is indicative of bad

academic practice it should be referred to the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role and the APVC Research before the External Examiner is contacted. The Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role will then follow the relevant steps in the University's General Regulations affecting Students as they apply to research degree candidates (see also Regulation 32).

24. Oral Examination (Viva Voce)

24.1 When the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role and the APVC Research has approved the Examination Arrangements, the examiners will be notified of their appointments. The student's First Supervisor will receive copies of the correspondence.

24.2 Examiners will be made aware that if they annotate the thesis the student may get to see such comments.

24.3 It is the responsibility of the Doctoral College to make the specific arrangements for the examination, including the date, time, location and hospitality.

24.4 All students are examined orally in English, on the programme of work and on the field of study. However, in cases of sickness, disability or comparable valid cause, supported by appropriate evidence, an alternative form of examination may be approved. Such cases require the approval of the APVC Research on the recommendation of the examiners and/or supervision team.

24.5 The purposes of an oral examination are:

24.5.1 to establish that the submitted work is that of the student;

24.5.2 to give the student the opportunity to defend the direction, structure and conclusions of the work. This involves the examiners making constructive criticisms of both the research and the thesis and giving the student the opportunity to respond;

24.5.3 to explore with the student any particular issues in the thesis or submitted work which require clarification or development. This is particularly important in cases where the examiners feel that their final decision could be other than an unconditional pass;

24.5.4 to test the student's personal eligibility for the award of the degree by exploring their understanding of issues arising in and from the research and of the relationship of the research to the wider field of knowledge. In the case of a doctoral student, the student should be able to demonstrate understanding of the nature and extent of the original contribution to knowledge entailed in the research.

24.6 One of the student's supervisors may attend the oral examination, unless the

student has expressed a wish to the contrary. Attendance by a supervisor is not compulsory but if the student feels that this would be helpful, the University then expects the supervisor to be at the oral examination.

24.7 Oral examinations can take place with the student and the examination team present at the same location. Alternatively, the examination may be conducted online enabling either the student and/or members of the examination team to participate in the examination in separate locations. Online examinations can only take place once students have signed the video conferencing policy document.

24.8 The recording of the proceedings of the oral examination, by any method, is normally prohibited. In any exceptional case, approval must be sought from the APVC Research in advance of the examination day.

24.9 The oral examination should normally last between 2 and 3 hours. The pattern for each particular oral is for the examiners to determine but in most cases the examiners will wish to focus on a detailed consideration of the research, its methodology and its findings. In some cases, however, the examiners could wish to focus on a discussion of broader aspects of the research process or findings, or the implications for policy/research, or publication possibilities. For this, the student could be invited to highlight aspects or issues that appear most important or interesting.

24.10 Supervisors of students who are undertaking their research degree by Exhibition, Performance or similar work must arrange prior to the oral for the full examination team to have sight of the work. This may be in the form of a performance to which the examination team are invited or could be a private showing of the work set up for this purpose. This showing can take place well in advance or on the day of the viva voce. The student must ensure the final submission is accompanied by some permanent record (for instance, USB stick, video, photographic record, musical score, choreographic notation, diagrammatic representation) of the exhibition, performance or other creative work where practicable, and with the electronic copy of the thesis. In addition, it is expected that normally the textual component of the submission sent to examiners should be accompanied by documentary evidence in photographic/video form of the creative work undertaken.

24.11 The intention is that oral examinations should be constructive and stimulating for all participants. The student should expect to be challenged on their ideas, but should be assured that the experience is intended to be helpful and positive. In preparation, students are advised to re-familiarise themselves with their thesis, make their own assessment of its strengths and weaknesses, and try to anticipate issues that are likely to be raised. The student must bring a copy of their thesis with them to the oral examination.

24.12 At the conclusion of the viva examination, the examiners might indicate to the student the recommended outcome they will be putting forward, subject to any corrections required. Formal notification of the results of the candidature will come from the Doctoral College on behalf of the APVC Research.

25. Examination Outcomes

25.1 Unless operating under Regulation 26, a copy of the final joint report shall be issued to the student. In the case of 25.2.2, 25.2.3 and 25.2.4 below the student will be given a written statement of the work to be done to achieve the degree within an agreed timescale. The criteria for assessing the degree of MA/MSc by Research/MPhil shall be in accordance with Regulation 1.2 and those for PhD shall be in accordance with Regulation 1.4.

25.2 The final report of the examiners on the student shall recommend one of the following:

25.2.1 the student be awarded the degree sought;

25.2.2 the student be awarded the degree sought, provided that minor amendments and corrections in the submitted work are made to the satisfaction of the nominated examiner(s) within a specified period not exceeding 3 months from the notification of the result to the student;

25.2.3 the student be awarded the degree sought, provided that major amendments and corrections in the submitted work are made to the satisfaction of the nominated examiner(s) within a specified period not exceeding 6 months from the notification of the result to the student. Major corrections can be approved by the Internal Examiner(s);

25.2.4 the student be permitted to re-submit for the degree sought and be re-examined. In this case the examiners shall specify the maximum period open to the student to re-submit, which shall not exceed 12 months. The maximum period shall date from the notification of the result to the student:

25.2.4.1 the thesis is to be revised and if deemed satisfactory by the Examiners, the student will be exempt from further examination, oral or otherwise; or

25.2.4.2 the thesis is to be revised and the student must undergo a further oral or alternative examination; or

25.2.4.3 the thesis is satisfactory, but the student must undergo a further oral examination or other such examination as the examiners shall specify.

25.2.5 if the student was working towards the award of a PhD, the student should be awarded the MPhil, if appropriate, subject to minor corrections, on the basis stated in 25.2.2. Examiners must only make this recommendation for positive achievement by the student in accordance with regulation 1.2; or

25.2.6 the student should not be awarded any degree and should be given no further opportunity of examination.

25.2.7 When examining a student who has previously been examined (unless the re-examination is the outcome of an appeal) examiners may only recommend 25.2.1(award), 25.2.5 (award lower award – no further amendments) and 25.2.6 (no award).

25.3 Where examiners require revision of a thesis careful consideration should be given as to whether the student should undergo further oral (or other) examination. In any event, the decision made by the examiners in respect of the below will be adhered to. Any requirement for, or waiver of, further oral or other examination specified shall be binding. Practical tests of the distinction are:

25.3.1 Whether carrying out the revisions requires significant new work (such as the gathering of new or additional data and/or any new analysis) that may affect the results and conclusions of the study, such that oral defence of therevised thesis and its findings is likely to be necessary;

25.3.2 Whether the student's knowledge of research methods and the field of study in general require a level of professional development that can only be evaluated by further oral examination;

25.3.3 Otherwise, where the examiners are of the view that the specific requirements of the viva voce examination (Regulation 24.5) have fallen short of an acceptable standard;

25.4 Examiners for Doctor of Business Administration may not select outcome 25.2.5

25.5 Where examiners recommend in terms set out in Regulations 25.2.2, 25.2.3 or 25.2.4 they must compile a list of corrections as soon as possible and definitely within 5 working days of the oral examination (excluding grammatical and typographical errors, which may be advised to the student separately).

25.6 Where the examiner recommends that a student should not be awarded the degree sought as set out in 25.2.6 above, and should have no further opportunity of examination, the examination team must provide a robust rationale on the Examiners Report Form.

25.7 Where the examination team are recommending that the student should be awarded the degree sought 'subject to minor amendments and corrections' should consider an appropriate length of time. This is normally a maximum of 3 months but in some circumstances 3 months might be too long, and examiners are encouraged to specify a shorter time in these instances where appropriate.

25.8 Before forwarding a recommendation for the award of a degree to the Doctoral College the examiners must be satisfied that the format of thesis is in accordance with the University's regulations (see Regulation 22).

25.9 Examiners should be aware of the distinction between the decision to pass a student

subject to correction of minor or major amendments and the decision not to award a degree to a student but to permit the student to revise and re-present the thesis. The following aim to clarify the distinctions:

25.9.1 one factor, among many others, in assessing a thesis is to judge whether it demonstrates satisfactorily the student's ability to produce a substantial and coherently argued report on the research. Ultimately, a successful thesis is one which is judged worthy to be lodged for public access in the library. Nonetheless, it is not immediately clear in every case when a thesis is unsatisfactory which of the recommendations summarised above is appropriate. These guidelines are intended to aid examiners in coming to an appropriate decision in such cases;

25.9.2 it should be borne in mind that there is a substantive difference between recommending the award subject to correction of the thesis, and not recommending the award but permitting the student to revise and re-present the thesis;

25.9.3 a practical yardstick is whether the External Examiner wishes to see the thesis again in order to check matters of substance. If the External Examiner does so wish then the decision should be not to award the degree but to permit the student to revise and re-present.

25.9.4 If the External Examiner believes the thesis can be brought to an acceptable standard and does not need further inspection from them then it can be recommended that the student be awarded the degree subject to minor or major amendments. The basis for this distinction is that a student who has been permitted to revise and re-present has to have their thesis re-examined formally in its entirety, while a corrected thesis simply has the corrections checked by the examiner(s);

25.9.5 Minor amendments 25.2.2 are changes that do not alter the arguments or conclusions of the thesis. They include corrections of editorial, typographical and grammatical errors, as well as corrections to references and minor re-writing to clarify context or interpretation.

25.9.6 Normally, errors of presentation can be remedied by minor amendments unless they are judged as fundamentally and comprehensively impairing the argument of the thesis, which would require substantial re-writing or re-structuring. In such a case it is advisable to recommend major amendments as the final form of the thesis would differ substantially from its original form and would need reassessing as a whole. For example, the inclusion of new data, fieldwork or practice, new analysis or substantial new additions to literature would revise and resubmit.

25.9.7 Examiners should be aware of the distinction between the decision to pass a student subject to minor and major corrections. The following aim to clarify the distinctions:

25.9.7.1 Major amendments has the potential to merit the award of the degree for which it has been submitted, but does not yet satisfy the requirements for award and contains deficiencies that are in excess of editorial or presentational corrections. This may involve re-writing sections, correcting calculations or clarifying arguments, but should not require the candidate to undertake any further original research.

26. Disagreement Amongst Examiners

26.1 Where examiners fail to agree on a recommendation they shall report separately on the appropriate form to the Doctoral College. The APVC Research, in consultation with the Research Degrees Committee may:

26.1.1 accept the recommendation of the External Examiner or, if more than one, the agreed recommendation of the External Examiners; or

26.1.2 appoint an additional External Examiner;

26.1.3 accept a majority recommendation, provided that this includes the recommendation of at least one External Examiner; or

26.2 Where an additional External Examiner is appointed, they shall not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners but shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the thesis and, if considered necessary, conduct a further oral examination. On receiving the report of this additional External Examiner, the APVC Research in consultation with the Research Degrees Committee shall have outcomes 25.2.1, 25.2.2, 25.2.3 or 25.2.4 available.

27. Amendment to Theses

27.1 When amendments to the thesis, as required by the examiners, have been completed, copies of the thesis should be forwarded to the Doctoral College, so that the relevant documentation can be distributed.

28. Examination of an Amended Thesis

28.1 Copies of an amended thesis are sent to the Examiners separately, who must confer in reaching a recommendation, including whether or not they wish to re-examine the student in a further oral examination when this had been previously recommended under Regulation 25.2, and submit their joint recommendation to the Doctoral College on the appropriate form. In the case of disagreement, the Examiners must submit separate recommendation forms in accordance with Regulation 26, Disagreement Amongst Examiners.

28.2 The decisions of the examiner(s) regarding an amended thesis submitted under

Regulation 25.2.4 are normally limited to:

28.2.1 a recommendation for the award of a degree (Regulation 25.2.1)

28.2.2 a recommendation that no degree should be awarded (Regulation 25.2.6)

28.2.3 a recommendation for lower award (no corrections)

29. Lodging of Thesis

29.1 When the viva voce documentation recommends the award of the research degree or when any required amendments have been completed and approved by the examiners, the student is required to submit an electronic copy of the final version of the thesis. This must be lodged with the Doctoral College as soon as possible.

30. Conferment of the Research Degree

30.1 Following the receipt of completed examination documents and the electronic thesis, the form DMU 10REC will be completed by the Doctoral College and the recommendation for the award to be conferred upon Research Degree students will be forwarded to a representative of the Vice-Chancellor acting on behalf of the Academic Board and the Board of Governors. The Director of Research Services or representative is responsible for reviewing, checking and completing the recommendation paperwork for signature by a representative of the Vice-Chancellor.

30.2 If the regulations are adhered to a degree parchment will then be produced and normally will be sent to the student and the student will be invited to attend a Graduation Ceremony.

31. Students' Rights of Appeal

31.1 A student has the right to appeal against a decision of:

31.1.1 the University to close their registration

31.1.2 the examination team to recommend the examination outcome of 25.2.4 or 25.2.6.

31.2 Grounds for appeal are limited to those set out in the 'General Regulations and Procedures Affecting Students' which also sets out the appeals process.

32. Academic Offences Panel

32.1 Academic Offences often involve plagiarism. The University considers such offences to be a serious issue and it is important that students make themselves aware of what is meant by plagiarism and how to avoid it. The regulation concerning Academic Offences for

research degree students is outlined in the 'General Regulations and procedures Affecting Students'. All work submitted through the PGR records management system or directly to supervisors and the faculty as part of your progression is recognised as a formal submission of work.

33. Misconduct in Research Policy

33.1 The Misconduct in Research Policy investigates allegations of research misconduct at the University. The procedure covers anyone conducting research under the auspices of DMU, including research degree students. The policy and investigation procedure can be found on the University's research webpages.

33.2 The Guidelines for Good Research Practice provide information on the standards researchers are expected to adhere to. Additionally, the Guidelines outline the responsibilities DMU has to support best practice

34. Fieldwork Process

34.1 Students who wish to undertake field work of 30 days or greater are required to complete a Field Work Request form through the PGR records management system prior to undertaking a Field Trip as part of their research.

34.1.1 Trips of 30-60 days - First Supervisor and Immigration Compliance manger (if applicable) approval required;

34.1.2 Trips of 60 days or more require a Field Trip Request and Absence Request Form to be completed and approved by First Supervisor and Immigration Compliance manger (if applicable).

34.2 Engagement during fieldtrips will be monitored by the completion of Monthly Progress Reports.

35. Higher Doctorates

35.1 In exercising its delegated powers to recommend academic awards, which include Higher Doctorates, and as set out in the Research Degrees Committee Terms of Reference, where an application to be considered for a Higher Doctorate is recommended by a Dean of Faculty the Research Degrees Committee shall appoint a Higher Doctorates Panel with membership appropriate to:

35.1.1 receive and consider the application and determine whether it meets, prima facie, the criteria for examination;

35.1.2 appoint examiners and approve Examination Arrangements;

35.1.3 receive and consider reports and recommendations from examiners and, where appropriate, recommend the granting and conferment of a Higher Doctorate of the University

35.2 The Higher Doctorates Panel membership must meet the below requirements:

35.2.1 Category 1 – A Pro Vice-Chancellor
35.2.2 Category 2 – Dean of Faculty
35.2.3 Category 3 – A Head of School who holds a Professorial Chair
35.2.4 Category 4 – An Associate Professor or Professor with at least 7 years Post-Doctoral Standing

Higher Doctorates Panel Terms of Reference

35.3 To receive applications from candidates for Higher Doctorate Degrees and determine whether they meet, prima facie, the criteria for consideration as detailed in the eligibility section below.

35.4 To appoint examiners and approve Examination Arrangements in accordance with the provisions set out in these regulations.

35.5 To receive reports and recommendations from the examiners of registered candidates and in appropriate cases, recommend to the Vice-Chancellor (who acts on delegated authority from the Academic Board for the conferment of academic awards) the granting and conferment of Higher Doctorates of the University.

Eligibility

35.6 The University's Ordinances (September 2007) provide the following definition:

35.6.1 *Higher Doctorates* (DEd, LLD, DLitt, DSc, DTech)

35.7 The award of Higher Doctorate is awarded to a candidate who is the holder of at least 7 years standing of a first degree or holder of at least 4 years standing of a masters or higher degree, who is a leading authority in the field of study concerned and has made an original sustained and substantial contribution of high distinction to the advancement or application of knowledge in that field.

35.8 To be eligible to submit for a Higher Doctorate an applicant must be a graduate of the University, or a graduate or Diplomate of the former Leicester Polytechnic or a member or former member of the Academic Staff of the University. Graduates of the University may submit 7 years after having had conferred the degree of Bachelor or Masters, 4 years after having had conferred the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Academic staff must have been in post 7 years.

Application

35.9 There shall be no standard form of application which a candidate must use, but each

applicant would be expected to give relevant Curriculum Vitae information in addition to the published material which forms the substance of the candidate's submission which should also contain a proposed summary title to be associated with the Higher Doctorate if awarded.

There must also be submitted a statement which includes:

35.9.1 a list of the candidate's publications in which are marked those which contain the main substance of the submission. Where publications are co-authored, there should be a statement on the extent of the candidate's own contribution to each such paper.

35.9.2 a statement on the overall direction and focus of the work, to include a brief guide to the nature and importance of the publications so marked;

35.9.3 a declaration of what part of the publications, if any, has been submitted by the candidate, or collaborators, for a degree of this or any other University, or of any professional body or learned society.

35.10 Each application shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Research Degrees Committee through a sponsoring Faculty of the University with a supporting statement from the Dean of the Faculty

35.11 On receipt of such an application the Research Degrees Committee will establish a Panel to consider the application.

Prima facie consideration by Panel

35.12 The Higher Doctorate Panel, once constituted, will consider the applicant and determine whether it meets prima facie the criteria. Where in particular cases it is deemed necessary, the Panel may seek the views of appropriately qualified persons external to it to assist in reaching a decision.

35.13 Where applications are approved the Higher Doctorate Panel shall proceed to appoint two examiners to consider the application, one of whom may be an Internal Examiner, except where the applicant is a current member or employee of the University, where two External Examiners shall be appointed.

Examination

35.14 The examiners shall submit individual reports independently prior to discussing the award; this shall be submitted to the Secretary of Research Degrees Committee.

35.15 The examiners shall then submit a joint recommendation to the Secretary for consideration by the Higher Doctorate Panel.

35.16 Where the examiners cannot reach a joint recommendation, they should submit individual recommendations. A further External Examiner shall be appointed by the

Higher Doctorate Panel who shall be given access to the original reports and shall make a final recommendation.

35.17 There shall be no provision for application by the candidate or other person(s) for re-examination of a candidate's submission beyond the stage set out in iii) above, save that in the event of the Higher Doctorate Panel not accepting the recommendation of the examiners, a recommendation may be made by the Research Degrees Committee to the Academic Board for some other course of action. The Academic Board's decision on such matters so referred shall be final.

Fees

35.18 Fees to cover academic and administrative costs must be paid to the University by the candidate together with two copies of the published work submitted with the application.

Retention of Publications

35.19 One copy of the work submitted in support of a successful application shall be retained by the University and shall be available for consultation for scholarly purposes by its members.