We are pleased to announce the University has conferred two DSc higher degrees.

The distinguished Doctor of Science is awarded only in recognition of not just a distinctive, original and sustained scholarly contribution to the field of study but one that significantly advances the discipline. Candidates need to demonstrate a sustained contribution to their field and this is reviewed by an internal and external examining panel. Following recommendations from external examiner panels to Academic Board the DSc is conferred to Professor Bernd Stahl in School of Computer Science and Informatics, Centre for Computing and Social Responsibility and Professor Simon Dyson from the School of Allied Health Sciences.

Professor Stahl said “I am delighted that my research has been recognised through the award of the DSc. This sends an important signal that the work undertaken by the Centre for Computing and Social Responsibility is world leading. In conjunction with other successes, such as the recent endorsement of the CONSIDER project that we coordinated by Carlos Moedas, the European Commissioner for Research, Science and innovation (http://www.eesc.europa.eu/?i=portal.fr.videos.34612), it shows that research excellence can correspond with impact.”

On receiving news of the award, Professor Dyson said: “I am very pleased to receive a letter from the Vice Chancellor acknowledging “that your seminal publications and academic standing are of international significance”.

I am equally pleased that the award is specifically for Social Studies in Sickle Cell, recognising sociology as a critical discipline within the academy.

In turn I would like to acknowledge my debt to the many people in the sickle cell communities, both in the UK and globally, who have supported my research since I began working with them in 1986.”
In April the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) conducted the university-wide Higher Education Review, the purpose of which is to review whether the university’s quality and academic standards meet UK expectations. These expectations are defined in the statements of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, the specific Code for research degree students is ‘Chapter B11’.

During the visit, the review panel scrutinised multiple documents, policies and committee minutes from the GSO, the Research Degrees Committee and the Research Training Committee. The panel also met with research students, senior staff, academics and the Director of Graduate School and Graduate School Office Head.

In relation to research degree students, the QAA panel particularly noted in their report:

- The students they met were clear about the appropriate channels for obtaining information and support about their research programme
- The joint arrangements and relationships between Faculties and the GSO work well; citing as an example the applications and admissions process
- The supervisors spoken to valued GSO email updates, newsletters and supervisor training
- The students they met spoke positively about their supervision experiences
- Students confirmed they were fully informed about their programmes from induction events and handbooks
- Students spoke positively about the Researcher Development Programme and their individual training profiles from the Training Needs Analysis
- The introduction of new monitoring software satisfied the review team that the university is now in a position to align fully to the Chapter B11 Code
- Students identified the PGR Forums held by the GSO as a valuable way to meet other students and a positive mechanism for student engagement with DMU

The panel concluded that DMU has given increased priority to enhancing the quality of its research degree provision in response to both the previous QAA review of 2009 and also in response to the outcomes of its own reviews and surveys. The panel associated a ‘low’ level of risk with research degree quality and standards and had no recommendations for this area of the University.

So, as there were no recommendations for the administration and monitoring of progression of post graduate research students, in the GSO we are of course mightily chuffed with this judgement and would like to say a huge thanks to our colleagues in DAQ and Faculties for working with us to prepare for the review; we also especially want to thank the students who gave up their valuable research time to meet the reviewers.

DATE FOR THE DIARY:
POSTER COMPETITION TUESDAY 15 MARCH 2016
If you would like to be a judge next year for this half day event (9.00-1.30), we’d be pleased to welcome you on board, it’s a great experience and the pastries are plentiful! Contact Nisha on NCholera@dmu.ac.uk
The University has been successful in securing four PhD scholarships through the second round of scholarships of the Midlands 3 Cities Doctoral Training Partnership. The DTP is a collaboration between De Montfort University and the universities of Nottingham, Nottingham Trent, Leicester, Birmingham and Birmingham City. This newly launched programme will provide students with combined research expertise for personal and professional development, creating the next generation of arts and humanities doctoral researchers. The scholarships have been awarded to:

**Kieran Foster**  
*Unseen Horror—The Unmade Films of Hammer*  
Supervisors: Ian Hunter, Steve Chibnall and Matthew Jones

**Laura Fryer**  
*The Adapted Screenplays of Ruth Prawer Jhabvala*  
Supervisors: Jane Dowson and Claire Monk

**Emma Povall**  
*Godwin, Holcroft and Inchbald: Writing and Friendship*  
Supervisors: Phil Cox and Tim Fulford

**Jennifer Voss**  
*Performing Emotion: Women’s screen acting and the transition from silent to sound cinema, 1926-1934*  
Supervisors: Alissa Clarke, Laraine Porter and Steve Chibnall

The scholarship application process is extremely competitive, not to mention rigorous and our congratulations go to the second M3C cohort who will begin their research programme in October 2015.

---

**EMUA
STUDENT CONFERENCE 2015**

The Graduate School has funded five students to attend the forthcoming East Midlands University Association postgraduate research student conference on 3 September at the University of Lincoln. Rowena Doughty, Aime Armstrong, Jane Codona, I-Chun Hsiao and Aveen Haji Mam are attending the conference where doctoral researchers will be presenting papers and posters under the themes of ‘Impact and Collaboration’.
Following a competitive recruitment process, the following scholarships have been awarded by Professors Andy Collop and John Young through the Graduate School scholarship programme.

**HIGH FLYERS SCHOLARSHIPS**

**Kieran Sellars:** Decree Absolute: Engaging with Performance Art to Reconfigure the Masculine Gendered Landscape (Alissa Clarke, Ramsay Burt)

**Matthew Simons:** Pilgrimages in Pursuit of Englishness: Morris Dancing in England & Beyond (Robert Colls, Simon Featherstone)

**Kiranjit Kaur:** Ethnic Minority Small Family Firms (Natalia Vershinina, Kassa Woldesenbet Beta)

**Bhaskar Pandya:** Enabling Technologies for the Development and Manufacture of New Protein-Based Drugs for the Treatment of Autoimmune Diseases & Cancer (Geoff Smith, Irina Ermolina)

**Mohamed Sereez:** Development of Aerodynamic Model of a Transport Airliner in Extended Flight Envelope using Computational Fluid Dynamics Methods (Mikhail Goman, Xin Kai Li, Nikolay Abramov)

**FULL SCHOLARSHIPS**

**Marta Binazzi:** Photographic History (Kelley Wilder and Gil Pasternak)

**Marco Gottero:** Industrial relations/austerity and structural adjustment (Phil Almond and Heather Connolly)

**Ruth Lorimer:** Interrogating Urban Crisis (Jonathan Davies and Jo Richardson)

**Christopher Stamper:** Disclosure & Desistance: a relational account of the lived experiences of ex-offenders’ journeys in gaining and retaining employment (Jenna Ward, Victoria Knight, Anne-Marie Greene)

**David Mounfield:** A Knight of Comedy: Exploring the Sir Norman Wisdom Archive (Steve Chibnall and Laraine Porter)

**Andreas Katsiavalos:** Computational Methods for Identifying High-Level Music-Theoretic Concepts (Tom Collins and Bret Battey)

**Zainab Yusuf:** A phenomenological study on the asthma and sporting/exercise experiences of South Asian populations (Diane Wensley, Helen Owton, Jacquelyn Allen-Collinson)

**Alexandra Davis:** Viruses, inflammation and cancer: investigating the role for the viral oncoprotein, LMP1, in generating a “wounded keratinocyte” phenotype as a precursor to tumourigenesis (Mhairi Morris and Zeeshan Ahmad)

**Kristine Fearon:** Reproductive decision-making, parenthood and the use of assisted conception amongst women with Turner Syndrome: an exploratory study (Cathy Herbrand, Irene Daly, Nicky Hudson Lorraine Culley)

**Sally King:** Parody by Numbers: A Computational Approach to Fairy Tale Adaptations (Gabriel Egan, Deborah Cartmell)
SCHOLARSHIP NEWS:
GRADUATE SCHOOL AWARDS

FEES SCHOLARSHIPS

Jugraj Singh: Semi-Autonomous Model Based System Engineering Design Environment (Seng Chong, Parminder Kang)

Zahraa Al-Juboori: The use of a skin model to investigate the ability of an enzyme-sensitive gel to deliver drugs preferentially to enzyme-exuding lesions (Joan Taylor, Tarsem Sahota)

Bilal Hallaq: Cyber Security (Leandros Maglaras, Helge Janicke, Kevin Jones)

Zeeshan Lahaware: Leadership and employee motivation: A study of Small and Medium Enterprises in Leicester (Martin Beckinsale, Hulya Oztel, Kassa Woldesenbet Beta)

Benita Percival: Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmacy/Investigations of the Metabolism of First- and Second-Generation Statins using High-Resolution 19F and 1H NMR Analysis (Ewa Jaroszkiewicz, Martin Grootveld)


Lucy Owen: Development of Novel Synergistic Therapeutic Strategies to Combat Antimicrobial Resistance: Critical Roles for Natural Products (Katie Laird Martin Grootveld Randolph Arroo)

Stuart Drummond: Conceptualising, Theorising and Operationalising Social Value in the Context of the Public Sector (Colin Copus, Mark Roberts)

Ruijie Wang: Psychologically informed usability design for assistive systems for the ageing population (Liming Chen, Aladdin Ayesh)

Michelle Brown: Responsible Innovation in Video Games: improving design, development & play (Catherine Flick, Samad Ahmadi, Margaret Montgomery)

Tove Dalenius: Holographic Data Visualisation (Martin Richardson, Ernest Edmonds)

Jane Wood: Communication disorders and the criminal justice system (Rob Canton, Andy Hill)

Nik Hill-Izani: Powder Flow (Geoff Smith, Ahmet Orun, David Armitage)

Cassandra Brummitt: Harry Potter and the Spaces of Adaptation: Franchise, Fans and Contemporary Adaptive Practice (Deborah Cartmell, James Russell)

Lisa Thurlow: Designers Who Don’t Draw (Peter Ford, Grahame Hudson)
For your information, when an student who is studying on a Tier 4 visa is granted a period of interruption from study, the university is required to formally notify the UKIV; this means that the student’s visa will be curtailed and they will not be able to re-enter the UK on their old visa but must instead apply for a new visa.

When international students apply to the GSO for interruption they are notified of this consequence but it would be helpful if supervisors could also remind their students about this if you are aware that your student is considering requesting an interruption. Thank you.

In case you weren’t aware, Payroll will not process any external examiner expense claims unless:

- A residential address is provided
- Original receipts are produced (scanned documents are not accepted)

This detail is confirmed to examiners in the letter of appointment examiners receive from the GSO.

It’s been a long time coming….. but following the successful launch of myResearch monitoring software in February 2015, we are now in a position to pull the plug on the paper based admin forms in the GSO. Yes!! Believe it!!! What this means is that we are now moving to full adoption of the software for research student progression forms and associated administration, the forms from the old system are no longer available. We have notified students of this.

As you will know from our many messages over recent months, myResearch is the online progression management tool for students and supervisors which enables users to record and track their progress throughout the research degree programme from the point of enrolment through to submission of thesis. This means that students can log into the system and access status information concerning their progress through the research cycle, including key progression milestones that are due or have been completed. The traffic light system on the software provides a simple visual indicator of the milestones through the cycle. The Pathway also provides an ‘at a glance’ timeline image of the main compulsory milestones identified at enrolment. Progression forms can now be submitted online, enabling students to submit forms for supervisor/assessor review and comment.

If you have not yet visited myResearch you can do so by logging into: https://myresearch.dmu.ac.uk

If you have any queries concerning or myResearch, please contact researchstudents@dmu.ac.uk
The Research Degrees Committee and Academic Board have agreed the following changes and additions to the Regulations for Research Degree Students.

- **Tuition Fee Charging: Regulation 3.5**
  An addition to clarify the tuition fee charging policy currently in operation for students with a viva outcome of major revisions.

  3.6 *If the outcome of the viva voce examination is that the student be permitted to re-submit for the degree sought 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 Graduate School Office.*

- **Retrospective Interruptions and Withdrawals: Regulations 9 and 8.3**
  The option to apply for withdrawal or interruption from study retrospectively is withdrawn for all students. The decision to exceptionally approve retrospective interruptions by the Director of the Graduate School or the Head of Academic Services is maintained.

- **Frequency of External Examiner Appointments: Regulation 16.1**
  An adjustment to the regulation to reflect the standard practice of not appointing the same external examiner more than three times within any five year period.

  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 three times within any five year period.

- **External Examiner Appointments for Members of Staff: Regulation 16.5**
  To clarify the circumstances under which two external examiners are appointed for a member of staff.

  *If the student is a member of academic staff of the University, it is a requirement that two External Examiners are nominated as well as an Internal Examiner. 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 a research and/or teaching fellow) the requirement for two examiners will normally be applied, subject to consideration by the Faculty Head of Research Students and the Director of Graduate School.*

- **Submission of Progress Reports: Regulation 6.3g) and 6.3h)**
  An adjustment to the frequency of submission of progress reports.

  6.3g) *The frequency of these should be in accord with the stipulated university minimum values (normally at least once per month for full time students and at least every two months for part time students)*

  h) *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 reports for 5 consecutive months will be deemed non compliant and reported to the PVC for Research and Innovation. Persistent non compliance of progress report submission may lead to the termination of registration.*
Nomination of Internal Examiners/observers: Regulation 16.7

In order to clarify the nomination and role of internal examiners and observers:

d) 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 Graduate School Office.

The internal observer is present solely to gain experience and will not submit any post-viva report. A glue-bound thesis is not required for the observer, only the examiners. The Graduate School Office 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.

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.

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.

Regulation 16.9

The internal examiner has particular responsibilities to ensure that:

Those present at the viva understand the university’s examination procedures, and the conduct expected during the viva examination itself.

An agreed recommended outcome of the examination process is stipulated (as in regulation 18.2), paying particular attention to noting the examiners’ agreement as to whether a second viva examination is required.

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 relate clearly to the separate statement of thesis deficiencies. The statement of thesis deficiencies 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 17.9).

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 section 8 of the Guidance Notes for Examiners, and regulation 19).
The Graduate School funded three students to attend the Cumberland Lodge residential postgraduate research conference ‘Life Beyond the PhD’ in August. The conference is for doctoral students of all disciplines and is a highly prestigious series of meetings, seminars and workshops involving speakers from industry and academia. Students Ahlem Lezerad, Aveen Haji Mam and Ausra Bremner attended and by all accounts had a thoroughly inspiring time of it! Here’s what they had to say:

“The conference allowed me to practice my poor presentation skills, networking, and most importantly it has acted as a real booster. Meeting other PhD students who told us about their experiences made me realise that the journey to obtain the PhD is not a straight line and the challenges I had were normal as well as necessary. May I take this opportunity to thank you for allowing me to attend the conference”. Ahlem Lezerad

“The event has shaped my thinking and aspirations in many ways and provided a number of useful tools for furthering my academic career, e.g. how to write a successful application, present with an impact, deal with blocks in writing up and how to design an inter-disciplinary project. The delivery and engagement of the seminars and workshops was exceptionally high quality! The biggest impact of the conference on me was that it inspired and academically charged me to complete my theses at the very highest level I could push myself for and eagerly seek the publishing and job opportunities to become a respectable/professional member of academic community.

What I also realised being there – how much I love and appreciate DMU for their constant support and guidance. The Graduate School Office, my incredibly hard working supervisors – Professor Ward and Dr, Knight, library staff, courses provided…I have it all at DMU! And I spoke about my studying experience at DMU with great pride and appreciation. Many students were jealous of our luck at DMU. Thank you once again for a marvellous opportunity.” Ausra Bremner