



ACADEMIC REGULATIONS
for
Postgraduate Research Degrees

LIVERPOOL HOPE UNIVERSITY AWARDS

CONTENTS

A: Overall Regulatory Framework..... 3

 A1 Components of the Framework 3

 A2 Approval of the Regulations and the Code of Practice 3

 A3 Status of the Regulations and the Code of Practice 3

B: Degrees of Master of Philosophy [M.Phil.] and Doctor of Philosophy [Ph.D].... 4

 B1 Cohorts covered by the Regulations 4

 B2 Eligibility for Initial Registration 4

 B3 Duration of the Programmes..... 5

 B4 Standard Progression Points 6

 B5 Interruption of Studies, and Changes between Full-time & Part-time Study 10

 B6 The Appointment of Supervisors and Examiners 11

 B7 Assessment of the Thesis, and Eligibility for Awards 12

 B8 The Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students 18

 B9 Appeals 19

 B10 Academic Misconduct 20

C: Regulations Governing Professional Doctorates..... 27

 C1 Routes covered by the Regulations..... 27

 C2 Cohorts covered by the Regulations 27

C3	Eligibility for Initial Registration	27
C4	Structure of the Programme	28
C5	Interruption of Studies	28
C6	Duration of the Programme	29
C7	Assessment of Taught Courses	30
C8	Standard Progression Points	30
C9	The Appointment of Supervisors and Examiners for Part Two	34
C10	Assessment of the Thesis, and Eligibility for Awards	35
C11	Boards of Examiners	39
C12	Awards Available from the Programme	39
C13	Appeals	40
C14	Academic Misconduct	40

A: Overall Regulatory Framework**A1 Components of the Framework**

A1.1 Research Degrees at Liverpool Hope University shall be governed by:

- [a] the Regulations for Postgraduate Research Degrees, and
- [b] a Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Degrees.

A1.2 The Regulations constitute the definitive set of general precepts according to which the University requires research degrees to operate.

A1.3 The Code of Practice supplements the formal regulations by providing detailed guidance on a variety of issues including a commentary on how the regulations are to be interpreted. The Regulations will specify issues which must, *inter alia*, be included in the Code of Practice.

A2 Approval of the Regulations and the Code of Practice

A2.1 The Regulations are formally approved by Senate, normally for a minimum of three academic sessions.

A2.2 The Code of Practice is formally approved by Research Committee, and ratified by Senate, on an annual basis.

A3 Status of the Regulations and the Code of Practice

A3.1 The Regulations are binding on staff and students across Faculties. Normally, the only body empowered to authorise a procedure or outcome contrary to the regulations is Research Committee, following a recommendation from Research Degrees SubCommittee.

A3.2 The principles in the Code of Practice are also binding. However, the detailed implementation of the principles may legitimately but marginally vary across Faculties, and across Departments within a Faculty. Normally, the only body empowered to authorise a procedure or outcome contrary to a principle in the Code of Practice is the Research Degrees SubCommittee. However, the Code of Practice may identify principles that may be violated only with the authority of the Chair of Research Committee following a recommendation from Research Degrees SubCommittee.

A3.3 The Research Degrees SubCommittee is the only body responsible for resolving any uncertainty or disagreement on how the principles set out in the Code of Practice may be applied at Departmental or Faculty level.

B: Degrees of Master of Philosophy [M.Phil.] and Doctor of Philosophy [Ph.D]**B1 Cohorts covered by the Regulations**

- B1.1 These Regulations will apply to students who register for PhD and MPhil degrees from September 2009.
- B1.2 The Regulations will also apply to any students who registered for PhD or MPhil degrees of the University of Liverpool before September 2009, but subsequently transfer their registration to Liverpool Hope University.

B2 Eligibility for Initial Registration

- B2.1 Applicants may be initially admitted either to a PhD programme or to an MPhil programme. However, in the case of students initially admitted to a PhD programme, continued registration for the award of PhD would be subject to satisfactory completion of a subsequent Confirmation of Registration Event [cf paragraph B4.2]
- B2.2 The requirements for admission to a programme of study leading to the award of a PhD are that an applicant should:
- [a] submit a proposed programme of research which is approved by Research Degrees SubCommittee, following a recommendation from the Faculty Research Committee, as providing a satisfactory basis for study towards a PhD degree;
 - [b] normally possess a Masters degree which matches the descriptor for a Level 7 qualification in the UK Framework of Higher Education Qualifications, and comprises:
 - EITHER a Masters degree with Distinction from a UK University;
 - OR a Masters degree with Merit from a UK University, INCLUDING a Distinction grade for the Dissertation [or equivalent];
 - OR a Masters degree from a UK University that does not offer awards with Merit, the Registrar having confirmed that the profile of marks satisfies or exceeds Liverpool Hope University's requirements for the award of a Masters degree with Merit, AND that the Dissertation [or equivalent] was awarded a Distinction grade;
 - OR an equivalent qualification from outside the UK.
- B2.3 The requirements for admission to a programme of study leading to the award of an MPhil are that an applicant should:
- [a] submit a proposed programme of research which is approved by Research Degrees SubCommittee, following a recommendation from the Faculty Research Committee, as providing a satisfactory basis for study towards an MPhil degree;
- AND
- [b] normally possess a Masters degree which matches the descriptor for a Level 7 qualification in the UK Framework of Higher Education Qualifications, and comprises:
 - EITHER a Masters degree from a UK University;
 - OR an equivalent qualification from outside the UK.
- B2.4 Applicants who do not satisfy the requirements in paragraph B2.2b or B2.3b, but have relevant research experience and submit a satisfactory research proposal in accordance with paragraph B2.2a or B2.3a may nevertheless, at the discretion of Research Degrees SubCommittee, be considered eligible for admission. Admission of a student under B2.4 requires the final approval of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Academic Development).

- B2.5 In addition to satisfying the requirements in paragraphs B2.1 to B2.4, applicants must be able to demonstrate a high level of competence in written and spoken English.
- B2.6 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance governing the admissions process, including, *inter alia*, the nature and length of research proposals, the procedures and timescales according to which proposals are to be assessed, criteria for judging whether a student is suitable for admission to a PhD programme, criteria for judging whether a student is suitable for admission to an MPhil programme, criteria for judging whether an applicant is competent in written and spoken English, and guidelines for explaining to students that continued registration for a PhD is to be subject to the successful completion of the Confirmation of Registration Event.
- B2.7 Applicants who have successfully completed one or more years of full-time study [or two or more years of part-time study] for a research degree at a UK University may be considered for admission with advanced standing. In such cases, the admissions procedure shall be identical to that covered by paragraphs B2.1 to B2.6 inclusive. However, the duration of the programmes shall be as specified in paragraph B3.2 below.

B3 Duration of the Programmes

B3.1 Normal Durations

B3.1.1 *PhD*

- [a] Full-time students shall normally submit their thesis after a minimum of two years and a maximum of four years from initial registration.
- [b] Part-time students shall normally submit their thesis after a minimum of four years and a maximum of six years from initial registration.
- [c] The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about the number of years a “typical” student might be expected to take before submitting a thesis for the award of a PhD, and circumstances in which a student might be advised to submit before or after the “typically expected” date.

B3.1.2 *MPhil*

- [a] Full-time students shall normally submit their thesis after a minimum of one year and a maximum of three years from initial registration.
- [b] Part-time students shall normally submit their thesis after a minimum of two years and a maximum of four years from initial registration.
- [c] The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about the number of years a “typical” student might be expected to take before submitting a thesis for the award of an MPhil, and circumstances in which a student might be advised to submit before or after the “typically expected” date.

B3.2 Students Admitted with Advanced Standing

- B3.2.1 The normal minimum duration from initial registration at Hope to the submission of the thesis shall be no less than half the length of the relevant minimum duration specified in paragraph B3.1; the minimum duration for each individual student shall be specified by Research Degree SubCommittee when approving eligibility for registration.
- B3.2.2 The normal maximum duration from initial registration at Hope to the submission of the thesis shall be at least 1 year shorter than the relevant maximum duration specified in paragraph B3.1; the maximum duration for each individual student shall be specified by Research Degrees SubCommittee when approving eligibility for registration.

B3.2.3 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about specifying the minimum and maximum durations for individual students.

B3.3 Extended Durations

B3.3.1 If a student interrupts studies in accordance with paragraph B5.1, the maximum durations in paragraphs B3.1 and B3.2 shall be extended by the duration of the interruption.

B3.3.2 In the event of evidence demonstrating exceptional mitigating circumstances, the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students shall be empowered, on receipt of a recommendation from the Faculty, to extend the maximum duration allowed to submit the thesis by:

- [a] a maximum of one year for students who have not interrupted studies, and
- [b] a maximum of one year in addition to any extensions due to interruption of study.

B3.3.3 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about criteria for judging whether a student warrants an extension to the maximum duration allowed to submit the thesis.

B3.4 Thesis Submission Deadline for Students who are Required to Transfer from PhD to MPhil Registration following an Unsuccessful Confirmation of Registration Event

The final thesis submission deadline for such students shall be *the later of*:

- the maximum submission deadline for an MPhil [counting from the student's initial date of PGR registration, and including any periods of interruption]; or
- 12 months after the unsuccessful Confirmation interview.

B4 Standard Progression Points

B4.1 Annual Monitoring

B4.1.1 Continuing students shall be required to undergo a formal annual review of their progress at the end of each academic session.

B4.1.2 The annual review shall normally lead to one of the following three outcomes:

- [a] progress satisfactory: *eligible to re-register for the coming academic session;*
- [b] progress not yet satisfactory: *reassessment required in order to become eligible to re-register for the coming academic session [where necessary, the student may be allowed to re-register temporarily, pending the outcome of the reassessment];*
- [c] progress not satisfactory: *studies terminated* or, in the case of a student whose registration at PhD level has previously been confirmed in accordance with B4.2 below, recommendation to re-register at MPhil level and submit within the timeframe outlined in B3 above.

B4.1.3 A student shall only be eligible for a single reassessment opportunity in any given academic session. Where a student has been reassessed, the annual review shall normally lead to one of the following two outcomes:

- [a] progress now satisfactory: *eligible to re-register for the coming academic session;*
- [b] progress still not satisfactory: *studies terminated.*

- B4.1.4 Annual Monitoring outcomes shall be determined as follows:
- [a] each student's documentation shall be read by the supervisory team and an independent reader, who is not a member of the student's supervisory team, but has been recognised by the University as an Approved Supervisor;
 - [b] each Faculty shall establish a Panel, comprising all Approved Supervisors in each Supervisory Team in the Faculty, to consider all research students in the Faculty;
 - [c] the Chair of the Panel shall have been recognised by the University as eligible to be a Director of Studies, and the Chair shall rotate during the meeting, so that no person chairs the consideration of their own supervisee;
 - [d] the Panel shall submit a recommendation for each student to the University's Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students;
 - [e] the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students shall confirm the outcome for each student;
 - [f] the Student Administration unit shall formally communicate the confirmed outcome to the student, and, where appropriate, arrange for the student to re-register for the following academic session.
- B4.1.5 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance governing, *inter alia*, the nature and length of submissions to be made by students in preparation for annual monitoring, the criteria to be used when assessing students' progress [including not only criteria for assessing the student's research *per se*, but also the specification of training in research skills, or personal development activities, that all students are required to have undertaken successfully], the conduct of the event, and the appointment of Chairs of Panels.

B4.2 The Confirmation of Registration Event [PhD Students Only]

- B4.2.1 Students shall be required to undergo a formal review to confirm their registration for their intended award.
- B4.2.2 The Confirmation of Registration Event shall normally take place within 2 years of initial registration for full-time students and 4 years of initial registration for part-time students. The event may, if appropriate, be held at the same time as an annual review.
- B4.2.3 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance to staff about judging when a student is ready to undertake the Confirmation of Registration Event.
- B4.2.4 The Confirmation of Registration Event shall normally lead to one of the following four outcomes:
- [a] progress satisfactory and registration confirmed: *all subsequent annual registrations to be for a PhD;*
 - [b] progress only satisfactory for MPhil: *all subsequent annual registrations to be for an MPhil;*
 - [c] further assessment required: *student continues registered for a PhD for a maximum of one calendar year, pending a further Confirmation of Registration Event;*
 - [d] progress not satisfactory: *studies terminated.*

- B4.2.5 A student shall only be eligible for a single reassessment. For a second Confirmation Event, the only outcomes shall be:
- [a] progress now satisfactory and registration confirmed: *all subsequent annual registrations to be for a PhD;*
 - [b] progress only satisfactory for MPhil: *all subsequent annual registrations to be for an MPhil;*
 - [c] progress not satisfactory: *studies terminated.*
- B4.2.6 The outcomes of the Confirmation of Registration Event shall be determined as follows:
- [a] a Panel shall be established, comprising the supervisory team and an independent reader, who shall serve as Chair;
 - [b] the Chair shall, acting on advice from the Panel, submit a recommendation to the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students;
 - [c] the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students shall confirm the outcome for each student;
 - [d] the Student Administration unit shall formally communicate the confirmed outcome to the student, and, where appropriate, arrange for the student to re-register for the following academic session.
- B4.2.7 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance governing, *inter alia*, the nature and length of submissions to be made by students in preparation for the event, the criteria to be used when assessing students' progress [including not only criteria for assessing the student's research *per se*, but also the specification of training in research skills, or personal development activities, that all students are required to have undertaken successfully], the conduct of the event, and the appointment of Chairs of Panels.

B4.3 The Application to Transfer Registration Event [MPhil Students only]

- B4.3.1 If a student makes suitable progress, he or she shall be offered the opportunity to apply to transfer registration from MPhil to PhD.
- B4.3.2 Students wishing to undertake the Application to Transfer Registration Event shall do so within 2 years of initial registration for full-time students and 3 years of initial registration for part-time students. The event may, if appropriate, be held at the same time as an annual review.
- B4.2.3 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance to staff about, *inter alia*, how students indicate their intention to undertake the Application to Transfer Registration Event, and how the University judges whether a student's progress warrants the offering of an opportunity to Transfer Registration.
- B4.3.4 The Application to Transfer Registration Event shall normally lead to one of the following three outcomes:
- [a] progress justifies transfer: *all subsequent annual registrations to be for a PhD;*
 - [b] further assessment required: *student continues registered for an MPhil for a further calendar year, but may request a second, and final, Transfer of Registration Event to upgrade to PhD;*
 - [c] progress satisfactory and registration confirmed: *all subsequent annual registrations to be for MPhil;*
 - [d] progress not satisfactory: *studies terminated.*

- B4.3.5 A student shall only be eligible for a single reassessment for a possible upgrade to PhD. For a second Event, the only outcomes shall be:
- [a] registration confirmed: *all subsequent annual registrations to be for MPhil*;
 - [b] progress justifies upgrade: *all subsequent annual registrations to be for a PhD*;
 - [c] progress not satisfactory: *studies terminated*.
- B4.3.6 In the event of a transfer of registration to PhD, the maximum time allowed to submit the thesis shall be calculated on the basis of the PhD durations in paragraph B3.1, starting from the date of initial registration for the MPhil.
- B4.3.7 The outcomes of the Application to Transfer Registration Event shall be determined as follows:
- [a] a Panel shall be established, comprising the supervisory team and an independent reader, who shall serve as Chair;
 - [b] the Chair shall, acting on advice from the Panel, submit a recommendation to the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students;
 - [c] the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students shall confirm the outcome for each student;
 - [d] the Student Administration unit shall formally communicate the confirmed outcome to the student, and, where appropriate, arrange for the student to re-register for the following academic session.
- B4.3.8 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance governing, *inter alia*, the nature and length of submissions to be made by students in preparation for the event, the criteria to be used when assessing students' progress [including not only criteria for assessing the student's research *per se*, but also the specification of training in research skills, or personal development activities, that all students are required to have undertaken successfully], the conduct of the event, and the appointment of Chairs of Panels.

B5 Interruption of Studies, and Changes between Full-time & Part-time Study

B5.1 Interruption of Studies

- B5.1.1 Students may formally request that their studies be interrupted for up to 6 months on the basis of evidence demonstrating that ill-health or other circumstances would prevent them from pursuing their research.
- B5.1.2 Such requests shall be initially considered by the Director of Studies, following which the Head of Department [or equivalent] shall submit a recommendation to the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students.
- B5.1.3 Following the granting of an interruption by the Board, the Student Administration unit shall formally notify the student of the change to their status, the date on which the student is expected to resume study, and the revised date by which the thesis is expected to be submitted.
- B5.1.4 The Student Administration unit shall contact the student again before the expected date of return to seek confirmation of whether the student intends to return on schedule or wishes to seek an extension to the interruption. If the student indicates that they wish an extension for up to a further 6 months, the Student Administration unit shall advise the student to contact the Faculty, who shall proceed in accordance with paragraph B5.1.2.
- B5.1.5 Extending a period of interruption beyond 12 months shall require the formal approval of Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students, on receipt of a recommendation from the Faculty Research Committee.

B5.2 Change to Mode of Attendance

- B5.2.1 Students may, at any point up to one year before the end of the maximum duration between initial registration and the submission of the thesis [cf paragraph B3.1], formally request a transfer from part-time study to full-time study or vice-versa.
- B5.2.2 Such requests shall be initially considered by the Director of Studies, following which the Head of Department [or equivalent] shall submit a recommendation to the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students.
- B5.2.3 Following the granting of a change to mode of attendance by the Board, the Student Administration unit shall formally notify the student of the change to their status and of any changes to their latest date by which the thesis must be submitted [which shall be calculated on a pro rata basis].

B6 The Appointment of Supervisors and Examiners

B6.1 The Supervisory Team

- B6.1.1 Each student shall be allocated a minimum of two supervisors.
- B6.1.2 At least two members of each student's supervisory team shall have been formally approved by Research Degrees SubCommittee as an **Approved Research Supervisor**, and at least one member of each team shall also have been formally approved by Research Degrees SubCommittee as a Director of Studies [DoS].
- B6.1.3 In each team, one member with DoS status shall be the student's formally designated **Director of Studies**.
- B6.1.4 Where appropriate, a supervisory team may, in addition to staff listed in B6.1.1 to B6.1.3 above, include one or more **Research Advisers** and/or **External Advisers**.
- B6.1.5 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about *inter alia*, the structure of supervisory teams [including role definitions], the requirements for and process of approval for research degree supervisors, the expected frequency and duration of supervisory meetings, the means by which such meetings are recorded, how supervisors and students might prepare for meetings, and the conduct of meetings.

B6.2 Internal Examiners

- B6.2.1 Each student [with the exception of students who are also members of staff at the University] shall be allocated at least one internal examiner.
- B6.2.2 No member of staff shall serve as internal examiner unless they have been formally recognised as an **Approved Research Supervisor** by Research Degrees SubCommittee.
- B6.2.3 No member of staff shall serve as internal examiner and supervisor for the same student.
- B6.2.4 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about procedures and criteria to be used by Research Degrees SubCommittee when preparing recommendations for the approval of internal examiners.

B6.3 External Examiners

- B6.3.1 Each student shall be allocated at least one external examiner.
- B6.3.2 All nominations for external examiners shall be formally approved by the Pro Vice Chancellor [Research & Academic Development], on the basis of a recommendation from Research Degrees SubCommittee.
- B6.3.3 No External Examiner shall have previous close involvement with Liverpool Hope University [or a partner institution at which students are registered for Liverpool Hope research degrees] that might compromise objectivity or impartiality of judgement. Specifically, the proposed examiner should not, in the 5 years prior to nomination, have been a member of staff, a governor, or a student of Liverpool Hope University [or a partner institution].
- B6.3.4 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about procedures and criteria to be used by Research Degrees SubCommittee when preparing recommendations for the approval of external examiners.

B7 Assessment of the Thesis, and Eligibility for Awards

B7.1 Summary of Procedures

- B7.1.1 A student shall be required to:
- [a] formally notify the Registrar [or Nominee] of their Intention to Submit a Thesis [the notification normally to be received at least 2 months before the expected submission date], and then
 - [b] submit the thesis, and then
 - [c] defend the thesis via an oral examination, and then
 - [d] undertake such revisions to the thesis, and attend any further oral examination, as may be required by the examiners.
- B7.1.2 If the Registrar [or nominee] judges that the Intention to Submit a Thesis form has been validly completed, he/she shall
- [a] arrange for Student Administration to change the student's status to "Submission Pending";
 - [b] authorise the Faculty Research Administration to initiate the process for the selection and appointment of the examining team.
- B7.1.3 A thesis submitted for the degree of PhD shall normally not exceed 100,000 words, and a thesis submitted for the degree of MPhil shall normally not exceed 60,000 words; any student who wishes, exceptionally, to exceed these maxima must first seek authorisation from Research Degrees SubCommittee. [It is acknowledged that the typical length of theses will vary significantly across academic subjects.] The Code of Practice shall provide guidance to candidates about, *inter alia*, the required length of the thesis and the manner in which the thesis must be submitted.
- B7.1.4 The thesis shall be examined, and the oral examination conducted, by at least two examiners:
- [a] normally, at least one internal examiner from Liverpool Hope University [who shall not be the supervisor]; and
 - [b] at least one external examiner.
 - [c] where the candidate is a member of Hope staff (academic or support) both examiners will be external;
- B7.1.5 Before the oral examination, each examiner shall be required to submit an independent written report to the Faculty Research Administration.
- B7.1.6 The oral examination shall be chaired by an independent Chair, who shall be a senior member of academic staff at Liverpool Hope University with experience of the University's procedures for examining research students.

- B7.1.7 The outcome of the oral examination shall be determined as follows:
- [a] the Independent Chair shall submit a joint recommendation from the internal and external examiners to the Registrar or Nominee;
 - [b] the examiners' recommendation shall place the student in one of the categories listed in paragraph B7.2 below and, where appropriate, shall specify a date by which the thesis must be submitted;
 - [c] the recommendation shall specify whether students are required [in accordance with paragraphs B7.2 and B7.3] to attend a further oral examination;
 - [d] if the Registrar [or nominee] judges that the recommendation form has been validly completed, he/she shall arrange for the Student Administration unit to:
 - i. amend the student's record on the University's database;
 - ii. publish the result;
 - iii. copy the outcome to the Faculty;
 - iv. arrange for the outcome to be reported to the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students.
 - [e] in all cases, the result shall formally outline the overall recommendation of the examiners, and give the deadline by which further work must be completed;
 - [f] where the examiners have recommended that the student is entitled to an award without making further amendments to the thesis, the result shall also formally state the deadline by which, in order for the student to be eligible to graduate -
 - o the hard-bound copy of the thesis, and confirmation of completion of the final stage of Vitae, must be received by the Faculty;
 - o a 100-word lay summary of the thesis, suitable for reading at the graduation ceremony, must be received by the Registrar.
 - [g] the internal examiners shall be required to supply the student with detailed feedback agreed by the full examining team.
- B7.1.8 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about, *inter alia*:
- the nature of the examiners reports to be submitted before the oral examination, and when they should be submitted;
 - the conduct of the oral examination;
 - guidelines for selecting the most appropriate outcome of the oral examination [cf paragraph B7.2]
 - the timing and nature of feedback supplied to students by the examiners after the oral examination.

B7.2 Outcomes of the Oral Examination [Candidates for the Degree of PhD]

B7.2.1 *Normal Outcomes*

Following the oral examination, one of the following outcomes shall normally be agreed.

- [a] Award of PhD
 - o The candidate has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD [but may be required to make minor typographical corrections to the thesis, and/or to make other very minor non-substantive changes to the thesis prior to final submission of hard-bound copy].

[b] Award of PhD Subject to Minor Amendments

- The candidate has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD. However, the candidate is required to make minor amendments to the content of the thesis, the candidate being required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than three months after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
- The candidate will only become eligible for the award of PhD when the University is satisfied that the thesis has been appropriately amended and the appropriate documentation has been signed by the internal and/or the external examiner.

[c] Award of PhD Subject to Major Amendments

- The candidate has broadly satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD. However, the candidate is required to make major amendments to the content of the thesis, the candidate being required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than one year after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
- The candidate will only become eligible for the award of PhD when the University is satisfied that the amended thesis fully meets the academic requirements for the award of a PhD and the appropriate documentation has been signed by the *both* the internal *and* external examiner.
- The candidate will not normally be expected to undertake a second oral examination. However:
 - following the initial oral examination, the examiners may, exceptionally, specify, in their recommendation to the Progression and Award Board, that a second oral examination is required;
 - if, exceptionally, the examiners are not satisfied that the resubmitted thesis fully meets the requirements for the award of a PhD, they may then require the candidate to attend a second oral examination.

[d] Re-Examination Required

- The candidate has not yet satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD. However, the candidate is entitled to revise and resubmit the thesis and [if necessary] undertake further research.
- The candidate is required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than two years after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
- The candidate will only become eligible for the award of PhD when the University is satisfied, via a full reassessment, including an oral examination, that the amended thesis fully meets the academic requirements for the award of a PhD.
- The candidate will be fully informed that the advice and guidance given by the examiners, even if followed to the letter, cannot be taken as a guarantee of the outcome of the re-examination.

B7.2.2 *Other Outcomes*

If the examiners judge that none of the outcomes in paragraph B7.2.1 is appropriate, one of the following outcomes may be agreed.

[a] Award of MPhil

- The candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD, but has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil.
- The candidate may be advised to make minor typographical corrections to the thesis, and/or to make other non-substantive changes to the thesis].

[b] Award of MPhil Subject to Minor Amendments

- The candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD, but has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil. However, the candidate is required to make minor amendments to the content of the thesis, the candidate being required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than three months after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
- The candidate will only become eligible for the award of MPhil when the University is satisfied that the thesis has been appropriately amended and the appropriate documentation has been signed by the internal and/or the external examiner.

[c] Award of MPhil Subject to Major Amendments

- The candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD, but has broadly satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil. However, the candidate is required to make major amendments to the content of the thesis, the candidate being required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than one year after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
- The candidate will only become eligible for the award of MPhil when the University is satisfied that the amended thesis fully meets the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil and the appropriate documents have been signed by *both* the internal *and* the external examiner.
- The candidate will not normally be expected to undertake a second oral examination. However:
 - following the initial oral examination, the examiners may, exceptionally, specify, in their recommendation to the Progression and Award Board, that a second oral examination is required;
 - if, exceptionally, the examiners are not satisfied that the resubmitted thesis fully meets the requirements for the award of an MPhil, they may then require the candidate to attend a second oral examination.

[d] Re-Examination for MPhil Required

- The candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD, and has not yet satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil. However, the candidate is entitled to revise and resubmit the thesis and [if necessary] undertake further research.
- The candidate is required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than one year after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
- The candidate will only become eligible for the award of MPhil when the University is satisfied, via a full reassessment including an oral examination, that the amended thesis fully meets the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil and the appropriate documentation has been signed by the *both* internal *and* the external examiner.

- [e] Fail
 - The candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a postgraduate research degree, is not entitled to resubmit the thesis, and so must terminate studies with no entitlement to an award.

B7.3 Outcomes of the Oral Examination [Candidates for the Degree of MPhil]

B7.3.1 *Normal Outcomes*

Following the examination, one of the following outcomes shall normally be agreed.

- [a] Award of MPhil
 - The candidate has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil [but may be advised to make minor typographical corrections to the thesis, and/or to make other minor non-substantive changes to the thesis].
- [b] Award of MPhil Subject to Minor Amendments
 - The candidate has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil. However, the candidate is required to make minor amendments to the content of the thesis, the candidate being required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than three months after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
 - The candidate will only become eligible for the award of MPhil when the University is satisfied that the thesis has been appropriately amended and the appropriate documentation has been signed by the internal and/or the external examiner.
- [c] Award of MPhil Subject to Major Amendments
 - The candidate has broadly satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil. However, the candidate is required to make major amendments to the content of the thesis, the candidate being required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than one year after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
 - The candidate will only become eligible for the award of MPhil when the University is satisfied that the amended thesis fully meets the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil and the appropriate documentation has been signed by *both* the internal *and* the external examiner.
 - The candidate will not normally be expected to undertake a second oral examination. However:
 - following the initial oral examination, the examiners may, exceptionally, specify, in their recommendation to the Progression and Award Board, that a second oral examination is required;
 - if, exceptionally, the examiners are not satisfied that the resubmitted thesis fully meets the requirements for the award of an MPhil, they may then require the candidate to attend a second oral examination.
- [d] Re-Examination Required
 - The candidate has not yet satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil. However, the candidate is entitled to revise and resubmit the thesis and [if necessary] undertake further research.
 - The candidate is required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than one year after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
 - The candidate will only become eligible for the award of MPhil when the University is satisfied, via a second oral examination, that the amended thesis fully meets the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil.

[e] Fail

- The candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a postgraduate research degree, is not entitled to resubmit the thesis, and so must terminate studies with no entitlement to an award.

B7.3.2 *Other Outcomes*

If, very exceptionally, the examiners judge that a thesis that has been submitted for an MPhil substantially reaches the standard required for a PhD, the candidate is to be offered the opportunity to submit a revised thesis. If the candidate wishes to resubmit, the examination is suspended and the registrar notified. The examination panel is to reconvene within six months to consider a revised thesis under B7.2.1 above. The candidate is to be fully informed that the advice and guidance given by the examiners, even if followed to the letter, cannot be taken as a guarantee of the outcome of the (reconvened) examination.

B7.4 Reassessment Procedures

B7.4.1 Extended Deadlines for Resubmitting the Thesis

The Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students shall be empowered to recommend to Research Committee that, due to evidence of ill health or other mitigating circumstances, a student may be granted an extension of up to 1 month for minor amendments, and 12 months in other cases.

B7.4.2 Candidates Required to Undertake Major Modifications or a Re-examination.

- [a] The reassessed work shall normally be assessed by the same examiners who assessed the original thesis and oral examination, who shall be required to submit their recommendations to the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students, in accordance with paragraph B7.1.6 above.
- [b] Normally, the only recommendations possible following such reassessments shall be:
- the candidate has now satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD, but may be advised to make typographical corrections or other minor non-substantive changes;
 - the candidate has now satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD, but is required to make minor modification to the thesis;
 - the candidate has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil, but may be advised to make typographical corrections or other non-substantive changes;
 - the candidate has now satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil, but is required to make minor modification to the thesis;
 - the candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a postgraduate research degree, and is not entitled to resubmit the thesis.

- B7.4.3 Candidates Required to Make Minor Modifications to the Thesis.
- [a] The revised thesis shall normally, but with the recorded approval of the external examiner, be assessed by the internal examiner[s], and the outcome notified to the Student Administration unit.
 - [b] Normally, the only outcomes possible following such minor amendments shall be:
 - the candidate has now satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a PhD, but may be advised to make typographical corrections or other non-substantive changes;
 - the candidate has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of an MPhil, but may be advised to make typographical corrections or other non-substantive changes;
 - the candidate has not fully satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a postgraduate research degree, and is not entitled to resubmit the thesis.
- B7.4.4 Notwithstanding paragraphs B7.4.2 and B7.4.3, the examiners may recommend, in exceptional circumstances, that a student whose resubmission fails to satisfy the academic requirements for an award should be granted a further opportunity to make major modifications or to be examined.

B8 The Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students

B8.1 Membership

- B8.1.1 The Board will comprise:
- the Chair of Research Degrees Sub-Committee, who will Chair the Board;
 - the three Faculty Research Co-ordinators;
 - the Associate Dean [Postgraduate Research];
 - the Programme Leader of each Professional Doctorate;
 - the University Moderator for each partner institution at which students are registered for Liverpool Hope Research Degrees;
 - the Registrar or nominee [who will be responsible for providing expert regulatory and procedural guidance to the Board];
 - three Faculty Research Administration staff [one from each Faculty];
 - a member of the Student Administration unit [to note decision for entry to the university's database, in preparation for the publication of results].
- B8.1.2 Each Board meeting will be serviced by one of the Faculty Research Administration staff.

B8.2 Terms of Reference

B8.2.1 The Main End of Session Meeting

The Board will meet at the end of each academic session to:

- [a] receive, consider and confirm the recommendations for **progression** submitted by supervisors following the “annual review”, “confirmation of registration” and “application to transfer registration” processes;
- [b] receive, consider and confirm any recommendations for **awards** submitted by examiners since the previous Board meeting.
- [c]. receive, consider and confirm any recommendations for **interruption of study, extension of study, and change of mode of attendance** submitted by examiners since the previous Board meeting and, if necessary, make recommendations to Research Committee.

B8.2.2 Other Meetings

The Board will meet at least three times a year in order to:

- [a] receive, consider and confirm any recommendations for **progression** submitted by supervisors following the “confirmation of registration” and “application to transfer registration processes”;
- [b] receive, consider and confirm any recommendations for **awards** submitted by examiners since the previous Board meeting.
- [c] receive, consider and confirm any recommendations for **interruption of study, extension of study, and change of mode of attendance** submitted by examiners since the previous Board meeting and, if necessary, make recommendations to Research Committee.

The Code of Practice shall specify procedures for holding ad hoc meetings of the Board as necessary.

B8.3 Relationship to Research Degrees SubCommittee

B8.3.1 Membership of the two bodies shall be identical, EXCEPT that:

- the membership of the SubCommittee shall include student representation;
- Research Administrators do not attend the SubCommittee.

B8.3.2 In relation to the discussion of students:

- following each Board meeting, the SubCommittee should receive and consider anonymised statistical summaries of outcomes, and discuss any general issues arising out of the Board’s consideration of individual students.

B9 Appeals

Students who wish to appeal against a decision of the Progression & Award Board, including instances where the Board is confirming a recommendation following the outcome of an examination, shall proceed in accordance with the University’s Academic Appeals Procedures.

B10 Academic Misconduct

B10.1 General

With the exceptions outlined below in paragraphs B10.2 to B10.5, postgraduate research students shall be governed by the University's standard regulations governing academic misconduct, and in all case the University's standard Academic Appeals Procedures shall apply.

B10.2 Procedures for the Investigation of Academic Misconduct

- B10.2.1 Where a student is suspected of having engaged in academic misconduct in a **draft** of the thesis, or in a **draft** document prepared for the Annual Review, Confirmation of Registration or Transfer of Registration procedures, the student's Director of Studies shall draw the matter to the attention of the student, and inform the student of the penalties [cf paragraphs B10.4 and B10.5 below] for confirmed academic misconduct in the final versions submitted for examination or assessment.
- B.10.2.2 Where a student is suspected of having engaged in academic misconduct in the thesis submitted for examination, or in any document prepared for the Annual Review, Confirmation of Registration or Transfer of Registration procedures, the matter shall be referred to the Registrar, who will invite an Independent Director of Studies [IDOS] to investigate the matter and submit a recommendation to the Chair of the Progression and Award Board.
- B10.2.3 The IDOS shall be neither a member of the student's Supervisory Team, nor the Independent Chair of the student's AMR Panel or oral examination, nor on the student's CRE Panel, nor an Internal Examiner for the student, nor one of the scrutineers who recommended the student for admission.
- B10.2.4 Notwithstanding clause B10.2.3, the expertise of the IDOS should sufficiently close to that of the thesis for the IDOS to understand relevant conventions relating to authorship and the citation of sources.
- B10.2.5 The IDOS must not begin the investigation until he or she has been trained by the Registrar [or nominee] in relevant regulations and procedures at the University.
- B10.2.6 The Registrar shall develop standard letters for use by the IDOS, which shall be adapted from those used for taught programmes.

- B10.2.7 The IDOS shall invite the student for an interview to discuss the suspected misconduct.
- The interview should also be attended by the person [eg the student's Director of Studies, research supervisor or examiner] who had referred the matter for investigation. However, if the suspected misconduct had been identified by an External Examiner, the interview should instead, be attended by an Internal Examiner, who shall be sufficiently briefed to be able to explain the basis of the External's concern.
 - The student may be accompanied at the misconduct interview by one other person, who should normally be one of the following:
 - a Students' Union officer;
 - a trained nominee of the Students' Union;
 - a member of academic staff at this University;
 - a student at this University.Any student who wishes to be accompanied by another person instead [eg a parent or other relation, or a solicitor], must seek permission from the University Secretary.

B10.2.8 Additional Procedures governing the Investigation of Suspected Academic Misconduct in the Thesis Submitted for Examination

- [a] The misconduct interview should be separate from the oral examination, and should be timed in a way that would enable the subsequent cancellation of the examination if appropriate.
- [b] If the oral examination is subsequently held, then any Examiners involved in the investigation of misconduct should normally retain their roles in the examining team. However, the student shall be asked to confirm in writing, before the oral examination, that they are happy for the original team of examiners to conduct the examination.
- In providing such confirmation, the student accepts that they would not be able to appeal against the outcome of the examination on the basis that one or more of the examiners had also been involved in the misconduct investigation.
 - If the student refuses to provide such confirmation, an alternative examining team shall be appointed, following the standard procedures.

B10.3 Penalties [General]

- B10.3.1 When deciding upon the recommendation, the IDOS shall take into account any guidance given to the student about academic misconduct or referencing procedures. Such guidance might be *inter alia*, general guidance issued to all students, or specific guidance given to the student via feedback on earlier work or drafts.
- B10.3.2 A failure on the part of the Director of Studies to have identified plagiarism or other academic misconduct in a draft of the thesis [*or in a draft document prepared for the Annual Review, Confirmation of Registration or Transfer of Registration procedures*] shall not, in itself, be a sufficient basis for the IDOS to recommend that the normal penalty not be applied.
- B10.3.3 When deciding upon the recommendation, the IDOS shall proceed in accordance with paragraph B10.4 or B10.5 below, as appropriate.

B10.4 Penalties and their Implementation [Misconduct in Theses Submitted for Examination]

The IDOS shall normally select ONE of the following four options.

B10.4.1 Termination of Studies

- [a] This is the normal penalty if the IDOS confirms that there has been academic misconduct.
- [b] If the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar accept the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from Student Administration, explaining the outcome, and drawing attention to the appeals procedure. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff.

B10.4.2 Unfit to Submit

- [a] This means that:
 - the IDOS judges that, due to valid mitigating circumstances, the student was not fit to make sound judgements at the time the relevant parts of the thesis had been written and/or the thesis had been submitted;
 - before the thesis can be examined, the student must submit:
 - a declaration that they are now fit to make sound judgements;
 - an amended version of the thesis, at their own expense [the IDOS shall specify the nature and extent of the amendments].
- [b] If the student's Director of Studies had alerted the student to similar problems in a draft, and the student had failed to make amendments, the only basis for the IDOS to select this option would be if the student presented evidence that they were not fit to make sound judgements *when considering the feedback from their Director of Studies*;
- [c] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome, and giving a deadline by which the amendments must be made.
- [d] When the IDOS is satisfied that the student has amended the thesis in a satisfactory manner, the IDOS will inform the student, the Faculty Research Administration staff and the Registrar that the oral examination may proceed, on the basis that the thesis is the student's own work.
HOWEVER
 - If the student makes amendments which had not been required by the IDOS, this would be treated as evidence of academic misconduct, and the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph B10.4.1].
 - If the student fails [without evidence of valid mitigating circumstances] to submit the amended thesis by the deadline required by the IDOS, or fails to make all amendments required by the IDOS, the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph B10.4.1].

B10.4.3 Ambiguous Referencing

- [a] This is very exceptional, and means that the IDOS is satisfied that the student had not intended to present for assessment any work other than their own, and that suspicion had been aroused by a lack of clarity in how sources had been cited in part of the thesis, with sources being clearly identified elsewhere in the thesis.
- [b] Before the thesis can be examined, the student must submit, at her/his own expense, an amended version [the amendments shall be limited to clarifying authorship in parts of the thesis specified by the IDOS].
- [c] This option is not available for cases in which, in general, citation of sources throughout the thesis was such that it is difficult to identify authorship. For such students, the IDOS shall normally recommend Termination of Studies [cf paragraph B10.4.1] or Unfit to Sit [cf paragraph B10.4.2].
- [d] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome, and giving a deadline by which the amendments must be made.
- [e] When the IDOS is satisfied that the student has amended the thesis in a satisfactory manner, the IDOS will inform the student, the Faculty Research Administration staff and the Registrar that the oral examination may proceed, on the basis that the thesis is the student's own work.
HOWEVER
 - If the student makes amendments which had not been required by the IDOS, this would be treated as evidence of academic misconduct, and the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph B10.4.1].
 - If the student fails [without evidence of valid mitigating circumstances] to submit the amended thesis by the deadline required by the IDOS, or fails to make all amendments required by the IDOS, the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph B10.4.1].

B10.4.3 No Case

- [a] The matter is not to be treated as plagiarism [or other misconduct] and the oral examination should proceed on the basis that the thesis is the student's own work.
- [b] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff

B10.5 Penalties [Misconduct in Documents Submitted for the Annual Review, Confirmation of Registration or Transfer of Registration Procedures]

The IDOS shall normally select ONE of the following five options.

B10.5.1 Termination of Studies

- [a] If the student has, during their career as a research student at this University, previously been found guilty of academic misconduct of any kind, then the IDOS shall normally select Termination of Studies as the penalty for a repeated offence.,
- [b] If the IDOS confirms that there has been academic misconduct, but the student has no previous case of academic misconduct on their postgraduate research student record, at this University, the IDOS may select either Termination of Studies or Resubmission Required [cf paragraph B10.5.2]. The choice should reflect the severity of the case.
- [b] If the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar accept the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from Student Administration, explaining the outcome, and drawing attention to the appeals procedure. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff.

B10.5.2 Resubmission Required

- [a] The student shall be deemed to have failed the Annual review, Confirmation of Registration Event or Transfer of Registration Event.
- [b] However, the student shall be given one further opportunity to pass the assessment, to a timescale agreed by the Progression and Award Board.
- [c] If the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar accept the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from Student Administration, explaining the outcome, and drawing attention to the appeals procedure. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff.

B10.5.3 Unfit to Submit

- [a] This means that:
 - the IDOS judges that, due to valid mitigating circumstances, the student was not fit to make sound judgements at the time the relevant parts of the work had been written and/or the work had been submitted;
 - before the work can be assessed, the student must submit:
 - a declaration that they are now fit to make sound judgements;
 - an amended version of the work, at their own expense [the IDOS shall specify the nature and extent of the amendments].
- [b] If the student's Director of Studies had alerted the student to similar problems in a draft, and the student had failed to make amendments, the only basis for the IDOS to select this option would be if the student presented evidence that they were not fit to make sound judgements when considering the feedback from their Director of Studies.

- [c] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome, and giving a deadline by which the amendments must be made.
- [d] When the IDOS is satisfied that the student has amended the work in a satisfactory manner, the IDOS will inform the student, the Faculty Research Administration staff and the Registrar that the assessment process may proceed, on the basis that the documents are the student's own work.
HOWEVER
 - If the student makes amendments which had not been required by the IDOS, this would be treated as evidence of academic misconduct, and the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph B10.5.1].
 - If the student fails [without evidence of valid mitigating circumstances] to submit the amended work by the deadline required by the IDOS, or fails to make all amendments required by the IDOS, the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph B10.5.1].

B10.5.4 Ambiguous Referencing

- [a] This is very exceptional, and means that the IDOS is satisfied that the student had not intended to present for assessment any work other than their own, and that suspicion had been aroused by a lack of clarity in how sources had been cited in part of the work, with sources being clearly identified elsewhere in the work.
- [b] Before the work can be assessed, the student must submit, at her/his own expense, an amended version [the amendments shall be limited to clarifying authorship in parts of the work specified by the IDOS].
- [c] This option is not available for cases in which, in general, citation of sources throughout the work was such that it is difficult to identify authorship. For such students, the IDOS shall normally recommend Termination of Studies [cf paragraph B10.5.1] or Resubmission Required [cf paragraph B10.5.2] or Unfit to Sit [cf paragraph B10.5.3].
- [d] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome, and giving a deadline by which the amendments must be made.
- [e] When the IDOS is satisfied that the student has amended the work in a satisfactory manner, the IDOS will inform the student, the Faculty Research Administration staff and the Registrar that the assessment process may proceed, on the basis that the documents are the student's own work.
HOWEVER
 - If the student makes amendments which had not been required by the IDOS, this would be treated as evidence of academic misconduct, and the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph B10.4.1].
 - If the student fails [without evidence of valid mitigating circumstances] to submit the amended work by the deadline required by the IDOS, or fails to make all amendments required by the IDOS, the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph B10.4.1].

B10.54.4 No Case

- [a] The matter is not to be treated as plagiarism [or other misconduct] and the assessment process should proceed on the basis that the documents are the student's own work.
- [b] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff

C: Regulations Governing Professional Doctorates

C1 Routes covered by the Regulations

C1.1 These Regulations will apply to the following Routes:

Doctor of Education [Ed.D]

Doctor of Ministry [D.Min]

C1.2 The list of Routes covered by the regulations shall be updated annually following approval of new routes.

C2 Cohorts covered by the Regulations

These Regulations will apply to students who register for Professional Doctorates from January 2014.

C3 Eligibility for Initial Registration

C3.1 The requirements for admission to a programme of study leading to the award of a Professional Doctorate are that an applicant should:

[a] submit a summary statement to indicate how undertaking study at the level of a professional doctorate relates to the applicant's professional context;

AND

[b] normally possess:

EITHER a first class or upper second class honours degree from a UK University;

OR degree from an overseas institution that is judged by the Registrar or Nominee to be equivalent to a first class or upper second class honours degree from a UK University,

AND

[c] have at least 3 years' significant and relevant experience in a professional area appropriate to the programme of study.

C3.2 Exceptionally, an applicant may be accepted without holding the qualifications outlined in clause C3.1. However, such applications will only be approved if Award Director and the Faculty Dean are both satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated, via a sample of academic writing and performance in an interview, the potential to achieve national standards for awards at Level M[7].

C3.3 Each Route may specify additional entrance qualifications. These shall be approved by Approval or Periodic Review Panels, and included in the Programme Specifications.

C3.4 In addition to satisfying the requirements in paragraphs C3.1 to C3.3, applicants must be able to demonstrate a high level of competence in written and spoken English.

C3.5 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance governing the admissions process, including, *inter alia*, the nature and length of the summary statement, the procedures and timescales according to which reviews are to be assessed, criteria for judging whether a student is suitable for admission to a Professional Doctorate, and criteria for judging whether an applicant is competent in written and spoken English

C3.6 Under exceptional circumstances, applicants may, by following the University's Accreditation of Prior Learning procedures, request exemption, on the basis of prior certificated learning, from

one or more Part One courses [cf paragraph C4.3 below]. No applicant shall be normally exempted from the Research Proposal, exempted from more than 120 credits, or granted an exemption on the basis of anything other than credits already gained towards a cognate professional doctorate qualification.

C4 Structure of the Programme

- C4.1 All Professional Doctorate programmes shall constitute 540 credits, each credit being defined as the equivalent of 10 hours of student commitment.
- C4.2 The intended learning outcomes for all taught elements of Professional Doctorate programmes shall be constructed to match the University's Qualification Descriptors for the award of Masters degrees [cf Appendix One of the Code of Practice].
- C4.3 All Professional Doctorate programmes shall comprise two parts, as follows.
- [a] Part One [Taught Courses]
This shall comprise taught courses approved for the student's route to the value of 180 credits, of which.
- all 180 credits shall be at Level M[7], and
 - 60 credits shall be specifically devoted to preparation for the thesis, to include the development, by the student, of a formal Research Proposal.
- All taught courses shall carry a credit rating [as defined in C4.1 above].
- [b] Part Two [Thesis]
The thesis shall carry 360 credits at Level D[8], and shall be assessed by a formal oral examination.
- C4.4 The Programme Specifications for each Route shall indicate the approved compulsory taught courses and approved optional taught courses which comprise Part One of the Route.
- C4.5 Acceptance of a student on an optional taught course is conditional upon availability and the agreement of the Route concerned.

C5 Interruption of Studies

- C5.1 Students may formally request that their studies be interrupted for up to 6 months on the basis of evidence demonstrating that ill-health or other circumstances would prevent them from pursuing their studies.
- C5.2 Such requests shall be initially considered within the student's Department, following which the Head of Department [or equivalent] shall submit recommendations to the relevant Board of Examiners [cf paragraph C11]
- C5.3 Following the granting of an interruption by the Board, the Student Administration team shall formally notify the student of the change to their status, the date on which the student is expected to resume study, and the revised date by which, as appropriate, the student is expected to complete Part One and/or submit the thesis.

- C5.4 The Student Administration team shall contact the student again before the expected date of return to seek confirmation of whether the student intends to return on schedule or wishes to seek an extension to the interruption. If the student indicates that they wish an extension for up to a further 6 months, the Student Administration team shall advise the student to contact the Faculty, who shall proceed in accordance with paragraph C5.2.
- C5.5 Extending a period of interruption beyond 12 months shall require the formal approval of the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students, on receipt of a recommendation from the Faculty.

C6 Duration of the Programme

C6.1 Normal Durations

- [a] Students shall normally submit their thesis after a minimum of four years from initial registration.
- [b] Students shall normally complete Part One over a period of two years, and then devote the following two years to Part Two.

C6.2 Maximum Durations

- [a] Students shall complete Part One no later than 4 years following initial registration [including reassessments and periods of interrupted study].
- [b] Students shall submit their thesis no later than 4 years following the satisfactory completion of Part One.

C6.3 Durations for Students Granted Exemption from Elements of Part One

Such students shall be expected to complete the programme in less time than those admitted to study the full programme. The reduced duration shall be calculated on the basis of the number of credits from which the student has been exempted, and shall be communicated to the student as part of the formal notification of the outcome of the request for exemption.

C6.4 Extended Durations

- [a] *Part One*
In the event of evidence demonstrating exceptional mitigating circumstances, the relevant Board of Examiners shall be empowered, to extend the maximum duration allowed to complete Part One by a maximum of one year.
- [b] *Part Two*
- i. If, having completed Part One, a student interrupts studies in accordance with paragraph 5 above, the maximum duration in paragraph C6.2b shall be extended by the appropriate number of months.
 - ii. In addition to “i” above, in the event of evidence demonstrating exceptional mitigating circumstances, the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research shall be empowered to extend the maximum duration allowed to submit the thesis by:
 - a maximum of one year for students who have not interrupted studies, and
 - a maximum of one year in addition to any extensions due to interruption of study.
 - iii. No student shall be permitted to submit their thesis more than 10 years after initial except by special permission of Senate. Such permission would only granted if there was evidence of very exceptional mitigating circumstances.

- iv. The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about criteria for judging whether a student warrants an extension to the maximum duration allowed to submit the thesis.

C7 Assessment of Taught Courses

C7.1 General

Except where specified otherwise, taught courses shall be assessed and moderated in line with the University's Universal Assessment Regulations.

C7.2 Marking Scale

For the Level M[7] courses, the marking scale shall be in common with the University's scale for taught Masters Degrees.

C7.3 External Examiners

At least one External Examiner shall be appointed for each route, in accordance with the Universal Assessment Regulations. Where the Route covers disparate subject areas, more than one External Examiners may, exceptionally, be appointed.

C7.4 The Research Proposal

The Code of Practice shall provide detailed guidance about the nature and submission of the Research Proposal, the selection of supervisors and internal examiners, the conduct of the oral examination, and the assessment criteria.

C8 Standard Progression Points

C8.1 Interim Annual Reviews before the Completion of Part One

- [a] The Board of Examiners shall, on an annual basis, review the progress of those students who have not yet undertaken all the assessment required for Part One.
- [b] The Board shall normally determine that such students are eligible to continue with their studies UNLESS:
 - the student has failed, without providing evidence of mitigating circumstances, to undertake tasks expected of them; or
 - the student will be unable, as a result of interruptions, reassessments or some other cause, to complete Part One by the deadline specified in paragraph C6 above.
- [c] The Board shall determine, for each module undertaken, whether students have gained a Pass with Merit result or are eligible for a redemption opportunity [cf clauses C8.2iii-v below]. The Board shall also stipulate the date by which any redemption opportunity shall be completed.

C8.2 Completion of Part One and Eligibility to be Assessed for Progression to Part Two

- [a] The Board of Examiners shall, normally at the end of the second year after initial registration, review the eligibility of students to complete Part One and to be assessed for to progress to Part Two.
- [b] The Board's decisions shall normally be in accordance with the following regulations:
- i. in order to be **eligible to complete Part One**, a student shall normally be required to have passed [or been granted exemption from] taught courses to the value of 180 credits,
 - ii. in order to be **eligible to be assessed for progression to Part Two**, a student shall normally be required to have achieved, in the 180 credits of Part One, a level of performance commensurate with the University's regulations for the award of a Masters degree with Merit [the Research Proposal being treated as the equivalent of a Dissertation];
 - iii. students who fail to achieve a Pass with Merit grade for one or more taught courses shall normally be eligible to undertake further assessment, by a date to be specified by the Board, for any course for which the student's aggregate mark was at least 25;
 - iv. students who fail a reassessment for one or more taught courses, or who obtain less than 25 on the initial assessment for one of more taught courses, shall normally be eligible to retake the relevant course[s] with attendance on one occasion, and with such reassessment opportunities in clause iii above;
 - v. notwithstanding clauses iii & iv above, no student shall normally be offered an opportunity to redeem a fail if, by so doing, the student would exceed the maximum period allowed for the completion of Part One [cf paragraph C6 above].
 - vi. students who are eligible to be assessed for progression to Part Two, but who formally indicate to the Student Administration unit that they wish to discontinue their studies, shall be eligible for the award of a Masters degree [any eligibility for an award with Merit or Distinction shall being determined in accordance with the University's regulations for taught postgraduate programmes];
 - vii. students who gain 180 credits, but EITHER remain ineligible, following the redemption opportunities outlined in clauses iii-v above, to be assessed for progression to Part Two, OR who formally indicate to the Student Administration unit that they wish to discontinue their studies, shall be eligible for the award of a Masters degree [without Merit or Distinction];
 - viii. students who gain 60-179 credits, but EITHER remain ineligible, following the redemption opportunities outlined in clauses iii-v above, to complete Part One, OR who formally indicate to the Student Administration unit that they wish to discontinue their studies, may be eligible for the award of a Postgraduate Certificate or a Postgraduate Diploma [any eligibility for such an award shall be determined in accordance with the University's regulations for taught postgraduate programmes].

C8.3 Progression to Part Two

- [a] Where the Board of Examiners determines that a student is eligible to be assessed for progression to Part Two, the student shall be required to attend a **Confirmation of Doctoral Registration Interview**, conducted by the Supervisory Team Designate and an Independent Reader [Chair] within one month of the publication of the Part One result.

- [b] The Confirmation of Doctoral Registration Interview shall focus on the potential of the student's Research Proposal to lead to research that meets doctoral standards, and shall normally lead to one of the following four outcomes:
 - i. the student may progress to Part Two of the Professional Doctorate;
 - ii. the student is not yet eligible to progress to Part Two, but is required to undergo a second interview, to be held no later no later than 3 months after the publication of the outcome of the first interview;
 - iii. the student is not yet eligible to progress to Part Two, but is required to revise the Research Proposal AND undergo a second interview, to be held no later no later than 3 months after the publication of the outcome of the first interview;
 - iv. the student is not eligible to progress to Part Two, and so is to be awarded a Masters degree with Merit.

- [c] For a second Confirmation of Doctoral Registration Interview, the only outcomes shall be:
 - i. the student may progress to Part Two of the Professional Doctorate;
 - ii. the student is not eligible to progress to Part Two, and so is to be awarded a Masters degree with Merit.

- [d] The Code of Practice shall provide guidance governing, *inter alia*, the criteria to be used when assessing students' eligibility to progress [including not only criteria for assessing the student's research *per se*, but also the specification of training in research skills, or personal development activities, that all students are required to have undertaken successfully], the conduct of the event, and the appointment of Independent Readers.

C8.3 Annual Monitoring Reviews during Part Two

- C8.3.1 The Board of Examiners shall, on an annual basis, review the progress of those students in Part Two who have not yet submitted their thesis.

- C8.3.2 The annual review shall normally lead to one of the following three outcomes:
 - [a] progress satisfactory: *eligible to re-register for the coming academic session;*
 - [b] progress not yet satisfactory: *reassessment required in order to become eligible to re-register for the coming academic session [where necessary, the student may be allowed to re-register temporarily, pending the outcome of the reassessment];*
 - [c] progress not satisfactory: *studies terminated.*

- C8.3.3 A student shall only be eligible for a single reassessment opportunity in any given academic session. Where a student has been reassessed, the annual review shall normally lead to one of the following two outcomes:
 - [a] progress now satisfactory: *eligible to re-register for the coming academic session;*
 - [b] progress still not satisfactory: *studies terminated.*

- C8.3.4 Annual Monitoring outcomes shall be determined as follows:
- [a] each student's documentation shall be read by the supervisory team and an independent reader, who is not a member of the student's supervisory team, but has been recognised by the University as an Approved Supervisor;
 - [b] each Faculty shall establish a Panel, comprising all Approved Supervisors in each Supervisory Team in the Faculty, to consider all research students in the Faculty;
 - [c] the Chair of the Panel shall have been recognised by the University as eligible to be a Director of Studies, and the Chair shall rotate during the meeting, so that no person chairs the consideration of their own supervisee;
 - [d] the Panel shall submit a recommendation for each student to the University's Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students;
 - [e] the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students shall confirm the outcome for each student;
 - [f] the Student Administration unit shall formally communicate the confirmed outcome to the student, and, where appropriate, arrange for the student to re-register for the following academic session.
- C8.3.5 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance governing, *inter alia*, the nature and length of submissions to be made by students in preparation for annual monitoring, the criteria to be used when assessing students' progress [including not only criteria for assessing the student's research *per se*, but also the specification of training in research skills, or personal development activities, that all students are required to have undertaken successfully], the conduct of the event, and the appointment of Chairs of Panels.

C9 The Appointment of Supervisors and Examiners for Part Two

C9.1 The Supervisory Team

- C9.1.1 Each student shall be allocated a minimum of two supervisors.
- C9.1.2 At least two members of each student's supervisory team shall have been formally approved by Research Degrees SubCommittee as an **Approved Research Supervisor**, and at least one member of each team shall also have been formally approved by Research Degrees SubCommittee as a Director of Studies [DoS].
- C9.1.3 In each team, one member with DoS status shall be the student's formally designated **Director of Studies**.
- C9.1.4 Where appropriate, a supervisory team may, in addition to staff listed in C9.1.1 to C9.1.3 above, include one or more **Research Advisers** and/or **External Advisers**.
- C9.1.5 The proposed Supervisory Team shall be submitted for approval to the Chair of Research Degrees Sub Committee as soon as the Board of Examiners has confirmed the student's eligibility to be assessed for progression to Part Two. The Confirmation of Doctoral Registration Interview may not take place until the Team has been formally approved.
- C9.1.6 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about *inter alia*, the structure of supervisory teams [including definitions of roles], the requirements for and process of approval for research degree supervisors, the expected frequency and duration of supervisory meetings, the means by which such meetings are recorded, how supervisors and students might prepare for the meetings, and the conduct of the meetings.

C9.2 Internal Examiners

- C9.2.1 Each student [with the exception of students who are also members of staff at the university] shall be allocated at least one internal examiner.
- C9.2.2 No member of staff shall serve as internal examiner unless they have been formally recognised as an **Approved Research Supervisor** by Research Degrees SubCommittee.
- C9.2.3 No member of staff shall serve as internal examiner and supervisor for the same student.
- C9.2.4 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about procedures and criteria to be used by Research Degrees SubCommittee when preparing recommendations for the approval of internal examiners.

C9.3 External Examiners

- C9.3.1 Each student shall be allocated at least one external examiner.
- C9.3.2 All nominations for external examiners shall be formally approved by the Pro Vice Chancellor [Research & Academic Development], on the basis of a recommendation from Research Degrees SubCommittee.
- C9.3.3 No External Examiner shall have previous close involvement with Liverpool Hope University that might compromise objectivity or impartiality of judgement. Specifically, the proposed examiner should not, in the 5 years prior to nomination, have been a member of staff, a governor, or a student of Liverpool Hope University.
- C9.3.4 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about procedures and criteria to be used by Research Degrees SubCommittee when preparing recommendations for the approval of external examiners.

C10 Assessment of the Thesis, and Eligibility for Awards

C10.1 Summary of Procedures

- C10.1.1 A student shall be required to:
 - [a] formally notify the Registrar [or Nominee] of their Intention to Submit a Thesis [the notification is normally to be received at least 2 months before the expected date of submission], and then
 - [b] submit the thesis, and then
 - [c] defend the thesis via an oral examination, and then
 - [d] undertake such revisions to the thesis, and attend any further oral examination, as may be required by the examiners.
- C10.1.2 If the Registrar [or nominee] judges that the Intention to Submit a Thesis form has been validly completed, he/she shall
 - [a] arrange for Student Administration to change the student's status to "Submission Pending";
 - [b] authorise the Faculty Research Administration to initiate the process for the selection and appointment of the examining team.
- C10.1.3 A thesis submitted for a professional doctorate shall normally be between 50,000 and 60,000 words in length; any student who wishes, exceptionally, to exceed 60,000 words must first seek authorisation from Research Degrees SubCommittee. [It is acknowledged that the typical length of theses will vary significantly across academic subjects.] The Code of Practice shall provide guidance to candidates about, *inter alia*, the required length of the thesis and the manner in which the thesis must be submitted.
- C10.1.4 The thesis shall be examined, and the oral examination conducted, by at least two examiners:
 - [a] normally, at least one internal examiner from Liverpool Hope University [who shall not be the supervisor]; and
 - [b] at least one external examiner.
 - [c] where the candidate is a member of Hope staff (academic or support) both examiners will be external;

- C10.1.5 Before the oral examination, each examiner shall be required to submit an independent written report to the Faculty Research Administration.
- C10.1.6 The oral examination shall be chaired by an independent Chair, who shall be a senior member of academic staff at Liverpool Hope University with experience of the University's procedures for examining research students.
- C10.1.7 The outcome of the oral examination shall be determined as follows:
- [a] the Independent Chair shall submit a joint recommendation from the internal and external examiners to the Registrar or Nominee;
 - [b] the examiners' recommendation shall place the student in one of the categories listed in paragraph C10.2 below and, where appropriate, shall specify a date by which the thesis must be submitted;
 - [c] the recommendation shall specify whether students are required [in accordance with paragraphs C10.2 and C10.3] to attend a further oral examination;
 - [d] if the Registrar [or nominee] judges that the recommendation form has been validly completed, he/she shall arrange for the Student Administration unit to:
 - i. amend the student's record on the University's database;
 - ii. publish the result;
 - iii. copy the outcome to the Faculty;
 - iv. arrange for the outcome to be reported to the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students.
 - [e] in all cases, the result shall formally outline the overall recommendation of the examiners, and give the deadline by which further work must be completed;
 - [f] where the examiners have recommended that the student is entitled to an award without making further amendments to the thesis, the result shall also formally state the deadline by which, in order for the student to be eligible to graduate -
 - the hard-bound copy of the thesis, and confirmation of completion of the final stage of Vitae, must be received by the Faculty;
 - a 100-word lay summary of the thesis, suitable for reading at the graduation ceremony, must be received by the Registrar.
 - [g] the internal examiners shall be required to supply the student with detailed feedback agreed by the full examining team.
- C10.1.8 The Code of Practice shall provide guidance about, *inter alia*:
- the nature of the examiners reports to be submitted before the oral examination, and when they should be submitted;
 - the conduct of the oral examination;
 - guidelines for selecting the most appropriate outcome of the oral examination [cf paragraph C10.2]
 - the timing and nature of feedback supplied to students by the examiners after the oral examination.

C10.2 Outcomes of the Oral Examination

Following the oral examination, one of the following outcomes shall normally be agreed.

- [a] Award of a Professional Doctorate
The candidate has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate required to make minor typographical corrections to the thesis, and/or to make other very minor non-substantive changes to the thesis prior to final submission of hard-bound copy].
- [b] Award of a Professional Doctorate Subject to Minor Amendments
- The candidate has satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate. However, the candidate is required to make minor amendments to the content of the thesis, the candidate being required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than three months after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
 - The candidate will only become eligible for the award of a Professional Doctorate when the University is satisfied that the thesis has been appropriately amended and the appropriate documentation has been signed by the internal and/or the external examiner.
- [c] Award of a Professional Doctorate Subject to Major Amendments
- The candidate has broadly satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate. However, the candidate is required to make major amendments to the content of the thesis, the candidate being required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than one year after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
 - The candidate will only become eligible for the award of a Professional Doctorate when the University is satisfied that the amended thesis fully meets the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate and the appropriate documentation has been signed by the *both* the internal *and* external examiner.
 - The candidate will not normally be expected to undertake a second oral examination. However:
 - following the initial oral examination, the examiners may, exceptionally, specify, in their recommendation to the Progression and Award Board, that a second oral examination is required;
 - if, exceptionally, the examiners are not satisfied that the resubmitted thesis fully meets the requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate, they may then require the candidate to attend a second oral examination.
- [d] Re-Examination Required
- The candidate has not yet satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate. However, the candidate is entitled to revise and resubmit the thesis and [if necessary] undertake further research.
 - The candidate is required to submit a revised thesis normally no later than two years after the formal publication of the outcome of the examination.
 - The candidate will only become eligible for the award of Professional Doctorate when the University is satisfied, via a full reassessment, including an oral examination, that the amended thesis fully meets the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate.
 - The candidate will be fully informed that the advice and guidance given by the examiners, even if followed to the letter, cannot be taken as a guarantee of the outcome of the re-examination.

[e] Fail

- The candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate, is not entitled to resubmit the thesis, and so must terminate studies.
- The matter shall be referred to the Board of Examiners. The Board shall determine whether, in accordance with paragraph C13, the candidate is entitled, on the basis of his/her performance in Part One, to the award of a Masters degree.

C10.3 Reassessment Procedures

C10.3.1 Extended Deadlines for Resubmitting the Thesis

The Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students shall be empowered to recommend to Research Committee that, due to evidence of ill health or other mitigating circumstances, a student may be granted an extension of up to 1 month for minor amendments, and 12 months in other cases.

C10.3.2 Candidates Required to Undertake Major Modifications or a Re-examination.

- [a] The reassessed work shall normally be assessed by the same examiners who assessed the original thesis and oral examination, who shall be required to submit their recommendations to the Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students, in accordance with paragraph C10.1.7 above.
- [b] Normally, the only recommendations possible following such reassessments shall be:
- the candidate has now satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate, but may be advised to make typographical corrections or other minor non-substantive changes;
 - the candidate has now satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate, but is required to make minor modification to the thesis;
 - the candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a postgraduate research degree, is not entitled to resubmit the thesis. and so must terminate studies, the matter being referred to the Progression and Award Board [cf C10.2e above].

C10.3.3 Students who were required to make minor modifications to the thesis.

- [a] The revised thesis shall normally, but with the recorded approval of the external examiner, be assessed by the internal examiner[s], and the outcome notified to the Student Administration team.
- [b] Normally, the only outcomes possible following such minor amendments shall be:
- the candidate has now satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a Professional Doctorate, but may be advised to make typographical corrections or other non-substantive changes;
 - the candidate has not fully satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a postgraduate research degree, and is not entitled to resubmit the thesis.
 - the candidate has not satisfied the academic requirements for the award of a postgraduate research degree, is not entitled to resubmit the thesis. and so must terminate studies, the matter being referred to the Progression and Award Board [cf C10.2e above].

C10.3.4 Notwithstanding paragraphs C10.3.2 and C10.3.3, the examiners may recommend, in exceptional circumstances, that a student whose resubmission fails to satisfy the academic requirements for an award should be granted a further opportunity to make major modifications or to be examined.

C11 Boards of Examiners

C11.1 For Part One

Each Route will, in common with other taught programmes, have its own Assessment, Progression and Award Board, which shall operate in accordance with the Universal Assessment Regulations.

The final task of this Board shall be to confirm a student's eligibility for assessment for progression to Part Two.

C11.2 For Part Two

Professional Doctorates will fall under the remit the University's Progression and Award Board for Postgraduate Research Students.

The first task of this Board shall be to confirm the recommended outcome of the Confirmation of Doctoral Registration Interview.

C12 Awards Available from the Programme

C12.1 Professional Doctorates

- [a] Candidates whose thesis satisfies the examiners in accordance with paragraph C10 above will normally be deemed by the Progression and award Board to be eligible for the award of a Professional Doctorate.
- [b] The title of each Route leading to a Professional Doctorate shall be as agreed at the Validation Event for the Route. Following validation, the title shall be included in the Programme Specification.

C12.2 Professional Masters Degrees

- [a] Candidates who complete Part One but either do not complete Part Two or whose thesis is judged to have Failed, shall be eligible for the award of a Masters degree.
- [b] The titles of Professional Masters degrees shall be as agreed at the Validation Event for the relevant Route, but shall normally be commensurate with the title for the Professional Doctorate. The titles "MPhil", "MA", "MSc" and "MBA" shall not be used. Following validation, the titles shall be included in Programme Specifications.
- [c] The degrees shall be classified in accordance with the University's standard regulations governing the granting of Masters awards with Merit or Distinction.

C13 Appeals

Students who wish to appeal against a decision of a Board of Examiners, including instances where the Board is confirming a recommendation following the outcome of an examination, shall proceed in accordance with the University's Academic Appeals Procedures.

C14 Academic Misconduct

C14.1 General

With the exceptions outlined below in paragraphs C14.20.2 to C14.5, Professional Doctorate students shall be governed by the University's standard regulations governing academic misconduct, and in all case the University's standard Academic Appeals Procedures shall apply.

C14.2 Procedures for the Investigation of Academic Misconduct

- C14.2.1 Where a student is suspected of having engaged in academic misconduct in a **draft** of the thesis, or in a **draft** document written during Part One of the programme, the student's Director of Studies [or equivalent for Part One students] shall draw the matter to the attention of the student, and inform the student of the penalties [cf paragraphs C14.4 to C14.5 below] for confirmed academic misconduct in the final versions submitted for examination or assessment.
- C14.2.2 Where a student is suspected of having engaged in academic misconduct in the thesis submitted for examination, or in any document submitted during Part One of the programme, the matter shall be referred to the Registrar, who will invite an Independent Director of Studies [IDOS] to investigate the matter and submit a recommendation to the Chair of the Progression and Award Board.
- C14.2.3 The IDOS shall be neither a member of the student's Supervisory Team, nor the Independent Chair of the student's oral examination, nor an Internal Examiner for the student, nor one of the scrutineers who recommended the student for admission, nor a member of staff who had taught or assessed the student during Part One.
- C14.2.4 Notwithstanding clause C14.2.3, the expertise of the IDOS should be sufficiently close to that of the thesis for the IDOS to understand relevant conventions relating to authorship and the citation of sources.
- C14.2.5 The IDOS must not begin the investigation until he or she has been trained by the Registrar [or nominee] in relevant regulations and procedures at the University.
- C14.2.6 The Registrar shall develop standard letters for use by the IDOS, which shall be adapted from those used for taught programmes.

- C14.2.7 The IDOS shall invite the student for an interview to discuss the suspected misconduct.
- The interview should also be attended by the person [eg the student's Director of Studies, research supervisor or examiner] who had referred the matter for investigation. However, if the suspected misconduct had been identified by an External Examiner, the interview should instead, be attended by an Internal Examiner, who shall be sufficiently briefed to be able to explain the basis of the External's concern.
 - The student may be accompanied at the misconduct interview by one other person, who should normally be one of the following:
 - a Students' Union officer;
 - a trained nominee of the Students' Union;
 - a member of academic staff at this University;
 - a student at this University.Any student who wishes to be accompanied by another person instead [eg a parent or other relation, or a solicitor], must seek permission from the University Secretary.

C14.2.8 Additional Procedures governing the Investigation of Suspected Academic Misconduct in the Thesis Submitted for Examination

- [a] The misconduct interview should be separate from the oral examination, and should be timed in a way that would enable the subsequent cancellation of the examination if appropriate.
- [b] If the oral examination is subsequently held, then any Examiners involved in the investigation of misconduct should normally retain their roles in the examining team. However, the student shall be asked to confirm in writing, before the oral examination, that they are happy for the original team of examiners to conduct the examination.
- In providing such confirmation, the student accepts that they would not be able to appeal against the outcome of the examination on the basis that one or more of the examiners had also been involved in the misconduct investigation.
 - If the student refuses to provide such confirmation, an alternative examining team shall be appointed, following the standard procedures.

C14.3 Penalties [General]

- C14.3.1 When deciding upon the recommendation, the IDOS shall take into account any guidance given to the student about academic misconduct or referencing procedures. Such guidance might be *inter alia*, general guidance issued to all students, or specific guidance given to the student via feedback on earlier work or drafts.
- C14.3.2 A failure on the part of the Director of Studies [or equivalent for Part One students] to have identified plagiarism or other academic misconduct in a draft of the thesis [*or in a draft document written during Part One*] shall not, in itself, be a sufficient basis for the IDOS to recommend that the normal penalty not be applied.
- C14.3.3 When deciding upon the recommendation, the IDOS shall proceed in accordance with paragraph C14.4 or C14.5 below, as appropriate.

C14.4 Penalties and their Implementation [Misconduct in Theses Submitted for Examination]

The IDOS shall normally select ONE of the following four options.

C14.4.1 Termination of Studies

- [a] This is the normal penalty if the IDOS confirms that there has been academic misconduct.
- [b] If the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar accept the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from Student Administration, explaining the outcome, and drawing attention to the appeals procedure. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff.

C14.4.2 Unfit to Submit

- [a] This means that:
 - the IDOS judges that, due to valid mitigating circumstances, the student was not fit to make sound judgements at the time the relevant parts of the thesis had been written and/or the thesis had been submitted;
 - before the thesis can be examined, the student must submit:
 - a declaration that they are now fit to make sound judgements;
 - an amended version of the thesis, at their own expense [the IDOS shall specify the nature and extent of the amendments].
- [b] If the student's Director of Studies had alerted the student to similar problems in a draft, and the student had failed to make amendments, the only basis for the IDOS to select this option would be if the student presented evidence that they were not fit to make sound judgements *when considering the feedback from their Director of Studies*;
- [c] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome, and giving a deadline by which the amendments must be made.
- [d] When the IDOS is satisfied that the student has amended the thesis in a satisfactory manner, the IDOS will inform the student, the Faculty Research Administration staff and the Registrar that the oral examination may proceed, on the basis that the thesis is the student's own work.
HOWEVER
 - If the student makes amendments which had not been required by the IDOS, this would be treated as evidence of academic misconduct, and the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph C14.4.1].
 - If the student fails [without evidence of valid mitigating circumstances] to submit the amended thesis by the deadline required by the IDOS, or fails to make all amendments required by the IDOS, the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph C14.4.1].

C14.4.3 Ambiguous Referencing

- [a] This is very exceptional, and means that the IDOS is satisfied that the student had not intended to present for assessment any work other than their own, and that suspicion had been aroused by a lack of clarity in how sources had been cited in part of the thesis, with sources being clearly identified elsewhere in the thesis.
- [b] Before the thesis can be examined, the student must submit, at her/his own expense, an amended version [the amendments shall be limited to clarifying authorship in parts of the thesis specified by the IDOS].
- [c] This option is not available for cases in which, in general, citation of sources throughout the thesis was such that it is difficult to identify authorship. For such students, the IDOS shall normally recommend Termination of Studies [cf paragraph C14.4.1] or Unfit to Sit [cf paragraph B10.4.2].
- [d] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome, and giving a deadline by which the amendments must be made.
- [e] When the IDOS is satisfied that the student has amended the thesis in a satisfactory manner, the IDOS will inform the student, the Faculty Research Administration staff and the Registrar that the oral examination may proceed, on the basis that the thesis is the student's own work.
HOWEVER
 - If the student makes amendments which had not been required by the IDOS, this would be treated as evidence of academic misconduct, and the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph C14.4.1].
 - If the student fails [without evidence of valid mitigating circumstances] to submit the amended thesis by the deadline required by the IDOS, or fails to make all amendments required by the IDOS, the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph C14.4.1].

C14.4.3 No Case

- [a] The matter is not to be treated as plagiarism [or other misconduct] and the oral examination should proceed on the basis that the thesis is the student's own work.
- [b] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff

C14.5 Penalties [Misconduct in Documents Submitted During Part One]

The IDOS shall normally select ONE of the following five options.

C14.5.1 Termination of Studies

- [a] If the student has, during their career as a research student at this University, previously been found guilty of academic misconduct of any kind, then the IDOS shall normally select Termination of Studies as the penalty for a repeated offence.,
- [b] If the IDOS confirms that there has been academic misconduct, but the student has no previous case of academic misconduct on their postgraduate research student record, at this University, the IDOS may select either Termination of Studies or Resubmission Required [cf paragraph C14.5.2]. The choice should reflect the severity of the case.
- [b] If the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar accept the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from Student Administration, explaining the outcome, and drawing attention to the appeals procedure. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff.

C14.5.2 Resubmission Required

- [a] The student shall be deemed to have failed the Annual review, Confirmation of Registration Event or Transfer of Registration Event.
- [b] However, the student shall be given one further opportunity to pass the assessment, to a timescale agreed by the Progression and Award Board.
- [c] If the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar accept the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from Student Administration, explaining the outcome, and drawing attention to the appeals procedure. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff.

C14.5.3 Unfit to Submit

- [a] This means that:
 - the IDOS judges that, due to valid mitigating circumstances, the student was not fit to make sound judgements at the time the relevant parts of the work had been written and/or the work had been submitted;
 - before the work can be assessed, the student must submit:
 - a declaration that they are now fit to make sound judgements;
 - an amended version of the work, at their own expense [the IDOS shall specify the nature and extent of the amendments].
- [b] If the student's Director of Studies had alerted the student to similar problems in a draft, and the student had failed to make amendments, the only basis for the IDOS to select this option would be if the student presented evidence that they were not fit to make sound judgements when considering the feedback from their Director of Studies.

- [c] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome, and giving a deadline by which the amendments must be made.
- [d] When the IDOS is satisfied that the student has amended the work in a satisfactory manner, the IDOS will inform the student, the Faculty Research Administration staff and the Registrar that the assessment process may proceed, on the basis that the documents are the student's own work.
HOWEVER
 - If the student makes amendments which had not been required by the IDOS, this would be treated as evidence of academic misconduct, and the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph C14.5.1].
 - If the student fails [without evidence of valid mitigating circumstances] to submit the amended work by the deadline required by the IDOS, or fails to make all amendments required by the IDOS, the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph C14.5.1].

C14.5.4 Ambiguous Referencing

- [a] This is very exceptional, and means that the IDOS is satisfied that the student had not intended to present for assessment any work other than their own, and that suspicion had been aroused by a lack of clarity in how sources had been cited in part of the work, with sources being clearly identified elsewhere in the work.
- [b] Before the work can be assessed, the student must submit, at her/his own expense, an amended version [the amendments shall be limited to clarifying authorship in parts of the work specified by the IDOS].
- [c] This option is not available for cases in which, in general, citation of sources throughout the work was such that it is difficult to identify authorship. For such students, the IDOS shall normally recommend Termination of Studies [cf paragraph C14.5.1] or Resubmission Required [cf paragraph C14.5.2] or Unfit to Sit [cf paragraph C14.5.3].
- [d] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome, and giving a deadline by which the amendments must be made.
- [e] When the IDOS is satisfied that the student has amended the work in a satisfactory manner, the IDOS will inform the student, the Faculty Research Administration staff and the Registrar that the assessment process may proceed, on the basis that the documents are the student's own work.
HOWEVER
 - If the student makes amendments which had not been required by the IDOS, this would be treated as evidence of academic misconduct, and the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph C14.5.1].
 - If the student fails [without evidence of valid mitigating circumstances] to submit the amended work by the deadline required by the IDOS, or fails to make all amendments required by the IDOS, the IDOS should recommend termination of studies [cf paragraph C14.5.1].

C14.5.4 No Case

- [a] The matter is not to be treated as plagiarism [or other misconduct] and the assessment process should proceed on the basis that the documents are the student's own work.
- [b] When the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the Registrar have accepted the recommendation from the IDOS, the student shall be sent a formal letter from the IDOS, explaining the outcome. The letter shall be copied to the Faculty Research Administration staff.