

**ACADEMIC REGULATIONS
FOR
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS**

With effect from September 2017

Preface

This document contains the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards* of the University of Greenwich. It contains the regulations relating to the following academic awards:

- **Research based awards – Master of Philosophy (MPhil) and Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)**
- **Doctorate by published work – PhD**
- **Professional doctorates – currently EdD**
- **Masters by Research – MA, MSc, LLM**
- **Higher doctorates –DSc, DTech, DLitt, LLD**

The regulations for each award are contained in their own section. Included in separate are the regulations relating to examination arrangements, examination and possible outcomes, academic appeals, and the conferment of such awards.

These regulations were approved by the University's Academic Council April 2017 for implementation from September 2017. They have been designed so as to not disadvantage any postgraduate research student who registered as such with the University before this date. Should any student consider that the regulations set out in this document disadvantages them, then the equivalent, relevant regulation contained in the previous approved regulations (i.e. those approved by Academic Council on 11 March 2015) will apply.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION TO THE ACADEMIC REGULATIONS FOR RESEARCH AWARDS.....	1
A1 General principles.....	1
A2 Structure of document	1
A3 Qualification descriptors.....	2
A4 Collaborating organisations.....	2
A5 Awards made in association with approved collaborating Higher Education Institutions, Dual Awards and Joint Awards.....	3
B. REGULATIONS RELATING TO MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY (MPhil) AND DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD) 4	
B1 General.....	4
B2 Admission requirements	4
B3 Admission of students and registration with the University.....	6
B4 Induction and Orientation.....	7
B5 Approval of proposed programme of research by Faculty Research Degrees Committee.....	8
B6 Permitted periods of registration	10
B7 Student progress and progression	11
B8 Transfer of registration from MPhil to PhD.....	13
B9 Submission of thesis for examination and other documentation.....	15
B10 Examination arrangements and examination.....	15
B11 Submission of definitive thesis	15
B12 Conferment of the award	16
B13 Academic Appeals	16
C. DOCTORATE BY PUBLISHED WORK (PhD)	17
C1 General.....	17
C2 Eligibility of applicants	17
C3 Admission requirements	17
C4 Registration with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee	18
C5 Admission of students and registration with the University.....	18
C6 Submission of work for examination and other documentation.....	19
C7 Examination arrangements and examination.....	20
C8 Examination outcomes.....	20
C9 Submission of definitive document	21
C10 Conferment of the award	21
C11 Academic Appeals	21
D. REGULATIONS RELATING TO PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATES – CURRENTLY DOCTORATE IN EDUCATION (EdD).....	22
D1 General.....	22
D2 Admission requirements	23
D3 Admission of students and registration with the University.....	24
D4 Maximum permitted period of registration	24
D5 Induction and orientation	24
D6 Student Progress and progression in taught phase	25
D7 Approval of proposed programme of research by Faculty Research Degrees Committee.....	25
D8 Student Progress and progression in research phase	27
D9 Submission of thesis for examination and other documentation.....	29
D10 Examination arrangements and examination.....	29
D11 Submission of definitive thesis	29
D12 Conferment of the award	29
D13 Academic Appeals	29
E. REGULATIONS RELATING TO MASTERS BY RESEARCH (MA, MSc, LLm)	30
E1 General.....	30
E2 Management and Quality Oversight of Masters by Research Programmes	30
E3 Admission of students and registration with the University.....	31
E4 The programme of study	31

E5	Assessment.....	32
	Taught courses.....	32
	The project/dissertation.....	32
E6	Conferment of the award.....	33
E7	Academic Appeals.....	33
	Taught Courses.....	33
	Project/dissertation.....	33
F.	REGULATIONS RELATING TO HIGHER DOCTORATES (DSc, DTech, DLitt, LLD).....	34
F1	General.....	34
F2	Eligibility of applicants.....	34
F3	Submission of work and establishment of a <i>prima facie</i> case.....	34
F4	Assessment of submission.....	35
G.	EXAMINATION ARRANGEMENTS AND EXAMINATION FOR MPhil, PhD AND EdD.....	37
G1	Overview of process.....	37
G2	Candidate's responsibilities.....	39
G3	The examiners.....	40
G4	The external examiner(s).....	42
G5	The internal examiner.....	42
G6	The Chair.....	43
G7	Supervisors and Director of Postgraduate Research.....	43
G8	The examination.....	43
G9	Outcomes of examination.....	44
G10	Resubmission and re-examination.....	47
G11	Posthumous Awards.....	49
G12	Submission of definitive thesis.....	50
G13	Conferment of the award.....	50
G14	Academic Appeals.....	50
H.	REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE CONFERMENT OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS..	51
H1	Awards.....	51
H2	Principles of conferment.....	51
H3	Publication of assessment results.....	52
H4	Preparation and issue of award certificates.....	52
H5	Posthumous awards.....	53
H6	Replacement certificates.....	53
H7	Awards ceremonies.....	53
I.	REGULATIONS RELATING TO POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH ACADEMIC APPEALS.....	54
I1	Grounds for appealing the decision of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to discontinue a student's registration.....	54
I2	Grounds for appealing the outcome of an allegation of research misconduct that has been upheld.....	54
I3	Grounds for appealing the outcome of a transfer viva (upgrade from MPhil to PhD).....	55
I4	Grounds for appealing the outcome of a formal oral examination (viva voce) for a final award.....	55
I5	Grounds under which an appeal cannot be made.....	56
I6	How to appeal.....	56
I7	Informal Review.....	57
I8	Formal Review.....	58
I9	Procedures of the Research Awards Appeal Board.....	58
I10	Reporting, Monitoring and Review.....	59
I11	Office of the Independent Adjudicator.....	60
I12	Advice and Support.....	60
	APPENDIX 1: QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY (QAA) MASTERS (LEVEL 7) AND DOCTORAL (LEVEL 8) QUALIFICATION DESCRIPTORS.....	61
1.1	Qualification Descriptors.....	61
1.2	'Descriptor for a higher education qualification at level 7: Master's degree.....	61
1.3	'Descriptor for a higher education qualification at level 8: Doctoral degree.....	62

APPENDIX 2: REGULATIONS RELATING TO RESEARCH AWARDS MADE IN ASSOCIATION WITH APPROVED COLLABORATING HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS	63
2.1 Regulations relating to MPhil, MPhil/PhD and PhD awards made in association with approved collaborating Higher Education/Research Institutions, Dual Awards and Joint Awards	63
2.2 Research awards made in association with approved collaborating Higher Education/Research Institutions	63
2.3 Dual Awards.....	64
2.4 Joint Awards.....	65
APPENDIX 3: REGULATIONS RELATING TO RESEARCH PROGRAMMES CONDUCTED	66
AT OVERSEAS INSTITUTIONS	66
3.1 Regulations relating to arrangements for University postgraduate research students studying outside of the UK.....	66
APPENDIX 4: REGULATIONS RELATING TO SUSPECTED RESEARCH MISCONDUCT BY POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS.....	68
4.1 EXPECTATIONS	68
4.2 SCOPE OF REGULATIONS.....	68
4.3 DEFINITIONS	68
4.4 SCALE OF OFFENCES RELATING TO RESEARCH MISCONDUCT.....	70
4.5 PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT.....	70
4.5.1 Stage 1 - Reporting a suspected offence.....	71
4.5.2 Stage 2 – Collecting relevant material	72
4.5.3 Stage 3 – Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel.....	72
4.5.4 Stage 4: Route 1 - Consideration by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for identified Levels 1 and 2 research misconduct.....	74
4.5.5 Stage 4: Route 2 – Consideration by University Research Student Misconduct Panel for identified Level 3 research misconduct.....	75
4.6 PENALTIES THAT MAY BE IMPOSED	76
4.7 ABSENCE OF STUDENT	77
4.8 RIGHT OF APPEAL.....	77
4.9 REPORTING CASES OF PROVEN RESEARCH MISCONDUCT.....	77
4.10 RIGHT TO REVISIT AN ALLEGATION OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT.....	78
4.11 OTHER MATTERS.....	78
APPENDIX 5: REGULATIONS RELATING TO CONFIDENTIALITY AND RESTRICTED ACCESS TO THESES	79
5.1 Regulations relating to confidentiality and restricted access to theses.....	79

A. INTRODUCTION TO THE ACADEMIC REGULATIONS FOR POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS

A1 General principles

- A1.1 The University of Greenwich (hereinafter referred to as the ‘University’) will award research degrees to registered candidates (also referred to as ‘postgraduate research students’, ‘research students’ or ‘students’) who successfully complete approved programmes of supervised research in line with the academic regulations set out in this document. These awards shall be consistent with and comparable in standard to similar degrees awarded by other institutions of higher education in the United Kingdom.
- A1.2 Programmes of research may be proposed in any field of study within the university’s academic portfolio, subject to the requirement that the proposed programme is capable of leading to scholarly research, and being presented in a written format in the form of a thesis for assessment by appropriately qualified examiners. The written thesis may be supplemented by material in forms other than the written form. All proposed research programmes shall be considered for research degree registration on their academic merits and without reference to the concerns or interests of any associated funding body.
- A1.3 In permitting postgraduate research students to undertake an approved programme of research that leads to the award of a research degree, the University will endeavour to follow the ‘Indicators of sound practice’ set out in the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) *UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part B, Chapter B11: Research Degrees, (2013)*.

A2 Structure of document

- A2.1 These *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards* cover the following research degrees awarded by the University of Greenwich. Award-specific regulations are presented in the following sections, as are the generic arrangements relating to examinations, conferment of such awards, and complaints and appeals.

- A. Research based awards – Master of Philosophy (MPhil) and Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)**
- B. Doctorate by published work – PhD**
- C. Professional doctorates – currently EdD**
- D. Masters by Research – MA, MSc**
- E. Higher doctorates – DLitt, DSc, DTech, LLD**
- F. Examinations arrangements and examination**
- G. Conferment of research awards**
- H. Academic Appeals**

Additionally, these regulations include a number of appendices which provide further information on specific matters.

- A2.2 **Section B** sets out the regulations relating to the traditional research based awards, Master of Philosophy (MPhil) and Doctors of Philosophy (PhD), including the usual route to Doctor of Philosophy through initial registration for MPhil, with transfer possibility to PhD.
- A2.3 **Section C** sets out the regulations relating to the award of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by acknowledgement of a candidate’s contribution to knowledge through research as exemplified by previously published work.
- A2.4 **Section D** sets out the regulations relating to the ‘research phase’ of Professional Doctorates, for which the university, currently, offers only one variant, the Doctorate in Education (EdD). As such, these regulations complement the Faculty-specific regulations relating to the ‘taught phase’ of this programme.

- A2.5 **Section E** sets out the overarching regulations relating to the ‘research element’ of the Masters by Research programme, i.e. MA, MSc and LLM by Research. As such, these regulations complement the Faculty-specific regulations relating to these awards.
- A2.6 **Section F** sets out the regulations relating to the higher doctorates (ie DLitt, DSc, DTech and LLD) through acknowledgement of a candidate’s sustained and on-going contribution to a body of knowledge through research over a considerable period of time, as, primarily, exemplified and articulated through a substantial body of previously published work.
- A2.7 **Section G** sets out the university regulations relating to the examination of candidates seeking the award of the foregoing research degrees, including information on the process for making an Appeal against an examination decision.
- A2.8 **Section H** sets out the university’s regulations surrounding the conferment of the foregoing research based awards.
- A2.9 **Section I** sets out the grounds and processes by which postgraduate research students may make an Appeal against the decision of a Faculty Research Degrees Committee.

The roles and responsibilities of postgraduate research students in undertaking an agreed programme of research in working towards their target research award, and those of their supervisors in assisting them to do so, are set out in the Postgraduate Research Student’s and Supervisor’s Handbook <http://www2.gre.ac.uk/current-students/postgrad-research/further-info>.

A3 Qualification descriptors

- A3.1 As referred to in the QAA *UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part B, Chapter B11, Research Degrees, (2013)*, and as a reference point, candidates for the award of the Masters level awards of Masters by Research (MA, MSc) and Master of Philosophy (MPhil) are expected to meet the Level 7 (Master’s Degrees) descriptors for such awards set out in the *UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards – The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies, QAA (October 2014)*, further information on which is contained in Appendix 1 to these regulations.
- A3.2 As a reference point, candidates for the award of the Doctoral level awards of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and of Doctorate in Education (EdD) are expected to meet the Level 8 (Doctoral) descriptors for such awards set out in the *UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards – The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies, QAA (October 2014)*, further information on which is also contained in Appendix 1 to these regulations.

A4 Collaborating organisations

- A4.1 In support of the University’s research and enterprise vision to engage in impact driven research that has a beneficial impact on society, it encourages collaboration with industrial, commercial, professional, public, educational, academic and research orientated establishments etc. for the purposes of furthering and supporting research leading to the award of research degrees. Such collaboration is intended to:
- (a) encourage topical, outward-looking, relevant and impactful leading edge research;
 - (b) extend the research student’s own experience and perspectives of the research topic;
 - (c) provide a wider range of experience and expertise to assist in the development of the topic;
 - (d) be to the mutual benefit of the university and the collaborating organisation;
 - (e) where appropriate, enable the student to become a member of a wider research community.

- A4.2 Formal co-operation may be with one or more such external bodies, which will be referred to as ‘collaborating organisations’. Such formal collaboration should normally involve a candidate using facilities and other resources provided jointly by the University and the collaborating organisation(s), and usually includes joint supervision of the candidate, or, through a nominated representative, acting in an advisory capacity.
- A4.3 In such cases a formal letter from the collaborating organisation confirming the agreed arrangements should be submitted with the application to the appropriate Faculty Research Degrees Committee when seeking approval of the proposed programme of research, except where such collaboration is an integral part of the research project (as, for example, with some research awards made by the Research Councils UK). The name(s) of the collaborating organisation(s) will appear in the candidate’s thesis and on the degree certificate.

A5 Awards made in association with approved collaborating Higher Education Institutions, Dual Awards and Joint Awards

- A5.1 The University may enter into a formal collaboration with another approved higher education institution for the purpose of furthering the postgraduate research endeavour. Accordingly, the regulations set out in this document will be those that will be used in situations where postgraduate research is undertaken under the auspices of the University as the formally recognised awarding body with other formally recognised higher education institutions that do not possess such research degree awarding powers. Further information on such arrangements are set out in Appendix 2 of this document.
- A5.2 The regulations set out in this document will be those that will be used from the University’s perspective in situations where formally approved programmes of postgraduate research form the basis of making Dual Awards with other formally recognised collaborating higher education institutions that also possess research degrees awarding powers. Further information on such arrangements are set out in Appendix 2 of this document.
- A5.3 The regulations set out in this document will be those that will be used from the University’s perspective in negotiating and agreeing on the overarching academic regulations to be used in situations where formally approved programmes of postgraduate research form the basis of making Joint Awards with other formally recognised collaborating higher education institutions that also possesses research degrees awarding powers. Further information on such arrangements are set out in Appendix 2 of this document.

B. REGULATIONS RELATING TO MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY (MPhil) AND DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD)

B1 General

- B1.1 The Master of Philosophy (MPhil) will be awarded to a candidate who meets the Level 7 descriptor set out in Appendix 1, which may be summarised as having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic, demonstrated an understanding of research methods applied to a chosen field, and has presented and defended a written thesis by oral examination (*viva voce*) to the satisfaction of approved examiners.
- B1.2 The Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) will be awarded to a candidate who meets the Level 8 descriptor set out in Appendix 1, which may be summarised as having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic, including demonstrating an understanding of research methods as applied to a chosen field, resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge, and has presented and defended a written thesis by oral examination (*viva voce*) to the satisfaction of approved examiners

B2 Admission requirements

- B2.1 Irrespective of the admission route by which an applicant becomes a postgraduate research student of the university, it is a requirement that the host/lead Faculty should be assured that the proposed programme is of sufficient substance and challenge, and it possesses the necessary supervisory expertise and access to appropriate facilities, to form the basis of a viable research topic that will lead to the award of research degree being sought by the applicant.
- B2.2 The University has three registration routes by which suitably qualified applicants may register as a postgraduate research student of the University, with the express aim of working towards the research awards of MPhil or PhD:
- (i) Master of Philosophy (MPhil), or
 - (ii) Master of Philosophy, with transfer possibility to Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), or, exceptionally,
 - (iii) Doctor of Philosophy
- B2.3 Applicants for registration for MPhil or MPhil with transfer possibility to PhD are normally expected to hold and be able to produce evidence of holding:
- (i) A taught Masters degree, with a minimum average of 60% in all areas of assessment (e.g. Merit) level or above, in a generic subject area relevant to the subject matter of the proposed research project, and/or
 - (ii) A First Class or Second Class, First Division (Upper Second Class) Honours degree in a subject(s) areas relevant to the proposed research project,
- Such qualifications should have been awarded by the University, another university in the UK, the Council of National Academic Awards, or be a qualification which is regarded by the University as equivalent to such awards whether it was awarded in the UK or overseas. The University's decision on this route to admission will be final.
- B2.4 An applicant holding qualifications or a portfolio other than those set out in para B2.3 may be considered to register for MPhil or MPhil with transfer possibility to PhD on an exceptional basis on their merits and in relation to the nature and scope of the proposed programme of work. In considering an applicant in this category, the University will look for evidence of the applicant's ability and background knowledge in relation to the proposed research. Professional experience, publications, written reports or other

appropriate evidence of accomplishment, including a portfolio which identifies an appropriate level of prior learning, shall be taken into consideration. An applicant wishing to be considered under this regulation will include with the application the names of two suitable persons whom the University may consult concerning the applicant's academic attainment and fitness to undertake research at an advanced level. The University's decision on this route to admission will be final.

B2.5 Exceptionally, entry to the University as a postgraduate research student, specifically with a view to direct registration for the degree of PhD, may be permitted on the following bases:

- (i) Where an applicant holds the research degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil), awarded by the University, another UK university, the Council for National Academic Awards, or an overseas Master's degree of equivalent standard, provided that it was awarded solely on the basis of undertaking and completing an approved programme of research in an area close to the focus of the proposed research that will form the basis for submission for PhD. The proposed research that will form the basis for the submission for PhD may not include the research contained in the thesis on which the award of MPhil was based.
- (ii) Where an applicant holds a Master's degree awarded by the University, another UK university, the former Council for National Academic Awards, or an overseas Master's degree of equivalent standard, provided that:
 - a) such a degree is a research focussed Masters award (e.g. Masters by Research) in a discipline that is of direct relevance to the proposed programme of research at PhD level,
 - b) the degree included explicit training in research methods, and the execution of a research project/dissertation in an area that is directly relevant to the proposed research, which amounted to not less than 67% (2/3rds) of the overall programme content, and
 - c) the degree was awarded with an average mark across all elements of assessment of not less than 60% (Merit), which must have included a mark of not less than 60% in the project/dissertation element.
- (iii) Where an applicant, although lacking a relevant Master's that meets the requirements set out in (i) and (ii) possesses First Class or Second Class, First Division (Upper second Class) Honours from a UK university (or equivalent) in an appropriate discipline, and has had appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level which has resulted in substantial and demonstrable published work, written reports or other appropriate and relevant evidence of high level accomplishment in the field relevant to the proposed programme of research.

The University's decision on these routes to admission will be final and there will be no recourse to appeal by applicants.

B2.6 Transfer of a postgraduate research student to the university, who holds an existing registration for MPhil, MPhil with transfer possibility to PhD, or PhD at another HEI can occur for a variety of valid reasons, but usually occurs where their lead supervisor moves employment from another HEI to the University. Such a transfer will only be considered where the previous HEI supports the application and good progress has been made by the applicant at their previous HEI, which can be evidenced, including meeting required progress targets. With the approval of the applicant, the University will seek evidence of this from the previous HEI, along with any other information it considers appropriate to assist in the assessment of their application. Such a transfer will be conditional upon the University being able to provide a suitable supervisory team and facilities to support the research, and on the previous HEI supporting the student's transfer. This must include the

previous HEI waiving its rights relating to all intellectual property arising out of the programme of work undertaken by the student up to the point of departure from the previous HEI. Proposed admissions under this regulation require the prior approval of the relevant Faculty Director of Research, which must be subsequently ratified by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, which will be assessed on the basis of a report presented to it by the proposed lead supervisor and the applicant. The report should detail the progress made at the previous HEI, and the proposed programme of work to be undertaken at the University, with targets and timescales to thesis submission along with other relevant information relating to the application. The applicant should also assure the University that they have sufficient financial resources to pay the relevant University's tuition fees for the duration of their registration. No registration will be considered where a student wishes to register for a research award that is of a higher level than that they were registered for at the time they left their previous institution. Further information on admission by this route is provided in the Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook. The University's decision on this route to admission will be final.

- B2.7 In relation to all of the admission routes by which applicants may apply to become a postgraduate research student of the University as set out in paras B2.1 to B2.6, where applicable, applicants whose first language is not English will also be required to provide evidence of sufficient proficiency in and command of English to engage in the proposed programme of research, and all matters relating to being a postgraduate research student of the university. The minimum requirements to be demonstrated are to a level of 6.5 in all elements of the *International English Language Testing System (IELTS)*, or an acceptable, demonstrable equivalent to this. This requirement is not applicable to those applicants who successfully studied in the UK for either a First Degree or Masters degree to the required level from a UK university, or those who successfully studied for, and were awarded a relevant, equivalent degree from a recognised university in a Majority English Speaking Country, such as Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America (a full list of qualifying countries is available on the university website). The University's decision on this matter will be final.
- B2.8 The decision to admit a prospective student by the routes set out in paras B2.2 – B2.5 will involve at least two members of the Faculty/Department staff, which must include the designated first supervisor, and who have both/all received instruction, advice and guidance in selection and admissions procedures and equal opportunity training. The decision-making process must provide auditable evidence that balanced, independent admission decisions have been made that support the University's admissions policy. At this point the motivation of the applicant to undertake independent research, and their potential to complete the proposed programme of study, must be assessed, along with the applicant's access to appropriate funding for the duration of the programme. These matters must be discussed with all applicants at interview. The interview, where at all possible, should be in person, but exceptionally for applicants living or working overseas, the interview can be by Skype, or equivalent technology.
- B2.9 The University will make a written offer to a successful applicant for a research degree. This letter constitutes a contract between the applicant and the University. The terms contained in the offer letter are binding on the University and, upon acceptance, on the applicant.
- B2.10 In cases where the university's decision is not to make a written offer to an applicant, the matter is final, and there will be no recourse to appeal by the applicant.

B3 Admission of students and registration with the University

- B3.1 An applicant who accepts an offer must register as a research student with the University on the starting date set out in the offer letter, or as soon as possible after this date. This will enable the applicant to become a bona-fide postgraduate research student of the

University, thereby facilitating legitimate access to appropriate University facilities. For the first year, registration will normally be in two parts: on-line, and in person at a campus Student Centre, where the applicant will be required to present identification and original qualifications. Registration will be on-line in subsequent years.

- B3.2 In registering as a student of the University, the student shall adhere to all relevant research student focussed practices and policies in force at the University, including (but not exclusively so) those set out in the Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards, the Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook, and the University's Principal Conditions of Registration¹ and Student Disciplinary Procedure¹.
- B3.3 It is the student's responsibility to re-register on-line as a research student with the University, with payment of fees due, at the start of each academic year (September) and continue to do so until such a time where they have been examined for their award and a final, definitive copy of the thesis has been submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for approval. This also applies irrespective of the date the student first registered with the University during their first academic year of study. Where a student fails to re-register with the university in the September of the academic year, the student will be automatically withdrawn by the University from their programme of study.
- B3.4 The date the applicant officially commences their registration with the University as a bona-fide postgraduate research student will be the reference date to determine all relevant matters relating to the University's processes and procedures as they relate to the student.

B4 Induction and Orientation

- B4.1 Attendance at all induction and orientation sessions is required by all registered postgraduate research students, irrespective of prior qualifications and route of entry, and whether they have previously been a student at the University. The purpose of such induction and orientation is to provide new research students with sufficient information to enable them to begin their studies with an understanding of the academic and social environment in which they will be working, as well as knowledge about matters surrounding relevant policies and health and safety issues. Such induction and orientation takes place at three complementary levels:
- (i) At a local level between the student and their supervisors, the agenda for which is set out on [Research Degree Administration \(RDA\) 1c Form](#). An element of this agenda must be addressed between the student and supervisors, and signed-off as so, within 48 hours of the student completing their registration, with the remainder being addressed within 6 weeks of completing registration.
 - (ii) At the Faculty/sub-Faculty Level. Such induction at this level varies depending on the student's home Faculty, but all approaches are intended to provide students with Faculty information and its perspective on expectations relating to postgraduate research students at a higher level than that delivered at (i).
 - (iii) At the pan-University level. This forms an integral part of students' mandatory engagement with the pan-University *Postgraduate Researcher Development Programme (PGRDP)*. This session focuses on the roles and responsibilities of both the student and the university, in its widest sense, for the duration of students' registration at the University, and includes important issues such as professionalism and research integrity.

¹ <http://www2.gre.ac.uk/current-students/regs>

B5 Approval of proposed programme of research by Faculty Research Degrees Committee

- B5.1 A registered postgraduate research student is required to submit, within 2 months of completing registration, the [RDA Forms 1a-c](#) to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to seek approval of the proposed plan of research, supervisory arrangements and other related matters by the Committee. The date of registration on the relevant forms must align with the initial date of registration of the student as a postgraduate research student of the University as set out paragraph B.3.4. If the receipt of the relevant forms by the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee is beyond the two month requirement set out above, such an application for approval will only be considered by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee on an exceptional basis, with written reasons why the Committee should do so being appended to the relevant forms.
- B5.2 In approving an RDA Form 1a-c, whether under regulations B2.2 – B2.5, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will satisfy itself that:
- (i) It is assured by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute and the proposed supervisors that the student has provided evidence of suitable qualifications and a sufficient command of English to complete satisfactorily any programme of related studies, and to prepare and defend a thesis in English.
 - (ii) the student is embarking on a viable programme of research;
 - (iii) the proposed supervisors have appropriate skills, subject knowledge and supervisory experience to support, encourage and monitor the student effectively, the supervisory arrangements are appropriate and likely to be sustained, and the quality of supervision is not put at risk through excessive volume and range of responsibilities assigned to individual supervisors.
 - (iv) the host Department/Faculty and, if applicable, the collaborating organisation are able to provide appropriate facilities for the conduct of scholarly research in the area of the proposed research programme;
 - (v) The proposed timescale for submission of the thesis for examination of the proposed research is realistic.
- B5.3 Subject to meeting the requirements set out in Appendix 3, a Faculty Research Degrees Committee may approve an application where it is proposed that a student studies outside of the UK.
- B5.4 A student who has been admitted to the University by transfer of an existing MPhil or PhD registration from another HEI under regulation B2.6 is also required to make an application to register their research programme with the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee in accordance with the requirements in paragraph B5.5 below.
- B5.5 If the student was at their previous HEI for less than twelve months, or where their research programme was not formally approved by the previous HEI, such an application to the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee will be by submission of the standard University [RDA Form 1a-c](#) to register a programme of research with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. If the applicant was at the previous HEI for in excess of twelve months, a report detailing the required information set out in para A2.6 should be developed and submitted by the applicant and the proposed lead supervisor to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. Transfer of registration by such means will only be permitted on the basis of the standard of research achieved at the previous institution being considered by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to be commensurate with such registration, and it will be incumbent on both the incoming supervisor and the prospective student to demonstrate this.

- B5.6 A student is permitted to undertake a programme of research where the principal focus is the preparation of a scholarly edition of a text or texts, musical or choreographic work, or other original artefacts. The final submission will include a copy of the edited text(s) or collection of artefact(s), appropriate textual and explanatory annotations, and a substantial introduction and critical commentary which set the text in the relevant historical, theoretical or critical context. The thesis itself will conform to the usual scholarly requirements and be of an appropriate length in line with University guidelines.
- B5.7 A Faculty Research Degrees Committee will consider an RDA1a-c application from a student who is proposing to undertake all or part of their research at an institution outside the UK, providing that it is in compliance with the admission requirements set out in regulations B2 and the regulations and operational framework set out in Appendix 3.
- B5.8 A Faculty Research Degrees Committee may permit a student to register for another programme of study concurrently with the research degree registration, provided that both the research degree registration and other programme of study are by part-time study and that, in the opinion of the Committee, such dual registration will not inhibit progress with the research project.
- B5.9 Under the umbrella of the University's [*Postgraduate Research Development Programme \(PGRDP\)*](#), the student will follow a parallel programme of non-credit bearing related studies for the attainment of competence in research methods, of transferable and generic skills, and knowledge related to the subject of the proposed research. Such a programme is intended:
- (i) to provide the student with a broad base of skills and knowledge necessary for the pursuit of the proposed research;
 - (ii) to provide a body of knowledge normally associated with an advanced degree in the field of study of the proposed research;
 - (iii) to provide breadth of knowledge in related subjects;
 - (iv) to provide the autonomy, initiative and transferable/key skills necessary for subsequent employment at the postdoctoral level.
- B5.10 Where the proposed programme of research to be undertaken by the student forms part of a larger research project or initiative, the supervisors are required to assure the Faculty Research Degrees Committee that the programme of research represents a discrete, stand-alone body of work that is capable of being assessed in its own right for the award being sought by the student.
- B5.11 Where the proposed programme of work to be undertaken by the student forms part or all of a funded research initiative, the supervisors are required to assure the Faculty Research Degrees Committee that the terms on which the proposed research is funded will not detract from or compromise the requirements of the student in working towards the research degree and making the thesis available to the public on completion, unless, with good reason, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee agrees otherwise.
- B5.12 Any new research proposal submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee which, in the opinion of the Committee, appears to fall within the remit of the University's Research Ethics Committee (uREC), will be referred to the University's Research Ethics Committee for consideration, after it has been approved by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. It is the responsibility of the student, under the guidance of the first supervisor, to prepare and submit the appropriate application form (<http://www.gre.ac.uk/research/rec/guidance-on-ethical-approval-for-research>) as soon as possible after approval of the research proposal by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.

B5.13 All research students and their supervisors are expected to comply with any relevant research governance requirements or recommendations applicable to their research degree programmes. Examples include (but are not exclusively so) the UK Research Integrity Office Code of Practice for Research and research governance regulations of funding bodies and/or relevant professional/regulatory organisations.

B6 Permitted periods of registration

B6.1 The normal minimum and maximum periods of registration with the University associated with the award of PhD are set below:

- (i) For those postgraduate research students who registered as such with the university before February 2017, the normal minimum and maximum periods of registration for the completion** of the awards of MPhil and PhD are as follows:

MPhil	Minimum	Maximum
Full-time	18 months	36 months
Part-time	30 months	48 months

PhD (via transfer from MPhil registration, including period of MPhil registration)

Full-time	36 months	60 months
Part-time	48 months	72 months

PhD (by direct registration)*

Full-time	24 months	36 months
Part-time	36 months	60 months

**Note: This route to registration is exceptional. See paragraph B2.5 for further information.*

*** Note: For students where the examiners recommend them for the award they are examined for, completion refers to the date the thesis was submitted for examination. For students where the examiners recommend they re-submit their thesis for a further examination, completion refers to the date the thesis was re-submitted for examination.*

- (ii) For those postgraduate research students who registered as such with the University from February 2017, the normal minimum and maximum periods of registration for the completion** of the awards of MPhil and PhD are as follows:

MPhil	Minimum	Maximum
Full-time	18 months	36 months
Part-time	30 months	48 months

PhD (via transfer from MPhil registration, including period of MPhil registration)

Full-time	36 months	48 months
Part-time	48 months	84 months

PhD (by direct registration)*

Full-time	24 months	48 months
Part-time	36 months	60 months

**Note: This route to registration is exceptional. See paragraph B2.5 for further information.*

*** Note: For students where the examiners recommend them for the award they are examined for, completion refers to the date the thesis was submitted for examination. For students where the examiners recommend they re-submit their thesis for a further examination, completion refers to the date the thesis was re-submitted for examination.*

- B6.2 The periods set out in paragraph B6.1 above run from the initial date of registration of the student with the University, or, in the case of registration with the University being made through the transfer of an existing registration from another HEI, the date of the original date of registration of the research programme at the previous HEI, less any bona-fide period of inactivity resulting from such a transfer.
- B6.3 In exceptional circumstances the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may consider reducing the minimum period of registration where there is evidence a student is progressing exceptionally well with their studies. A request to reduce the minimum period of registration should be made at the same time the supervisors and student seek approval of the examination arrangements via Form RDA6a/b (refer to regulation G1.2).
- B6.4 In exceptional circumstances the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may consider extending the maximum period of registration where extenuating circumstances for doing so are evidenced, for periods of no longer than 6 months at a time and normally only two such extensions will be considered. A request to extend the maximum period of registration should be made at the earliest opportunity, once it has become apparent the student will not submit their thesis for examination within the required timeframe, and no later than 3 months prior to the expiration of the maximum permitted period of registration.
- B6.5 A student may register on a full-time or a part-time basis. A full-time student shall normally devote at least 35 hours per week to the research; a part-time student shall devote a minimum of 12 hours per week.
- B6.6 Where a student transfers from full-time to part-time mode of study or vice versa, in calculating the time available for the formal submission of the thesis under the new mode of study, the reader is referred to the [Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook](#).
- B6.7 Where a student's registration reverts to MPhil from MPhil/PhD or PhD, the maximum permitted period of registration for an MPhil award will apply. Where the student transferring has already exceeded the maximum permitted period of registration for an MPhil award, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may approve an extension to registration, which should not exceed 6 months, unless exceptional circumstances apply.
- B6.8 Backdating to a date before the student is registered as a postgraduate research student of the University will only be permitted in the cases where a student has transferred from an approved, existing programme of postgraduate research at another HEI, as set out in regulations B2.6, B5.3 and B5.4.

B7 Student progress and progression

- B7.1 In parallel with engaging in their research programme, research students are required to engage with the university's *Postgraduate Researcher Development Programme (PGRDP)*. Details on this programme are provided in the [PGRDP Handbook](#).
- B7.2 It is the student's responsibility to keep in regular contact with their supervisors for the purpose of providing information on progress with their research programme and related matters, including training. Supervisors shall regularly, and at intervals of not more than three weeks, provide feedback to the student on their academic performance and other related matters. Students should not engage in any form of research misconduct to further their research (refer to Appendix 4 for further information).
- B7.3 At no later than twelve months from the date the student commenced their registration with the University, the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee will establish whether the student is still actively engaged on the research programme, is making

satisfactory progress, and is maintaining regular and frequent contact with the supervisors.

To effect this, a progress report shall be submitted annually, on [Form RDA4](#), by both the student and supervisors to a sub-committee of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for consideration, which will review the report and forward it on to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee with its recommendations.

Where progress and matters impinging on progress are considered unsatisfactory by the sub-committee, the student's supervisors are required to draw up an action plan and the student shall be given an opportunity to address the requirements of the plan. The timescale to address the identified concerns will depend on the nature of the concerns, but must be specified to the student, and can be no longer than three months.

In the event the requirements of the action plan are not met and the student is unable to provide satisfactory evidence to the Faculty to justify the continuation or extension of the registration, the supervisors are required to follow the Discontinuation of Studies Due to Lack of Academic Progress procedures outlined in the [Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook](#), prior to the submission of Form RDA5 to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to request the discontinuation of the student's studies. Where the supervisor's submit Form RDA5 for approval to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, the student will have the right to present their case in writing to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to remain on the programme.

Where the Faculty Research Degrees Committee approves the withdrawal, the Vice-Chancellor, or nominee, shall write to the student informing them that their registration with the University will be discontinued on the grounds of lack of academic progress. The student shall have a right of appeal in accordance with the provisions of the regulations set out in Section I.

- B7.4 Where disagreement occurs between the student and the supervisors in relation to the content of Form RDA4, the student and the supervisors should submit two separate versions of the form to the sub-committee for consideration. The sub-committee will determine whether an informal meeting is required to resolve the concerns raised by one or both parties in the RDA4 Forms. If the concerns raised are unable to be resolved informally, the sub-committee will refer the matter to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for further consideration.
- B7.5 Where a student has failed to keep in contact with their supervisors for a period of three months, despite repeated, evidenced attempts by the supervisor(s) to keep in contact with them, including a final written notification, the student will be considered to have withdrawn themselves from the programme of research and the University. Under such circumstances the Faculty Director of Research will recommend to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, through the submission of [Form RDA5](#) and appropriate accompanying documentation, discontinuation of the student's registration as a postgraduate research student of the University.
- B7.6 Where a student fails to pay tuition fees in accordance with the Postgraduate Research Degrees Tuition Fees Charging and Refund Policy and the university's standard payment policy, they will be subject to the sanctions outlined in the [Policy and Procedures from 2014-15 for the Non-Payment of Tuition Fees](#). Should these sanctions result in the authorised withdrawal of the student by the Director of Student & Academic Services and the University Director of Finance, Student Finance & Financial Support will, via the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, recommend to the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee withdrawal of the student's registration as a postgraduate research student of the University. The Research & Enterprise Training Institute and the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will not be required to send prior notification of the

withdrawal to the student, as this will have been initiated via Student Finance & Financial Support as part of the *Policy and Procedures from 2014-15 for the Non-Payment of Tuition Fees*.

- B7.7 Supervisor's may at any time submit to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee a progress report on [Form RDA4](#), or the Committee may request such a report, outside of the normal cycle of consideration of such reports for a student where either consider a lack of progress to be of concern. The Committee will recommend the creation of an action plan setting out expectations and timescales, in line with regulation B7.3.
- B7.8 A student may at any time submit to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee a progress report on [Form RDA4](#), outside of the normal cycle of consideration of such reports where they consider there is a significant issue beyond their control which is impacting on their progress.
- B7.9 Where the student is prevented, by ill health or other valid causes, from making progress with the research, the student is required to request an interruption of study at the earliest opportunity by following the interruption procedure for postgraduate research students detailed in the [Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook](#). All interruptions will be noted by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. Any such interruption will normally be for not more than 12 months at a time, with the normal maximum period of any such interruptions amounting to no more than 24 months in total. It is the student's responsibility, or their supervisors in appropriate circumstances, to ensure the interruption of study process is completed and appropriate documentary evidence is provided to support the request. The Faculty Research Degrees Committee has the authority to intervene and take appropriate action in cases of repeated interruptions made by the student.
- B7.10 Amendments to the approved arrangements for a research degree programme may only be made with the approval of the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee. Proposed amendments should be set out on [Form RDA5](#), and, along with any supporting documentation, submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for subsequent consideration by the Committee.
- B7.11 Where a student discontinues working on the approved programme of research, it is the student's responsibility, or their supervisors in appropriate circumstances, to notify the Faculty Research Degrees Committee of the withdrawal of registration by completing the withdrawal procedure for postgraduate research students detailed in the [Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook](#). All withdrawals of registration will be noted by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.
- B7.12 Where there are exceptional reasons for doing so, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may extend a student's period of registration, normally for not more than 12 months. It is the student's responsibility to make such a request to the Research Degrees Committee on [Form RDA5](#), providing appropriate documentation to support the request.

B8 Transfer of registration from MPhil to PhD

- B8.1 Students who are initially registered for MPhil with transfer possibility to PhD who wish to transfer registration to PhD, in consultation with their supervisor, shall apply to their Faculty Research Degrees Committee to do so when they consider that sufficient progress has been made on the agreed programme of research to provide evidence of the development of the research to a level commensurate with Doctoral study (Level 8), as set out in Appendix 1 to these regulations. It is expected the transfer stage will be reached not later than 24 months from the date registration commenced for a research student studying on a full-time basis, and no later than 48 months for a student studying on a part time basis.

B8.2 Consideration by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to establish an assessment process to consider the merit of approving the transfer of registration is initiated by the student and supervisor completing [Form RDA2](#) and submitting it to the Committee Secretary. This must include the names of two appropriately qualified, independent internal Assessors from within the university who will conduct an oral examination (*viva voce*) of the student, with a view to them assuring the Faculty Research Degrees Committee that the student has made sufficient progress and the proposed future programme provides a suitable basis for work at a Doctoral standard, and which the student is capable of pursuing to the point of submitting a credible thesis for examination.

B8.3 The assessment team will consist of:

- (i) one member of academic staff from the host Faculty, and
- (ii) another from the same Faculty, or from another Faculty within the University

Collectively, the assessment team should possess the following characteristics:

- a) Neither Assessor should be part of the student's supervisory team or involved in the student's research project.
- b) At least one Assessor should have expertise close to the area of research being undertaken by the student.
- c) The assessment team should have previous experience of examining research degree candidates at PhD level, having examined two or more research degree candidates at PhD level/supervised at least two PhD candidates to completion.

No person external to the University is permitted to act as an Assessor, unless there are exceptional reasons for the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to consider such a proposal.

B8.4 In support of the transfer application, and to assist the Assessors, the student, under the guidance and approval of their supervisor will submit a separate progress report, in an appropriate format, which should normally be approximately 5,000 words in length and include:

- (i) A review and critique of the work already undertaken, including evidence of the emergence of work that will make an original contribution to knowledge, and
- (ii) an insight into the intended further work, including details of the original contribution to knowledge that is likely to emerge that is a requirement of Doctoral level awards

Alternatively, the report may take the form of no less than two peer-reviewed published papers or a significant part of an acceptable thesis, with detailed notes to cover (i) and (ii) above.

It is the responsibility of the Faculty to ensure that copies of this report are submitted to the assessors by no later than 10 working days prior to the transfer viva being scheduled to take place, with a copy forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee at the same time.

B8.5 Following approval of the student's RDA2 application to be considered for upgrade of registration, the Faculty will make arrangements for the assessment by oral examination within 3 months. Should the assessment not take place within 3 months, the RDA2 will become invalid and a new RDA2 application should be submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for approval in accordance with regulation B8.2. A valid reason must be provided as to why the assessment did not take place within the required timeframe.

- B8.6 The student's supervisors may be in attendance at the oral examination in a silent, supportive capacity, subject to prior agreement with the student and the Assessors.
- B8.7 On completion of the oral examination the Assessors will complete the formal report on their assessment of the student's readiness to transfer registration from MPhil to PhD using [Form RDA3](#), with the host Assessor forwarding it to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. This report must include a recommendation on whether the student should be permitted to transfer registration, or not at this stage. The host Assessor must also forward the Assessors' written feedback to the student and supervisors indicating their views on progress, along with recommendations for further work. It is the responsibility of the supervisor to discuss the feedback with the student.
- B8.8 The Faculty Research Degrees Committee will consider the recommendation of the Assessors and arrive at a decision accordingly.
- B8.9 A student will be eligible for no more two attempts at transferring registration from MPhil to PhD. If a student fails to gain the support of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee following their second attempt at transferring registration, their registration will remain at MPhil, and their subsequent submission for a final award will be at this level. A student may appeal the decision to remain at MPhil in accordance with the regulations set out in Section I.
- B8.10 A student who is registered for the degree of PhD with the University and who is unable to complete the approved programme of work, may, at any time prior to the submission of the thesis for examination and, with reasons, apply in writing to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for the registration to be transferred to MPhil. Such applications will be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Committee. Should such an application be approved, the permitted period of registration will be in accordance with regulation B6.5.

B9 Submission of thesis for examination and other documentation

- B9.1 The candidate will ensure that the requisite copies of the thesis are submitted for examination, bound in a temporary form, but in every other respect prepared in accordance with the University guidelines in the Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook. These, along with a completed and signed Form [RDA6a/b](#), shall be delivered to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, for subsequent dispatch to the examiners and Chair. The hard copy versions of the submission must also be accompanied by the same in a digitised pdf format. A hard-copy of the candidate's Postgraduate Research Student Logbook and Professional Development Portfolio, or approved equivalent, must also be submitted at the same time.

B10 Examination arrangements and examination

- B10.1 The regulations relating to examination arrangements and examination of MPhil and PhD candidate are set out in Section G.

B11 Submission of definitive thesis

- B11.1 Following recommendation by the examiners that such an award should be made, the candidate is required to provide the Research & Enterprise Training Institute with a final, hard copy version of the approved thesis. The hard copy of the definitive thesis must also be accompanied by the same in a digitised pdf format. The latter will be used to include the submitted work in the Greenwich Academic Literature Archive (GALA).

B12 Conferment of the award

B12.1 Conferment of an award will follow the process and procedures set out in Section G of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

B13 Academic Appeals

B13.1 Academic appeals relating to MPhil and PhD will follow the processes and procedures set out in Section I of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

C. DOCTORATE BY PUBLISHED WORK (PhD)

C1 General

C1.1 The University will award the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) to a candidate who is eligible to apply for the degree, and who has submitted a body of previously published work which, in the opinion of the examiners, provides a clear base of evidence that exemplifies a contribution to knowledge and learning, as set out by the Level 8 Doctoral Descriptor in Annex 1 to the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*. The standard required is the same as for a PhD awarded on the basis of the submission of a thesis. Candidates may apply for the award of PhD on the basis of published work subject to the conditions that follow in this section.

C2 Eligibility of applicants

C2.1 The PhD by published work route to a research degree is open to current contracted members of staff of the University and those who hold a formal honorary position in connection with the University.

C2.2 Normally, applicants must meet the standard entry requirements for registration to MPhil/PhD as set out in Section A of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*, and thereby satisfy the University that they possess intellectual ability comparable to that required for a PhD standard by the normal route.

C2.3 Appropriate expertise in the field concerned must exist within the University, so that suitable and experienced supervision may be provided to the applicant.

C3 Admission requirements

C3.1 Applicants for PhD by Published work, should, with the explicit support of the relevant Head of Department, approach the Chair of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee directly so that a suitably qualified independent internal assessor may be appointed initially to screen the application. Such an assessor will make an academic judgement, based on the prima facie application, as to whether the applicant's work, when fully considered is likely to equate broadly to the doctoral standard normally exemplified in a PhD by written thesis. The role of the assessor is to reach, within the parameters of the particular discipline, a judgement concerning the appropriate balance of quantity and quality of the submitted material.

C3.2 Where it has not been possible to identify an appropriate independent assessor within the university, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may appoint a suitably experienced external academic to provide the required initial assessment.

C3.3 To facilitate the assessor to complete the task, applicants must supply, at their own expense, evidence of their published work in a format that will demonstrate the breadth and depth of their work. The evidence base to be presented must consist of a summary of 3,000 words (maximum);

- demonstrating there is a body of material potentially to be submitted according to the regulations as required in C4.1 below;
- indicating briefly how a case will be made for the independent, original and coherent nature of the submission as required in C4.2 below;
- indicating briefly how the contribution of the applicant will be measured in the case of multiple authorship of cited published work, as required in C4.3 below.

- C3.4 No applications will be permitted to proceed where any element of the planned submission is based on a publication date at some point in the future, or the equivalent for other artefacts.
- C3.5 The assessor will make an academic judgement as to whether a prima facie case has been established. In doing so, the assessor is required to submit a report to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to confirm either;
- (i) that a prima facie case has been established.
 - or
 - (ii) that a prima facie case has not been established. In this case the assessor is required to explain where the deficiencies lie in the application.
- C3.6 Where a prima facie case has been established, a supervisor (exceptionally two in cases of cross-disciplinary work) will be appointed by the relevant Head of Department, subject to approval by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, to assist the applicant with:
- formally registering with both the University and the Faculty Research Degrees Committee,
 - preparing the body of work for submission, and
 - proposing two appropriately qualified examiners to consider the submitted material, further details on which are set out in Section F of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.
- C3.7 Where a prima facie case has not been established, following recognition of this by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, the Secretary of the Committee will inform the applicant of this outcome with any appropriate feedback, within 10 working days of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee's recognition of this outcome.
- C3.8 The applicant should not regard the establishment of a prima facie case as a guarantee of progression from registration through to examination for the award, as this will depend on progress made by the applicant and the possible discovery of pre-existing work by others that may emerge during the preparation of the body of work which compromise the claim of originality required in such a submission.

C4 Registration with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee

- C4.1 Following regulation C3.5(i), it is the responsibility of the applicant and the proposed supervisor(s) to submit [Form RDA1aPW](#) to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for approval.
- C4.2 On approval of the RDA1aPW the applicant is then registered with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee and is permitted to formally apply to the University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Published Work.

C5 Admission of students and registration with the University

- C5.1 Once registered with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, and on acceptance of an offer, the applicant must register with the University on the starting date set out in the offer letter, or as soon as possible after this date. This will enable the applicant to become a bona-fide part-time postgraduate research student of the University, thereby facilitating legitimate access to appropriate university facilities. For the first year, registration will normally be in two parts: online and in-person at a campus Student Centre, where the applicant will be required to present identification and original qualifications. Registration will be online in subsequent years, where necessary.

- C5.2 In registering as a student of the University, the student shall adhere to all relevant research student focussed practices and policies in force at the University, including (but not exclusively so) those set out in the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*, the [Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook](#), the [University's Principal Conditions of Registration](#) and [Student Disciplinary Procedure](#).
- C5.3 It is the student's responsibility to re-register online as a research student with the University, with payment of tuition fees due at the start of each academic year (September), and continue to do so until they have been examined for their award and a final, definitive copy of the thesis has been submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for approval. This also applies irrespective of the date the student first registered with the University during their first academic year of study. Where a student fails to re-register with the University in the September of each academic year, the student will be automatically withdrawn by the University from their programme of study.
- C5.4 The date the applicant officially commences their registration with the University as a bona-fide postgraduate research student will be the reference date to determine all relevant matters relating to the University's processes and procedures as they relate to the student.
- C5.5 Students will have no more than twelve months from the time their official registration with the University to prepare and submit their work in line with the information given in section C6. A student may apply to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, on Form RDA5, for an extension to this timeframe where exceptional circumstances occur.

C6 Submission of work for examination and other documentation

- C6.1 The student will, along with a completed and signed Form RDA6a (please refer to Section G), ensure that the requisite number of published works will be submitted, bound in a temporary form, and will normally consist of one or more of the following:
- published scholarly works, e.g. research monograph(s), but not a textbook;
 - a series of peer reviewed articles and conference papers displaying a coherent theme;
 - non-confidential research reports displaying a coherent theme
 - other media formats approved by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, which must be accompanied by a written summary clearly setting out how such formats contribute to the whole submission.

The work submitted under (a) and (b) must have been published and in the public domain prior to approaching the Chair of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, as set out in regulation C3.1 above.

- C6.2 The work submitted:
- must embody a strong measure of coherence around a particular theme which runs central to the submitted body of work;
 - must constitute an independent and original contribution to knowledge, as set out in the Level 8 Doctoral descriptor contained in Appendix 1 of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.
- C6.3 Where a candidate submits work published jointly with other authors, they will submit a separate declaration explaining explicitly, in percentage terms, the extent of their contribution to such work, along with an indication of confirmation from each co-author to this effect. The Faculty Research Degrees Committee reserves the right to verify the claims made by a candidate in the case of all multi-authored works with any of the other cited authors.

- C6.4 The case for support must include:
- an abstract;
 - a written exposition providing a framework for the context and impact of the individual candidate's work;
 - a literature review that places the submitted work and its impact within the wider context of the candidate's field of research;
 - a short assessment of multi-authorship if relevant (see C6.3).

The case for support (excluding the multi-authorship document) should not normally exceed 5,000 words in the case of topics in science, engineering and technology, and 10,000 words in the case of those in humanities, social sciences, education, health and business.

- C6.5 Three copies of the material set out in C6.1 – C6.4 above must be submitted to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute. All material, other than books, should be secured in one, or more folder(s), each containing a title and contents page, and displaying on the front cover the name of the candidate and the University, and the degree for which the material has been submitted. Stand-alone books may also form part of the applicant's submission.

C7 Examination arrangements and examination

- C7.1 In every respect, with the exception of the recommendations available to examiners following examination as set out in the C8 regulations below, the examination arrangements, the examination and post-examination processes will follow the procedures set out in Section G of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

C8 Examination outcomes

- C8.1 Following the examination process, the examiners' may recommend either;
- (i) the award of PhD by Published Work, or
 - (ii) the Candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree of PhD and be re-examined. The thesis must be revised and, if deemed satisfactory by the examiners, the candidate will be exempt from further examination, oral or otherwise.

In recommending (ii), at this stage the examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright, but must be given a further opportunity to retrieve the situation by being permitted to make a resubmission. This circumstance is considered as a referral, which allows for one further submission and examination, with an attendant limitation on the recommendations available to the examiners as set out in B6.2 below. In such a case the candidate should normally be given twelve months from the date of the formal notification to them of the examiners' recommendation and feedback to facilitate them to submit the revised material for re-examination.

The Chair of the examination panel will be responsible for communicating the examiners' recommendation arising out of the examination process to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute on the appropriate documentation.

- C8.2 Following reading the resubmitted material, the examiners recommend either:
- (i) the award of PhD by Published Work, or
 - (ii) delay making a recommendation pending the arrangement of a further oral examination.

Following the further oral examination, the examiners may;

- (iii) recommend the award of PhD by Published Work, or
- (iv) the candidate has failed to meet the standard required to make a recommendation for such an award.

Should the outcome of the further oral examination be that that the candidate has failed to meet the standard required for such an award, a further resubmission shall not be permitted.

The Chair of the examination panel will be responsible for communicating the examiners' recommendation arising out of the re-examination process to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute on the appropriate documentation.

C9 Submission of definitive document

- C9.1 Following recommendation by the examiners that an award should be made, the candidate is required to provide the Research & Enterprise Training Institute with a final, hard copy version of the approved published work and associated documentation submitted in support of the application in a format that is akin to that of a PhD thesis of the University. Guidance on the required format of a conventional thesis is provided in the Postgraduate Research Students' and Supervisors' Handbook. Photocopies of relevant books and/or relevant parts of, must also be included as an integral part of the definitive document, which must also include the front/title page of each, as applicable. The hard copy document must also be accompanied by a digitised pdf format. The digitised version will be uploaded to the Greenwich Academic Literature Archive (GALA).

C10 Conferment of the award

- C10.1 Conferment of an award will follow the process and procedures set out in Section H of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

C11 Academic Appeals

- C11.1 Academic appeals relating to PhD by Published Work will follow the processes and procedures set out in Section I of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

D. REGULATIONS RELATING TO PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATES – CURRENTLY DOCTORATE IN EDUCATION (EdD)

D1 General

- D1.1 The Professional Doctorate is a generic title. Titles for specific Professional Doctorate awards will relate to a subject area, and will be agreed by Academic Council, conditional upon the programme being validated and approved through appropriate University quality assurance processes.
- D1.2 At the time of issue of these regulations, the only title approved by Academic Council is the Doctorate in Education (EdD), by part-time mode of study. Other specific titles may be approved over time, which must align with the generic regulations set out in this section.
- D1.3 A Professional Doctorate will be awarded to a student who has accrued 540 Level 8 academic credits, comprising of those awarded for completing a ‘taught’ phase and those awarded for completing a subsequent ‘research’ phase. The balance of these phases will be specified when the award is initially validated and on periodic review, with the research phase comprising of at least 50% of the award.
- D1.4 Given the professional context of the programme, formal collaboration with an external collaborating organisation is strongly encouraged, particularly in connection with the research phase of the programme, in line with Section A4 (*Introduction to Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*).
- D1.5 The taught phase is focussed on students successfully completing a programme of study aimed at attaining competence in research methods and knowledge relating to their professional practice and proposed research. This phase will comprise of no less than 50% of academic credits at Level 8, as relevant to the Doctoral descriptor set out in Appendix 1 of these regulations. Management of the taught phase of the programme will be in accordance with the [University’s Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#).
- D1.6 The research phase is focussed on successfully completing a research project that meets the Level 8 Doctoral descriptor set out in Appendix 1 of these regulations, which may be summarised as having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic, including demonstrating an understanding of research methods as applied to a chosen field, resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge, and has presented and defended a written thesis by oral examination (*viva-voce*) to the satisfaction of approved examiners.
- D1.7 The topic of the research phase may be selected from any area within the general field of the approved doctorate programme, consistent with the professional context of the student.
- D1.8 Management of the programme and quality assurance processes and procedures, as well as all matters relating to the student experience, are the responsibility of the host Faculty, particularly during the taught phase, where student progression and assessment is managed in accordance with the *Academic Regulations for Taught Awards*. During the research phase, responsibility for quality assurance processes and procedures pass over to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee following a student successfully progressing from the taught phase to the research phase of the programme, and progression and assessment is in accordance with Section D of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

D1.9 Students who successfully complete the taught phase,

- (i) but do not progress to the research phase, or
- (ii) progress to the research phase but do not submit their thesis for examination,

may be awarded the approved Masters award relevant to the programme, on the basis of sufficient academic credits accrued during the taught phase.

D2 Admission requirements

D2.1 Applicants for a Professional Doctorate programme of study will normally be expected to hold a Masters degree awarded by the University, another university in the UK, the Council of National Academic Awards, or a qualification that is considered by the University as equivalent to such awards, whether it was awarded in the UK or overseas. Additionally, applicants should have had at least three years full-time experience (or equivalent) in a relevant professional arena.

D2.2 Applicants who have not completed a Masters degree as set out in paragraph D2.1, but who can successfully demonstrate equivalent experience and qualification(s) will be considered for entry onto the programme. Such applicants must demonstrate this equivalence by providing evidence, appropriate to their individual and other professional circumstances, such as publications, written reports, a portfolio of work, or other professional accomplishments. This may include additional work requested by the programme director of the relevant Faculty, such as a critical and reflective essay. Those making an application on such a basis must also have at least four years of full-time experience in a relevant professional arena.

D2.3 The decision to admit a prospective student will involve at least two doctoral programme leaders from the Faculty/Department staff, or one of the doctoral programme leaders and the Faculty Director of Research, and who have both received instruction, advice and guidance in selection and admissions procedures and equal opportunity training. The decision-making process must provide auditable evidence that balanced, independent admission decisions have been made that support the University's admissions policy. At this point the motivation of the applicant to undertake independent research, and their potential to complete the proposed programme of study, must be assessed, along with the applicant's access to appropriate funding for the duration of the programme. These matters must be discussed with all applicants at interview. The interview, where at all possible, should be in person, but exceptionally for applicants living or working overseas, the interview can be by Skype, or equivalent technology.

D2.4 In relation to the admission routes by which applicants may apply to become a professional doctorate student of the University as set out in paragraphs D2.1 and D2.2, where applicable, applicants whose first language is not English will also be required to provide evidence of sufficient proficiency in and command of English to effectively engage with the programme, and all matters relating to being a professional doctorate student of the university. The minimum requirements to be demonstrated are to a level of 6.5 in all elements of the *International English Language Testing System (IELTS)*, or an acceptable, demonstrable equivalent to this. This requirement is not applicable to those applicants who successfully studied in the UK for a Masters degree to the required level from a UK university, or those who successfully studied for, and were awarded a relevant, equivalent degree from a recognised university in an English majority speaking country, such as Australia, New Zealand, United States of America & Ireland. The University's decision on this matter will be final.

- D2.5 The University will make a written offer to a successful applicant for a professional doctorate. This letter constitutes a contract between the student and the University. The terms contained in the offer letter are binding on the University and, upon acceptance, on the student.
- D2.6 In cases where the university's decision is not to make a written offer to an applicant, the matter is final, and there will be no recourse to appeal by the applicant.

D3 Admission of students and registration with the University

- D3.1 An applicant who accepts an offer must register as a research student with the University on the starting date set out in the offer letter, or as soon as possible after this date. This will enable the applicant to become a bona-fide postgraduate research student of the University, thereby facilitating legitimate access to appropriate University facilities. For the first year, Registration will normally be in two parts: on-line, and in person at a campus Student Centre, where the applicant will be required to present identification and original qualifications. Registration will be on-line in subsequent years.
- D3.2 In registering as a student of the University, the student shall adhere to all relevant research student focussed practices and policies in force at the University, including (but not exclusively so) those set out in the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*, the [Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisors' Handbook](#), and [University's Principle Conditions of Registration](#) and [Student Disciplinary Procedure](#).
- D3.3 It is the student's responsibility to re-register on-line as a research student with the University, with payment of fees due, at the start of each academic year (September) and continue to do so until such a time where they have been examined for their award and a final, definitive copy of the thesis has been submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for approval. This also applies irrespective of the date the student first registered with the University during their first academic year of study. Where a student fails to re-register with the university in the September of the academic year, the student will be automatically withdrawn by the University from their programme of study.
- D3.4 The date the applicant officially commences their registration with the University as a bona-fide postgraduate research student will be the reference date to determine all relevant matters relating to the University's processes and procedures as they relate to the student.

D4 Maximum permitted period of registration

- D4.1 The maximum period of registration to accrue the academic credits required for the award of a professional doctorate is six years by part-time study, with the breakdown of the maximum times permissible for completion of the taught and research phases being those approved on programme validation, and set out in the definitive programme handbook.

D5 Induction and orientation

- D5.1 Attendance at induction and orientation sessions is required by all professional doctorate students, irrespective of prior qualifications and route of entry, and whether they have previously been a student at the University. The purpose of such induction and orientation is to provide new students with sufficient information to enable them to begin their studies with an understanding of the academic and social environment in which they will be working, as well as knowledge about matters surrounding relevant policies and health and safety issues. It is the responsibility of the relevant programme leader to arrange such session(s).

D6 Student Progress and progression in taught phase

- D6.1 As set out in regulation D1.5, management of the taught phase of the programme will be in accordance with the University's [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#).
- D6.2 Professional Doctorate students are expected to progress through the programme in accordance with the processes and procedures set out in the relevant programme handbook. As such, it is the responsibility of the student to:
- (i) attend all scheduled lectures, seminars, workshops, supervisory meetings etc. as set out in the relevant programme handbook, as well as maintaining regular contact with tutors, mentors and supervisors with a view to obtaining feedback on progress as a result of engaging with the programme, and
 - (ii) complete all assignments and assessments required to accrue the academic credits to progress to the research phase.
- D6.3 Any requests by students to interrupt or extend studies within the period of the taught phase of the programme, will be addressed through the relevant processes and procedures in operation within the host Faculty. Such requests must be considered on the basis of the evidence produced to support the request. A record of such approved interruptions and extensions must be kept by the Faculty so as to facilitate an understanding of the time elapsed in studying on the programme in relation to the maximum period of registration that is permitted to obtain such an award.
- D6.4 Students who have successfully completed the taught phase of the programme, which will be determined by the Faculty Progression and Award Board, may be considered for progression to the research phase of the award. The Programme Leader will interview each student and review their profile taking into account:
- (i) the number of coursework re-submissions made to date by the candidate;
 - (ii) the nature of the dissemination of the candidate's work, as well as the quality of feedback received on that work;
 - (iii) an overview of the candidate's progress during the taught courses, based on tutor observation and written feedback; and
 - (iv) any documented extenuating circumstances that may have affected student performance.

The Programme Leader will only recommend progression for those who, as well as passing all the required elements of the taught phase, on interview, demonstrate a sound understanding of their intended research project and the tasks associated with such a project. An ability to address and manage deadlines and achieve doctoral standards within the remaining time permitted for completion of the whole programme, and be clearly motivated to do so, must also be evident.

- D6.5 Should lack of academic progress and/or attendance of a student be of cause for concern for the programme leader and/or tutors prior to approval of the proposed programme of research by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, action should be taken by the Faculty, in accordance with its processes and procedures, to address the matter, which should include the provision to withdraw a student's registration with the University should this be considered appropriate.

D7 Approval of proposed programme of research by Faculty Research Degrees Committee

- D7.1 On approval of progression from the taught phase to the research phase, the student is required, within two months of being approved to progress, to submit completed [RDA PF](#)

[Forms 1a-c](#) to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to seek approval of the proposed plan of research, supervisory arrangements and other related matters by the Committee. The date of registration on the relevant forms must align with the initial date of registration of the student as a professional doctorate student of the University as set out paragraph D3.4. If the receipt of the relevant forms by the Faculty administrator, or Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee is beyond the two month requirement set out above, such an application for approval will only be considered by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee on an exceptional basis, with written reasons why the Committee should do so being appended to the relevant forms.

- D7.2 In approving the application for registration the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will satisfy itself that:
- (i) the student is embarking on a viable programme of research relevant to their professional contest that contains sufficient challenge commensurate with working towards the award of a doctorate;
 - (ii) the proposed supervisors have appropriate skills, subject knowledge and supervisory experience to support, encourage and monitor the student effectively, the supervisory arrangements are appropriate and likely to be sustained, and the quality of supervision is not put at risk through excessive volume and range of responsibilities assigned to individual supervisors.
 - (iii) the host Department/Faculty and, if applicable, the collaborating organisation are able to provide appropriate facilities for the conduct of scholarly research in the area of the proposed research programme;
 - (iv) the proposed timescale for submission of the thesis for examination of the proposed research is realistic.
- D7.3 On commencement of the research phase the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may permit a professional doctorate student to register for another course of study concurrently with the professional doctorate registration, provided the registration on the other course of study is also by part-time study and that, in the opinion of the Committee, such dual registration will not inhibit progress with the approved research project.
- D7.4 Where the proposed programme of research to be undertaken by the student forms part of a larger research project or initiative, the supervisors are required to assure the Faculty Research Degrees Committee that the programme of research represents a discrete, stand-alone body of work that is capable of being assessed in its own right for the award being sought by the student.
- D7.5 Where the proposed programme of work to be undertaken by the student forms part or all of a funded research initiative, the supervisors are required to assure the Faculty Research Degrees Committee that the terms on which the proposed research is funded will not detract from or compromise the requirements of the student in working towards the research degree and making the thesis available to the public on completion, unless, with good reason, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee agrees otherwise.
- D7.6 Any research proposal submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee which, in the opinion of the Committee, appears to fall within the remit of the University's Research Ethics Committee (uREC), will be referred to the University's Research Ethics Committee for consideration, after it has been approved by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. It is the responsibility of the student, under the guidance of the first supervisor, to prepare and submit the appropriate application form (<http://www.gre.ac.uk/research/rec/guidance-on-ethical-approval-for-research>) as soon as possible after approval of the research proposal by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.

- D7.7 All research students and their supervisors are expected to comply with any relevant research governance requirements or recommendations applicable to their research degree programmes. Examples include (but are not exclusively so) the UK Research Integrity Office Code of Practice for Research and research governance, regulations of funding bodies and/or relevant professional and regulatory organisations/statutory bodies.

D8 Student Progress and progression in research phase

- D8.1 It is the student's responsibility to keep in regular contact with their supervisors for the purpose of providing information on progress with their research programme and related matters, including training. Supervisors shall regularly, and at intervals of not more than three weeks, provide feedback to the student on their academic performance and other related matters. Students should not engage in any form of research misconduct to further their research (refer to Appendix 4 for further information).
- D8.2 At no later than twelve months from the date the relevant Faculty Progression and Award Board confirm the student has successfully passed the taught phase, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will establish whether the student is able to progress to the research phase in accordance with regulation D6.4, is still actively engaged on the research programme, is making satisfactory progress, and is maintaining regular and frequent contact with the supervisors.

To effect this, a progress report ([Form RDA4a](#)) shall be submitted annually by both the student and supervisors to a sub-committee of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for consideration, which will review the report and forward it on to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee with its recommendations.

Where progress and matters impinging on progress are considered unsatisfactory by the sub-committee, the student's supervisors are required to draw up an action plan and the student shall be given an opportunity to address the requirements of the plan. The timescale to address the identified concerns will depend on the nature of the concerns, but must be specified to the student, and can be no longer than three months.

In the event the requirements of the action plan are not met and the student is unable to provide satisfactory evidence to the Faculty to justify the continuation or extension of the registration, the supervisors are required to follow the Discontinuation of Studies Due to Lack of Academic Progress procedures outlined in the [Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook](#), prior to the submission of Form RDA5 to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to request the discontinuation of the student's studies.

Where the supervisor's submit Form RDA5 for approval to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, the student will have the right to present their case in writing to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to remain on the programme.

Where the Faculty Research Degrees Committee approves the withdrawal, the Vice-Chancellor, or nominee, shall write to the student informing them that their registration with the University will be discontinued on the grounds of lack of academic progress. The student shall have a right of appeal in accordance with the provisions of the regulations set out in Section I.

- D8.3 Where disagreement occurs between the student and the supervisors in relation to the content of Form RDA4a, the student and the supervisors should submit two separate versions of the form to the sub-committee for consideration. The sub-committee will determine whether an informal meeting is required to resolve the concerns raised by one or both parties in the forms. If the concerns raised are unable to be resolved informally, the sub-committee will refer the matter to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for further consideration.

- D8.4 Where a student has failed to keep in contact with their supervisors for a period of three months, despite repeated, evidenced attempts by the supervisor(s) to keep in contact with them, including a final written notification, the student will be considered to have withdrawn themselves from the programme of research and the University. Under such circumstances the Faculty Director of Research will recommend to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, through the submission of [Form RDA5](#), withdrawal of the student's registration as a postgraduate research student of the University.
- D8.5 Where a student fails to pay tuition fees in accordance with the Postgraduate Research Degrees Tuition Fees Charging and Refund Policy and the university's standard payment policy, they will be subject to the sanctions outlined in the [Policy and Procedures from 2014-15 for the Non-Payment of Tuition Fees](#). Should these sanctions result in the authorised withdrawal of the student by the Director of Student & Academic Services and the University Director of Finance, Student Finance & Financial Support will, via the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, recommend to the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee withdrawal of the student's registration as a postgraduate research student of the University. The Research & Enterprise Training Institute and the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will not be required to send prior notification of the withdrawal to the student, as this will have been initiated via Student Finance & Financial Support as part of the *Policy and Procedures from 2014-15 for the Non-Payment of Tuition Fees*.
- D8.6 Supervisor's may at any time submit to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee a progress report ([Form RDA4a](#)) or the Committee may request such a report, outside of the normal cycle of consideration of such reports for a student where either consider a lack of progress to be of concern. The Committee will recommend the creation of an action plan setting out expectations and timescales, in line with regulation D8.2.
- D8.7 A student may at any time submit to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee a progress report ([Form RDA4a](#)) outside of the normal cycle of consideration of such reports where he/she considers there is a significant issue beyond their control which is impacting on their progress.
- D8.8 Where the student is prevented, by ill health or other valid causes, from making progress with the research, the student is required to request an interruption of study at the earliest opportunity by following the interruption procedure for postgraduate research students detailed in the [Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook](#). All interruptions will be noted by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. Any such interruption will normally be for not more than 12 months at a time, with the normal maximum period of any such interruptions amounting to no more than 24 months in total. It is the student's responsibility, or their supervisors in appropriate circumstances, to ensure the interruption of study process is completed and appropriate documentary evidence is provided to support the request. The Faculty Research Degrees Committee has the authority to intervene and take appropriate action in cases of repeated interruptions made by the student.
- D8.9 Amendments to the approved arrangements for a research degree programme may only be made with the approval of the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee. Proposed amendments should be set out on [Form RDA5](#), and, along with any supporting documentation, submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for subsequent consideration by the Committee.
- D8.10 Where a student discontinues working on the approved programme of research, it is the student's responsibility, or their supervisors in appropriate circumstances to notify the Faculty Research Degrees Committee of the withdrawal of registration by completing the withdrawal procedure for postgraduate research students detailed in the Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook (<http://www2.gre.ac.uk/current->

[students/postgrad-research/further-info](#)). All withdrawals of registration will be noted by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.

- D8.11 Where there are exceptional reasons for doing so, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may extend a student's period of registration, normally for not more than 12 months. It is the student's responsibility to make such a request to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee on [Form RDA5](#), providing appropriate documentation to support the request.

D9 Submission of thesis for examination and other documentation

- D9.1 The student will ensure that the requisite copies of the thesis are submitted for examination, bound in a temporary form, but in every other respect prepared in accordance with the University guidelines in the Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook. These, along with a completed and signed Form RDA6a/b, shall be submitted to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, for subsequent dispatch to the examiners and Chair. The hard copy versions of the submission must also be accompanied by the same in a digitised pdf format.

D10 Examination arrangements and examination

- D10.1 The regulations relating to examination arrangements for the research phase of EdD candidates are set out in Section G of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

D11 Submission of definitive thesis

- D11.1 Following recommendation by the examiners that such an award should be made, the candidate is required to provide the Research & Enterprise Training Institute with a final, hard copy version of the approved thesis. The hard copy of the definitive thesis must also be accompanied by the same in a digitised pdf format. The digitised version will be uploaded to the Greenwich Academic Literature Archive (GALA).

D12 Conferment of the award

- D12.1 The conferment process for an EdD award is initiated by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee recommending to the Faculty Professional Doctorates Progression and Awards Board that the candidate be awarded 360 Level 8 (D) credits in recognition of successful completion of the research phase of this programme. The Faculty Professional Doctorates Progression and Awards Board will then ensure that the candidate has accrued the required 540 Level 8 (D) credits to make the award. If the candidate is awarded the 540 Level 8 (D) credits commensurate with the requirement of a Professional Doctorate in Education (EdD), the final recommendation for the EdD award will be referred back to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to initiate the conferment process set out in Section H of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

D13 Academic Appeals

- D13.1 Academic appeals relating to research phase of the EdD programme will follow the processes and procedures set out in Section I of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

E. Regulations relating to Masters by Research (MA, MSc, LLM)

E1 General

- E1.1 The University will award the degree of Master of Arts (MA), Master of Science (MSc) or Master of Laws (LLM) by Research to a candidate who meets the Level 7 descriptor set out in Annex 1 to the Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards, which may be summarised as having, through independent research, supported by relevant taught course study,
- critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic,
 - demonstrated an understanding of research methods applied to a chosen field, and
 - presented and defended a written thesis/dissertation by oral examination (*viva voce*) to the satisfaction of approved examiners.
- E1.2 The Masters by Research programme represents a special case of the taught Masters degree, in which the relative credits for taught courses and project are reversed. Students will normally be expected to gain 60 credits from taught courses (of which at least 30 credits are at level M), and 120 credits from a supervised research project.
- E1.3 The overall aims of the Masters by Research programme are:
- (a) to provide a critical understanding of the knowledge base required for a proposed research project;
 - (b) to provide and build upon analytical, conceptual and research skills;
 - (c) to achieve an understanding of the research methods appropriate to the chosen field;
 - (d) to undertake a critical investigation of an approved topic;
 - (e) to foster the ability to present and defend a thesis in written format (thesis/dissertation);
 - (f) to foster the ability to defend the thesis in an oral examination.

E2 Management and Quality Oversight of Masters by Research Programmes

- E2.1 A Faculty operating a Masters by Research portfolio will appoint a Postgraduate Tutor, or equivalent, to be responsible for all administrative aspects of its operation, and be accountable to the Faculty Director of Research. The Postgraduate Tutor will be a senior member of staff experienced in research degree supervision. They will be nominated by the Faculty Pro Vice-Chancellor. The Postgraduate Tutor will act as the interface between the Faculty and Masters by Research students. In some cases, the Postgraduate Tutor will also be responsible for MPhil and PhD students, according to the experience available within the Faculty.
- E2.2 Masters by Research programmes are Faculty based programmes. As such, Faculties are responsible for all aspects of the operation of these programmes, in a similar way to taught Masters awards, including matters relating to specifying permissible maximum periods of registration for different modes of study, and quality assurance throughout the programme of study.
- E2.3 There are three areas in relation to the quality assurance referred to in regulation E2.2, which overlap with the remit of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. These are;
- Following initial registration, the Postgraduate Tutor is required to forward details on the nature of the student's research, on the appropriate Research Degree Administration Form, to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. This information will be noted by and lodged with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, for information and statistical monitoring purposes.

- The supervisors are required to make a formal application, on the appropriate Research Degrees Administration Form, to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to approve the establishment of the examination arrangements (i.e. examiners and Chair) for the research/dissertation element of the programme submitted by a student.
- Following an award to a candidate made by the relevant Faculty Progression and Awards Board, the Postgraduate Tutor is required to forward a copy of the student's approved assessment profile to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. This information will be noted by and lodged with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for information and statistical monitoring purposes.

E3 Admission of students and registration with the University

- E3.1 All matters relating to the admission and registration of the applicant will rest with the Faculty.
- E3.2 Applicants who wish to register to study for a Masters by Research award must normally satisfy the same academic requirements set out by the Faculty for a Masters award (with the exception of Master of Philosophy). Each Faculty's academic requirements are available via the [University on-line prospectus](#).
- E3.3 Having satisfied the academic requirements, the applicant will be interviewed by the Faculty Postgraduate Tutor who will make an initial assessment of eligibility under the University regulations. Particular assessment will be made relating to the applicant's qualifications, prior learning and/or experience.
- E3.4 Applicants must provide evidence of, or be able to demonstrate sufficient competence in English to complete satisfactorily the taught component, and to prepare and defend a project/dissertation in English, which, as a minimum, will be to a level commensurate with the admission of students to taught Masters programmes within the Faculty.

E4 The programme of study

- E4.1 The Head of Department, in consultation with the Postgraduate Tutor, will normally appoint two appropriate supervisors for each student. The student and supervisor(s) will work together to produce a project/dissertation specification which sets out:
- (a) the aims of the research project/dissertation;
 - (b) the proposed programme of work;
 - (c) expected deliverables;
 - (d) the taught courses to be followed by the student in support of the research project, amounting to no less than 60 credits, of which at least 30 credits must be at Level M. Additionally, the taught course element should include, either in an implicit or explicit way, delivery of research methods to a level equivalent to no less than 15 level M credits;
 - (e) the key skills to be achieved during the course of the research.
- E4.2 The project specification should be submitted to the Faculty's Postgraduate Tutor and agreed by them in writing. The project specification, including the supervisory arrangements, will be authorised by the Chair of the relevant Faculty Progression and Awards Board, and submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, on the appropriate Research Degrees Administration Form, to be noted by and lodged with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. As a research student, under the aegis of the relevant Faculty Progression and Awards Board, they will proceed through the available induction procedures at the Faculty level.

- E4.3 The first designated supervisor shall possess a demonstrable level of expertise in the area of the student's project/dissertation. Where appointed, the second supervisor shall, at least, possess expertise in the general area relating to the student's project/dissertation. Collectively, both supervisors should have normally supervised no less than a total of two Masters by Research, Master of Philosophy and Doctoral candidates to successful completion.
- E4.4 Student progress will be monitored in the Faculty by their supervisors and the Postgraduate Tutor.

E5 Assessment

Taught courses

- E5.1 Assessment of candidates' knowledge and understanding following studying each of the agreed taught course elements will follow the processes and procedures set out in the University's *Academic Regulations for Taught Awards*.

The project/dissertation

- E5.2 The examination of the project element of the programme will be conducted by two suitably qualified examiners, defined as one internal to the university, but independent from the candidate's work, and the other external to the university. In the cases where the candidate is a member of staff of the university, two external examiners will be used. The oral examination process will be managed by an independent Chair, who will be an experienced member of academic staff of the university.
- E5.3 The internal examiner will be an academic member of staff of the university and shall possess a demonstrable level of expertise in the area of the candidate's project/dissertation. They must have had no prior involvement with the candidate's project. Normally, an internal examiner should have had previous experience of examining research degrees at the Masters and/or Doctoral Level. At the very minimum an internal examiner will have supervised, in the capacity of a first supervisor, no less than a total of two Master of Philosophy (MPhil) and/or Doctoral (PhD/EdD) candidates to successful completion.
- E5.4 The external examiner will be a permanent member of academic staff of another recognised university, and will have expertise directly relating to the candidate's topic of research/dissertation. Additionally, an external examiner will have had previous experience examining candidates for Master of Philosophy (MPhil) and/or Doctoral (PhD/EdD) awards on no less than a total of two previous occasions. Such examiners may be drawn from the Faculty's approved pool of external examiners for taught Masters awards, providing they meet the requirements set out above.
- E5.5 The oral examination of the candidate will be chaired by an experienced member of University academic staff. As such, the role of the independent Chair is not that of being an additional examiner of a candidate, but is to act in an independent capacity to ensure a fair assessment of the candidate in accordance with the university regulations for such awards and good academic practice. Additionally, a Chair will have previous experience of being an internal and/or external examiner for Master of Philosophy (MPhil) and/or Doctoral (PhD/EdD) on no less than three previous occasions.
- E5.6 All of the foregoing must be included on the [Research Degree Administration Form](#) application for approval of examination arrangements.

- E5.7 Assessment of the project/dissertation is based on the outcomes as judged by:
- (a) The final project report /dissertation submitted by the candidate which is read by the approved examiners prior to the oral examination.
 - (b) An oral examination chaired by the approved independent Chair, and conducted by the approved examiners. This examination comprises two parts:
 - An initial oral presentation made by the candidate to the examiners should assist in contextualising the project/dissertation by defining the problem addressed, the methodology used, as well as an overview of the results obtained or arguments constructed and their relevance. There is no formal mark awarded for such a presentation, as its primary purpose is to assist the examiners to understand the nature of the work completed from the candidate's perspective. It is nevertheless a requirement for the award of the degree that the performance of the student in this respect is considered to be satisfactory. The oral presentation will last for no longer than fifteen minutes.
 - An oral examination of the candidate by the examiners to assist them in examining in greater depth the processes and techniques employed to address the project/dissertation, and the findings and implications of such.
- E5.8 Following the conclusion of the oral examination, the examiners will jointly agree a mark for the project/dissertation. The Chair of the examination panel will be responsible for conveying this mark to the Postgraduate Tutor, who will ensure that it, along with the marks for the taught course elements are presented to the relevant Faculty Progression and Awards Board for consideration. Following the Progression and Award Board meeting, the Pass List will be sent to the Conferment Office, and copy of the candidate's approved assessment profile should be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to be noted and lodged with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for information and statistical monitoring purposes. The host Faculty will archive all the relevant paperwork, either in hard or electronic copy form, for local records.

E6 Conferment of the award

- E6.1 Conferment of an award will follow the Faculty processes and procedures relating to such matters.

E7 Academic Appeals

Taught Courses

- E7.1 Academic appeals relating to the taught course element of the Masters by Research programme will follow the processes and procedures set out in the university's [*Academic Regulations for Taught Awards*](#).

Project/dissertation

- E7.2 Academic appeals relating to the project/dissertation element of the Masters by Research programme will follow the processes and procedures set out in Section I of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

F. REGULATIONS RELATING TO HIGHER DOCTORATES (DSc, DTech, DLitt, LLD)

F1 General

F1.1 As higher doctorates do not feature as part of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) document *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (2014)*, there is no commonly accepted UK based framework relating to the content, assessment and award of such degrees. As a consequence, this section sets out the regulations, processes and procedures relating to the award of such degrees by the University of Greenwich from the university perspective.

F1.2 The University will award a higher doctorate to a candidate who is eligible to apply for such a degree on the basis of submission by the candidate of a body of published work which, in the opinion of the assessors, constitutes a significant and sustained contribution to the advancement and/or application of knowledge in a particular field of activity. Current higher doctorates recognised by the University are:

- Doctor of Science (DSc)
- Doctor of Technology (DTech)
- Doctor of Letters (DLitt)
- Doctor of Law (LLD)

Other titles may be awarded to recognise equivalent endeavour in other disciplines.

F1.3 The work submitted will be of high distinction, will constitute an original and significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge, or to the application of knowledge, or both, over a sustained period of time, and will establish that the applicant is a leading authority in the field of study concerned.

F2 Eligibility of applicants

F2.1 The route to the award of a higher doctorate set out in this document is open to current contracted members of staff of the university and those who hold a formal honorary position in connection with the university.

F2.2 Normally, both categories of applicant in F2.1 should be holders, of at least five years' standing, of a doctoral degree from a recognised higher education institution, and be able to demonstrate the establishment of a prima-facie case, as set out in F3, which supports the view that a significant and sustained contribution to the advancement and/or application of knowledge in a particular field of activity is worthy of consideration by the assessment process set out in section F4.

F3 Submission of work and establishment of a prima facie case

F3.1 An applicant must submit four copies of the work, on which the application for the formal submission will be considered, to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute. The submission will normally consist of published materials which may take the form of books, monographs, peer-reviewed journal papers, peer reviewed conference papers, other relevant papers, specifications and design studies, and other formats of original work that support the thrust of the application. All material, other than books and/or other forms of non-paper-based formats, should be secured safely in one or more hard-bound folders, with each containing the applicant's name, a title and contents page. An application including non-paper based material or evidence should include a written explanation of/context to the relevance or significance of such material/evidence to the application. An applicant should also state which part of the submission, if any, has been

submitted for a previous academic award. The contents of the submission should be in English, and any material included which is in a language other than English must include an English translation.

- F3.2 Any book or paper submitted in support of the application for the degree must have been published for at least one year at the time of application.
- F3.3 In addition to the copies of the work on which the application is based, the applicant will submit a statement of not more than 5,000 words setting out the applicant's view on the trajectory of the nature of the evidence submitted and its significance in terms of impact, from either a national or international perspective, as relevant to the discipline under consideration.
- F3.4 Where an applicant submits work published jointly with other authors, they will submit a separate declaration explaining explicitly, in percentage terms, the extent of their contribution to that work, along with an indication of confirmation from each co-author to this effect. The Faculty Research Degrees Committee reserves the right to verify the claims made by an applicant in the case of all multi-authored works with any of the other cited authors.
- F3.5 All of the foregoing material set out in F3.1 – F3.4 should be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, who will manage the process of the establishment of a prima facie case.
- F3.6 On receipt of the material submitted by an applicant, the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will convene a Higher Doctorate Panel comprising of the:
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) - Chair
 - Faculty Director of Research
 - Chair of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee

At this stage the purpose of the panel is to arrive at a decision as to whether a prima facie case has been established, thereby justifying the initiation of the formal assessment process. This stage of the process may also incorporate the involvement of an invited expert in the field to advise the panel on the merits of the application.

- F3.7 In itself, the applicant should not regard the establishment of a prima facie case as a guarantee of an award, as this will depend on the recommendations made by the assessors who are appointed specifically for this purpose.
- F3.8 In the case where the panel does not support the application made by the candidate, the application will proceed no further. In this situation the Chair of the Panel is required to provide feedback to the applicant.
- F3.9 The Secretary to the panel will write to inform the applicant, in writing, of the outcome of this stage of the process within ten working days of their decision on this matter.

F4 Assessment of submission

- F4.1 If a prima facie case has been established, the application will be considered by no less than three external assessors nominated by the Higher Doctorate Panel set out above. The panel may consult externally to assist in the process of identifying suitable assessors. Such assessors should be acknowledged as experts of international standing in the field, or a very closely related field, corresponding to that set out in the submission made by the candidate. All such assessors must be external to, and wholly independent, of the University. Each such assessor will be required to make an independent report on the merits of the application, which should also include a recommendation to make the

award, or not. In the event of disagreement between the reports of the assessors, the panel may appoint an additional assessor(s), should this be considered to be an appropriate way of arriving at an overall recommendation.

- F4.2 The Secretary to the panel will write to inform the applicant, in writing, of the outcome of this stage of the process within ten working days of the final recommendation of the panel.
- F4.3 In the case where the panel consider that such an award should be made, the Chair of the panel is required to write formally to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, for onward transmission to the Chair of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, recommending that such an award should also be recommended by the committee to the university's Research and Enterprise Committee. From there on the process of making the award will follow the procedure set out in Section G of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.
- F4.4 Following recommendation by the panel that such an award should be made, the candidate is required to provide the Research & Enterprise Training Institute with a final, hard copy version of the published work and associated documentation submitted in support of the application in a format that is akin to that of a PhD thesis of the university. The hard copy document must also be accompanied by the same in an electronic pdf format. The latter will be used to include the submitted work into the Greenwich Academic Literature Archive (GALA).
- F4.5 In a case where the panel does not recommend an award should be made, the matter will be considered as final. The candidate may seek feedback from the Chair of the panel on the reported deficiencies of the application but there is no recourse to appeal the decision.

G. EXAMINATION ARRANGEMENTS AND EXAMINATION FOR MPhil, PhD AND EdD

Note: At the point at which students submit their thesis for examination they are then formally considered as ‘candidates’ for their chosen award. Therefore, this terminology is used throughout this section.

G1 Overview of process

G1.1 The examination for awards of the Master of Philosophy (MPhil), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), including the Published Work route, and research phase of the Doctorate of Education (EdD) programme will have two stages:

- the submission and preliminary, independent assessment of the thesis prepared by the candidate by at least two approved, independent examiners, and
- defence of the thesis by the candidate at an oral examination (*viva-voce*) or other approved form of alternative examination conducted by the examiners.

The oral examination will be chaired by a senior, experienced academic member of staff of the University.

G1.2 Proposals seeking approval of examination arrangements should be submitted on [Form RDA6a/b](#) with the appropriate documentation, as specified on the form and in regulation G1.3, to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for subsequent consideration by the Committee. Form RDA6a/b should, normally, be approved by the committee not less than two months before the expected date of the oral examination. Additionally, where the candidate and supervisors wish the final thesis to remain confidential for a period of time following completion of the candidate’s programme of work (for no more than two years after approval of the award), this must be indicated in the relevant section of the RDA6a/b Form. Further information on the conditions under which the candidate may request for the thesis to remain confidential can be found in Appendix 5 of these regulations. Once the proposed examination arrangements have been approved by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, they remain valid for a period of three months from the date of approval by the Committee and the examination must occur within this time. If the candidate’s examination does not take place within this time, the supervisors must either reapply in the form of a written request to the Committee, where there are no changes to the original RDA6a/b, to extend the existing approval of the examination arrangements for an additional three months. Where changes are required to the information contained within the original RDA6a/b, a new Form RDA6a/b will be required. Only one such extension may be made.

G1.3 In conjunction with G1.2, the candidate must submit the following to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute:

- (i) a signed [Form RDA6a/b](#);
- (ii) three copies of the thesis (four in the case where an additional external examiner has been appointed) bound in a temporary form, but in every other respect prepared in accordance with University guidelines, which can be found in the Postgraduate Research Student’s and Supervisor’s Handbook;
- (iii) completed Postgraduate Research Student Logbook and Professional Development Portfolio, or a Faculty Research Degrees Committee approved equivalent;
- (v) where applicable, evidence that any other previously specified requirements have been satisfied.

In addition, the candidate must be a current registered postgraduate research student of the University.

- G1.4 Form RDA6a/b will not be considered where the thesis and accompanying documentation has not been received by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute. Equally, the thesis and accompanying documentation will not be accepted where Form RDA6a/b has not been received by the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for consideration.
- G1.5 Following submission of the required documents specified in regulations G1.2 and G1.3(i)–(v), the examination should take place within three months of approval of Form RDA6a by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.
- G1.6 A candidate will normally be examined orally on the programme of work and on the field of study in which the programme lies. Where, for reasons of sickness, disability or comparable valid cause, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee is satisfied that a candidate would be under serious disadvantage if required to undergo a conventional oral examination, an alternative form of examination may be approved. Such approval will not be given on the grounds that the candidate's knowledge of and ability in spoken English is inadequate.
- G1.7 The oral examination will be held at the University and will be conducted on a face-to-face basis, and not by electronic means, unless exceptional approval for it to be held elsewhere, or in another format, is obtained from the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. A written case detailing reasons for such a request must be made by the first supervisor and submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee at the same time as the RDA6a/b application for examination arrangements, as outlined in G1.2. The Committee's decision on this matter will be final. Should such approval be granted, all costs associated with staging the examination will be the responsibility of the host Faculty and/or the collaborating organisation.
- G1.8 Following approval of the examination arrangements by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, the Research & Enterprise Training Institute will take responsibility for the organisation of the oral examination, which will be arranged in consultation with the candidate, supervisors, examiners and the Chair. The host Faculty will be responsible for all costs associated with facilitating and staging the examination.
- G1.9 To maintain the integrity of the examination process, once the application for examination arrangements (Form RDA6a/b) has been approved, the candidate and supervisors are not permitted to initiate contact with any member of the Examination Panel at any time during the examination process, from approval of the arrangements through to the time of their oral examination. Post examination, contact may be permitted in terms of clarifying the interpretation of modifications that may be required but not in relation to questioning the examiners recommendation.
- G1.10 The Research & Enterprise Training Institute will forward copies of the thesis and other examination related material to the examiners and the Chair.
- G1.11 Each examiner shall provide an assessment of the thesis on [Form RDA7/RDA7PD](#) to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute by no later than seven working days before the oral examination takes place. A copy of each RDA7/RDA7PD Form will be forwarded to the Chair of the examination panel. If the completed RDA7/RDA7PD Forms have not been returned to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute seven working days prior to the examination, the Chair will decide whether to proceed with the examination.
- G1.12 Following the oral examination, the Chair shall forward to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute the completed Form RDA8/RDA8PD/RDA9 confirming the agreed recommendation on the outcome of the examination and the examination panel shall forward a full list of the agreed amendments, by no later than fourteen days after the date of the oral examination. Formal notification of the examination recommendation and

amendments, including the timeframe for completion of the amendments, will be sent to the candidate by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute within five working days of receipt of the above documentation.

- G1.13 The Faculty Research Degrees Committee will ensure that all examinations are conducted, and the recommendations of the examiners are presented in accordance with the University's regulations, the operational responsibility for which rests with the designated Chair. In any instance where the Faculty Research Degrees Committee is made aware of a material failure to comply with the normal procedures of the examination process, the Chair of the Committee will investigate and report their findings to the Committee. The Committee has the power to declare the examination null and void, appoint new examiners and arrange a new examination, which will be treated as the candidate's first examination.
- G1.14 In order to consider a recommendation of the examiners to award the degree being sought, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee must have available for consideration:
- (i) the RDA7/RDA7PD preliminary reports and the RDA8/RDA8PD/RDA9 signed recommendation of the examiners;
 - (ii) if applicable, a statement from the examiner(s) that all required amendments and corrections have been satisfactorily completed;
 - (iii) the approved final bound thesis presented in accordance with University requirements;
 - (iv) the completed Postgraduate Research Student Logbook and Professional Development Portfolio;
 - (v) evidence that any other specified requirements have been satisfied.
- G1.15 The Faculty Research Degrees Committee will make a decision based on the reports and recommendations of the examiners, and if it supports and confirms the recommendation that the award of the degree being sought should be made, it will make a corresponding recommendation that the award is confirmed by the Research and Enterprise Committee.

G2 Candidate's responsibilities

- G2.1 The candidate will ensure that the requisite copies of the thesis are submitted for examination, bound in a temporary form, but in every other respect prepared in accordance with the University guidelines set out in in the Postgraduate Research Student's and Supervisor's Handbook. No aspect of the candidate's submission may include any material that has formed part of the process for the candidate being granted a previous academic award without an appropriate declaration to this fact. The submitted copies along with a completed and signed [Form RDA6a/b](#) shall be delivered to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, for subsequent dispatch to the examiners and Chair, before the expiry date of Form RDA6a/b. The hard copy version of the submission must also be accompanied by the same in a digitised pdf format. Where applicable, a hard-copy of the candidate's Postgraduate Research Student Logbook and Professional Development Portfolio, or approved equivalent, must be submitted at the same time.
- G2.2 The submission of the thesis for examination will be at the sole discretion of the candidate. Supervisors may advise on the submission of the thesis, but shall not have powers of veto against the student's decision to submit.
- G2.3 The candidate should not assume that the supervisor's agreement to the submission of a thesis for examination guarantees the award of the degree.
- G2.4 Apart from being consulted over the date and time of the oral examination, the candidate will take no part in the arrangement of the examination and will have no contact with the

examiners during the examination process, from approval of the arrangements through to the time of their oral examination. Post examination, contact may be permitted in terms of clarifying the interpretation of modifications that may be required but not in relation to questioning the examiners recommendation.

- G2.5 The candidate should prepare for and must attend the oral or other approved form of examination on the agreed date. Should valid extenuating circumstances arise that prevent examination on the agreed date, the candidate and/or supervisor should inform the Research & Enterprise Training Institute at the earliest available opportunity. The Research & Enterprise Training Institute will liaise with the Chair of the Examination Panel.
- G2.6 The candidate will comply with the requirements according to the recommendation made by the examiners in their final report, including engaging in another oral examination, or any other format of examination, should this form part of their recommendation.
- G2.7 It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure the amended/revised thesis is submitted to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute within the examiner's/regulatory required timeframe. Where extenuating circumstances occur that prevent the candidate from completing the amendments/revisions within the required timeframe, they may exceptionally submit a request for an extension to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee via Form RDA5.
- G2.8 Upon approval by the examiners of any amendments, corrections or revisions, the candidate will ensure that the approved final bound thesis including a signed 'Declaration' is submitted to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute in accordance with University requirements. The title of the thesis must be the same as the definitive title set out on Form RDA6a/b, unless a change to the title has been recommended by the examiners.
- G2.9 The candidate will not be precluded from incorporating in the thesis work which has already been submitted for a degree or comparable award, provided that it is indicated on the Declaration in the thesis which work has been so incorporated, and it is clearly referred to as such in the text. Any such work will not be considered as new work and it will not be considered as such by the examiners in arriving at their recommendation about the award being sought.

G3 The examiners

- G3.1 A candidate will be examined by no less than two examiners, one of which must be an external examiner. Where the case for another examiner is justified, this must not be an additional internal examiner.
- G3.2 An internal examiner, who will not be a member of a candidate's supervisory team or any other person closely involved with the candidate's work, will normally be defined as an examiner who is an appropriately qualified contracted member of academic staff of the University. Variations to this may be permitted on an exceptional basis and where justified. An internal examiner may not be a registered postgraduate research student of the University or any other Higher Education Institution. It is preferable that an internal examiner has not previously acted in the capacity of a transfer Assessor for the candidate, but this may be permissible, on an exceptional basis, where there is a limited number of experienced internal examiners in the field of expertise being examined. Where this is proposed, there must be a clear declaration to this effect on Form RDA6a/b when approval of the examination arrangements for a candidate is being sought from the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.
- G3.3 Where the candidate is a permanent member of staff of the University, a second external examiner will be appointed in place of an internal examiner. A candidate who starts their

research programme as a research student and completes the substantive part of the write-up of the thesis in this capacity, but subsequently engages in a formal employment contract with the University before the oral examination will be exempt from the requirements of this regulation, providing that such employment is less than two years in duration before the oral examination. Additionally, a candidate who is on a fixed term employment contract with the University of less than two years at the time of the oral examination will be exempt from the requirements of this regulation. Where a candidate, who at the time of initial registration with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, was a member of staff at the University and subsequently leaves its employment, they will, for the purpose of these regulations, continue to be treated as a member of staff for a period of three years after the date of leaving the University's employment.

- G3.4 Where no suitable internal examiner is available, two external examiners may be appointed.
- G3.5 Examiners will be experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's thesis and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined as demonstrated by evidence of their recent published work.
- G3.6 At least one external examiner will have previously examined at the PhD level in the United Kingdom, or in a country that operates a PhD examination system similar to that of the United Kingdom, on no less than three previous occasions. However, in exceptional circumstances, for subject areas where there are a very limited number of experienced external examiners, an external examiner may be appointed, where, as a minimum, they have completed their own PhD and are respected in their field for the quality of their research, as evidenced by their professional standing and recent publications. Where a Faculty wishes to invoke this exceptional circumstance, a clear justification should be set out and appended to Form RDA6a/b, in accordance with G1.2.
- G3.7 Where the work to be examined is substantially interdisciplinary in nature, a second external examiner, in addition to the first external examiner and the internal examiner is encouraged.
- G3.8 An external examiner will be independent both of the University and of the collaborating establishment and will not have acted previously as the candidate's supervisor or adviser. An external examiner will not be either a supervisor of another student or be an external examiner on a taught course in the same Department/Faculty at the university. Should a proposed external examiner have acted in either capacity in the past, a period of three years must have elapsed between acting in such a capacity and being proposed to act as an external examiner again. Former members of staff will normally not be approved as external examiners until three years after leaving their employment with the University.
- G3.9 The Faculty Research Degrees Committee will ensure that the same external examiner is not approved so frequently that their familiarity with the Faculty/Department might prejudice objective judgement, in accordance with G3.8.
- G3.10 No candidate for a research degree of the University will act as an examiner for a research degree in a related discipline, either as an internal examiner at the University or as an external examiner at another institution.
- G3.11 The host Faculty will pay a set examination fee to, and reimburse reasonable expenses incurred by the external examiner(s) in travelling from within the United Kingdom to attend the oral examination, or other approved form of examination, in accordance with the University's policies and practices on such matters.

- G3.12 If an external examiner is travelling from outside the United Kingdom, the host Faculty will reimburse reasonable expenses incurred in travelling to and from the point of entry to the United Kingdom to attend the oral examination, in accordance with the University's policies and practices on such matters.

G4 The external examiner(s)

G4.1 The roles of the external examiner are to:

- (i) read the thesis, and produce a preliminary report and make an independent provisional recommendation on Form RDA7/RDA7PD ,
- (ii) take a lead role in the oral examination or any other approved form of examination,
- (iii) together with the other examiner(s), produce an agreed report, or otherwise, and make a recommendation on the submission made by the candidate, having due regard to the elements comprising the relevant qualification descriptor set out in Appendix 1,
- (iv) fulfil the same roles as set out in (i) – (iii) where any form of re-examination of the candidate is required, and
- (v) if required, approve any amendments/corrections/revisions to the thesis arising out of the examination process, so that a definitive version may be produced by the candidate.

All of the above roles should be addressed within the timescales specified in regulations G1.8-9, G9.6-8.

G4.2 In the case where the work being examined is substantially interdisciplinary in nature and a second external examiner has been approved (in addition to the first external examiner), or the candidate being examined is a member of University staff and, instead of an internal examiner, a second external examiner has been approved, the examination will be led equally between the external examiners.

G4.3 In making recommendations following the outcome of the examination process, an external examiner shall also indicate whether, based on their academic judgement, the standard of work for the award under consideration is comparable to that of similar awards of other higher education institutions in the United Kingdom, having due regard to the elements comprising the relevant qualification descriptor set out in Appendix 1.

G5 The internal examiner

G5.1 The roles of the internal examiner are to:

- (i) read the thesis, and produce a preliminary report and make an independent provisional recommendation on Form RDA7/RDA7PD ,
- (ii) participate in the oral examination or any other approved form of examination,
- (iii) together with the other examiner(s), produce an agreed report, or otherwise, and make a recommendation on the submission made by the candidate, having due regard to the elements comprising the qualification descriptor set out in Appendix 1,
- (iv) fulfil the same roles as set out in (i) – (iii) where any form of re-examination of the candidate is required, and
- (v) if required, approve any corrections/additions/modifications to the thesis arising out of the examination process, so that a definitive version may be produced by the candidate.

All of the above roles should be addressed within the timescales specified in regulations G1.8-9, G9.6-8.

G6 The Chair

G6.1 The oral examination will normally be chaired by a senior, full-time contracted academic member of staff of the University who has experience of examining at least five examinations and/or successful completions at the Doctoral level. The Chair will be independent from the two examiners and will not be an examiner. The Chair will also be independent from the programme of work forming the basis of the subject matter under examination, and is present to manage the examination process and to act in an advisory capacity during the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination. The Chair must not have previously acted as an Assessor at the candidate's transfer assessment.

The roles of the Chair are to:

- (i) ensure that the conduct of the examination is in accordance with the University procedures and regulations, including the submission of the examiners' recommendations on Form RDA8/RDA8PD/RDA9 and any related documentation, and to ensure this is forwarded to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute by no later than fourteen days after the date of the oral examination or other approved form of examination,
- (ii) maintain the focus of the subject of the examination such that it remains within the candidate's area of research,
- (iii) where invited by the examiners, provide advice on the interpretation of the Academic Regulations for the award under consideration,
- (iv) arbitrate in relation to any disagreements emanating out of the oral examination,
- (v) provide an additional viewpoint on matters relating to the conduct of the oral examination should this become the subject of a student appeal, and
- (vi) fulfil the same roles as set out in (i) and (v) where any re-examination of the candidate is required.

The Chair may invite any supervisors present at the oral examination to clarify matters of fact for the examiners where this is considered appropriate or necessary.

G7 Supervisors and Head of Research & Enterprise Training Institute

G7.1 With the consent of the candidate, examiners and Chair, supervisors may attend the oral examination, but are required to withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination. Supervisors in attendance at the oral examination should be so in a silent, supportive role. The Head of the Research & Enterprise Training Institute may attend any oral examination in an *ex-officio* capacity, but, following the conclusion of the examination, they will also be required to withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners.

G7.2 The maximum number of supervisors permitted to attend the oral examination is two. Priority should be given to the first supervisor.

G8 The examination

G8.1 Each examiner will read and examine the thesis, and submit an independent preliminary report on Form RDA7/RDA7PD. In completing this preliminary report, each examiner will consider whether, based on their academic judgement, the content of the thesis provisionally satisfies the basic requirements for the award under consideration as identified by the relevant qualification descriptor set out in Appendix 1, and whether the candidate be permitted to proceed to oral examination, or any other approved form of examination. Each examiner is required to ensure that their Form RDA7/RDA7PD is forwarded to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute seven working days prior to the

date of the planned oral examination. These preliminary reports will then be forwarded to the Chair of the Examination Panel.

G8.2 In cases where, following their reading of the thesis, the examiners or the External Examiner are/is of the opinion that, following the subsequent oral examination, the likely outcome of the examination process will be a referral requiring resubmission for the degree being sought and another examination, examiners are encouraged not to proceed to an oral examination at this time, but, instead and where appropriate, consider invoking regulation G8.4(iii)

G8.3 The Research & Enterprise Training Institute will make provisional arrangements for the oral examination or other approved form of examination. Subject to the examiners agreeing that the examination process can proceed to this stage, the Institute will finalise the examination arrangements at a time and venue agreed between the candidate, the examiners and the Chair, and will confirm these arrangements with all concerned.

G8.4 In cases where;

- (i) Examiners disagree in their initial findings, the view of the external examiner shall take precedent.
- (ii) There is a disagreement in views in cases where two external examiners are employed, the examination process is suspended until the candidate addresses the concerns expressed by the examiner who is not comfortable with proceeding to the oral examination at that point. This external examiner is required to forward the completed preliminary report containing detailed reasons for this initial recommendation. This will then be passed on to the candidate and supervisors, so that the former may address the issues identified. Such an outcome will be considered to be a failed first attempt at examination, and the candidate is then only permitted one further attempt to be examined for the award being sought.
- (iii) The examiners or the external examiner consider the submitted thesis to be so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting the oral examination, or other form of approved examination at that time, they can recommend on Form RDA7/RDA7PD to the Chair and the Research & Enterprise Training Institute that the oral examination be suspended, in accordance with regulation G9.1.

G8.5 Within fourteen days of the oral examination the examiners will, where they are in agreement, submit Form RDA8/RDA8PD/RDA9, consisting of a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree, to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, via the Chair of the Examination Panel. The preliminary reports and joint recommendation of the examiners should, when taken as a whole, provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to enable the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to satisfy itself that the recommendation from the examiners is appropriate, and the standard of the award is being upheld. Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations should be submitted by each examiner.

G9 Outcomes of examination

G9.1 Where, on reading and considering the thesis, the examiners are of the view that the submission is sub-standard, the examination process shall not proceed to the oral examination, or other approved form of examination. The examiners must include detailed reasons for their decision in writing through submission of their respective preliminary report on Form RDA7/RDA7PD, appending any additional information as appropriate. The appointed Chair, in association with the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, will then manage the subsequent process of:

- (i) informing the candidate and supervisors that the oral examination, or other form of examination will not take place as scheduled,
- (ii) the candidate receiving written feedback within fourteen days of them being informed that the oral or other approved form of examination will not be taking place as scheduled, so as to identify to the candidate the deficiencies of the thesis and the timescale within which these should be addressed prior to resubmitting for examination, which should be no more than twelve months and
- (ii) submission of the reports from the examiners setting out the deficiencies of the thesis to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for information and consideration.

At this stage the examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright. This circumstance is considered as a referral, which allows for one further submission and examination, with an attendant limitation on the range of recommendations available to the examiners as set out in paragraph G10.5. The candidate will normally have no more than twelve months to address the concerns raised by the examiners and to re-submit the thesis for re-examination from the date the recommendation of the examiners is confirmed by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee and communicated to the applicant. Tuition fees at the relevant level will be payable by the candidate during this period.

G9.2 Where the examination process proceeds to the oral, or other approved form of examination, on completion of this the examiners may recommend to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee that:

- (a) The candidate be awarded the degree being sought.
- (b) The candidate be awarded the degree being sought, subject to minor amendments and corrections being made to the thesis to the satisfaction of the internal and/or external examiner, or one or both external examiners where two such examiners have been appointed.
- (c) The candidate be awarded the degree being sought, subject to major amendments and corrections being made to the thesis to the satisfaction of the internal and/or external examiner, or one or both external examiners where two such examiners have been appointed.
- (d) The candidate is referred and shall be permitted to re-submit for the degree being sought and be re-examined in accordance with one of the following:
 - (i) The thesis is considered satisfactory, but the candidate is required to undergo a further oral or other approved form of examination.
 - (ii) The thesis must be revised and, if considered satisfactory by the examiners, the candidate will be exempt from further examination, oral or otherwise.
 - (iii) The thesis must be revised and the candidate must undergo a further oral or other approved form of examination.
- (e) In the case of a PhD examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.
- (f) In the case of an EdD examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of a Masters Degree (MEdRes).
- (g) The candidate be not awarded the degree being sought and be not permitted to be re-examined.

- G9.3 In the case of a PhD by Published Work the candidate may re-examined once subject to the satisfactory completion of additional work, but MPhil may not be awarded.
- G9.4 Examiners may indicate informally their recommendation on the outcome of the examination process to the candidate following their deliberations, but the final decision shall rest with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee and no informal conveyance of their recommendation to the candidate shall have any bearing on the decision of the Committee.
- G9.5 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may:
- (i) Accept the recommendation of the external examiner, where the examination team comprises an internal and external examiner;
 - (ii) Accept a majority recommendation, where the examination team comprises an internal examiner and two external examiners;
 - (iii) Require the appointment of an additional external examiner, where the initial examination team comprises two external examiners.
- G9.6 Where an additional external examiner is appointed, they will prepare a preliminary report on Form RDA7/RDA7PD on the basis of reading the thesis and other relevant paperwork and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further oral examination. On receipt of written reports from the additional examiner, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will, through consideration of all examiners' reports, make a decision based on a majority recommendation.
- G9.7 Where the outcome of the examination is as set out in regulation G9.2(b and c), the examiners will provide formal written feedback for the candidate on the amendments and corrections required and the timescale in which they are to be completed to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute within fourteen days of the oral examination for formal notification to be communicated to the candidate. Such a timescale should be no more than three months for minor modifications and twelve months for major modifications from the date the recommendation and required amendments and corrections are formally notified to the candidate by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute. Information on the implication for tuition fees can be found in the Postgraduate Research Degrees Tuition Fees Charging and Refund Policy.
- G9.8 Where the outcome of the examination is as set out in regulation G9.2(b and c), the internal examiner will communicate in writing to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute when these have been completed to the satisfaction of one or both examiners within fifteen working days from the date the examiner receives the amended thesis from the Research & Enterprise Training Institute. In the case where the candidate is a member of staff of the University and there is no internal examiner, this responsibility will fall to the Chair.
- G9.9 Where the outcome of the examination is as set out in the relevant section of regulation G9.2(d), such a referral will allow for one further submission and examination. The examiners will provide formal written feedback for the candidate on the amendments/corrections/revisions required to address the identified deficiencies to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute within fourteen days of the oral examination. The candidate will have no more than twelve months to address these deficiencies and resubmit for examination from the date the Research & Enterprise Training Institute communicates such official feedback from the examiners to the candidate. This information must also be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty Postgraduate Research Committee. Relevant tuition fees will be payable by the student during this period, except in situations where the examiner's recommendation is as set out in G9.2 (d)(i). Information on the applicable

tuition fees may be found in the Postgraduate Research Degrees Tuition Fees Charging and Refund Policy.

- G9.10 The Research & Enterprise Training Institute will maintain a record of all examinations and re-examinations undertaken in each academic year, and their outcomes.

G10 Resubmission and re-examination

- G10.1 One resubmission and re-examination of a candidate for the awards of MPhil, PhD and EdD may be permitted, subject to the following:
- (a) a candidate whose thesis fails to satisfy either of the examiners to the extent that the oral or other approved form of examination was suspended, and was referred by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to address the deficiencies of the thesis, and, if considered satisfactory, be required to undergo an oral or other approved form of examination, in accordance with regulation G9.1, and
 - (b) the candidate has received, through the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, the examiners' reports and recommendations, along with any other written guidance from the examiners on the deficiencies of the first submission,
- or
- (c) a candidate who fails to satisfy the examiners at the first oral examination and is recommended by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to make revisions to the thesis and/or undergo a further oral or other approved form of examination, in accordance with the relevant element of regulation G9.2.(d), and
 - (d) the candidate has received, through the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, the examiners reports and recommendations, along with any other written guidance from the examiners on the deficiencies of the first submission,
- G10.2 The same examination panel (examiners and Chair) employed to conduct the first examination should be employed to conduct the re-examination of the candidate. Notwithstanding this, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee reserves the right to request the nomination and appointment of an additional external examiner for the re-examination, and, in exceptional circumstances, the Committee can request the same for a new examination team, including a new Chair.
- G10.3 If the period of time between the first examination and the proposed re-examination is such that it is not possible for any of the examiners, or the Chair, to continue to act in these capacities, the supervisors will be required to propose to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee a new examiner(s) and/or Chair via submission of Form [RDA6a/b](#).
- G10.4 The supervisory team may, where exceptional circumstances arise (e.g. suspected improper conduct or procedural irregularity relating to the first oral examination), submit a proposal via Form RDA6a/b, to the Secretary to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to make a change to the Examination Panel. The proposal must include a clear rationale for the proposed change(s) and should be submitted a minimum of 3 months prior to the candidate's resubmission deadline. Any decision to alter the Examination Panel is at the discretion of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee taking due regard of the justifications presented by the supervisory team. The Faculty Research Degrees Committee decision on this matter will be final.
- G10.5 Following the completion of the re-examination process the examiners may recommend to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee that:
- (i) the candidate be awarded the degree being sought;

- (ii) the candidate be awarded the degree being sought subject to minor amendments being made to the thesis. (Note: This option is not applicable to the category of re-examination set out in paragraph F9.2(d)(i),
 - (iv) the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil subject to any amendments to the thesis required by, and to the satisfaction of the examiners, in cases where the degree being sought was PhD
 - (v) the candidate be awarded the degree of MEdRes in cases where the degree being sought is EdD
 - (vi) the candidate not be awarded the degree of MPhil or PhD.
- G10.6 If the examiners disagree in their initial findings about progressing to the oral examination (if applicable) following their reading of the thesis presented by the candidate to initiate the re-examination process:
- (i) the view of the external examiner shall take precedent in cases where an internal examiner and external examiner have been appointed,
 - (ii) the majority view shall prevail in cases where two external examiners and an internal examiner have been appointed,
 - (iii) the re-examination process will proceed no further in cases where two external examiners have been appointed.
- G10.7 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous following completion of the re-examination process, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may:
- (i) Accept the recommendation of the external examiner, where the re-examination team comprised an internal and external examiner.
 - (ii) Accept a majority recommendation, where the re-examination team comprised an internal examiner and two external examiners.
 - (iii) Require the appointment of an additional external examiner, where the re-examination team comprised two external examiners, following which the majority recommendation shall prevail.
- G10.8 Where an additional external examiner is appointed under paragraph G10.6(iii), they will prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of reading the thesis and any other relevant paperwork and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further oral examination, which will require submission of a full written report. On receipt of the report(s) from the additional external examiner, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will, through consideration of all examiners' reports, make a decision based on a majority recommendation.
- G10.9 In the case of a resubmission under the circumstances set out in paragraphs G9.1 and G9.2(d)(ii) and (iii) each examiner will read and examine the revised thesis and submit, an independent preliminary report on Form [RDA7/RDA7PD](#). In cases where the re-submission progresses to an oral examination, a joint report on Form [RDA8/RDA8PD/RDA9](#) will be submitted by the examiners setting out their recommendation following completion of the oral examination. The forms must be submitted to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute.
- G10.10 Examiners may indicate informally their recommendation on the outcome of the re-examination process to the candidate following their deliberations, but the final decision shall rest with the Faculty Research Degrees Committee and no informal conveyance of their recommendation to the candidate shall have any bearing on the decision of the Committee. The final decision will be communicated to the candidate by the Secretary of the Committee.

G10.11 Following the completion of the examination process, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee is required to convene an internal enquiry panel, to identify any lessons that might be learned from examinations where;

- (i) the candidate was recommended for a lower award than the award they were examined for, or
- (ii) no award was recommended

The panel will comprise of three senior academics from within the University who are experienced in matters relating to the supervision of postgraduate research students. The panel members must not include the candidates' supervisors, any individual involved in the candidate's research studies, or those involved in any previous review of a formal complaint or academic appeal made by the candidate. One will act as a Chair and will be from outside the Faculty. The panel has the right to interview the candidate's supervisors where this is considered appropriate. The Secretary to the panel will be drawn from the Research & Enterprise Training Institute.

The findings of the internal enquiry panel will be reported to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee and used to identify required improvements/amendments to internal University regulations and procedures.

G11 Posthumous Awards

G11.1 The degrees of MPhil, PhD and EdD may be awarded posthumously where:

- (i) the thesis is ready for submission for examination prior to the death of the student, or
- (ii) the Faculty Research Degrees Committee considers that prior to the death of the student they completed enough work of an appropriate standard to demonstrate sufficient evidence that a thesis could have been submitted for examination for the degree being sought.

In both cases an original contribution to knowledge should be evident. Such a case should be made by the first supervisor, with the support of the Faculty Director of Research, in writing, with relevant evidence, and forwarded to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for consideration. The Chair of the Committee will seek external advice on the merits of the case from a recognised specialist in the field who would have met the normal requirements of an external examiner had the deceased been in a position to have submitted for examination in the normal way. Should the Committee agree with the external advisor that the degree being sought by the deceased may be awarded posthumously, the host Faculty will ensure that all relevant material is gathered, collated and bound, as far as is practicable, in accordance with University guidelines on the presentation of theses, with the header page clearly indicating that the deceased has been posthumously awarded the degree of PhD. This should be submitted to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, along with a digitised version of the same in a pdf format.

G11.2 The degree of MPhil may be awarded posthumously where:

- (i) prior to the death of a student, they registered for the programme of MPhil/PhD but had not progressed their programme of study from MPhil to PhD, but had made sufficient progress to be considered for the award of MPhil.
- (ii) prior to the death of a student, they successfully progressed their programme of study from MPhil to PhD, but had not made sufficient progress to be considered for their intended award of PhD as set out in paragraph G11.1.

In both instances a case should be made by the first supervisor, with the support of the Faculty Director of Research, in writing, with relevant evidence, and forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for consideration by the Committee. The Committee will seek external advice on the merits of the case. Should the Committee agree with the external advisor that the degree being sought may be awarded posthumously on a fall-back basis, the host Faculty will ensure that all relevant material is gathered, collated and bound, as far as practicable, in accordance with University guidelines on the presentation of theses, with the header page clearly indicating that the deceased has been posthumously awarded the degree of MPhil. This should be submitted to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, along with a digitised version of the same in a pdf format.

- G11.3 The degree of MEdRes may be awarded posthumously where, prior to the death of a student, they successfully progressed their programme of study from the taught phase to the research phase of the EdD programme, but had not made sufficient progress to be considered for their intended award of EdD as set out in paragraph G11.1. Such matters are the responsibility of the Faculty Programme Committee for the EdD programme to pursue.

G12 Submission of definitive thesis

- G12.1 Following recommendation by the examiners that such an award should be made, the candidate is required to provide the Research & Enterprise Training Institute with a final, hard copy version of the approved thesis. The hard copy thesis must also be accompanied by the same in a digitised pdf format. The latter will be used to include the submitted work in the Greenwich Academic Literature Archive (GALA).

G13 Conferment of the award

- G13.1 Conferment of an award will follow the process and procedures set out in Section H of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

G14 Academic Appeals

- G14.1 Academic appeals relating to MPhil, PhD and the research phase of the EdD programme will follow the processes and procedures set out in Section I of the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards*.

H. REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE CONFERMENT OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS

H1 Awards

H1.1 The following awards of the University are currently available for research degrees:

- **Doctoral awards**
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
Professional Doctorate in Education (EdD)
Higher Doctorate (DSc, DTech, DLitt, LLD)
- **Masters awards**
Master of Philosophy (MPhil)
Master by Research (MA, MSc, LLM)

H2 Principles of conferment

H2.1 An academic award can only be conferred on a candidate who has satisfied the academic requirements to qualify for the award and all other requirements of the University, including the settlement of any outstanding financial obligations.

H2.2 Authority to decide that a student has satisfied the academic requirement for a research award is normally as follows:

Doctorates/MPhil: *Recommended by Faculty Research Degrees Committee
Confirmed by Research and Enterprise Committee
Ratified by Academic Council*

Professional Doctorates: *Faculty Research Degrees Committee recommends the award of the appropriate credits in recognition of successful completion of the research phase
Recommended by Faculty Professional Doctorates Progression Award Board following consideration of accrual of appropriate overall academic credits
Confirmed by Research and Enterprise Committee
Ratified by Academic Council*

Higher Doctorates: *Recommended by Faculty Research Degree Committee
Confirmed by Research and Enterprise Committee
Ratified by Academic Council*

Masters by Research: *Confirmed by Faculty Progression and Award Board for Masters programmes*

H2.3 The date of conferment of a PhD or MPhil degree authorised by the Research and Enterprise Committee will normally reflect the date of approval by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.

H2.4 The date of conferment of a Masters by Research degree will normally be the date of the final decision by the Progression and Award Board that the student has qualified for the award.

- H2.5 In very exceptional circumstances it may be necessary for an award to be rescinded. This could arise for two reasons:
- (i) if it should come to the attention of the Chair of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee/Research and Enterprise Committee/Award Board after the Committee had met that there had been a breach of regulations which would affect the final outcome of the assessment and of which the Committee was not aware;
 - (ii) if an error in recording the decisions of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee/Research and Enterprise Committee/Award Board was undetected up to and after the point of publishing the results.
- H2.6 In these circumstances, the Chair of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee/Award Board will consult with the Director of Student & Academic Services informing them of the circumstances. Subject to their advice, the following action should be taken:
- (a) if a recording error has taken place, the Chair will inform all members of the Committee and issue a corrected record as quickly as possible, writing individually to the student(s) affected;
 - (b) where it has been established by the appropriate procedure that a breach of regulations has taken place, the Committee should be reconvened to reconsider the results of the student(s). The decision(s) of the reconvened Committee will be circulated and letter(s) will be sent by the Chair to the student(s) whose results have been changed.

H3 Publication of assessment results

- H3.1 Following a Faculty Research Degrees Committee/Award Board meeting, letters will normally be sent by post to students whose awards have been confirmed.
- H3.2 It is the responsibility of the student to update their personal details via Bannerweb so that a letter can be posted to the student.
- H3.3 Staff are not authorised to give results over the telephone or in person. Any result so given cannot be considered to be official.

H4 Preparation and issue of award certificates

- H4.1 The certificate available to a student will be that specified in the regulations for the programme on which they are registered. Unless specified in the regulations, an interim certificate will not be awarded to a student who is continuing to the final award.
- H4.2 A student who leaves the University having completed one or more stages of an award may receive, upon request, a certificate for the highest stage completed, as an exit award, if the programme regulations allow it.
- H4.3 It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that their name is correctly entered in the student records system at registration, as the name registered is the one which will appear on the award certificate. If a student changes their name whilst registered for the award, evidence of this, e.g. deed poll or marriage certificate, must be shown to the appropriate Student Centre.
- H4.4 The name shown on the certificate will be the student's full name at the time the award is made. A change of name after that date will not result in a change of name on the certificate, it will be for the student to keep evidence that they were previously known by the name on the certificate.

H4.5 Unless the award is made by an external body the certificate will be in the format approved by the University. Samples of the approved format and wording of certificates will be held by the Conferments Office. Certificates will bear the signature of the Vice-Chancellor and the Chancellor. Certificates without these signatures, or which have been amended after issue, are not valid.

H4.6 The following will be recorded on the certificate:

- (a) the name of the University;
- (b) the full name of the student;
- (c) the award achieved;
- (d) the title of the programme of study;
- (e) the date of conferment of the award;
- (f) collaborating establishment(s), if appropriate.

H5 Posthumous awards

H5.1 Any award listed in the Introduction A1.1 may be conferred posthumously as accepted at an awards ceremony on the students' behalf by a parent, spouse or other appropriate individual. If the normal conditions of the award have not been met, the appropriate exit award should be conferred. The award certificate will state that the student:

“has been posthumously awarded the degree of”

H6 Replacement certificates

H6.1 Duplicate certification will be issued where the appropriate application form is completed and the necessary fee paid. Application forms can be obtained from The Conferments Office, University of Greenwich, Fry Building, Avery Hill Campus, Southwood Site, Avery Hill Road, Eltham, London SE9 2UG.

H6.2 If a damaged award certificate is received by post, this should be immediately returned to the University for replacement.

H7 Awards ceremonies

H7.1 Students who successfully complete their studies will be eligible to attend the next available Awards Ceremony for their programme of studies.

I. REGULATIONS RELATING TO POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH ACADEMIC APPEALS

11 Grounds for appealing the decision of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to discontinue a student's registration

11.1 As outlined in regulation B7.3, the Faculty Research Degrees Committee may decide to discontinue a student's registration with the university following unsatisfactory completion of an action plan. A student may appeal against the decision of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee on the following two grounds only:

- (a) That there exist circumstances materially affecting the student's ability to meet the requirements of the action plan which were not known to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee when its decision was taken, and which it was not reasonably practicable for the student to make known to the Committee beforehand.

Students wishing to appeal on such grounds **must** show a compelling reason why this information was not made available to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee before it reached its decision, and provide documentary evidence in support. Where the student could have made the information available prior to the decision being made, such evidence cannot normally be accepted as grounds for appeal.

- (b) That there is evidence of procedural irregularity on the university's part, including administrative error, affecting the student's performance of such a nature as to create a reasonable possibility that the decision might have been different had it not occurred.

Problems associated with supervision and training, and environment including resources, should have been raised on Form RDA4a at the appropriate time during a student's programme of study. If, however, there is a compelling reason why supervisory and environment issues were not previously reported at the appropriate time, the student will be required to provide demonstrable evidence of the reason(s).

12 Grounds for appealing the outcome of an allegation of research misconduct that has been upheld

12.1 A student may appeal against the outcome of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee or the University Research Student Misconduct Panel to uphold a research misconduct allegation where the outcome of the committee/panel is as follows:

- (i) The Stage 4 Faculty Research Degrees Committee outcome recommends a **Level 1 – Minor Research Misconduct** penalty or a **Level 2 – Moderate Research Misconduct** penalty, or
- (ii) The Stage 4 University Research Student Misconduct Panel outcome recommends a **Level 3 – Major Research Misconduct** penalty.

A student may appeal one of the above research misconduct outcomes on the following grounds only:

- (a) That there is evidence of procedural irregularity on the university's part, including administrative error, which are of such a nature as to create a reasonable possibility that the outcome of the decision-making party might have been different had it not occurred.

- (b) New evidence has been made available which could not have been made available to the decision-making party/parties when the student's case was considered and which can be shown to be material to the case.

The student must demonstrate valid reasons why such evidence could not have been made available prior to the decision being made. Where the student could have made the new evidence available prior to the decision being made, such evidence cannot subsequently be cited as grounds for appeal.

I3 Grounds for appealing the outcome of a transfer viva (upgrade from MPhil to PhD)

I3.1 A student may appeal the outcome of a transfer viva voce only where the recommendation of the assessors is that the student should apply for an MPhil examination. A student may appeal the outcome of the assessors on the following three grounds only:

- (a) That there are circumstances affecting the student's performance that the assessors were not aware of at the oral examination.

Students wishing to appeal on such grounds **must** show a compelling reason why this information was not made available to the assessors before their decision was reached, and provide documentary evidence in support. Where the student could have made the information available prior to the decision being made, such evidence cannot normally be accepted as grounds for appeal.

- (b) That there has been demonstrable material procedural irregularity in the conduct of the oral assessment and/or assessment procedures of such a nature as to create a reasonable possibility that the outcome might have been different had it not occurred.
- (c) That there is evidence of unfair or improper assessment on the part of one or more of the assessors.

I4 Grounds for appealing the outcome of a formal oral examination (viva voce) for a final award

I4.1 A student may appeal the outcome of a formal viva voce examination only where the recommendation of the examiners is as follows:

- (a) PhD/PhD by Published Work;
 - (i) the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil subject to presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners
 - (ii) that the candidate be not awarded the degree of PhD or MPhil and be not permitted to be re-examined
- (b) Professional Doctorate;
 - (i) that the candidate be awarded a Masters degree (MEdRes)
- (c) MPhil;
 - (i) that the candidate be not awarded the degree of MPhil and be not permitted to be re-examined

A student may appeal one of the above examination outcomes on the following grounds only:

- (a) That there are circumstances affecting the student's performance that the examiners were not aware of at the oral examination.

Students wishing to appeal on such grounds **must** show a compelling reason why this information was not made available to the examiners before their decision was reached, and provide documentary evidence in support. Where the student could have made the information available prior to the decision being made, such evidence cannot normally be accepted as grounds for appeal.

- (b) That there has been demonstrable material procedural irregularity in the conduct of the oral examination and/or examination procedures of such a nature as to create a reasonable possibility that the outcome might have been different had it not occurred.
- (c) That there is evidence of unfair or improper assessment on the part of one or more of the examiners.

15 Grounds under which an appeal cannot be made

15.1 An academic appeal cannot be made under the following grounds:

- (a) Academic judgement, namely that although the decision being appealed was properly made, the decision making body is alleged to have erred in its judgement of the academic standard achieved by the student.
- (b) Dissatisfaction with provision in relation to environment, resources, supervision and training, as grievances in relation to these areas should have been raised on Form RDA4a at the appropriate time and resolved through the university's Student Complaints Procedure, except in the case of I1.1(b).

16 How to appeal

16.1 An appeal must be submitted in writing by the student concerned by completing the Postgraduate Research Academic Appeal Form. Procedures for submitting the Postgraduate Research Academic Appeal Form are outlined in the accompanying Guidance for Students.

16.2 The Postgraduate Research Academic Appeal Form **must** be submitted no later than **15 working days** after the notification to the student of the decision being appealed*. The Postgraduate Research Academic Appeal Form must be submitted to the nearest campus Student Centre where it will be receipted and forwarded to the Research & Enterprise Training Institute.

* *In respect of Faculty Research Degree decisions or formal notification of the examination outcome, notification to the student is normally defined as the date a student receives their formal email notification of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee examination outcome.*

16.3 An acknowledgement letter will be issued by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute upon receipt of the appeal. Any appeals received after the 15 working day deadline will be deemed out of time for consideration and will not normally be considered. The student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter including details of the OIA Scheme (see regulation I8).

16.4 There may be exceptional circumstances in which evidence cannot be provided at the time of the appeal submission. If this is the case, it **must** be identified on the form that further evidence is to be provided in support of the appeal. The acknowledgment letter will confirm the timeframe for evidence to be submitted, which will not normally exceed

- 10 working days. Original evidence must be provided in support of the appeal and listed on the appeal form. Medical evidence and other supporting documentation should be provided in English.
- 16.5 An appeal will not be considered until relevant evidence is provided. If relevant evidence is not received within the stipulated deadline the appeal will be deemed to have been withdrawn, and the original decision/outcome being appealed against will remain and be processed by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute.
- 16.6 These procedures apply only to academic appeals which fall under the stipulated grounds. In the event of a set of circumstances legitimately giving rise to grounds for both appeal and complaint the Appeals Investigation Officer and the Complaints Investigation Officer will jointly determine in consultation with the appellant/complainant the manner in which the two matters will be addressed, and the appropriate timescales. All parties will ensure that the requirements of the respective procedures are fully adhered to.
- 16.7 The Appeals Investigation Officer will identify and appropriately act upon those appeals which may require a particularly swift response.
- 16.8 Where a student has declared a disability to the university, the university will endeavour to ensure that information is available to them at all stages of the procedure in the appropriate formats, and that any reasonable adjustments are made to the associated proceedings to accommodate the student's needs.
- 16.9 A student has the right to appeal on academic matters without risk of disadvantage.
- 16.10 The appellant may withdraw the appeal at any stage.

17 Informal Review

- 17.1 All academic appeal submissions received within the deadlines identified in I5.2 will undergo an initial filtering stage. The Appeals Investigation Officer may reject the appeal at this stage if any of the following conditions apply:
- (i) The appellant is in disagreement solely with the academic or professional judgement of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee and/or examination panel.
 - (ii) Appeals that do not on the face of the submitted documentation provide sufficient evidence to support a finding in favour of the appellant in relation to the grounds on which they have appealed.
 - (iii) The appeal is not within the scope of any of the grounds specified in I1-4.
- 17.2 The Appeals Investigation Officer may request relevant information from the Faculty and/or the Faculty Research Degrees Committee prior to rejecting an appeal at the filtering stage.
- 17.3 The Appeals Investigation Officer will consider the appeal, supporting documentation and any information provided by the Faculty and/or the Faculty Research Degrees Committee to determine whether or not there is sufficient evidence to warrant the case being considered by the Research Awards Appeal Board. The Appeals Investigation Officer considers cases in good faith and will accept statements and documents accordingly.
- 17.4 If the Appeals Investigation Officer determines there is sufficient evidence, the case will be referred to the next available meeting of Research Awards Appeal Board for formal review (see section I8).

- 17.5 If it is determined that no substantive case has been established, the appeal procedure within the University will be at an end. The student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter including details of the OIA Scheme (see section I11).

18 Formal Review

- 18.1 The Research Awards Appeals Board will normally comprise:
- Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) or nominee
 - Pro-Vice Chancellor of the Faculty concerned
 - two members of the Research and Enterprise Committee having experience of supervising and examining research degrees
 - Students' Union Sabbatical Officer (or nominee)

The quorum for any meeting of the Research Awards Appeals Board is four and must include a Students' Union Sabbatical Officer.

- 18.2 No member will have had any previous involvement with the student in matters directly relating to the appeal, in which case, a neutral person of equivalent or near seniority will deputise.
- 18.3 Wherever possible, no member of the Board should work in the Department within which the student's programme of study resides. Any member from the student's Faculty will be asked to declare any perceived interest which could give rise to conflict at the beginning of the meeting, which will be recorded in the minutes. If deemed appropriate by the Chair, the member will absent themselves from any relevant areas of discussion.
- 18.4 The Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee will act as Secretary to the Research Awards Appeals Board. The Secretary is not a member but will be present throughout to advise on regulatory matters and take an accurate record of the meeting.
- 18.5 A Research Awards Appeals Board is not constituted as an examination board and has no authority to set aside the decision of examiners and thereby to recommend the award of the degree.

19 Procedures of the Research Awards Appeal Board

- 19.1 The student will be given a minimum notice period of 10 working days of the date, time and place of the meeting. The notice of the meeting will be accompanied by copies of all documentation to be used in consideration of the appeal.

- 19.2 The student will have the right to be heard in person by the Appeal Board.

The appellant may be accompanied by a friend or supporter of their choice or a representative of the Students' Union. A student who intends to be accompanied will inform the Secretary of the name of the person accompanying them in writing in advance of the meeting. The accompanying person may not be a practicing solicitor or barrister.

The appellant may also invite witnesses not connected with the decision being appealed to give evidence on their behalf providing that they have informed the Secretary at least 3 working days in advance of the meeting.

- 19.3 The Appeals Board may deal with the case in the absence of the student if the student fails to appear without reasonable excuse, or notifies the Secretary that they do not wish to appear. The Chair will determine what constitutes a reasonable excuse.

- H9.4 A representative of the Faculty in which the student is studying will be invited to be present at the hearing to give evidence in response to the appeal.
- I9.5 During the hearing:
- The Chair will outline the procedure of the meeting
 - The Chair will ask the student to present their case in support of the appeal and to introduce any witnesses in support of the case
 - Members of the Appeal Board may ask questions of the student or witnesses
 - The Chair will ask the Faculty representative to respond to the appeal
 - Members of the Appeal Board may ask questions of the representative of the Faculty
 - All parties will be asked to leave the meeting and the Appeal Board will consider the case in private

I9.6 The Committee may request supplementary information from either the Faculty or the student within a given deadline before reaching a decision. The student and Faculty will be advised of this decision in writing. On consideration of such supplementary information, the Appeal Board will determine its final decision within 15 working days of the receipt of the supplementary information.

I9.7 After considering the evidence the Appeal Board may decide as follows:

- a) That the appeal is rejected and the original decision stands, in which case the appellant will be given reasons for the decision.

The student will be notified in writing by the Secretary within 5 working days. The decision of the Appeal Board will be deemed final and the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter including details of the OIA Scheme (see section I11).

- b) That the appeal is referred back to the relevant decision making body or examiners to reconsider the original decision taking into account such information or findings as the Appeal Board may have presented.

In the case of outcomes relating to appeals submitted against grounds I3 and I4, the Appeals Board must recommend that Academic Council either invite the original assessors/examiners to reconsider their decision or that new assessors/examiners be appointed. The reconvened decision making body will have the power to confirm or amend the original decision.

The appellant will be notified in writing by the Secretary within 5 working days. The outcome of the referred decision will be provided to the Secretary within 20 working days and will include the reasons for the decision made. The student will then be notified in writing of the outcome by the Secretary within 5 working days after of the notification. The referred decision will be deemed final and the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter including details of the OIA Scheme (see section I11).

I10 Reporting, Monitoring and Review

I10.1 The Research & Enterprise Training Institute will maintain a database of academic appeals for each academic session and provide an annual report to the Research & Enterprise Committee. It will be the responsibility of the Research & Enterprise Committee to monitor the data and make recommendations to Faculty Boards as appropriate.

- 110.2 It will be the responsibility of the Faculty Research Degree Committee to review the Postgraduate Research Academic Appeals Procedure and its effectiveness and to make recommendations for changes, where appropriate, to be considered by Academic Council.

111 Office of the Independent Adjudicator

Students who have been issued with a Completion of Procedures letter may be able to complain to the OIA if they remain dissatisfied with a final decision of the University providing that their complaint is eligible under its Rules, which are available on the OIA website at <http://www.oiahe.org.uk/>.

Students will need to send to the OIA a Scheme Application Form within **twelve months** of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter. A Scheme Application Form can be downloaded from the OIA website.

112 Advice and Support

Free independent advice and advocacy is available from the University of Greenwich Students' Union and GK Unions Advice Service.

The University of Greenwich Students' Union:

Advice line: 020 8331 8267

Email: suugadvice@gre.ac.uk

Web: www.suug.co.uk/welfare

Medway-based students can contact the GK Unions Advice Service:

Advice line: 01634 88 88 82

Email: advice@gkunions.co.uk

Web: www.gkunions.co.uk/advice

APPENDIX 1: QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY (QAA) MASTERS (LEVEL 7) AND DOCTORAL (LEVEL 8) QUALIFICATION DESCRIPTORS

1.1 Qualification Descriptors

- 1.1.1 As referred to in the QAA *UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part B, Chapter B11, Research Degrees, (2013)*, and as a reference point, candidates for the Masters awards (MA, MSc and MPhil) and Doctoral Awards (PhD and EdD) are expected to meet the appropriate Level 7 (Masters degrees) or Level 8 (Doctoral degrees) qualification descriptors relevant to their target award, as set out in the *UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards -The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies, QAA (October 2014)*. Additionally, examiners of candidates seeking such awards are required to use these descriptors as a reference point during the examination process. These descriptors are reproduced in the following sections.

1.2 ‘Descriptor for a higher education qualification at level 7: Master’s degree

- 1.2.1 The descriptor provided for this level of the framework is for any master’s degree which should meet the descriptor in full. This qualification descriptor can also be used as reference point for other qualifications at level 7, including postgraduate certificates and postgraduate diplomas.

Master’s degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice
- a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship
- originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline
- conceptual understanding that enables the student:
 - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline
 - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level
- continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level.

And holders will have:

- the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:
 - the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility
 - decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations
 - the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.’

1.3 'Descriptor for a higher education qualification at level 8: Doctoral degree'

1.3.1 The descriptor provided for this level of the framework is for any doctoral degree which should meet the descriptor in full. This qualification descriptor can also be used as reference point for other level 8 qualifications.

Doctoral degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, 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
- the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications 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 technique for research and advanced academic enquiry.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches.

And holders will have:

- the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex and unpredictable situations, in professional or equivalent environments.'

APPENDIX 2: REGULATIONS RELATING TO UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AWARDS MADE IN ASSOCIATION WITH APPROVED COLLABORATING HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

2.1 Regulations relating to MPhil, MPhil/PhD and PhD awards made in association with approved collaborating Higher Education/Research Institutions, Dual Awards and Joint Awards

2.2 Research awards made in association with approved collaborating Higher Education/Research Institutions

- 2.2.1 The University may enter into a formal collaboration with other approved/recognised higher education or research based institutions for the purpose of furthering the postgraduate research endeavour. Accordingly, the regulations set out in this document will be those that will be used in situations where postgraduate research is undertaken under the auspices of the University as the formally recognised awarding body with other formally recognised higher education or research institutions that do not possess such research degree awarding powers.
- 2.2.2 A Faculty Research Degrees Committee will consider an application from a student who is proposing to undertake part of their research programme for Master of Philosophy (MPhil), Master of Philosophy with transfer possibility to Doctor of Philosophy (MPhil/PhD) or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) direct at an approved higher education institution or high level research institution, providing that, in addition to the overarching academic regulations for these awards as set out in Sections A, G and H of this document, it also complies with the regulations and operational framework set out below.
- 2.2.3 The university, through the appropriate Faculty Research Degrees Committee, must be assured by the host Faculty/Department that the institution at which a student proposes to study as part of an approved programme of work leading to a research degree of the university, is a bona-fide institution of higher education or research institution of advanced standing as recognised by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), or the British Council, or equivalent, in the case of overseas institutions.
- 2.2.4 On the basis that a student will be undertaking an approved programme of work leading to the award of a research degree of the University of Greenwich, such research will be conducted in accordance with the relevant academic regulations and codes of practice of the University, and these will take precedence over those of the other institution, unless indicated otherwise in this Appendix.
- 2.2.5 The designated first and second supervisors must be contracted members of university staff. A local supervisor at the other institution should be the designated third supervisor, and will take responsibility for the day-to-day supervision of the student whilst they are studying at that institution.
- 2.2.6 The local supervisor should be appropriately qualified in terms of a good alignment of expertise and research interests to that of the proposed programme of research, as evidenced by their recent publications, and previous successful supervisions of research awards to a level equivalent to the final award at Greenwich being sought by the student. These may be assessed by the university supervisors interviewing the local supervisor with a view to formulating a customised CV of the local supervisor containing such information, which should then be appended to [Forms RDA1a-c](#) submitted to the

Faculty Research Degrees Committee seeking approval of the student's proposed programme of research.

- 2.2.7 The arrangements for frequent and substantial face-to-face contact between the student and the local supervisor and the university supervisors should be set out on [Forms RDA1a-c](#) . University supervisors should meet the student in person at the University and other institution on an alternate basis at intervals of no than more two months for the duration of the student's registration with the University. The University supervisor(s) should also keep in regular contact with the student and vice-versa, as to their progress and well-being. The proposed arrangements for regular contact should be appended to Forms RDA1a-c.
- 2.2.8 In registering for a research degree, and in furthering the approved programme of research, it is understood that a student will have access to appropriate facilities at the collaborating institution. It will be the responsibility of the host Department/Faculty to seek confirmation of this from the collaborating institution. Appropriate resources to support and facilitate the proposed research should include where applicable, but are not limited to, laboratory facilities, computing facilities and specialist software and access to appropriate books and journals. This should be evidenced by a report from a resources visit to the institution made by the proposed first supervisor or the Faculty Director of Research. Such evidence should be appended to [Forms RDA1a-c](#).
- 2.2.9 Should a major issue(s) arise whilst the student is studying at the collaborating institution, the first supervisor should immediately report this to the Chair of the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee, Faculty Director of Research and the Research & Enterprise Training Institute.
- 2.2.10 Students should spend no less than six weeks per year studying at the University, at a time agreed with the host Department/Faculty.
- 2.2.11 The host Department/Faculty will be responsible for all costs associated with supervisors in visiting and meeting with the student whilst they are studying at the collaborating institution.
- 2.2.12 It is the student's and first supervisor's joint responsibility to liaise with the relevant University contact to clarify the position on insurance related cover during the proposed period of study at the collaborating institution.

2.3 Dual Awards

- 2.3.1 The regulations relating to MPhil, MPhil/PhD and PhD as set out in Sections A, G and H of this document will be those that will be used from the University's perspective in situations where formally approved programmes of postgraduate research form the basis of making Dual Awards with other formally recognised collaborating higher education institutions that also possess research degrees awarding powers.
- 2.3.2 Arrangements for the establishment of a dual award must be considered by the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee as an integral part of the application to approve the proposed programme of research. To effect this requires the following to be appended to [Forms RDA1a-c](#):
- (i) Acknowledgement that a formally approved programme of collaboration exists between the University and the other collaboration university for the purposes of making joint awards, and that the awards of MPhil, MPhil/PhD and PhD are conditional on compliance with Sections A, G and H of the University's *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards* in their entirety.

- (ii) How it is envisaged the proposed programme of research will be undertaken between the two universities, including timescales etc.
- (iii) The name(s), qualification(s), research interests and supervisory experience of supervisor(s) who will support the student whilst they are studying at the collaborating university.
- (iv) The facilities available to the student whilst studying at the collaborating university.
- (v) The arrangement for regular and substantial contact between the student and University supervisors whilst the student is studying at the collaborating university.
- (vi) Evidence an agreement is in place concerning the division of services and costs in supporting the student in working towards the dual award.

2.3.3 Before any commitment is made regarding entering into any form of formal agreement relating to the award of joint research degrees, the Faculty Director of Research must liaise with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) over the matter.

2.4 Joint Awards

2.4.1 The regulations relating to MPhil, MPhil/PhD and PhD as set out in Sections A, G and H of this document will be those that will be used from the University's perspective in negotiating and agreeing on the overarching academic regulations to be used in situations where formally approved programmes of postgraduate research form the basis of making Joint Awards with other formally recognised collaborating higher education institutions that also possess research degrees awarding powers.

2.4.2 Arrangements for the establishment of a dual award must be considered by the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee as an integral part of the application to approve the proposed programme of research. To effect this requires the following to be appended to [Forms RDA1a-c](#):

- (i) Acknowledgement that a formally approved programme of collaboration exists between the University and the other collaboration university for the purposes of making dual awards, and that the awards of MPhil, MPhil/PhD and PhD are conditional on the written academic regulations being agreed and approved by the two collaborating universities.
- (ii) How it is envisaged the proposed programme of research will be undertaken between the two universities, including timescales etc.
- (iii) The name(s), qualification(s) and supervisory experience of supervisors who will support the student whilst they are studying at the collaborating university.
- (iv) The facilities available to the student whilst studying at the collaborating university.
- (v) The arrangement for regular and substantial contact between the student and University supervisors whilst the student is studying at the collaborating university.
- (vi) Evidence an agreement is in place concerning the division of services and costs in supporting the student in working towards the joint award.

2.4.3 Before any commitment is made regarding entering into any form of formal agreement relating to the award of joint research degrees, the Faculty Director of Research must liaise with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) over the matter.

APPENDIX 3: REGULATIONS RELATING TO RESEARCH PROGRAMMES CONDUCTED AT OVERSEAS INSTITUTIONS

3.1 Regulations relating to arrangements for University postgraduate research students studying outside of the UK

- 3.1.1 A Faculty Research Degrees Committee will consider an application from a student who is proposing to undertake part of their research programme for Master of Philosophy (MPhil), Master of Philosophy with transfer possibility to Doctor of Philosophy (MPhil/PhD) or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) direct at an institution outside of the UK, providing that it is in compliance with the admission requirements in Section A2 of these regulations and the regulations and operational framework set out below. Such regulations and requirements will apply in cases where part of the student's research programme is conducted at such an institution for a total of three months or more for the duration of the programme.
- 3.1.2 The university, through the appropriate Faculty Research Degrees Committee, must be assured by the host Faculty/Department that the overseas institution at which a candidate proposes to study as part of an approved programme of work leading to a research degree of the university, is a bona-fide institution of higher education or research institution of advanced standing recognised by the British Council, or any other equivalent authority.
- 3.1.3 On the basis that a student will be undertaking an approved programme of work leading to the award of a research degree of the University of Greenwich, such research will be conducted in accordance with the relevant academic regulations and codes of practice of the University, and these will take precedence over those of the overseas institution, unless indicated otherwise in this Appendix document.
- 3.1.4 The designated first and second supervisors must be contracted members of university staff. A local supervisor at the overseas institution should be the designated third supervisor, and will take responsibility for the day-to-day supervision of the student whilst they are studying at the overseas institution.
- 3.1.5 The local supervisor should be appropriately qualified in terms of a good alignment of expertise and research interests to that of the proposed programme of research, as evidenced by their recent publications, and previous successful supervisions of research awards to a level equivalent to the final award at Greenwich being sought by the student. These may be assessed by the university supervisors interviewing the local supervisor with a view to formulating a customised CV of the local supervisor containing such information, which should then be appended to [Forms RDA1a-c](#) submitted to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee seeking approval of the student's proposed programme of research.
- 3.1.6 The arrangements for frequent and substantial face-to-face contact between the student and the local supervisor and the university supervisors should be set out on [Forms RDA1a-c](#). A university supervisor should visit the student in person at the overseas institution at intervals of no longer than six months for the duration of the student's period of study at the overseas institution. Whilst at the overseas institution the university supervisor(s) should also keep in regular contact with the student and vice-versa, with regards to progress and their well-being.
- 3.1.7 In registering for a research degree, and in furthering the approved programme of research, it is understood that a student will have access to appropriate resources at the overseas institution. It will be the responsibility of the host Department/Faculty to ensure this. Appropriate resources to support and facilitate the proposed research should

include where applicable but are not limited to access to laboratory facilities, computing facilities and specialist software and access to appropriate books and journals. This should be evidenced by a report from a resources visit to the overseas institution made by the proposed first supervisor or the Faculty Director of Research. Such evidence should be appended to [Forms RDA1a-c](#).

- 3.1.8 Should a major issue(s) arise whilst the student is studying at the overseas institution, the first supervisor should immediately report this to the Chair of the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee, Faculty Director of Research and the Research & Enterprise Training Institute.
- 3.1.9 For students who are planning to study at the overseas institution for the majority of their research programme, they should spend no less than six weeks per year studying at the University of Greenwich, at a time agreed with the host Department/Faculty.
- 3.1.10 The host Department/Faculty will be responsible for all costs associated with the supervisors visiting and meeting with the student whilst they are studying at the overseas institution. The costs of the student visiting the University to facilitate compliance with regulation A3.9 is to be discussed and agreed between the University, student and overseas institution at the time the research programme is proposed, and the Faculty Research Degrees Committee must receive confirmation as to who will bear these costs when considering [Forms RDA1a-c](#).
- 3.1.11 It is the student's and first supervisor's joint responsibility to liaise with the relevant University contact concerning matters relating to insurance cover during the proposed period of study at the overseas institution.

APPENDIX 4: REGULATIONS RELATING TO SUSPECTED RESEARCH MISCONDUCT BY POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS

4.1 EXPECTATIONS

The university expects its postgraduate research students to conduct themselves with integrity and to operate to the highest ethical standards at all times. Implicit with this expectation is that no student will engage in research malpractice, as being proven to have done so is damaging to the individual concerned, their supervisors, their Department and Faculty, and the wider university as a whole. Additionally, such practices undermine the trust the wider community places in universities to make advances in knowledge through their research endeavours and dissemination of the findings in an open and honest way. To address these matters, at Greenwich it is the responsibility of supervisory teams to ensure that research students are schooled in good research practice on a continuous basis, and the possible penalties which may result from engaging in research misconduct. To this end, this document sets out:

- what the university interprets as research misconduct in relation to its postgraduate research students,
- the procedures to be followed in investigating suspected research malpractice in the event of any such issues being brought to the attention of the university, and
- The penalties that may be recommended and applied in cases that have been investigated and have led to the conclusion that such misconduct has taken place.

4.2 SCOPE OF REGULATIONS

These regulations apply to postgraduate research students who are registered as such with the university for the specific purpose of working towards one of the university's approved research awards at either Level 7 (Masters) or Level 8 (Doctorate) by undertaking and completing a substantive research project. During such studies students are expected to produce various reports and other documentation to demonstrate and record their progress and achievements during their journey from initial registration to final award. Therefore, the main focus of this policy is on any research malpractice, current or past, that is considered to have been perpetrated by a student during their time as a postgraduate research student at the university, whether such be present in any such documentation, paper or electronic, or in any other ways.

These regulations do not cover the contents of papers and the like published, or intended for publication, in journals and other media outlets, and papers supporting presentations at conferences, symposia and seminars, where the base documentation and presentation material has multi-authorship that include a student(s), supervisor(s) and/or others. Allegations in this arena will be addressed in other ways. The responsibility for research misconduct in such circumstances will normally rest primarily with the senior author.

Additionally, these regulations do not apply to members of University staff who are studying for a research degree of the University. Should an allegation of research malpractice be made against such a member of staff, this matter will be prosecuted through the staff research misconduct route.

4.3 DEFINITIONS

'Research misconduct' is defined as, but not limited to, fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, misrepresentation, or failure to address ethical issues in proposing, performing or reviewing research, or in reporting research results, as well as matters relating to health and safety, and research activity resulting in significant damage to the environment. Accordingly, in the context of this policy, misconduct in research is considered to cover issues arising under the following generic headings:

4.3.1 Falsification

This term applies to cases where a student intentionally changes information, or excludes information from their own sources or from pre-existing sources, to support or disprove a particular point, case or argument being made by the student, which has no basis in truth or fact, and cannot be substantiated by proof, i.e. through experimentation, results, calculation, analysis, reasoned argument etc.

4.3.2 Fabrication

This term applies to cases where a student intentionally creates, invents or fabricates information (e.g. results, references etc) to support or disprove a particular point or argument being made by the student, which has no basis in truth or fact, and cannot be substantiated by proof, i.e. through experimentation, results, calculation, analysis, reasoned argument etc.

4.3.3 Plagiarism

This term applies to cases where a student intentionally takes the work of another/others, with the intention of passing it off as their own. It encompasses, but is not limited to:

- a) using existing published work of others, with deliberate or accidental omission of referencing, and using/presenting it as the student's own,
- b) copying published work, without appropriately presented paraphrasing and referencing,
- c) copying words or ideas from others without giving credit
- d) using work previously submitted for another award, without correct referencing and acknowledgement
- e) taking another person's computer files/programs/designs/drawings, using and passing off the contents as the student's own
- f) changing words but copying the sentence structure of a source without giving credit
- g) soliciting others, paid or otherwise, to write material for the student's use
- h) copying the writings and results of another student
- i) giving incorrect information about the source of a quotation

Important note: The contents of a previously published research paper or papers based on the work and outcomes of the student's research programme that is/are included in the thesis that forms the basis for being considered for the research award being sought, or documentation to assist an application to transfer registration from MPhil to PhD, in itself, does not constitute plagiarism, providing that in the thesis or documentation it is appropriately presented and referenced in keeping with conventional academic norms.

4.3.4 Misrepresentation

This term applies to cases where a student intentionally misrepresents a position, case, information, data etc, having the aim of advancing or furthering a particular point, case, argument to their benefit.

4.3.5 Ethical issues

This area concerns cases where a student intentionally fails satisfactorily to address ethical issues that relate to their research, whether it be through failure to gain ethical approval through the relevant Research Ethics Committee, or misrepresenting a position to gain ethical approval to conduct their research, or failing to comply with any requirements or undertakings imposed in the course of obtaining ethical approval.

4.3.6 Health and safety issues

This area relates to cases where a student intentionally fails to adhere to relevant health and safety policies, guidance and good practice in conducting research, as well as engaging in practices that have a detrimental impact on the environment. Such actions will be considered a breach of the student's duty of care to themselves and/or to others as set out in the University Health & Safety Policy.

4.3.7 Intellectual property issues

This area relates to cases where a student intentionally uses the intellectual property of others, in whatever form it takes, without seeking the prior permission of the holder of such intellectual property to do so, and/or failing to acknowledge such in any material (written or otherwise) authored/prepared by the student.

Important note: It should be noted that the university may make use of technology to detect any of the foregoing categories where this is possible.

4.4 SCALE OF OFFENCES RELATING TO RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Level 1 – Minor: This level of offence applies to cases where it is considered that any form of alleged misconduct set out in Section 3 has no impact on any claims made by the student as to a contribution to knowledge produced, so that they gain no material advantage in progressing their research studies, e.g. the basis of making a case for transfer of registration from MPhil to PhD. For example, in cases of alleged plagiarism, a student's work contains a small amount of inadequate referencing to the work of others, including the omission of a small amount of appropriate paraphrasing or small amounts of unattributed or incorrectly attributed copying.

Any repeat of a Level 1/Minor offence will be treated as a Level 2/Moderate offence.

Level 2 – Moderate: This level of offence applies to cases where it is considered that any form of alleged misconduct set out in Section 3 has a minor impact on claims made by the student as to originality and/or contribution to knowledge produced. For example, in cases of alleged plagiarism, a student's work contains significant 'lifting' of text and/or other material (verbatim) from a source or sources without correct attribution and/or significant instances of unreferenced paraphrasing.

Any repeat of a Level 2/Moderate offence will be treated as a Level 3/Major offence.

Level 3 – Major: This level of offence applies to those students where it is considered that any of the forms of alleged research misconduct set out in Section 3 has a major impact on any claims made by the student as to originality and/or contribution to knowledge produced, with the intention of deliberately gaining a significant material advantage in progressing their research, e.g. forming the basis of making a case for transfer of registration from MPhil to PhD, forming an integral part of a thesis submitted for examination. For example, in cases of alleged plagiarism, this level of misconduct is typified by students' work containing significant and sustained lifting of text and/or other material (verbatim) from a source or sources without correct attribution and/or sustained or repeated instances of unreferenced paraphrasing.

4.5 PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

In dealing with cases of research misconduct at any level, all those involved in the process are required to do so in an impartial, fair, confidential and timely way. Deliberate

unwarranted delay or disruption of the proceedings will in itself constitute a disciplinary offence under student disciplinary regulations.

The procedure for dealing with reported cases of research misconduct comprises four stages:

Stage 1 – The reporting of alleged research misconduct on the part of a research student by the claimant to the relevant Programme Leader for postgraduate research programmes (or equivalent) for the Department to which the student is attached.

Stage 2 – Collection of all relevant materials relating to the allegation by the Programme Leader. This process will be conducted as quickly as possible and will in any case commence within ten working days of the allegation being made.

Stage 3 – Consideration of the case by a Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel having the purpose of identifying if research misconduct has occurred, and, if so, at what level (as set out in Section 4.4). If a case is considered to have been proven, this panel then passes the case onto one of two higher bodies for further consideration.

Stage 4 – If the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel consider the case for either Level 1 or 2 research misconduct has been proven, the matter will then be considered by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, which, taking all relevant matters into account, has the responsibility of setting a penalty appropriate to the level of misconduct identified. Given the significant implications of the penalty associated with Level 3 research misconduct, any such recommendation made by the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel will be considered by a University Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel, convened by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise).

***Important note:** It should be noted that initiating the process for addressing reported cases of research misconduct starts at Stage 1 with the relevant postgraduate research Programme Leader within the Faculty, who also has the responsibility for ensuring the matter progresses through the subsequent stages in a timely way. If the Programme Leader is, in some way, connected to the student in question, e.g. as a supervisor, then the Faculty Pro Vice-Chancellor must nominate an alternate member of staff of equivalent standing to take on this role.*

4.5.1 Stage 1 - Reporting a suspected offence

4.5.1.1 Any reports of research misconduct must be directed to the appropriate Programme Leader for postgraduate research in the first instance. Such allegations of research misconduct may be made in a number of different ways, ranging from written to oral allegations made by university staff and students, by a named individual or anonymously, as well as from external sources. The key first step to initiating the procedure for investigating such an allegation is getting the allegation presented in a written format, preferably by the claimant.

- If the claimant indicates they wish to make an allegation of research misconduct, they should be encouraged to complete and submit Form PGRM 1 to the Programme Leader.
- If the allegation is made in a written form in a note, letter, email or other means, the claimant should be encouraged to complete Form PGRM 1, to which their original written report should be appended.
- If a claimant declines to complete Form PGRM 1, or the initial report is made by oral means, it is the responsibility of the Programme Leader to transcribe a summary of the oral claimant's allegation(s) on Form PGRM 1, clearly indicating on the form that they have done so, to which, in cases where a written report exists, should be appended to the original report.

- 4.5.1.2 Any concern raised in accordance with this policy will be treated seriously. All steps will be taken to protect students and members of staff of the University raising concerns in good faith by maintaining confidentiality as far as is consistent with progressing the matter. Students and staff members who raise concerns through the agreed procedures will not be subject to disciplinary action providing they do so lawfully, without malice, in the public interest and in a way which respects confidentiality.
- 4.5.1.3 Concerns should not be raised in order to pursue any private dispute, i.e. a matter which is not, in any way, connected to the business of the University. Raising a false allegation will not necessarily lead to disciplinary action, if it can be demonstrated that the matter was raised in good faith. However, where there is evidence that an allegation has been made with malicious, vexatious or frivolous intent, the matter will be regarded as a serious disciplinary offence. Similarly, any victimisation of a student or member of staff who raises a concern, or any attempts to deter them from raising a legitimate concern about malpractice, will be regarded as a serious disciplinary offence.

4.5.2 Stage 2 – Collecting relevant material

On receipt of a report on a suspected offence of research misconduct, the Programme Leader will impound all the relevant material(s) from the student and call another, independent member of staff to witness to this process. Both the Programme Leader and witness will receipt the impounded material in detail, as set out in Form PGRM 2, and hold it securely. The student will be provided with a copy of this form as receipt for the impounded material. The first designated supervisor for the student should be informed of the situation by the Programme Leader. Should reporting of the alleged research misconduct coincide with either the student preparing for, or being part way through a major assessment process, i.e. MPhil/PhD transfer or final examination, the Programme Leader will, as a matter of urgency, inform the Training and Research Programmes Manager with a view to ensuring that such a process of assessment is suspended, pending the outcome of the procedures described in this policy.

Once the Programme Leader has completed the task of collecting all relevant material, they will refer this, along with the completed Form PGRM 2 to the Faculty Director of Research so that they may establish a Faculty Research Student Misconduct Panel to consider the allegation.

4.5.3 Stage 3 – Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel

The principal purpose of the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel is to decide if the allegation of research misconduct is upheld, and, if so, the level to which it is considered to have occurred, along with making a recommendation of the penalty that should be imposed on the student.

4.5.3.1 Membership of the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel will comprise:

- The Head of the Department to which the student is attached – Chair
- Two senior research Professors – one from the student’s Faculty and the other from another Faculty within the University
- Secretariat – provided by the Faculty.

None of the first two categories may be the supervisor of the student under investigation, or have had any prior involvement with the allegation being considered. Should this be the case, such a member(s) of staff having such a conflict of interest should be replaced by a colleague(s) having equivalent standing and knowledge.

For the Panel to be quorate, the Chair and the two nominated senior research Professors must be present at all meetings where the case is considered.

4.5.3.2 In its work the Panel will:

- Consider the material impounded, and any other relevant material
- Interview the claimant(s) relating to their allegation of research misconduct
- Interview the student relating with the allegation of research misconduct
- Interview any or all of the student's designated supervisors about the allegation of research misconduct
- Interview any witnesses to the misconduct or other interested third parties.

To assist the Panel to undertake its work, it may make appropriate use of technology to help in detecting research misconduct.

The Panel will determine whether the alleged misconduct was intentional and, thereby, is substantiated, or not. If intentional misconduct is considered to have taken place, the Panel is also required to identify at what level, as set out in Section 4.4.

4.5.3.3 In attending the interview the student may be accompanied by a friend, from the Students' Union, or otherwise. The accompanying person may not be a practicing solicitor or barrister. If, following due notice, the student elects not to attend to meet with the Panel, the Panel will continue with its work in the absence of the student, and will arrive at a conclusion based on the balance of probability.

4.5.3.4 If, either in writing prior to, or at the meeting with the Panel, the student admits to intentionally engaging in research misconduct, the necessity for the Panel to conduct interviews with others falls away, and the Panel will merely identify the level of research misconduct that has occurred, and report to the relevant Stage 2 body via completion and submission of Form PGRM 3.

4.5.3.5 If a student denies the alleged case of research misconduct, the range of questioning of the student and others, along with the information the Panel considers, will be such that it facilitates the Panel to arrive at a conclusion, based on the balance of probability, of whether the student engaged in research misconduct or not, and, if so, at what level.

4.5.3.6 In cases where it is considered that intentional research misconduct on the part of the student has occurred, the Panel will forward the report of its findings and recommendation, via Form PGRM 3, to either:

- The Faculty Research Degrees Committee - in cases where the Panel considers that Level 1 or 2 research misconduct has occurred, or
- The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) so that they may convene a University Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel – in cases where the Panel consider that Level 3 research misconduct has occurred (see Section 5.4).

4.5.3.7 Should the Panel consider that the misdemeanour is of a minor (Level 1) degree of research misconduct, committed unintentionally, and without any motive to enhance the student's research, it has the discretionary power to dismiss the case, and issue a written warning to the student that any further allegations of research misconduct will be treated more seriously. To avoid repetition of misconduct, the student will be required to engage in an educational programme on Research Integrity specified by their Head of Department, and monitored by their first supervisor. In such cases, the fact that such an allegation was made will not appear on the official University student record and will not be referred to in any formal approach to the University for a reference for the student.

- 4.5.3.8 Should the Panel arrive at the conclusion there is no case to answer on the part of the student, the case will be dismissed and the student exonerated. In such cases, the fact that such an allegation was made will not appear on the official University student record and will not be referred to in any formal approach to the University for a reference for the student.
- 4.5.3.9 Any substantive suspicion of malicious intent on the part of those reporting misconduct shall be reported to the Pro Vice-Chancellor of the Faculty.
- 4.5.3.10 Should, during the course of the Panel's work, there be a substantive suspicion that the allegation has been the result of the student being coerced by another, or others, to engage in research misconduct, the Chair should immediately report this to the Pro Vice-Chancellor of the Faculty. The extent of coercion shall be taken into account in determining exoneration of the student or mitigation of the offence.
- 4.5.3.11 The Secretary to the Panel should inform the student of the recommendation following the deliberations of the Panel within ten working days of completion of the work of the Panel.
- 4.5.3.12 The university may reopen any case relating to research misconduct where new information becomes available that is considered to substantiate the original allegation of such misconduct.

4.5.4 Stage 4: Route 1 - Consideration by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee for identified Levels 1 and 2 research misconduct

- 4.5.4.1 In cases where the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel recommends that either Level 1 or Level 2 research misconduct has occurred, the matter will be considered by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee.
- 4.5.4.2 If the person making the allegation of research misconduct, the Chair or other members of the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel have been a members of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, they are required to absent themselves from the relevant part of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee meeting whilst the matter is considered.
- 4.5.4.3 The Faculty Research Degrees Committee will consider the completed Forms PGRM 1, 2 and 3 forwarded to it, and any appended paperwork. If the Committee is satisfied with the Faculty Research Student Misconduct Panel's recommendation as to the level of research misconduct identified, the Committee will apply the corresponding penalty, as set out in section 4.6. This will be recorded on Form PGRM 4.1, which is then forwarded to the Head of Department for actioning the penalty and, in association with the Training and Research Programmes Manager, updating the student records accordingly.
- 4.5.4.4 If the Faculty Research Degrees Committee finds that there have been substantive procedural irregularities by the Faculty Research Student Misconduct Panel, or disagrees with the recommendation made, it must refer the matter back to the Panel for further consideration, setting out the reason(s) for its concern(s).
- 4.5.4.5 To assist the Committee in its deliberations, it may call the Chair of the Faculty Research Student Misconduct Panel to the meeting(s) where the matter is to be discussed.
- 4.5.4.6 The Secretary to the Committee should inform the student of the resulting outcome within 10 working days of the completion of the work of the Committee in relation to the case.

4.5.5 Stage 4: Route 2 – Consideration by University Research Student Misconduct Panel for identified Level 3 research misconduct

4.5.5.1 In cases where the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel recommends that Level 3 research misconduct has occurred, the matter will be considered by the University Research Student Misconduct Panel with a view to applying the corresponding penalty.

4.5.5.2 The reason for special consideration of the recommendation made by the Investigative Panel by this particular body relates to the nature of the penalty associated with this level of research misconduct, and the security of the process leading to this recommendation

4.5.5.3 In cases of Level 3/Major research misconduct – a University Research Student Misconduct Panel will be convened by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), having the following membership:

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), or nominee - Chair
- Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor, Research and Enterprise
- Head of Research & Enterprise Training Institute
- Director of Research of student's home Faculty
- Students' Union Representative
- Secretary (provided by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute)

No member of this panel should have had prior engagement with the deliberative structure relating to the consideration of the case up to this point. Should this be the case, another member of staff having equivalent standing must be employed. The Panel will be quorate when at least 80% of the first five categories of membership set out above are in attendance.

4.5.5.4 To assist the Panel in its work, it may review any material considered by the Investigative Panel. Additionally, if it is considered helpful to their deliberations of the Panel, it may interview the Claimant who officially reported the case of suspected misconduct (section 4.5.1), the Postgraduate Research Programme Leader (section 4.5.2), the Chair of the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel (section 4.5.3) and the student. Concerning the interview with the student, they may be accompanied by a friend, who is not supporting/representing in a legal capacity. The nomination of a friend to be in attendance must be made to the Secretary of the Panel by no later than two working days before the student is required to attend the meeting.

4.5.5.5 Following its considerations of the case the Panel may,

- Uphold the position of the Faculty Postgraduate Research Misconduct Panel and recommend to the Vice-Chancellor that the penalty associated with Level 3/Major research misconduct is appropriate and is to be applied. In this case it is the responsibility of the Chair to forward on to the Vice-Chancellor the recommendation of the Panel, and, following their endorsement, ensure that the penalty is implemented, or
- If the panel is unclear that the evidence base is sufficient to recommend the Level 3 penalty, and that a lesser level of penalty is considered more appropriate, then it should specify and recommend the application of such a penalty. In this case it is the responsibility of the Secretary to the Panel to inform the Chair of the appropriate Faculty Research Degrees Committee of the Panel's recommendation, for them to act in accordance with the recommended penalty set out in Section 4.6.2.

The relevant option and other pertinent information must be recorded on Form PGRM 4.2, a copy of which must be forwarded to the Chair of the appropriate Faculty Research Degrees Committee.

- 4.5.5.6 The Secretary to the Committee should inform the student of the resulting outcome within 10 working days of the completion of the work of the Committee in relation to the case.

4.6 PENALTIES THAT MAY BE IMPOSED

4.6.1 Considerations

In deciding the penalties available the Faculty Research Degrees Committee and University Research Student Misconduct Panel shall assess the seriousness of the offence using the following criteria:

- (a) **Premeditation** – an offence that is deliberate or intended will be considered more serious than one which has arisen inadvertently, through mistake or ignorance.
- (b) **Scale** – an offence that is substantial in scale (e.g. it will advance/support the student's case in terms of progression or an award) will be considered more serious than one of lesser proportion.
- (c) **Previous history** – an offence that is carried out by a student with a previous history of research misconduct will be considered more serious than a first offence.
- (d) **Theft, falsification and fabrication** - an offence, or offences, involving the theft or falsification of the work of others, along with fabricating information will be considered more serious than one involving the permitted, but unattributed use of the work of others
- (e) **Miscellaneous** – other relevant factors pertinent to individual cases, including extenuating circumstances or coercion may be taken into account in the determination of the penalty.

4.6.2 Penalties

The penalties available to Faculty Research Degrees Committees and the University Research Student Misconduct Panel in cases where it is considered the student has engaged in research misconduct are one or more of:

Level 1 – Minor Research Misconduct

- Student reprimanded, and informed that further allegation of similar research misconduct will, as a matter of course, be considered at Level 2/Moderate
- Required to engage in an educational programme on 'Research Integrity' and produce an acceptable piece of coursework relating to this topic, to be administered by, and completed to the satisfaction of the Head of Department by a set date.
- Level of research misconduct and penalty to be held on official record, but is not to be referred to on any official references sought by external individuals or bodies from the University and its staff about the student.

Level 2 – Moderate Research Misconduct

- Student reprimanded, and informed that further allegation of similar research misconduct will, as a matter of course, be considered at Level 3/Major
- Required to engage in an educational programme on ‘Research Integrity’ and produce an acceptable piece of coursework relating to this topic, to be administered by, and completed to the satisfaction of the Head of Department by a set date.
- Level of research misconduct and penalty to be held on official record, and is to be referred to in any references sought by external individuals or bodies for legitimate purposes from the University and its staff about the student.

Level 3 – Major Research Misconduct

- Recommendation to the Vice Chancellor that the student be withdrawn from their programme of study, no award may be made and is excluded from the university.
- If the research misconduct is identified and proven as part of the examination process of the student no award will be made and is excluded from the university
- Level of research misconduct and penalty to be held on the University’s official student record, and **is to be referred** to on any references sought by external individuals or bodies for legitimate purposes from the university and its staff about the student.

4.7 ABSENCE OF STUDENT

If a student suspected of research misconduct is absent (e.g. abroad) at any stage of the process of considering the appeal where such active involvement of the student is considered necessary at either stages 2 and 3, the Chair of the appropriate stage of the investigation will decide whether the process may be delayed until the student is available. In cases where the student is not able to attend the university within a reasonable period of time, the process of investigation/hearing may proceed in their absence, but an opportunity must be provided for the student to present their case through the submission of a written statement. No other person may attend in place of the student to present the case of the student.

4.8 RIGHT OF APPEAL

Where a research misconduct allegation is upheld, the student shall have the right of appeal against the outcome in accordance with the provisions of the regulations set out in Section I.

4.9 REPORTING CASES OF PROVEN RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

In cases of proven research misconduct:

- Such misconduct must be reported within the statistical information contained in relevant annual Faculty Research Degrees Committee Reports, and it is the responsibility of the Committee Chair and Secretary to ensure this happens
- Where it is considered appropriate, the University bears the responsibility of informing relevant external governmental, charitable, private and commercial organisations that such research misconduct has occurred, e.g. publishers, sponsors, supporting funding

and collaborating bodies. It is the responsibility of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) to ensure this happens.

4.10 RIGHT TO REVISIT AN ALLEGATION OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

The University reserves the right to reopen any case relating to research misconduct where new information becomes available that is considered to substantiate the original allegation of such misconduct.

4.11 OTHER MATTERS

4.11.1 Allegations of research misconduct post - final award

Should allegations of research misconduct relating to the contents of a thesis arise after a final research award has been made by the University, the University reserves the right to rescind an award where it is considered that a case for such misconduct is proven. The University will employ its best efforts to locate the author of the thesis to participate in the investigative process relating to such an allegation. However, if, despite its best efforts, this is not possible and the balance of evidence indicates that such an offence is likely to have occurred, and has materially benefitted the author in gaining their award, the award may be rescinded in the absence of the author, with the university records being modified accordingly. The university also reserves the right to make a statement on the matter in public media outlets. Whilst any such matters are being investigated, the thesis on which the award is based will be removed from the University's academic literature archive (GALA), and, where appropriate, also the University Library. Should the outcome of the investigative process result in the award being rescinded, the thesis will remain removed from public view from both GALA, the University Library and the British Library.

Any allegation of research misconduct arising under such circumstances will be considered by the University Research Student Research Misconduct Panel, but having an additional member who is external to the university and has significant subject expertise in the area corresponding to the thesis under scrutiny, namely:

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) – Chair
- Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)
- Head of Research & Enterprise Training Institute
- Director of Research of student's former Faculty/academic discipline area
- A senior research academic, external to the university, who has significant subject expertise in the academic area of research corresponding to the thesis and/or related area(s) under scrutiny.
- Secretary (provided by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute)

APPENDIX 5: REGULATIONS RELATING TO CONFIDENTIALITY AND RESTRICTED ACCESS TO THESES

5.1 Regulations relating to confidentiality and restricted access to theses

- 5.1.1 This Annex sets out the regulations relating to confidentiality and restricted access to theses authored by postgraduate research students as an outcome of undertaking a programme of research approved by a Faculty Research Degrees Committee.
- 5.1.2 Where a postgraduate research student of the University wishes their thesis to remain confidential for a period of time after completion of the programme of research, application for approval will normally be made to the relevant Faculty Research Degrees Committee at the time the proposed examination arrangements are considered as set out on [Form RDA6a/b](#) , but by no later than the thesis being forwarded to the examiners. The period approved will not normally exceed two years from the date the Committee confirms the examiners' recommendation to award the degree. Where a shorter period of confidentiality would be adequate, the Committee will not automatically grant confidentiality for the maximum period of two years. In cases where the need for confidentiality emerges at a stage after approval of the examination arrangements, an application for the thesis to remain confidential should be made immediately to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. No such applications will be considered once the thesis has been dispatched to the approved examiners to initiate the examination process. A successful application for confidentiality will result in:
- (i) the electronic copy of the thesis not being made available through the Greenwich Academic Literature Archive (GALA), and
 - (ii) thesis title page and abstract not being lodged with the British Library.
- 5.1.3 Where the Faculty Research Degrees Committee has agreed that the confidential nature of a student's work is such as to preclude the thesis being freely available through the avenue set out in regulation .5.2, the approved thesis will, immediately on the Committee's confirmation of the Examiners' recommendation, be retained by the Research & Enterprise Training Institute on restricted access for a time not exceeding the approved period. During this time the thesis will only be made available to those who were directly involved in the research, along with the Chair and Secretary of the Faculty Research Degrees Committee, staff in the Research & Enterprise Training Institute, the Head of the Research & Enterprise Training Institute and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)
- 5.1.4 The Faculty Research Degrees Committee will normally only approve an application for confidentiality in order to facilitate an application to protect intellectual property to be lodged or otherwise to protect commercially sensitive material which is the subject of an obligation of confidentiality to a third party. The availability of a thesis may not be restricted in this way in order to pursue or protect research leads, or publish a book or monograph.
- 5.1.5 Where a student does not wish their thesis to remain confidential for a period of time after completion of the programme of research, the University, through the main supervisor, may, on good grounds, or where there is an overriding commercial concern or obligation of confidentiality to a third party, request that the student's thesis is placed on restricted access in accordance with the procedure set out in regulation 5.1.2
- 5.1.6 Only one such application for confidentiality and restricted access to a thesis will be permitted.