
DOCTORAL DEGREE REGULATIONS

Doctoral Researchers
enrolled from September
2020 onwards



Cardiff
Metropolitan
University

Prifysgol
Metropolitan
Caerdydd

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	SCOPE OF THIS DOCUMENT	2
3.	ADMISSION AND ENROLMENT	3
4.	APPOINTMENT OF SUPERVISORS AND INDEPENDENT PROGRESSION ADVISOR	4
5.	SUPERVISORY TEAM MEETINGS	5
6.	PERIODS OF STUDY, SUSPENSION AND MITIGATION	6
7.	THE MILESTONES	7
8.	ETHICS APPROVAL	10
9.	PROPOSING EXAMINATION PANELS	10
10.	PRESENTATION AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS: PHD CANDIDATES ONLY	11
11.	PRESENTATION AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS: ALL OTHER DOCTORAL PROGRAMMES	12
12.	THE EXAMINATION	12
13.	EXAMINATION OUTCOMES: PHD	13
14.	EXAMINATION OUTCOMES: PROF DOC	15
15.	EXAMINATION OUTCOMES: TAUGHT DOC	16

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** This document sets out the regulatory framework for the following Doctoral awards offered by Cardiff Metropolitan University (hereafter referred to as the University):

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), including the integrated pathway that comprises an intensive first year research skills training.

Professional Doctorate through one of the following pathways:

Doctor of Professional Practice [DProf];
Doctor of Business Administration [DBA];
Doctor of Education [EdD];
Doctor of Sustainable Built Environment [DSBE];
Doctor of Engineering [DEng].

Taught Doctorate through one of the following pathways:

Doctor of Sports Coaching [DSC];
Doctor of Management [DMan];
Doctor of Forensic Psychology [D.Foren.Psych]
(This is a top up programme only)

- 1.2** The regulations for the award of PhD by Published Works are available as a separate document.
- 1.3** Supplementary regulations exist for the Professional Doctorate and Taught Doctorate programmes that should be read in conjunction with this document.
- 1.4** This document seeks to reflect nationally recognised good practice as stated in the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education and other relevant policies and codes of practice issued by the UK Higher Education Funding Councils and UK Research & Innovation.

- 1.5** These regulations are subject to annual review via the University's Research Degrees Committee (RDC). A list of amendments made at each annual review will be made available alongside these regulations. Candidates will normally be subject to the version of these regulations which was extant at the time of their initial enrolment. However, when changes are made to these regulations, candidates will be informed of the changes and invited to be subject to new regulations.

- 1.6** In addition to the annual review, these regulations are subject to periodic review, as part of the University's quality assurance system. Such review aims to ensure that standards are comparable with those in place across the UK HE sector and consistent with QAA requirements and to ensure that the quality of provision provides candidates with a fair and reasonable expectation to achieve their award within an acceptable timeframe.

- 1.7** Candidates should ensure they are familiar with the contents of this document and any supplementary regulations relevant to their Degree (e.g., the Professional and Taught Doctorate Regulations). They should also ensure familiarity with the Code of Practice for Doctoral Awards and the Doctoral Researcher Handbook, which provide further advice and guidance.

- 1.8** All documentation is available on the [Doctoral Academy Portal](#).

2. SCOPE OF THIS DOCUMENT

2.1 This document sets out the regulatory framework for the following Cardiff Met awards:

2.1.1 Master of Philosophy (MPhil) by Research: This award will be bestowed by the University in recognition of the completion of a programme of study and research, the results of which are judged to constitute a critical evaluation and analysis of a body of knowledge or an original contribution to learning or knowledge.

2.1.2 Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by Research: This award will be bestowed by the University in recognition of the successful completion of a programme of study and research, the results of which are judged to constitute an original contribution to learning or knowledge and to give evidence of systematic study and of ability to relate the results of such study to the general body of knowledge in the subject.

2.1.3 Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by Research – Integrated: Including a first year of intensive research training, this award will be bestowed by the University in recognition of the successful completion of a programme of study and research, the results of which are judged to constitute an original contribution to learning or knowledge and to give evidence of systematic study and of ability to relate the results of such study to the general body of knowledge in the subject.

2.1.4 Professional Doctorate: This award will be bestowed by the University in recognition of the successful completion of a programme of study and research, the results of which are judged to constitute a critical understanding of the relevant knowledge base, the development of an applied project for new knowledge, an interpretation of findings to the contextual and relevant academic literature, and critical reflections on the impact of the applied project on practice and the candidate's development over the programme.

2.1.5 Taught Doctorate: This award will be bestowed in recognition of the successful completion of an approved programme of directed study, together with successful completion of further study and research, the results of which are judged to constitute an original contribution to learning and to give evidence of:

- The creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline and merit publication.
- A systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice.
- An ability to relate the results of such study to the general body of knowledge in the discipline.
- The general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, application or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems.
- A detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

2.2 Candidates can pursue the award of MPhil, PhD (including the integrated approach) or Taught Doctorate via either full-time or part-time study.

2.3 Candidates can only pursue the Professional Doctorate on a part-time basis.

2.4 Doctoral awards can also be awarded posthumously. See regulations for posthumous awards

3. ADMISSION AND ENROLMENT

- 3.1 The normal minimum entrance requirement for research degrees offered by the University is an upper second class honours undergraduate degree relevant to the proposed programme of study and research (or International Equivalent). The award must have been made by a recognised university or higher education institution, or by the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA). Applicants are required to provide evidence of their qualifications as part of the application process.
- 3.2 Applicants who do not possess the normal minimum qualification will be considered on a case by case basis. In such cases, the relevant School will take action to determine the applicant's academic attainment and suitability to undertake the programme of study and research. Prior experiential learning may be recognised as part of this process.
- 3.3 Where it is considered that an applicant may not have sufficient prior experience to immediately enrol for a PhD, they may be enrolled on an available integrated PhD Pathway or be required to complete research related modules (through attendance and, where required, assessment) available within the relevant school.
- 3.4 In addition to the above entrance requirements, applicants must be capable of satisfying the University with regard to their proficiency in the English or Welsh language (whichever they have chosen to pursue the award in) at a level necessary to complete the programme of work and to prepare and defend a thesis in that language.
- 3.5 In order to establish proficiency in the English language, overseas applicants whose first language is not English will normally be required to provide evidence of a minimum IELTS score (or equivalent) of 6.5 at application with a minimum of 6.5 in the reading and written components, or of a Masters Level qualification, gained through the medium of English from a recognised institution. Candidates will be required to provide such evidence as part of the admissions process.
- 3.6 Once in receipt of an offer letter from the University, applicants are required to confirm acceptance of the offer and to subsequently enrol via the University's online enrolment system.
- 3.7 For PhDs, the University offers three official enrolment points each academic year, in September, January and April.
- 3.8 For Professional Doctorates, the University offers two official enrolment points each academic year, in September and April.
- 3.9 For Taught Doctorates, the official enrolment point each academic year is in October.
- 3.10 For all our doctorates, should a candidate enrol at another point in the year, their official start date will be the closest official enrolment point.
- 3.11 The initial enrolment date will be considered the date of commencement of the research degree and begins the period of candidature.
- 3.12 Applicants will be advised of the fees applicable to their programme of study during the application process. All applicable fees must be paid upon enrolment or candidate's will be subject to the University's Debtor Policy.
- 3.13 The University will consider applications from individuals who have commenced a research degree programme at another institution. Applications to transfer into the University will be considered by the School's RDC and will follow the process set out in the document entitled *Application Process for a PGR Candidate at Another Institution to Transfer their Enrolment to Cardiff Metropolitan University*.
- 3.14 Where such applications are successful, the research conducted at the former institution may contribute to the thesis. The period of time spent studying for the award at the former institution will therefore be deducted from the applicable Cardiff Met maximum candidature period.

4. APPOINTMENT OF SUPERVISORS AND INDEPENDENT PROGRESSION ADVISOR

- 4.1** Each candidate will have at least two supervisors and a maximum of three, with any proposal for additional supervisors to be presented to the School's RDC for review. One of the supervisors will be appointed as a Director of Studies (DoS) and will have overall responsibility for the development and work of the candidate, the work of the supervisory team and for the progression and exam arrangements. Alternatively, a team of two supervisors will be supported by a Supervisory Team Coordinator (STC) who will have responsibility for the progression arrangements, exam arrangements and work/mentorship of the supervisory team. In order to be approved as part of the team, all supervisors must appear on the RDC List of Approved Supervisors and the proposed DoS or STC must appear on the RDC List of Approved DoS / STC.
- 4.2** A DoS / STC must be a member of the University's academic staff with a contract equivalent to at least 0.2 of a full-time position.
- 4.3** Each candidate will also be assigned an Independent Progression Advisor (IPA) who will be part of the review process for candidates at all progression points, from and including the 6 month progression point. Specifically, the role of the IPA will be to determine whether there is evidence of adequate progress, whether the candidate is engaging in appropriate skills development, whether there is an adequate plan for on-time completion of the thesis, and whether there are adequate resources available to the candidate to support timely completion.

5. SUPERVISORY TEAM MEETINGS

- 5.1** Each candidate is expected to keep in regular contact with their supervisory team, with at least six formal meetings per academic year (including the progression reviews), with a minimum of two being face-to-face. Remaining meetings can be remote through the use of a secure communications platform, advocated by the University.
- 5.2** Should concerns be raised by the supervisory team, the candidate and/or the School's RDC about the progress of the candidate, the School's RDC can insist on more regular meetings to be scheduled. Failure to adhere to the frequency of meetings directed by the School's RDC will result in the candidate being withdrawn from their studies.
- 5.3** All supervisory team meetings are the responsibility of the candidate to arrange and should ideally include all supervisory team members. All supervisory team meetings, except the progress reviews, must be recorded through *the Student Meeting Record* option on *PhD Manager* and include (in bullet points): what was discussed; what the agreed actions for the supervisee are by the next meeting; what the agreed actions for the supervisors are by the next meeting; and when the next meeting will take place.
- 5.4** Doctoral Researchers are recommended to organise the supervisor team meetings with an agenda. The following may act as a guide of what could be covered: 1) *review of current progress against objectives set in previous meeting (and any current or future concerns affecting performance)*; 2) *key discussion point(s) of the meeting*; 3) *set targets to be achieved by next meeting*; 4) *professional development/training*; 5) *candidate well-being*; and, 6) *key administration requirements (e.g., preparation for next formal progress review)*.
- 5.5** Failure to record these meetings on *PhD Manager* will result in progress being denied and the candidature being withdrawn at the next progress review, due to an evidenced lack of an engagement.
- 5.6** From the start of the second academic year onwards (i.e., from the start of month 13), should a candidate fail to record any formal meetings on *PhD Manager* over a 6 month period, the DoS will be sent an email through *PhD Manager* to complete a brief review of the candidate's progress. If little progress has been confirmed by the DoS, or the candidate has been reported to have not been in communication with the supervisory team over that period, then the School's Graduate Studies Coordinator (or equivalent) will write formally to the candidate to request an update in relation to the objectives set at the previous Milestone progress review within a one month timeline (from the date the letter is received). No response to this formal approach will result in the candidate being withdrawn.
- 5.7** A member of the supervisory team may also upload comments about the progress of their candidate outside of the Progress Review process, through the Supervisor Meeting Record on *PhD Manager*. These comments must be reviewed and commented upon and/or approved by the candidate within 14 days of the Supervisor uploading the comments.

6. PERIODS OF STUDY, SUSPENSION AND MITIGATION

- 6.1** Maximum candidature related to full-time and part-time study are provided below. Candidates will be required to submit their thesis within these timescales.

	MPhil	PhD	Professional Doctorate	Taught Doctorates
Full Time	2 years (24 Months)	4 years (48 Months)	NA	4 years (48 Months)
Part Time	4 years (48 Months)	8 years (96 Months)	6 years (72 months)	8 years (96 Months)

- 6.2** Given that the maximum length of candidature is 4 years, it is the expectation for each full-time candidate to be in a position to submit 6 months prior to the end of candidature, so that they can be examined within the 4 year period. This expectation is one year for part-time candidates.
- 6.3** In instances where a candidate's progress has been or is likely to be impeded thereby preventing satisfactory progress, they may apply for a period of suspension. Suspension requests will be made by the candidate and their supervisory team through the Change Request option on *PhD Manager* to the School (or equivalent) RDC and will be supported by appropriate independent documentary evidence. All applications are considered by the School RDC, but may be escalated to the University RDC for further consideration.
- 6.4** A formal period of suspension may not exceed twelve months for candidates enrolled on either a full-time or a part-time basis. During the suspension period, candidates will not have access to any Cardiff Met staff or resources.
- 6.5** **Mitigating Circumstances.** Mitigating Circumstances, often called exceptional personal circumstances, are significant changes in the candidate's circumstances during their studies, which are acute, unexpected and outside the control of the candidate, for example, a short illness, family emergency or accident. The candidate believes such circumstances will adversely affect their ability to engage with their studies to the extent that they may be unable to complete work to a high standard by the required deadline.
- If granted mitigation, the candidate will be given an extended deadline and will still have access to Cardiff Met staff and resources.**
- Longer-term or ongoing difficulties which are likely to prevent the student from engaging with their studies for a period of weeks or months will likely require a student to suspend their studies (see above).
- 6.6** All applications for mitigation must be made by the candidate and their supervisory team through the Change Request option on *PhD Manager* to the School (or equivalent) RDC and will be supported by appropriate independent documentary evidence.
- 6.7** When a period of suspension ends, candidates will be reminded of their resumption of studies through an email generated from *PhD Manager* two weeks prior to the end of suspension date. If a candidate wishes to extend the candidature period, they (or a supervisory team member) must apply for this extension through the Change Request option on *PhD Manager* prior to the end of the initial suspension period.
- 6.8** Maximum periods of candidature listed in 6.1 do not include periods of suspension, but do include periods where mitigation has been approved. Any approved period of suspension will be added to the maximum candidature period upon resumption of studies.
- 6.9** Maximum periods of candidature may only be exceeded in exceptional circumstances and following formal approval through a Special Cases Application reviewed at the University RDC. Applications to extend candidature will normally be made by the Director of Studies (or Lead Supervisor) in conjunction with the candidate and other members of the supervisory team through a Special Cases option on *PhD Manager*.
- 6.10** Should a candidate fail to submit their thesis without any suspension or mitigation by the end of their maximum candidature, the candidate will be confirmed as exited from the programme without completion and informed via email and letter.

7. THE MILESTONES

- 7.1** All candidates must fulfil the requirements of each Milestone within the specified time period to progress and continue to be enrolled on the relevant programme of study.
- 7.2** The Milestone progression points are at Month 1, Month 6, Month 12, Month 24, and Month 36. They will also be at Month 48, 60 and 70 for part-time candidates.
- 7.3** The requirements at the Month 12 Milestone will differ for part time candidates, Professional Doctorate and Taught Doctorate Candidates. These difference are specified on 7.23.
- 7.4** Candidates, the supervisory team and the Independent Progress Advisor (IPA) will be sent an email reminder of each Milestone, excluding the Month 1: Launchpad, via *PhD Manager* two months prior to the deadline. The reminder will include a link to a booking system for candidates to book a slot during a 'Progress Week'. If a slot has not been booked by one month prior to the progress week, a reminder will be sent to the candidate, supervisory team and IPA.
- 7.5** **Failure to complete first attempt.** For all Milestones, failure to complete the meeting, presentation (and any other requirement for that specific Milestone) and record the relevant information on *PhD Manager* without mitigation by the given deadline will result in the candidate being sent the first formal warning (via *PhD Manager*) to complete the requirements within a one month period.
- 7.6** **Failure to complete second attempt.** For all Milestones, failure to complete this second attempt without mitigation will result in a final formal warning (via *PhD Manager*) to complete the requirements within a further one month period.
- 7.7** **Failure to complete the third and final attempt.** For all milestones, failure to complete the requirements within the further one month period without mitigation will result in the candidate being withdrawn from the programme of work.
- 7.8** **Candidates with suspension or mitigation.** For candidates who have had mitigation through an approved suspension or mitigating circumstances request on *PhD Manager*, the candidates will be required to meet with their supervisory team and independent progression advisor at a time proportional to the amount of suspension/mitigation approved. As an example, if a candidate requested a three month suspension when five months into their programme of work (i.e., five months post initial enrolment), they will be expected to complete their Month 6 Milestone requirements one month after returning from suspension. Candidates will be reminded of this task through an email sent via *PhD Manager*.
- 7.9** **Assessing each attempt.** At each Milestone, each candidate will be assessed against the completion of specified requirements for the Milestone being completed, the quality of the work completed against Level 8 doctoral criteria, and their progress from the previous Milestone.
- 7.10** Each candidate will have three attempts to progress any Milestone successfully. Should a candidate fail the first two attempts, they will be provided with specific feedback to help them understand the submission requirements, the level of work required for Level 8 doctoral study and the work they must address to continue to progress towards the completion of a product suitable for doctoral assessment.
- 7.11** A candidate may appeal against the decision of the University's RDC in accordance with Section 1 of The University's **Appeals Procedure (Postgraduate Research Degrees)**.

Month 1: The launchpad

- 7.12** All candidates will be required to meet formally with supervisory team members **one month post enrolment**, either face to face or remotely through Microsoft Teams, to discuss with them, and confirm, the potential objective(s) for the next 5 months and assess training needs to support the achievement of the identified objective(s).
- 7.13** After the meeting, the candidate **must** record the objective(s) and training needs on *PhD Manager*.
- 7.14** **Failure to complete first attempt.** Candidates and the supervisory team will be sent an email reminder of this requirement via *PhD Manager* two weeks prior to the deadline. Failure to complete the meeting, presentation and record the relevant information on *PhD Manager* without mitigation by the given deadline will result in the candidate being sent a first warning (via *PhD Manager*) to complete the requirements within a further two week period.

7.15 Failure to complete second attempt. Failure to complete the requirements within the further two week period without mitigation (including the uploading of relevant information to *PhD Manager*) will result in the candidate being sent a final warning (via *PhD Manager*) to complete the requirements within a final two week period.

7.16 Failure to complete the third and final attempt. Failure to complete the requirements within the final two week period without mitigation will result in the candidate being withdrawn from the programme.

Month 6: The first progress week

7.17 All candidates will be required to meet formally with supervisory team members and their IPA six months post enrolment, either face to face or remotely through Microsoft Teams, to present to them, and then discuss, the following:

- A review of their work against the objectives set during the 'Launchpad';
- Insight into development of programme of work towards addressing Level 8 criteria;
- The research aim and potential objective(s) for the remainder of the programme (FT only) and those that will be addressed in the next 6 months (all candidates). for the remainder of the programme and those that will be addressed in the next 6 months. **For full-time PhD candidates, it is important to note the written requirements for the Month 12 Milestone, that must be**

considered here. For part-time PhD candidates, the written requirement should be an objective set at month 12, to be completed by month 24. For Professional Doctorate and Taught Doctorate candidates, the requirements should be related to the respective assessments within each programme.

- A justified and detailed plan of work to address the objectives, with deadlines provided against each identified step;
- Insight into the training requirements to support appropriate progress;
- Ethical considerations, mitigations and a deadline for ethical approval application.

7.18 After the meeting, the candidate must record all the presented and agreed upon detail in the relevant sections on *PhD Manager*.

Month 6 (integrated PHD Candidates Only)

7.19 For candidates who are undertaking the intensive first year training programme offered by the relevant School they are enrolled in, the regulations specified from 7.1 to 7.16 above are relevant.

7.20 As a result of the performance against the requirements specified on 7.15 and the work completed during the first 6 months of the intensive research skills training programme, a candidate enrolled on the integrated PhD pathway will be assessed to determine their capability to continue on the PhD programme.

7.21 Should the candidate be deemed capable based on addressing the requirements specified in 7.15 and demonstrating suitable progress on the intensive research skills training programme, the candidate will be recommended to continue on the PhD programme.

7.22 Should the candidate be deemed unsuitable for the PhD programme, the candidate will be transferred onto the MRes programme offered within the respective School.

Month 12: First annual progression week

- 7.23** All candidates will be required to meet formally with supervisory team members and their independent progression advisor on the first anniversary of enrolment, either face to face or remotely through Microsoft Teams, to present to them, and then discuss, the following:
- i. The paper could be: i) a critical literature review with a concluding summary, rationale, aim and objectives for the remaining programme of work; ii) a systematic review informed by PRISMA guidelines; iii) a scoping review or a meta-analysis; or iv) an empirical paper prepared for peer review.;
 - ii. A review of their work against the objectives set during the 'Month 6' Milestone;
 - iii. A brief critique of development of the programme of work towards addressing Level 8 criteria;
 - iv. The justification for potential objective(s) for the remainder of the programme and those that will be addressed in the next 12 months.
 - v. A justified and detailed plan of work to address the objectives, with deadlines provided against each identified step;
 - vi. Insight into the training requirements to support appropriate progress;
 - vii. Ethical considerations, mitigations and a deadline for ethical approval application.
- 7.24** For part-time candidates, Professional Doctorate and Taught Doctorate candidates, all of the above requirements must be completed **except** for requirement (i).
- 7.25** After the meeting, the candidate **must** record all the presented and agreed upon detail in the relevant sections on *PhD Manager*.

Month 24 and 36 (48, 60 and 72 for PT also): Annual progression weeks

- 7.26** All candidates will be required to meet formally with supervisory team members and their independent progression advisor on each anniversary of their enrolment, either face to face or remotely through Microsoft Teams, to present to them, and then discuss, the following:
- A review of their work against the objectives set at the previous Milestone;
 - A brief critique of development of the programme of work towards addressing Level 8 criteria;
 - The justification for potential objective(s) for the remainder of the programme and those that will be addressed in the next 12 months.
 - A justified and detailed plan of work to address the objectives, with deadlines provided against each identified step;
 - Insight into the training requirements to support appropriate progress;
 - Any ethical considerations that may still be pending, mitigations and a deadline for ethical approval application.
- 7.27** After the meeting, the candidate **must** record all the presented and agreed upon detail in the relevant sections on *PhD Manager*.

8. ETHICAL APPROVAL

- 8.1** Most research projects conducted by candidates will require ethical approval before any work on those projects can be commenced. Ethical approval must, therefore, be discussed with the supervisory team on a regular basis to ensure that applications for ethics approval are part of the planning process. All relevant forms and guidance are available on the University's Ethics page.
- 8.2** Applications for ethics approval of a research project are considered by the ethics committee of the School where the doctoral researcher is based. Specific queries regarding the ethics approval process should, therefore, be directed to the appropriate School contact in the first instance.

9. PROPOSING EXAMINATION PANELS

- 9.1** **Eight months before** a candidate intends to submit the final product (e.g., a thesis [PhD / Taught Doctorate] or final project report and reflective piece [Prof Doc]), the candidate must start to discuss their examination arrangements with the supervisory team - with the DoS (or Lead Supervisor) being tasked with contacting the potential examination panel on the candidate's behalf.
- 9.2** **Six months before** a candidate intends to submit the final product, the candidate's DoS must submit those examination arrangements for review and approval, to allow time for them to be approved and for Exam Arrangements to then be expedited on submission or where arrangements are not approved, for sufficient replacements to be considered.
- 9.3** The composition of the Examination Panel will be determined by the nature of the candidate's relationship with the University. Where the candidate is either not employed by the University or holds an HPL contract for six hours or less per week (averaged across the academic year), their Examination Panel will consist of a Chair, one internal examiner and one external examiner. Where the candidate holds an employment contract with the University, including an HPL contract for more than six hours per week (averaged across the academic year), their Examination Panel will consist of a Chair and two external examiners.
- 9.4** If it should prove impossible to appoint an internal examiner, a second external examiner may be appointed.
- 9.5** In all instances, the Chair will be a member of staff of the University who has undertaken the appropriate University's Chair Training, and who is normally from the same School (or equivalent) as the candidate. The Chair will be reviewed and approved by the University's RDC.
- 9.6** One supervisor can also be proposed to be present at the examination, with this requirement being presented at this proposal stage.
- 9.7** When proposing each examiner (not Chair) on *PhD Manager*, a brief, but sufficient, narrative on why each examiner is suitable is required. In addition, a short CV to complement this narrative and a completed and signed declaration form are also needed. A document to support examination panel proposals is included on *PhD Manager*, labelled PEP Selection Guidelines.
- 9.8** The University's RDC will approve the appointment of an examiner only in instances where it is satisfied that they are sufficiently familiar with the nature and purpose of the degree for which the candidate is being examined and that they possess sufficient knowledge and expertise in the subject area of the research project. **Any rejected proposed exam panel application must be addressed within four weeks of receipt of outcome.**
- 9.9** **A candidate must not submit their final product until the examination arrangements have been approved - unless the candidate is approaching the end of candidature. If the candidate is approaching the end of candidature date, then please submit. Please note that the viva-voce process WILL NOT progress until your examination arrangements are approved.**

10. PRESENTATION AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS: PHD CANDIDATES ONLY

- 10.1** Full details of the requirements of the University with regard to the presentation and binding of a thesis are provided in the Doctoral Researcher Handbook, [available on the Doctoral Academy Portal](#).
- 10.2** The thesis, including footnotes, must not exceed 100,000 words for the award of PhD or 60,000 words for the award of MPhil. **The word count would not include tables, figures, reference list and appendices.** Candidates who submit a thesis which is longer in length will have their thesis returned to them to address the word count – with a deadline of one month (two months for PT candidates) provided to address the word count. Failure to achieve this new deadline without mitigation will result in the candidate exiting without an award.
- 10.3** Candidates undertaking an award in the creative and performance arts are permitted to make a submission which includes the following:
- i.** a thesis not exceeding 30,000 words for the award of PhD or 15,000 words for the award of MPhil.
 - ii.** work in one of the following formats: artefact, score, portfolio of original works, performance or exhibition.
 - iii.** a written commentary, normally of 5,000 – 6,000 words, placing the work submitted under (ii) in its academic context as part of the thesis. The word count of the written commentary will count as part of the total word count of the thesis as outlined in (i) above.
- 10.4** In all cases, the thesis must contain within its binding an abstract not exceeding 300 words and a Declaration Form, signed by the candidate which includes:
- i.** a statement showing to what extent the work submitted is the result of the candidate's own investigation.
 - ii.** a declaration certifying that the work has not already been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any other degree.
 - iii.** a declaration of which work / chapter(s) that is included in the thesis that has been through a peer review process and published in a recognised journal outlet.
 - iv.** a statement regarding the availability of the thesis.
- 10.5** A submitted thesis will be made openly available and will not normally be subject to any security or restriction of access. In cases where this is not appropriate, a candidate's Director of Studies will make an application to the University's RDC to prohibit copying and/or access to the thesis for a specified period. Such applications should be made as soon as any issues relating to confidentiality arise. In such cases the title and summary of the thesis will normally be made freely available.
- 10.6** Candidates are required to submit two hard copies of the thesis and any additional material to the Registry Officer for Higher Degrees at Research and Innovation Services, in line with the guidance provided on examinations page of the Doctoral Academy Portal. In addition, candidates are required to submit an electronic copy of the thesis and any additional material via **PhD Manager**. Hard copies of the thesis should be accompanied by completed and signed copies of the Thesis Submission Form and Declaration Form.
- 10.7** The electronic submission will be uploaded to Turnitin, the plagiarism detection platform, in order to generate an originality report with a 'similarity index'. The report will be forwarded to the Chair of the Examination Panel to review and any submission whose academic integrity is deemed to be of concern will be forwarded to Registry Services to be formally considered under the Unfair Practice procedures.
- 10.8** Once the thesis has been submitted the candidate is not permitted to make any amendments, additions or deletions to it prior to examination, except where consent has been explicitly granted by the RDC.

11. PRESENTATION AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS: ALL OTHER DOCTORATE PROGRAMMES

- 11.1 Please refer to the respective Programme Handbooks that are available on the Doctoral Academy Portal, with hyperlinks below:

Professional Doctorate

Taught Doctorate

12. THE EXAMINATION

- 12.1 The examination process for all Doctoral Candidates consists of two stages:

STAGE ONE: preliminary independent assessment of the thesis by the examiners, who will each prepare a pre viva report on the thesis (or equivalent) and submit no later than 5 working days prior to the Viva Examination date. Examiners will be asked to complete their report on PhD Manager before the proposed date of the oral examination.

STAGE TWO: an oral examination (the *viva voce*) conducted by the Examination Panel.



13. EXAMINATION OUTCOMES: PHD

13.1 For *viva voce* examinations for PhD Candidates only, recommendations available to panel members are:

- A:** The candidate fulfils the criteria for the award on which they are enrolled. Examiners may recommend that the award be made:
- i.** Without further correction or amendment to the thesis.
 - ii.** Subject to correction of presentational or typographical errors in the thesis within a maximum of 2 weeks (full-time candidates) or 4 weeks (part-time candidates).

Corrections will be approved by one or both examiners.
 - iii.** Subject to minor amendment of the thesis as indicated by the examiners which can reasonably be completed within a maximum of 12 weeks (full-time candidates) or 24 weeks (part-time candidates).

Amendments will be approved by one or both examiners.
 - iv.** Subject to major amendment of the thesis which could include addressing deficiencies in terms of content, analysis and/or presentation in areas indicated by the examiners and which can reasonably be completed within a maximum of 6 months (full-time candidates) or 12 months (part-time candidates).

Amendments will be approved by both examiners although no re-examination will be required.

This option is not available to examiners when considering a resubmitted thesis from a candidate whose outcome was Bi in the first examination.

B: The candidate does not currently fulfil the criteria for the award on which they are enrolled. Examiners may recommend that one of the following courses of action are taken:

- i. Referred for resubmission:** The candidate does not currently fulfil the criteria of the award for which they are enrolled due to significant deficiencies of content and/or presentation as indicated by the examiners. The candidate is permitted to revise and resubmit the thesis for the same award and be re-examined on one further occasion, with or without a *viva voce*. Required revisions should be completed within a maximum of 12 months (full-time candidates) or 24 months (part-time candidates).

Both examiners will conduct the re-examination.

This option is not available to examiners when considering a resubmitted thesis from a candidate whose outcome was Bi in the first examination.

- ii. Recommend MPhil following amendments:** The candidate does not fulfil the criteria for a doctoral award but does meet the criteria for MPhil subject to amendments as indicated by the examiners. Amendments should be completed within a maximum of 4 weeks (full-time candidates) or 8 weeks (part-time candidates) and will be approved by one or both examiners.
- iii. Resubmission for MPhil:** The candidate does not fulfil the criteria for a doctoral award but has the potential to meet the criteria for MPhil subject to major amendments as indicated by the examiners. Revisions should be completed within a maximum of 6 months (full-time candidates) or 12 months (part-time candidates). Both examiners will conduct the re-examination.

This option is also available to examiners when considering a first resubmission of a thesis.

C: The candidate is not awarded the degree and is not permitted to be re-examined either for the award for which they are enrolled or an alternative award.

13.2 In cases where the examiners cannot agree on an examination outcome, an arbitrating external examiner may be sought following the procedures set out in the University's Academic Handbook (**Guidance for Chairs and Examiners of Doctoral Awards**).

13.3 A candidate may appeal against the decision of the Examination Panel in accordance with Section 1 of The University's **Appeals Procedure (Postgraduate Research Degrees)**.

13.4 The University will only consider appeals on one or more of the grounds outlined in Section 1 of the Appeals Procedure (Postgraduate Research Degrees). Appeals which question the academic judgement of the examiners will not be admissible.

13.5 For major resubmissions (i.e., outcome Bi), should the examination panel feel that the resubmission has not addressed the requirements and a significant amount of work is still required to reach a pass, the thesis will be referred. The candidate will be afforded a maximum of 12 weeks to complete the work and resubmit. The candidate will only be afforded this option once.

13.6 Candidates will only have two attempts at addressing corrections, which constitutes three submissions in total and candidates cannot receive the same outcome as the previous submission (See Figure 1 for a flow chart of options against submission number).

13.7 Any candidate who receives a Bi outcome in the first instance, cannot receive an Aiv for the second or final submission. If the candidate fails to achieve at least a pass with minor amendments (Aiii) on resubmission, following a Bi outcome, then they will receive a Bii or Biii outcome (dependent on the exam panel's appraisal).




Figure 1. PhD Exam outcome options against submission stage

14. EXAMINATION OUTCOMES: PROF DOC

14.1 For *viva voce* examinations for Professional Doctorate Candidates only, recommendations available to panel members are:

- A:** The candidate fulfils the criteria for the award on which they are enrolled. Examiners may recommend that the award be made:
- i.** Without further correction or amendment to the final project report and reflective essay;
 - ii.** Subject to correction of presentational or typographical errors within the final project report and reflective essay within a maximum of 4 weeks.

Corrections will be approved by one or both examiners;

- iii.** Subject to minor amendment of the final project report and reflective essay as indicated by the examiners which can reasonably be completed within a maximum of 24 weeks.

Amendments will be approved by one or both examiners;

- iv.** Subject to major amendment of the final project report and reflective essay which could include addressing deficiencies in terms of content, analysis and/or presentation in areas indicated by the examiners and which can reasonably be completed within a maximum of 12 months.

Amendments will be approved by both examiners although no re-examination will be required.

B: The candidate does not currently fulfil the criteria for the award on which they are enrolled. Examiners may recommend that one of the following courses of action are taken:

- i.** Referred for resubmission*: The candidate does not currently fulfil the criteria of the award for which they are enrolled due to significant deficiencies of content and/or presentation as indicated by the examiners. The candidate is permitted to revise and resubmit the final project report and reflective essay for the same award and be re-examined on one further occasion, with or without a *viva voce*. Required revisions should be completed within a maximum of 24 months. Both examiners will conduct the re-examination. This option will not be available to examiners when considering a resubmitted thesis;
- ii.** that the candidate not be approved for the award of a Doctorate Level degree. The candidate will exit with the MProf.

*Option (Bi) is not applicable when a re-submitted final project report and reflective essay is being examined.

14.2 Candidates will only have two attempts at addressing corrections, which constitutes three submissions in total and candidates cannot receive the same outcome as that awarded for the previous submission.

15. EXAMINATION OUTCOMES: TAUGHT DOC

15.1 After the *viva voce* examination of the Research Thesis, the examiners can make one of the following decisions as appropriate:

- A.** The candidate fulfils the criteria for the award on which they are enrolled. Examiners may recommend that the award be made:
 - i.** Without further correction or amendment to the Research Thesis;
 - ii.** Subject to correction of presentational or typographical errors in the Research Thesis within a maximum of 4 weeks. Corrections will be approved by one or both examiners;
 - iii.** Subject to minor amendment of the Research Thesis as indicated by the examiners which can reasonably be completed within a maximum of 12 weeks for a full-time candidate or 24 weeks for a part-time candidate. Amendments will be approved by one or both examiners;
 - iv.** Subject to major amendment of the Research Thesis which could include addressing deficiencies in terms of content, analysis and/or presentation in areas indicated by the examiners and which can reasonably be completed within a maximum of 6 months for a full-time candidate or 12 months for a part-time candidate. Amendments will be approved by both examiners although no re-examination will be required. This option is not available to examiners when considering a resubmitted thesis from a candidate who was awarded a Bi outcome in the first submission.

- B.** The candidate does not currently fulfil the criteria for the award on which they are enrolled. Examiners may recommend that one of the following courses of action are taken:
 - i.** Referred for resubmission*: The candidate does not currently fulfil the criteria of the award for which they are enrolled due to significant deficiencies of content and/or presentation as indicated by the examiners. The candidate is permitted to revise and resubmit the Research Thesis for the same award and be re-examined on one further occasion, with or without a *viva voce*. Required revisions should be completed within a maximum of 12 months (full-time candidates) or 24 months (part-time candidates). Both examiners will conduct the re-examination. This option will not be available to examiners when considering a resubmitted thesis.
 - ii.** Not approved for the doctoral degree sought but be approved instead for the award of MRes, provided that the submitted work fulfils the requirements for the degree, subject to completion of such minor corrections as may be required by the Examining Board. Corrections should be completed within a period of 4 weeks.
 - iii.** Not approved for the doctoral degree sought, but be allowed to modify the Research Thesis and re-submit it for the award of MRes. A candidate may be allowed a single opportunity to re-submit the work. The re-submission should take place within a period not exceeding 12 months.

C. The candidate not be approved for the award of a degree.

- 15.2 In compiling the final report after the *viva voce* examination, the examiners should give clear, detailed guidelines as to the work that is required of the candidate to meet the minimum requirements for the award being sought.
- 15.3 For outcome (Aiii), minor corrections and amendments may consist of the addition of new material or the removal of incorrect and/or misleading material, but should not require an extension of the substance of the research.
- 15.4 For outcome (Bi), should the examiners be agreed that the research design and execution of the Research Thesis is flawed and/or the Research Thesis requires substantial re-working, they may permit the candidate to re-submit the Research Thesis within a maximum of 12 months (full-time

candidates) or 24 months (part-time candidates). The examiners should be satisfied that there is evidence that the candidate knows what s/he is doing, that the work substantially addresses the problems or issues posed but that its execution in the Research Thesis requires modification of a scale capable of being accomplished by the candidate within the period. *The Examination Board must confirm whether another Viva Voce Examination is required for the resubmission.*

All recommendations from the Examination Board are subject to approval by the University's Research Degrees Committee.

- 15.5 Candidates will only have two attempts at addressing corrections, which constitutes three submissions in total and candidates cannot receive the same as that awarded for the previous submission.



