Regulations for Awards

Research Degrees

University of HUDDERSFIELD
Inspiring global professionals

2026/27

Please note that these regulations may be subject to change within the academic year and as such, any printed or downloaded documents will not reflect these changes.

For the most up to date version, please refer to Registry's website.

Contents

Section A: General Regulations Governing All Research Degrees 8
A1. Available awards 8
A1.2 Higher Doctorates 8
A1.3 Named awards 8
A1.4 Aegrotat/Posthumous awards 9
A1.5 Conferment 9
A1.6 Certificate of Award 9
A1.7 Programme scope 10
A1.8 Taught modules within research degrees 10
A1.9 Training and development 10
A1.10 Alternative formats of thesis submission 10
A1.11 Collaborating establishments 12
A2. Admissions and enrolment 13
A2.1 Admission to a research degree programme 13
A2.2 Recognition of prior research 13
A2.3 Change of degree programme within the University 14
A2.4 Mode of study 15
A2.5 Candidates enrolled on a campus-based research degree 15
A2.6 Research study by distance learning 15
A3. Supervision 15
A3.1 Criteria for the appointment of research degree supervisors 16
A3.2 The team: 16
A3.3 The Main Supervisor: 16
A3.4 The Co-supervisor/s: 16
A3.5 External supervisors and external advisors: 17
A3.6 Change of supervision arrangements 17
A3.7 Requirements of the supervisors 17
A4. Examinations and assessments 18
A4.1 Candidate responsibilities 18
A4.2 Options at the end of the programme 18
A4.3 Application for additional time before writing-up 19
A4.4 Application to enrol for the writing-up period 20
A4.5 Thesis length 21
A4.6 Language of submission 22
A4.7 The submission 22
A4.8 Arrangements for the examination of the final thesis 23
A4.9 The examination team 23

A4.10 The examination 27
A5. Revocation of a research degree 28
A5.1 Revocation of degree 28
A6. Emergency regulations for approved programmes of supervised research 28
A6.1 Introduction and principles 28
A6.2 Implementation 29
A6.3 Complaints and appeals 30
A6.4 Post-emergency recovery actions 30
Section B: Regulations for the Degree of Masters by Research (Including MA, MSc & MEnt) 31
B1. Learning outcomes 31
B1.2 The MA by Research and MSc by Research 31
B1.3 The MEnt 32
B1.4 Alternative formats of thesis submission 32
B2. Thesis length 32
B3. Admission criteria 32
B4. Period of enrolment 32
B5. Programme timeline and milestones 34
B5.1 Research support plan and skills audit 34
B5.2 Transfer from Masters by Research to PhD 35
B5.3 Transfer to or from a distance learning route 35
B5.4 Final thesis examination 35
B5.5 Recommendations following examination: 35
B5.6 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments: 36
B5.7 Recommendations following the submission of referred work: 36
Section C: Regulations for the Degree of Master of Philosophy 38
C1. Learning outcomes 38
C1.2 Master of Philosophy 38
C2. Thesis length 39
C3. Period of enrolment 39
C4. Final thesis examination 39
C4.1 The examination for MPhil has two stages: 39
C4.2 Recommendations following examination: 40
C4.3 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments: 40
C4.4 Recommendations following the submission of referred work: 41
Section D: Regulations for the Award of Professional Doctorate, Incorporating the Master in Research (MRes) Award 42
D1. Learning outcomes 42
D1.2 The Professional Doctorate award 42

D2. Thesis length....43
D3. Admission criteria....43
D4. Period of enrolment....43
D5. Programme timeline and milestones....44
D5.2 Change of programme....45
D5.3 Transferring out of the University....46
D5.4 Progression monitoring....46
D5.5 Assessment of progression....46
D5.6 The progression panel....47
D5.7 The progression report....47
D5.8 Available outcomes following initial assessment (progression stage)....47
D5.9 Available outcomes following amendments (progression stage)....48
D5.10 Final thesis examination....48
D5.11 Recommendations following examination:....49
D5.12 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments:....49
D5.13 Recommendations following the submission of referred work:....50
D6. MRes Regulations....51
D6.2 Learning outcomes (MRes)....51
D6.3 Period of enrolment (MRes)....52
D6.4 Final Examination (MRes)....52
D6.5 Recommendations following examination (MRes):....52
D6.6 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments (MRes):....53
D6.7 Recommendations following the submission of referred work (MRes):....53
Section E: Regulations for The Awards of PhD and EntD (Excluding PhD by Publication and PhD by Prospective Publication)....55
E1. Learning outcomes....55
E1.2 The PhD award....55
E1.3 The EntD award....55
E2. Thesis length....56
E2.2 Alternative formats of thesis submission....56
E3. Admission criteria....56
E3.1 PhD award....56
E3.2 EntD award....57
E4. Period of enrolment....57
E5. Programme timeline and milestones....58
E5.1 Change of programme....58
E5.2 Transfer from PhD or EntD to Master's....59
E5.3 Transfer from PhD to MPhil....59

E5.4 Transfer to or from a distance learning route 59
E5.5 Research support plan and skills audit 60
E5.6 Progression monitoring 60
E5.7 Assessment of progression 61
E5.8 The progression panel 62
E5.9 The progression report 62
E5.10 Available outcomes following initial assessment (progression stage) 62
E5.11 Available outcomes following amendments (progression stage) 63
E5.12 Final thesis examination 63
E5.13 Recommendations following examination 63
E5.14 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments 64
E5.14.1 Once a candidate has submitted minor amendments, the following may be recommended: 64
E5.15 Recommendations following the submission of referred work: 65
Section F: Regulations for the Award of PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) 67
F1. Learning outcomes 67
F2. Thesis length 67
F2.2 Alternative formats of thesis submission 68
F3. Admission criteria 68
F4. Period of enrolment 68
F5. Programme timeline and milestones 69
F5.1 Change of Programme 70
F5.2 Transfer from PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) to Masters 70
F5.3 Transfer from PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) to MPhil 70
F5.4 Transfer to or from a distance learning route 70
F5.5 Research support plan and skills audit 70
F5.6 Progression monitoring 71
F5.7 Assessment of progression 72
F5.8 The progression panel 72
F5.9 The progression report 73
F5.10 Available outcomes following initial assessment (progression stage) 73
F5.11 Available outcomes following amendments (progression stage) 73
F5.12 Final thesis examination 74
F5.13 Recommendations following examination 74
F5.14 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments 75
F5.15 Recommendations following the submission of referred work 76
Section G: Regulations for the Award of PhD by Publication 78
G1. The Award 78

G1.2 PhD by Publication 78
G2. Thesis length 79
G3. Period of enrolment 79
G4. Admission criteria 79
G5. Final thesis examination 80
G5.3 Recommendations Following the Submission of Minor Amendments: 81
G5.4 Recommendations Following the Submission of Referred Work: 81
Section H: Regulations for the Award of PhD by Prospective Publication 83
H1. The Award....83
H1.2 PhD by Prospective Publication....83
H2. Thesis length....83
H3. Period of enrolment....84
H4. Admission criteria....84
H5. Final thesis examination....84
H5.1 Final thesis examination 84
H5.2 Recommendations Following Examination: 85
H5.3 Recommendations Following the Submission of Minor Amendments: 85
H5.4 Recommendations Following the Submission of Referred Work: 86
Section I: Regulations for the Award of Higher Doctorates....87
I1. Awards available 87
I1.2 Criteria....87
I2. Regulations for candidature....87
I3. Application for candidature 87
I4. Form of submission 88
I5. Examination....89
I5.2 Outcome....89
I6. retention of work submitted....90
I7. Appeal of Outcome....90
Appendix A....91
Guidelines for alternative format research degree theses using practice as research: School of Arts and Humanities....91
Contents 91
Subject specialism: Creative Writing 96
Subject specialism: History 97
Subject specialism: Drama, Theatre, and Performance 98
Subject specialism: Music Performance....99
Subject specialism: Music Composition 102
Subject specialism: Art and Design, Fashion and Textiles, Architecture and the Built Environment 103

Subject specialism: Art and Design, Fashion and Textiles 105
Subject specialism: Architecture and the Built Environment 107
Appendix B 109
Guidance for journal format PhD thesis within the School of Human and Health Sciences 109
Appendix C 114
Guidelines for alternative format research degree theses using practice as research: School of Computing and Engineering 114
Subject specialism: Music Technology and Games Design 114
Document Sign-off, Ownership Details and Revision History 117
Section A: General Regulations Governing All Research Degrees 118
Section A: General Regulations Governing All Research Degrees 119
- Amendment and clarification provided within A1.10 Alternative formats of thesis submission, specifically in relation to requests made by PGRs with a disability 120

Section A: General Regulations Governing All Research Degrees

To be read in conjunction with the individual programme regulations.

A1. Available awards

A1.1 The University awards the following degrees to candidates who have successfully completed approved programmes of supervised research:

- Master of Arts by Research (MA (Res)).
- Master of Science by Research (MSc (Res)).
- Master in Research (MRes).
- Master of Enterprise (MEnt).
- Master of Philosophy (MPhil).
- Professional Doctorates (DAppCrim, DAppLing, DBA, DCouns, DM, DN, DOT, DPA, DPhys, DPod, DSW, EdD).
- Doctor of Enterprise (EntD).
- Doctor of Philosophy (PhD).
- PhD by Publication.

A1.2 Higher Doctorates

A1.2.1 The University awards the following Higher Doctorates:

- Doctor of Laws (LLD).
- Doctor of Letters (DLitt).
- Doctor of Music (DMus).
- Doctor of Science (DSc).

A1.2.2 Candidates are required to state the Higher Doctorate for which they wish their work to be considered.

A1.3 Named awards

A1.3.1 All research awards may be offered as named awards with the approval of the University Research Committee and the Senate. Named awards will be assessed and conferred in line with standard regulations, which are outlined in sections B-F of the Regulations for Research Degree Awards.

A1.3.2 Where a candidate has not met the requirements to be awarded their intended degree, they may be recommended for a lesser award for which the credit they have achieved is eligible. If a registered student achieves some credit, but not enough for an exit award, they will be issued a record of achievement in the form of a transcript only.

A1.4 Aegrotat/Posthumous awards

A1.4.1 All of the University's research degrees may be awarded posthumously or as an aegrotat award where, exceptionally, the Dean of the Doctoral College or Pro Vice-Chancellor is satisfied that for illness or other valid cause, a student would have qualified for the award. In such cases, the University Research Committee will consider evidence showing that the candidate was likely to have been successful, had the viva examination taken place.

A1.4.2 Evidence comprising any written material that is available (for example, draft chapters; published work; work prepared for publication; presentations to conferences / seminars; progress reports by the candidate) will normally be supplied by the candidate's supervisor.

A1.4.3 The supervisor will submit an accompanying report for consideration by the University Research Committee. The supervisor's report should have the support of the School Director of Graduate Education and the Dean of the Doctoral College. The following criteria should be satisfied:

- Enough of the research project must have been completed to allow a proper assessment to be made of the scope of the thesis.
- The research work completed must be of a standard normally required for the award of the degree and must demonstrate the candidate's grasp of the subject.
- The written material available must demonstrate the candidate's ability to write a thesis of the required standard.

A1.5 Conferment

A.1.5.1 Conferment is the formal ratification by the University of the recommendations made by the approved examiners. All awards (apart from Higher Doctorates, which will be conferred by the Higher Doctoral Board) will be ratified by either the Dean of the Doctoral College or the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research, Innovation & Knowledge Exchange).

A1.6 Certificate of Award

A1.6.1 The certificate of an award conferred by the University shall record:

- The name of the University together with, if appropriate, the name of any other institution sharing responsibility for the student's course of study or programme of research.
- The student's name, as provided by them through the University Applicant and Student Record System (ASIS), at the time of conferment.
- The award.
- The title of the course (if any) as approved for the purpose of the certificate.
- The certificate shall bear the signatures of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar andSecretary.

A1.7 Programme scope

A1.7.1 Programmes of research may be proposed in any field of study. All proposals must have the potential to lead to a programme of scholarly research that meets the learning outcomes for the programme the candidate is following.

A1.7.2 All proposed research programmes will be considered on their academic merits and without reference to the concerns or interests of any associated supervising or funding body.

A1.8 Taught modules within research degrees

A1.8.1 Research degrees will not normally include a taught element which extends over more than one third of the standard period of enrolment.

A1.8.2 Confirmation of the satisfactory completion of any compulsory taught element is a requirement for progression to the research phase of that programme.

A1.9 Training and development

A1.9.1 Training and development will be offered in line with the University's commitment to the Researcher Development Concordat.

A1.9.2 Candidates must work in partnership with their supervisors to identify any training needs they may require and regularly complete and update a personalised skills audit. Training can comprise of internal training or external training, where deemed necessary.

A1.9.3 Training must include research integrity training and may include training in research methods, academic integrity, research ethics, academic writing and academic English for non-native speakers.

A1.9.4 The University provides a range of training courses through the Researcher Development Programme which can be access through a searchable database (currently the PGR Data Management System).

A1.9.5 For candidates studying a distance learning research degree, alternative ways for candidates to acquire the necessary research skills will be provided, for example through the use of online training resources.

A1.10 Alternative formats of thesis submission

A1.10.1 Alternative formats of thesis submission must conform to the same academic standards expected of a standard format thesis. Alternatives may be offered where published guidelines exist, or if exceptional grounds for new guidelines to be made, these will be approved through Graduate Board.

A1.10.2 An alternative format of thesis submission may also be required to provide a reasonable adjustment for a PGR with a disability to provide consistent and equitable opportunity of assessment. If this is the ground for your request, before approved by the Doctoral College you must provide independent evidence from a registered disability

professional which supports the necessity for a different format to be considered. Candidates must submit these requests to registryresearch@hud.ac.uk in addition to the guidance detailed in A1.10.7.

A1.10.3 Published school/subject specific guidelines must detail the regulations for alternative thesis format acceptance, presentation, submission and examination of work. Please consult your School Director of Graduate Education for more information on alternative formats.

A1.10.4 Where the alternative format includes a practical component the balance between written and practical components may vary across subject specialisms. Please refer to the approved guidance for the word count conventions for your subject specialism or thesis format.

A1.10.5 Alternative formats may include (but are not limited to):

- Awards where the thesis presented for examination is in a non-standard or an alternative format, for example the submission includes practice or performance elements, a website, composition or software.

A1.10.6 Alternative format theses are already accepted in the following subject specialism and / or Schools:

Specialism / format	**School**	**Degree**
Creative writing (see page 70)	Arts and Humanities	PhD and MA by Research
History (see page 70)	Arts and Humanities	PhD and MA by Research
Drama, theatre and performance (see page 72)	Arts and Humanities	PhD and MA by Research
Music performance (see page 73)	Arts and Humanities	PhD and MA by Research
Music composition (see page 76)	Arts and Humanities	PhD and MA by Research
Art and design (see page 77)	Arts and Humanities	PhD
Fashion and textiles (see page 77)	Arts and Humanities	PhD
Architecture and the built environment (see page 77)	Arts and Humanities	PhD
Art and design (see page 79)	Arts and Humanities	MA / MSc by Research
Fashion and textiles (see page 79)	Arts and Humanities	MA / MSc by Research
Architecture and the built environment (see page 81)	Arts and Humanities	MA / MSc by Research
By journal format (see page 83)	Human and Health Sciences	PhD
Music Technology and Games Design (see page 114)	Computing and Engineering	PhD

A1.10.7 Candidates whose work may be suitable for an alternative format should discuss this with their supervisor early in their research. This would normally form part of their research support plan submission and be formalised at progression monitoring 1. An exception to this may be a thesis submission by journal format or due to a recent disability diagnosis which would significantly affect the format in which a thesis could be completed.

A1.10.8 In considering whether to submit via an alternative format, candidates and their supervisor should consider:

- Will the intellectual quality of the thesis be enhanced?
- Whether appropriate examiners can be appointed.
- Is the format appropriate to the thesis and subject discipline?
- Will the format allow the PGR to demonstrate their ability to meet the award criteria?

A1.10.9 Work will be examined according to the same criteria as a conventional thesis, including the volume and quality of original research: the thesis should make an original contribution to knowledge; it must locate the research in context; establish the contribution; and should include extensive critical discussion with conclusions, indicating directions for future work.

A1.10.10 Candidates shall be examined by one internal examiner who has undergone University training for the role and depending on the subject specialism, may be examined by more than one external examiner. Final decisions on the number of external examiners required rests with the School Director of Graduate Education.

A1.10.11 A copy of the appropriate guidelines should be made available to examiners of all theses submitted in an alternative format and familiarity with the format should be discussed when examiners are initially invited to examine.

A1.10.12 All approved guidelines are available as an appendix to these regulations

A1.11 Collaborating establishments

A1.11.1 The University encourages co-operation with industrial, commercial, professional or research establishments for the purposes of research leading to research degree awards.

A1.11.2 Formal collaboration normally involves the candidate's use of facilities and other resources, including supervision, which are provided jointly by the University of Huddersfield and an external body. For the purpose of the research degree regulations, these are referred to as Collaborating Establishments.

A1.11.3 Co-operation may be formalised with one or more external bodies.

A1.11.4 Delivery of programmes involving a Collaborating Establishment, whether ad hoc or through an ongoing partnership, must go through the appropriate approval process and will be assessed and conferred in line with standard regulations.

A1.11.5 Where a research degree project is part of a funded research project, the Senate, or the University Research Committee acting on its behalf, will establish to its satisfaction that the terms on which the research is funded do not detract from the fulfilment of the objectives and requirements of the candidate's research degree.

A2. Admissions and enrolment

A2.1 Admission to a research degree programme

A2.1.1 In order to be eligible for admission to a research degree programme, an applicant must be:

- Suitably qualified in terms of their ability and experience to undertake research in the proposed field.
- Embarking on a viable research programme.
- Able to demonstrate at least a minimum level of attainment in English language equivalent to IELTS 6.0 overall with no element lower than 5.5.
- Candidates may also be required to complete a formal English language assessment and training in advance of, or as an outcome of, progression monitoring.

A2.1.2 Applications from candidates holding qualifications other than those specified in the rules for award will be considered on their merits and in relation to the nature and scope of the programme of work proposed.

A2.1.3 Such candidates must include in the application the names of two suitable persons who can be consulted regarding the candidate's academic attainment and fitness for research.

A2.1.4 In accepting a candidate, the University will ensure that supervision is adequate and likely to be sustained, and that the research environment is suitable.

A2.1.5 For candidates undertaking a research degree by distance learning, the University must be satisfied that supervision, necessary resources and training can be delivered remotely and the candidate will have access to the necessary minimum computer system requirements.

A2.1.6 The Registrar andSecretary may permit a candidate to enrol for another course of study concurrent with the research degree if, in their opinion, the dual enrolment will not detract from the research. Requests should be initially made to your supervisor. Requests will not be approved before the thesis has been submitted. It is unlikely that requests will be approved before examination results are known.

A2.2 Recognition of prior research

A2.2.1 Where a candidate has previously undertaken research as a candidate for a research degree, they may be allowed to transfer and complete the research at the University of Huddersfield on the condition that the candidate has not previously been failed and exited with a lower award. If there has been a break in study between leaving one institution and the application to the University of Huddersfield, there should not normally be a break in study of more than two years.

A2.2.2 Where a candidate has previously undertaken research at the University of Huddersfield, they may be able to enrol to complete this research on the condition that the candidate has not previously been failed and exited with a lower award.

A2.2.3 Candidates will normally enrol at the same stage they were at in their previous institution.

A2.2.4 If a candidate is transferring from or has completed work at another institution, this must have the agreement of both institutions involved.

A2.2.5 In considering an application for the recognition of prior research for a candidate who has completed work at another institution, the Director of Graduate Education (or nominee) will normally require:

- A letter of agreement from the previous institution for the transfer of any data or completed research and confirmation of release from the previous institution.
- A statement of rationale from the candidate detailing why they wish to transfer from another institution.
- A copy of the original approved research project.
- The title of the research project and the names and contact details of supervisors at the previous institution.
- A report from the applicant of how the research has progressed and a projected timeline for completion of the project (3,000-6,000 words).
- The date of original enrolment and anticipated date of completion.
- The most recent progress report from the previous institution, which should confirm that the applicant has been progressing in accordance with the standard timescales for completion.
- In the case of international candidates, confirmation from the International Office that the candidate meets Home Office visa requirements.
- A short written statement from the proposed new supervisor/s confirming their willingness to supervise the project in its current form and their estimate of the remaining time needed for successful completion.
- The names of two referees, preferably the previous supervisors; or referees who are active researchers who know the candidate's work.
- A letter or statement of recommendation from the previous institution, confirming that the research undertaken is of sufficient quality to be taken on at doctoral level, written by a party with appropriate research expertise.

A2.2.6 The admissions process will include an interview that will take the form of a progression monitoring examination. The admissions decision will be based on the candidate's performance in the interview assessment and on the information in the application documentation. More information for applicants can be found on our website.

A2.3 Change of degree programme within the University

A2.3.1 Candidates seeking a change of research degree programme must apply to the Director of Graduate Education in their School for approval.

A2.3.2 Changes are only available where a route is specified in the regulations for the programme the candidate is changing from.

A2.4 Mode of study

A2.4.1 Candidates may enrol on a full-time or part-time basis.

A2.4.2 Full-time candidates are expected to devote on average 35 hours per week to their research and must not be in full-time employment.

A2.4.3 Part-time candidates should spend on average 17.5 hours per week.

A2.4.4 Where candidates change from full-time to part-time study, or vice versa, their enrolment period is calculated on a pro rata basis.

A2.5 Candidates enrolled on a campus-based research degree

A2.5.1 Candidates are expected to be based at the University of Huddersfield for the completion of their research degree, except as provided for under the arrangements agreed with collaborating establishments or they are studying on an approved distance learning research degree.

A2.5.2 Candidates are expected to attend campus frequently and this may include:

- Attendance at enrolment and induction sessions.
- Attending supervision meetings.
- Completing progression monitoring assessments or viva voice examination.
- Attending identified training and development opportunities.
- Use of the University's on campus resources, for example the library, computer suites, laboratories and equipment.

A2.5.3 Although there is flexibility that some of the above aspects could be delivered remotely, this cannot be guaranteed and candidates who would prefer to access a substantial amount of the programme remotely would be expected to enrol on an approved distance learning research degree.

A2.6 Research study by distance learning

A2.6.1 Candidates enrolled on a specified distance learning research degree can study on either a part-time or full-time basis and study will take place remotely and off-campus.

A2.6.2 Candidates studying by distance will not be excluded from attending University to meet with supervisors, attend events, training and development opportunities, viva examination for progression or end assessment points and / or access University resources and facilities, but there will be no compulsory on-campus element of their programme.

A3. Supervision

A3.1 Criteria for the appointment of research degree supervisors

A3.1.1 The supervisor role is central to the quality of education for research students. All supervisors appointed at the University of Huddersfield are expected to meet the following criteria.

A3.2 The team:

- The supervisory team comprises up to three members and will in almost all circumstances have at least two members.
- All supervision should be provided by staff who have research expertise related to the student's proposed research degree.
- In appointing supervisors, Schools need to be aware of the overall workload of the individual, including teaching, research, administration and any other professional commitments.
- At least one member of the supervisory team must have supervised a completion at the level of research degree for which the candidate is registered. This can either be the main supervisor or a co-supervisor.
- No more than one supervisor in the team will be new to supervision.

A3.3 The Main Supervisor:

- Will hold a qualification at least equivalent in level to the award being supervised, unless this requirement is covered by the co-supervisor.
- Will be publishing high-quality, internationally recognised research outputs to ensure that the direction and monitoring of the candidate's progress is informed by up-to-date subject knowledge and research developments.
- Must be a permanent full or part-time employee of the University, or an employee of the University who is on a fixed term contract of duration in excess of the standard registration period for the research degree in question.
- Will have completed the requisite new (or refresher) University of Huddersfield supervisor training.
- Will undertake supervisor training before commencing any new supervision duties and will need to refresh this training every three years.
- If the main supervisor retires or becomes an honorary member of staff during the period of a student's Doctoral degree, they can continue to undertake a supervisory role as co-supervisor, but a new main supervisor must be appointed.

A3.3.2 The following may not act as main supervisor but may be appointed as a member of the supervisory team:

- Non-permanent members of staff.
- Visiting professors, visiting fellows.
- Retired members of University staff.

A3.4 The Co-supervisor/s:

- Will hold a qualification at least equivalent in level to the award being supervised, , unless this requirement is covered by the main supervisor.
- Will have completed the requisite new (or refresher) UOH supervisor training.
- Will undertake supervisor training before commencing any new supervision duties and will need to refresh this training every three years.

A3.5 External supervisors and external advisors:

- Are not members of University of Huddersfield staff, nor employed at a Collaborating Establishment.
- May be proposed to contribute some specialised knowledge or to provide a link with an external organisation.
- The only difference is external supervisors are paid, and external advisors are unpaid. The expectations for both roles remain the same.

A3.6 Change of supervision arrangements

A3.6.1 Should a change in a PGR's supervisors be required, an Application to Change Supervisory Arrangements should be completed and submitted to the Director of Graduate Education for their consideration. Further information about changes to supervision arrangements can be found in the PGR Handbook.

A3.6.2 For international students, any change must be notified to the International Office.

A3.7 Requirements of the supervisors

A3.7.1 The supervisors shall have responsibility to supervise the candidate on a regular and frequent basis.

A3.7.2 The minimum requirement is that main supervisors will meet the candidates they are supervising at least once a month (once every two months for part-time students). In practice they may meet with candidates more frequently. This time should include at least an hour of one-to-one supervision with each candidate.

A3.7.3 Supervisors will remain in regular contact with candidates throughout any writing-up period, after an outcome of referral to re-write the submission or referral to complete amendments to re-submit for the award of MPhil. Candidates may have a reasonable expectation that their supervisors will be available to meet them and to review drafts of their work at least once every two months. Frequency of contact for other examination outcomes is subject to agreement between the candidate and the supervisor. It is the candidate's responsibility to send the work to their supervisor in good time, so they have time to read the work and make comments ahead of any submission date.

A3.7.4 At least four months prior to submission, students registered for the awards of Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Enterprise, Professional Doctorates and Master of Philosophy, will have an 'on track to submit' meeting with their supervisory team. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that the student is well prepared and on track to submit their thesis by the submission date. The supervisors will confirm arrangements for the appointment of examiners and may discuss potential examiners with the student. The meeting will also make final preparations for the viva voce examination. For students

registered for the award of Master of Arts by Research, Master of Science by Research, Master in Research and Master of Enterprise the meeting should take place at least one month prior to submission and exclude the requirement to make final preparations for the viva voce examination.

A3.7.5 The supervisory team as a whole must meet with the candidate at least four times a year (full-time) or twice a year (part-time).

A3.7.6 Supervision meetings must be recorded using the University online supervision system.

A3.7.7 Supervisors are expected to be available to attend viva examinations at progression monitoring and end assessment points for all candidates they are supervising.

A4. Examinations and assessments

A4.1 Candidate responsibilities

A4.1.1 It is the responsibility of the candidate to attend examinations and submit work for assessment by the submission date. The submission of work for assessment is at the sole discretion and responsibility of the candidate.

A4.1.2 **Fit to Submit:** By submitting any element of an assessment which is not subject to Fit to Sit, a candidate is declaring they are fit to submit the assessment. If the candidate had an extension request claim approved prior to submitting the work or tries to submit a claim after the work was submitted, the extension request may not be accepted. If a candidate submits the work and then appeals the outcome based on personal circumstances, it is unlikely that the appeal will be approved on those grounds.

A4.1.3 Candidates must ensure that the format of work submitted for assessment is in accordance with the relevant University guidelines.

A4.1.4 It is the candidate's responsibility to make sure that all work that will contribute to the final assessment is backed up. Candidates are strongly advised to use the electronic storage system provided by the University to keep copies of all their work.

A4.1.5 When you submit your work for assessment or you attend your progression viva or final viva examination, you declare that you are well enough to do so. In other words, you are telling us you are 'fit to sit' it. This means we are unlikely to approve any claim for extenuating circumstances which you make later.

A4.1.6 It is the candidate's responsibility to make sure that they are aware of any additional assessment requirements which may be stated in their Programme Specification Document (PSD), as detailed in E5a.

A4.2 Options at the end of the programme

A4.2.1 No later than three months before the end of the programme, candidates may:

- Apply for additional time to complete the research before going into the writing-up period; OR
- Apply to enrol for the writing-up period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis.

A4.2.2 Candidates enrolled on the programmes detailed below may apply for additional time at the end of the active research period and/or a writing-up period:

- Masters by Research (MA / MSc (Res) / MEnt).
- Master in Research (MRes).
- Professional Doctorate.
- Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) / Doctor of Enterprise (EntD).

A4.2.3 Candidates submitting for the following awards may not apply for additional time or for a writing-up period:

- PhD (4Year FT) (Projects only)
- PhD by Publication
- PhD by Prospective Publication

A4.2.4 Candidates studying on a student visa who wish to apply for extra time must take into consideration the period in which they apply, as if granted, their student visa may expire before the award can be completed.

A4.3 Application for additional time before writing-up

A4.3.1 Candidates may apply for additional time at the end of the active research period. The purpose of the application process is to make sure that the candidate is on track to complete their research and to determine how much additional time the candidate will need.

A4.3.2 The supporting documentation must include a plan for completing the research, as well as a summary of the work completed.

A4.3.3 Candidates are required to submit any application that they wish to make no later than three months prior to the end of the active research period for the award on which they are registered.

A4.3.4 It should be noted that, following the approval of additional time, a candidate will become liable to pay full fees (calculated pro-rata according to the length of additional time agreed).

A4.3.5 Candidates should continue with regular supervision during this period and will have full access to University facilities.

A4.3.6 Following receipt of the full application, the supervisor will review the submission and submit the application to the Director of Graduate Education.

A4.3.7 At the end of the additional time, candidates may either:

- Apply for more time, up to the maximum allowed; or
- Apply to enrol for writing-up to complete the writing of their degree; or
- Submit their work for examination.

A4.3.8 The maximum additional time for University of Huddersfield research degree awards is as follows:

Intended Award	Maximum Additional Time
Masters by Research (MA / MSc (Res) / MEnt)	4 months (full-time and part-time)
Master in Research (MRes)	4 months (full-time and part-time)
MPhil	4 months (full-time and part-time)
Professional Doctorate	12 months (full-time and part-time)
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) / Doctor of Enterprise (EntD)	12 months (full-time and part-time)

A4.4 Application to enrol for the writing-up period

A4.4.1 The purpose of the application process is to determine the eligibility of a candidate to enrol for the writing-up period.

A4.4.2 Candidates can only apply to enrol for the writing-up period if they are at the end of their final year of study.

A4.4.3 Candidates are required to submit any application that they wish to make no later than three months prior to the end of the active research period for the award on which they are registered.

A4.4.4 An application to enrol for the writing-up period must be supported by:

- A brief written report outlining progress to date, including progress made with writing-up.
- Explicit confirmation that all primary research/laboratory work has been completed.
- A detailed plan for submission within the maximum period permitted.

A4.4.5 Following receipt of the full application, the supervisory team will review it and submit it to the Director of Graduate Education for approval.

A4.4.6 The Director of Graduate Education will confirm whether the candidate has demonstrated satisfactory progress to be enrolled for the writing-up period. The Director of Graduate Education may recommend:

- That the candidate be allowed to enrol for the writing-up period.
- That the candidate is not allowed to enrol for writing-up but may have the option to apply for additional time.

A4.4.7 During the writing-up period, candidates can expect minimal supervision, usually meeting once every two months.

A4.4.8 Students will not be allowed access to laboratories / specialist equipment during the writing-up period.

A4.4.9 The fee is set at a lower rate for this period to reflect the reduced access to facilities and academic support.

A4.4.10 The maximum writing-up for University of Huddersfield research degree awards is as follows:

Intended Award	Maximum Writing-up Period
Masters by Research (MA / MSc (Res) / MEnt)	4 months (full-time and part-time)
Master in Research (MRes)	4 months (full-time and part-time)
MPhil	4 months (full-time and part-time)
Professional Doctorate	12 months (full-time and part-time)
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) / Doctor of Enterprise (EntD)	12 months (full-time and part-time)

A4.5 Thesis length

A4.5.1 These word counts prescribe the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In many instances, supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length. Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

Intended Award	Word count
MEnt	25,000
MA / MSc by Research*	25,000
MPhil	40,000
Professional Doctorate Thesis **MRes (exit route)**	50,000 15,000
PhD*	80,000
PhD by Publication / PhD by Prospective Publication	Publications plus commentary of 15,000 (NB: this is a minimum length)
*** If the work includes practical components and is an alternative format thesis**	Please refer to School-based guidance (found in the Appendices) for word count conventions

A4.5.2 Confirmation of what is included and excluded from the word count of the thesis can be found in the PGR Handbook.

A4.5.3 If a candidate wishes to submit a thesis which exceeds the maximum word count and the supervisor supports this, then permission should be sought from the School's Director of Graduate Education. If there is disagreement within the School, the request should be referred to the Dean of the Doctoral College. The Dean's decision will be final. These requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

A4.5.4 Where a research degree candidate exceeds the maximum word count without prior permission, examiners may require the thesis to be revised to the appropriate length as a resubmission prior to examination taking place. Following resubmission of the edited thesis in these circumstances, the work will be examined as a referred submission (i.e. a second submission) and the outcomes available will be those allowed following a referral.

A4.6 Language of submission

A4.6.1 All assessment and submission must be in English. The Registrar and Secretary's Office must approve any deviation from this in advance of the submission.

A4.7 The submission

A4.7.1 Candidates are required to submit work for examination in accordance with the criteria specified in the PGR Handbook – Preparing and submitting your thesis. The thesis should not be submitted directly to the examiners.

A4.7.2 The candidate must confirm, through the submission of a declaration form, that the work has not already been submitted for a comparable academic award. However, the candidate is not precluded from incorporating a submission covering wider fieldwork that has already been submitted for a degree or comparable award, if it is indicated on the declaration form and in the thesis.

A4.7.3 Candidates are required to make a statement at the start of their submission declaring any publications that have arisen from the thesis, whether they have been published or are pending consideration for publication.

A4.7.4 Where a candidate's research programme is part of a collaborative group project or is based on work done jointly with others, the work submitted must indicate clearly the candidate's individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration.

A4.7.5 The copyright of the work is vested in the candidate, except for the abstract, for which copyright rests with the University.

A4.7.6 At the University's discretion, following the award of the degree, the thesis will be lodged in the University repository or, where necessary, in the library of both the University and any Collaborating Establishment.

A4.7.7 Where a candidate or the Collaborating Establishment wishes the thesis and any accompanying documents and / or material to remain confidential for a period after the degree has been awarded, this must normally be requested when the candidate submits the work for examination.

A4.7.8 Where the Senate, or the University Research Committee acting on its behalf, has agreed that the confidential nature of the candidate's work precludes it from being made freely available in the library, it shall be held on restricted access for an approved period, and only be available to those who were directly involved in the project until then.

A4.8 Arrangements for the examination of the final thesis

A4.8.1 The arrangements for the candidate's examination, including the proposed examiners, must be approved by the School's Director of Graduate Education and the University Research Committee (or nominee) before the examination takes place.

A4.8.2 Candidates must take no part in the arrangement of their examination and have no contact with the examiners in connection with their research between the appointment of the examiners and the viva examination.

A4.8.3 In the period between the first examination and any resubmission, the examiners must maintain independence from the work before it is resubmitted. For this reason, examiners must not take on a supervisory role during this period.

A4.8.4 Where a candidate requests clarification of required amendments, they should consult the supervisor. Where clarification is desired from the examiners, a request must be submitted to The Registrar and Secretary's Office, who may contact the examiners on behalf of the candidate.

A4.8.5 One member of the candidate's supervisory team may attend the viva examination, but this is not a requirement. Any attending supervisor must withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination.

A4.8.6 Viva examinations for progression monitoring and end assessment points are normally held at the University or by video link. However, in special cases approval may be given for the examination to take place elsewhere in the UK or abroad.

A4.8.7 In cases where a viva examination is required, but for reasons of sickness, disability or comparable valid cause the University Research Committee is satisfied that a candidate would be under serious disadvantage if required to undergo a viva examination, an alternative form of examination may be approved. Such approval shall not be given where the candidate's knowledge of the language in which the work is presented is inadequate.

A4.8.8 In any instance where the University Research Committee is made aware of a failure to comply with all the procedures of the examination process, it may declare the examination null and void and appoint new examiners.

A4.9 The examination team

A4.9.1 The examination team will be appointed in line with the published Criteria for the Selection and Appointment of Research Degree Examiners, established by the University Research Committee which are outlined below.

A4.9.2 Examination team composition

The following are absolute requirements of the examination team:

- As a minimum, two appropriately qualified examiners are appointed, at least one of whom is internal and one external to the University.
- In cases where the research student is also a member of staff, at least two external examiners should be appointed, in addition to one internal.
- Additional external examiners may also be appointed, for example, where the thesis is highly interdisciplinary or where the team as a whole would benefit from additional experience or expertise.
- Where more than two examiners are appointed, the majority must be external to the University.
- None of the candidate's supervisors may be appointed as an examiner.
- Examiners should normally have relevant qualifications at least equivalent to that being examined.
- Examiners should understand the procedures which operate within the University of Huddersfield and have a clear sense of the expectations and standards associated with a successful Huddersfield award.
- The examining team must be able to reach an independent and authoritative judgement about the candidate's work, free from bias and conflict of interest.

A4.9.3 Standing, expertise and experience

All examiners should:

- Have expertise in the area of research to be examined.
- Be experienced in research.
- Have published in a relevant area.
- Normally be able to demonstrate appropriate prior experience in the examination procedure, at least equivalent in level to the award being examined.
- Understand the regulations and procedures that operate within the University of Huddersfield, and have a clear sense of the expectations and standards associated with a successful research award.
- Where one of the examiners is new to the process, the other examiner(s) should have sufficient experience to ensure academic rigour: the examination team as a whole must be able to demonstrate appropriate prior experience in the examination procedure and will have examined at least three research degrees equivalent in level to the award being examined.
- Hold a research degree at least equivalent to the level of the award being examined or have at least national standing in the subject area.

Internal examiners only must have attended University training for the role and will need to refresh this training every three years.

Emeritus Professors and other non-contracted staff may not act as the internal examiner for a research degree candidate.

A4.9.4 External Examiner Criteria and Term of Office

For the regulations on the criteria and frequency of the external examiner appointment process, please see section Q in the Quality Assurances Procedures for Research Awards.

A4.9.5 Close involvement

No-one in the following circumstances or categories should be appointed as an examiner:

- Anyone who has been a member of the student's supervisory team or been directly involved in the research of the candidate.
- The supervisor's former supervisees who have graduated in the last 5 years.
- Anyone who has, within the last 5 years, provided doctoral supervision to the candidate's supervisor.
- Anyone with a close professional, contractual, financial or personal relationship with the supervisor or candidate involved with the course. The term "personal" is taken to mean social and/or family connection.

In addition, no one in the following circumstances or categories should be appointed as an internal examiner:

- The current PGR Tutor/Pastoral Mentor for the candidate where they have provided substantial personal or academic support, and the extent of the involvement could result in a conflict of interest. If the internal examiner requires any further clarity, please seek advice from either the Dean of the Doctoral College or The Registrar and Secretary's Office.
- Anyone that has had direct involvement in the candidate's research. For example, where collaborative data collection has been undertaken or where papers have been co-authored between the candidate and the proposed internal examiner that directly link to the research area.
- Where the supervisor and the internal examiner have been the principal investigator and co-investigator for a research bid/s as partners, which resulted in this candidate gaining a studentship.

If there is no suitable discipline specific internal examiner available, the position will still need to be filled. Normally, the position holder will meet the following requirements;

- Be experienced in research.
- Hold a relevant qualification at least equivalent to that being examined.
- Understand the procedures which operate within the University of Huddersfield and have a clear sense of the expectations and standards associated with a successful Huddersfield award.
- Be able to demonstrate appropriate prior experience in the examination procedure by having examined at least six previous examinations at least equivalent to that being examined.
- Has attended University training for the role.

Internal examiners who assessed the work of a candidate at progression stage may also act as the internal examiner for the final examination. In the case of staff candidates, the external assessor for progression monitoring may also act as the external examiner for the final examination.

A4.9.6 Exceptions

In cases where the appointment would be an exception to the above criteria, the Director of Graduate Education may appoint an independent chair or seek to ensure that other examiners on the team compensate for standing, expertise and experience. All exceptions must be agreed by the Registrar and Secretary or nominee.

A4.9.7 Appointment of an independent chair

The Director of Graduate Education may appoint an independent chair under the following circumstances:

- Where the internal examiner will be undertaking their first appointment as a research degree examiner.
- Where neither the external nor internal examiner holds a senior academic position.
- Where the collective number of UKPGR examinations examined by the examination team falls below 3.
- Where a second viva is required on a resubmission following referral.
- Where exceptional or non-standard examination arrangements are agreed, including alternative format thesis submission and the award of PhD by Publication.
- Where a candidate is being examined for a lower award following an unsuccessful progression monitoring event.
- Any other circumstance which the Director of Graduate Education considers it necessary.

A4.9.8 Loss of an examiner / failure of an examiner to respond

It is expected that a team of examiners will normally oversee the whole examination process from initial submission to conferment of the award. However, if an examiner is no longer available at any stage during the examination process, or the examiner fails to comply with the examination process (including unacceptable delays in the submission of reports), a change to the examination team may be necessary. This will depend on the stage the candidate has reached in the process.

- If the thesis has been submitted but the viva has not taken place, a new examiner will be appointed
- In the case of a resubmission with editorial or minor amendments, the previous examiner might agree to continue with the examination process, despite their change in circumstances. Where this is not possible, the external examiner will be asked to undertake amendment checking. If neither examiner is available, a new internal examiner will be appointed.
- In the case of a resubmission with major amendments, a full re-write or submission for a lower award, a new internal examiner must be appointed.

A4.9.9 Termination of an examiner's appointment

An examiner's appointment may only be terminated prematurely in exceptional circumstances.

Any decision to terminate an appointment prematurely must be referred by the School's Director of Graduate Education to the Dean of the Doctoral College and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research, Innovation and Knowledge Transfer) in writing, giving reasons for the request. The grounds for premature termination may include the following:

- Failure to participate in the examination without due reason.
- Failure to submit a report without due reason.
- Failure to comply with the procedures of the examination process or the University's regulations and policies more generally.

Upon approval from the Director of Graduate Education and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research, Innovation and Knowledge Transfer) to terminate the appointment, the School should follow the Guidance on how to proceed when a change of examiner is required.

A4.10 The examination

A4.10.1 Candidates will be examined in accordance with the regulations in force at the time when they submit their final thesis or amended submission for examination (except in cases where this would disadvantage the candidate).

A4.10.2 Each examiner shall read and examine the work submitted and present an independent preliminary report on it before any viva examination is held.

A4.10.3 In completing the preliminary report, each examiner must consider whether the work provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree and make an academic assessment of the quality of the work.

A4.10.4 Following any viva examination, the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, present a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree.

A4.10.5 For awards where a viva examination is not required, the internal examiner will liaise with the external examiner(s) to produce a joint final report (following the submission of the initial independent reports).

A4.10.6 In all cases where a candidate is referred to complete further work or amendments, the examiners must indicate to the candidate in writing any deficiencies of the work and/or what amendments and corrections are required.

A4.10.7 Where the Senate, or the University Research Committee acting on its behalf, decides, on the recommendation of the examiners, that the degree should not be awarded and no re-examination should be permitted, the examiners must prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the work and the reason for their decision, which will be provided to the candidate.

A4.10.8 Where a candidate fails their examination and is not awarded the degree for which they were initially registered, they are not be permitted to re-enrol for the same degree to undertake the same topic of research.

A4.11 Disagreement between research degree examiners

A4.11.1 Where the examiners are unable to agree on a recommendation, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted. In this case, the Dean of the Doctoral College on behalf of the University Research Committee may:

- Accept a majority recommendation; or
- Accept the recommendation of the external examiner; or
- Require the appointment of an additional external examiner, whose appointment must be proposed in the normal way.

A4.11.2 Following consideration by an additional external examiner, if deemed necessary,

a further viva examination may be required

A5. Revocation of a research degree

A5.1 Revocation of degree

A5.1.1 Awards made by the University are conferred in good faith. However, in limited circumstances, an award may be revoked. They are normally under the following conditions:

- There is satisfactory evidence to prove an administrative error contributed to the decision to award.
- After conferment of the award, information becomes available which would influence the original decision made by the examiners.
- It is found that the candidate provided false information through the admissions process which, if known, would have resulted in them not being admitted onto the degree.
- A University Research Misconduct Panel issues a decision upholding evidence of research misconduct following an allegation(s).

A5.1.2 Recommendations for revocation will be referred to the Vice Chancellor or a nominee from the Senate membership for approval. If an award has been revoked, the reasons for the decision will be clearly outlined to the student. As part of the process, the student will have the right to appeal the decision. The decision will be made by a nominee of Senate and will be final. Please refer to **section 1.13** of the Regulations for Research Students for the full procedure.

A5.1.3 The University will require the student to return the degree certificate and reserves the right to notify relevant publishers if the research data or thesis content has been used in published work.

A6. Emergency regulations for approved programmes of supervised research

A6.1 Introduction and principles

A6.1.1 The University of Huddersfield, through the oversight of Senate, is committed to upholding the highest academic standards in all circumstances. However, during a period of major disruption like a pandemic or industrial action, it is recognised that it may be necessary to vary the normal protocols on an exceptional basis.

A6.1.2 In all cases, the objective is to ensure students are not disadvantaged by circumstances beyond their control or that of the University, whilst ensuring quality assurance and consistency in progression and awards decisions.

A6.1.3 Examiners are expected to operate in adherence to these underlying principles:

- Wherever possible normal assessment regulations, deadlines and timescales should be followed.

- Adjustments to assessment protocols will be carefully considered; they will enable the University to uphold rigorous academic standards whilst taking into account any serious, unforeseen or unavoidable circumstances having a wide impact across a cohort, course, School or at University level.
- Wherever possible, students should be able to graduate, or progress from one stage of their degree programme to the next.
- Where there is no doubt about a student's level of attainment (sufficient evidence exists for sound academic judgment to be made about the student's overall level of attainment), the normal regulations should be applied, and results determined accordingly. Where adjustments are considered essential, the regulations will be applied consistently and fairly to all students affected.
- The emergency regulations will only be introduced where it is likely that not to do so would cause protracted delay and severe disadvantage.

A6.1.4 These regulations will only come into force following consultation with students through their elected representatives. The decision to implement will be recommended by Graduate Board then approved by URC and Senate (by virtual meeting or by Chair's action as necessary) and will be lifted under the same authority. Schools will be informed as soon as the emergency regulations are invoked. If changes are required, research students will be consulted on all proposed changes to dates, times and examiners.

A6.1.5 For non-standard cases Schools are requested to consult with The Registrar and Secretary's Office in advance of the Course Assessment Meeting, this applies to Professional Doctorates only.

A6.2 Implementation

A6.2.1 The University requires project approval and annual progression for research students. If this is affected by an emergency scenario, students will normally be permitted to continue on the programme and to register for the next academic year.

A6.2.2 Schools will exceptionally be permitted to approve progression extensions in excess of the usual four weeks (for full-time candidates) and eight weeks (for part-time candidates).

A6.2.3 Decisions around end extensions and interruptions which are usually approved by The Registrar and Secretary's Office, but may exceptionally be delegated to Schools.

A6.2.4 Flexibility around exam arrangements will be exercised in the event of an emergency. Every effort will be made to avoid postponement of oral examinations; online progression monitoring or final vivas will be offered wherever possible.

A6.2.5 When a viva examination is to be conducted via video streaming an independent chair will not normally be appointed.

A6.2.6 It may be necessary to appoint new examiners to ensure a timely response and to prevent unreasonable delay to research progress..

A6.2.7 In some cases if the original examination team are not available after the examination has taken place but before the outcome report has been produced, it may be

necessary to appoint a new examination team. In such cases, the previous examination would be declared null and void.

A6.2.8 In some cases, after examination, if only the external examination report is available then it may be necessary to accept the recommendation of the External Examiner. In the case of major amendments or resubmissions, if only the internal examination report is available then the examination would be declared null and void and a new examination will need to take place with a newly appointed External Examiner.

A6.3 Complaints and appeals

A6.3.1 The University's accelerated procedure in the event of a major disruption will be followed.

A6.3.2 For all other complaints unrelated to the disruption, the standard regulations and procedures will apply.

A6.4 Post-emergency recovery actions

A6.4.1 Where a research student has been permitted to continue without project approval or progression monitoring, the School Director of Graduate Education will ensure that these steps are completed as quickly as possible. This may include the appointment of examiners or the re-scheduling of a viva.

Section B: Regulations for the Degree of Masters by Research (Including MA, MSc & MEnt)

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degrees of Masters by Research (excluding the MRes). They should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees.

This section does not apply where a candidate is asked to write-up for a Master's award as the outcome of a formal assessment.

B1. Learning outcomes

B1.1.1 Masters by Research degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

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

B1.1.2 Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

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

B1.2 The MA by Research and MSc by Research

B1.2.1 The MA by Research or MSc by Research is awarded to a candidate who, having successfully completed an approved programme of training and research that combines advanced study, research methodology and a substantial research project, or series of

research projects in a chosen field, has presented work to the satisfaction of the examiners.

B1.3 The MEnt

B1.3.1 The MEnt is awarded to a candidate who has demonstrated business innovation and/or development. They will have successfully completed an approved programme of enterprise research that combines advanced study, research methodology and a substantial research project, or series of research projects in a chosen field, underpinning a new business, or social enterprise, or an innovation within an existing business and have presented work to the satisfaction of the examiners.

B1.4 Alternative formats of thesis submission

B1.4.1 This model of submission is only available to Master's candidates where published guidelines exist, that have been approved by the School Dean and the Dean of the Doctoral College and subsequently approved by the University Research Committee and the Senate through approval of the regulations.

B1.4.2 All approved guidelines are available in the Appendices.

B1.4.3 Further details regarding the requirements for alternative formats of thesis submission can be found in Section A1.10.

B2. Thesis length

B.2.1 The text of the thesis should not normally exceed 25,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

B.2.2 This is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In some instances supervisors may recommend a shorter length. Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

B3. Admission criteria

B3.1 In addition to the general criteria specified in section A of the regulations, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is an upper second class honours degree from a UK university or a qualification of an equivalent standard, in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed.

B4. Period of enrolment

B4.1 The standard and maximum periods of enrolment for the Master's by Research are as follows. This does not include any periods of approved interruption that the candidate had been granted

Mode of Study	Standard Length	Maximum Length
Full-time	12 months	20 months
Part-time	24 months	32 months

B4.2 The standard period of enrolment reflects the amount of time that a candidate will ordinarily spend researching and writing their thesis.

B4.3 No later than three months before the end of the programme, candidates must:

- Apply for additional time to complete the research of 4 months; OR
- Apply to enrol for the writing-up period of 4 months, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis.

B4.4 Where a candidate fails to secure approval to enrol for the writing-up period or additional time, the candidate must submit work for examination by their course end date. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate's registration on the grounds of non-submission.

B4.5 The maximum period of enrolment is the total amount of time a candidate is permitted to have before they submit their thesis for examination. This includes the time spent in active research (standard period of enrolment), any writing-up period and an additional 4 months that could either consist of a period of additional time or an end extension owing to extenuating circumstances.

B4.6 In very exceptional extenuating circumstances, we may permit a candidate to exceed this maximum period of enrolment. This will be an evidence-based decision, determined on a case-by-case basis.

B4.7 At least one month before thesis submission, an 'on track to submit' meeting must take place between the student and the supervisory team.

B4.8 A candidate who is registered on a Doctoral degree (excluding Professional Doctorates) may choose to transfer to the Master's award. The timeline for the transferred programme must be calculated as outlined in section B4.9

B4.9 The Masters by Research is a one year full-time programme or two year programme part-time. Normally a full-time candidate who chooses to transfer will be allowed one year, minus the time that has already elapsed on their Doctorate to complete the award when they transfer. Normally a part-time candidate who chooses to transfer will be allowed two years, minus the time that has already elapsed on their Doctorate to complete the award when they transfer. The time elapsed does not include any periods of approved interruptions that the candidate had been granted. Any requests for transfer after these times have elapsed will not be approved. Candidates may also apply for additional time and/or writing-up period.

B5. Programme timeline and milestones

Full-time		**Part-time**	
Month 1	Registration and Induction	Month 1	Registration and Induction
Every month (minimum)	Supervision meeting: complete online log	Every second month (minimum)	Supervision meeting: complete online log
Month 2	Research Support Plan complete	Month 4	Research Support Plan complete
Month 9	Submit Application for Writing-up Period OR Apply for additional time	Month 21	Submit Application for Writing-up Period OR Apply for additional time
Month 12	Submit thesis OR Enter writing-up OR Complete active research during additional time	Month 24	Submit thesis OR Enter writing-up OR Complete active research during additional time
On Track to Submit meeting: at least 1 month before thesis submission an 'on track to submit' meeting must take place between the student and the supervisory team			
Examination Phase: see Thesis Examination below			

B5.1 Research support plan and skills audit

B5.1.1 The research support plan and skills audit is a formal requirement of the programme. It must be reviewed and signed off by the candidate's supervisory team and ratified by an academic external to the supervisory team. Approval of the plan should ensure the project is appropriate and viable.

B5.1.2 The Research Support Plan Submission deadline is:

- Two months after enrolment for full-time candidates.
- Four months after enrolment for part-time candidates.

B5.1.3 The candidate and the supervisor must document the proposed research support plan. This plan must set out the programme of related studies necessary for the attainment of competence in research methods and of knowledge related to the subject of the work.

B5.1.4 The plan should include consideration of research ethics and integrity, Health and Safety and resources or facilities that are required in relation to the research project.

B5.1.5 The plan should include a completed skills audit where the candidate has assessed their individual training requirements. This should become a working document that reflects the candidate's skill level.

B5.1.6 The plan should include confirmation that Research Integrity training has taken place.

B5.1.7 The plan may include registration for a maximum of 30 credits of Master's level modules.

B5.1.8 Failure to complete the research support plan satisfactorily by the required deadline may lead to the termination of a candidate's registration.

B5.2 Transfer from Masters by Research to PhD

B5.2.1 Candidates who enrolled initially for an MEnt, MA or MSc by Research and who wish to transfer to PhD must apply to transfer when they have made sufficient progress on the work to provide evidence of the development to PhD. For candidates enrolled on the MEnt, transfer to the EntD may also be available.

B5.2.2 In support of the application, the candidate shall prepare a full progress report on the work undertaken. The progress report should typically:

- Be 3,000 to 6,000 words in length.
- Include a brief review and discussion of the work already undertaken.
- Include a statement of the intended further work, including details of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.

B5.2.3 The transfer assessment will consider the candidate for entry onto the PhD at the start of year two (for full-time candidates) or the start of year three (for part-time candidates).

B5.2.4 The transfer viva is pass/fail and no opportunity for amendments is allowed.

B5.3 Transfer to or from a distance learning route

B5.3.1 Candidates who enrolled initially for an MA or MSc by Research, and were based on campus, may be able to transfer to a distance learning route.

B5.3.2 Candidates who enrolled initially for an MA or MSc by Research and were studying by distance learning, may be able to transfer to a campus based research degree.

B5.4 Final thesis examination

B5.4.1 The examination usually consists of the assessment of the written thesis alone. The requirement for a viva examination of the work is at the discretion of the examiners.

B5.5 Recommendations following examination:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Referral to complete major amendments**. The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within four months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a viva examination.

- **Referral to re-write the submission.** The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

B5.6 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred until the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.** Where a candidate who has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

B5.7 Recommendations following the submission of referred work:

B5.7.1 No further opportunity will be permitted for referral to complete major amendments or for referral to re-write the submission.

B5.7.2 Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred until the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission, addressing all amendments, must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred until the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.

Section C: Regulations for the Degree of Master of Philosophy

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degree of Master of Philosophy. They should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees.

This section does not apply where a candidate is asked to write-up for MPhil as the outcome of a final assessment.

C1. Learning outcomes

C1.1.1 Master's degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

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

C1.1.2 Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

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

C1.2 Master of Philosophy

C1.2.1 The MPhil is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

C2. Thesis length

C2.1 The text of the thesis should not normally exceed 40,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

C2.2 This word count is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In many instances supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length.

C2.3 Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

C3. Period of enrolment

C3.1 A candidate who is registered on a Doctoral degree may choose to transfer to the MPhil award. The timeline for the transferred programme must be calculated as outlined in section C3.2.

C3.2 The MPhil is a two-year full-time programme or four-year programme part-time. Normally a full-time candidate who chooses to transfer will be allowed two years, minus the time that has already elapsed on their Doctorate to complete the award when they transfer. Normally a part-time candidate who chooses to transfer will be allowed four years, minus the time that has already elapsed on their Doctorate to complete the award when they transfer. The time elapsed does not include any periods of approved interruptions that the candidate had been granted. Any requests for transfer after these times have elapsed will not be approved. Candidates may also apply for additional time and/or writing-up period.

C3.3 The allowance of a period of additional time and/or writing-up period does not apply where a candidate is asked to write-up for MPhil as the outcome of a formal assessment. The assessment outcome will specify the amount of time the candidate has available to complete and submit their MPhil work.

C3.4 No later than three months before the end of their programme, candidates may:

- Apply for additional time to complete the research; OR
- Apply to enrol for a writing-up period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis.

C3.5 Where a candidate fails to secure approval to enrol for the writing-up period or additional time, the candidate must submit work for examination by their course end date. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate's registration on the grounds of non-submission.

C3.6 At least four months before thesis submission an 'on track to submit' meeting must take place between the student and the supervisory team.

C4. Final thesis examination

C4.1 The examination for MPhil has two stages:

- The submission and preliminary assessment of the written thesis.
- Defence of the work by viva examination.

C4.2 Recommendations following examination:

C4.2.1 These do not apply where the MPhil is being examined as the outcome of a Doctoral examination.

C4.2.2 Following examination, including a viva, the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Referral to complete major amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within four months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Referral to re-write the submission.** The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months. On receipt of the resubmitted work the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

C4.3 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

C4.3.1 Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

C4.4 Recommendations following the submission of referred work:

- C4.4.1 No further opportunity will be permitted for referral to complete major amendments or for referral to re-write the submission.

C4.4.2 Following the examination of referred work (including a viva where required), the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission, addressing all amendments, must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

C4.4.3 Upon their initial assessment of the referred work, if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding the outcome.

Section D: Regulations for the Award of Professional Doctorate, Incorporating the Master in Research (MRes) Award

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award of the degree of Professional Doctorate and Master in Research.

A Professional Doctorate candidate will be governed by the University's taught regulations during the completion of the taught phase, until their module marks have been ratified by a Course Assessment Board. The following regulations will then be applicable during the research phase.

As such, these regulations should be read simultaneously with both the Regulations for Taught Students and the Regulations for Postgraduate Research Students.

A full list of Professional Doctorate awards can be found in Section A1. Available awards

D1. Learning outcomes

D1.1.1 Professional Doctorates are rooted in an academic discipline as well as in a profession. Doctoral degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

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

D1.1.2 Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

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

D1.2 The Professional Doctorate award

D1.2.1 A Professional Doctorate is awarded to a candidate who has:

- Successfully completed an approved taught programme of study.

- Critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic, resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge in a relevant professional discipline.
- Demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field.
- Presented and defended work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

D2. Thesis length

D2.1 The text of the thesis for these awards should not normally exceed 50,000 words (excluding references and appendices). Confirmation of what is included and excluded from the word count of the thesis can be found in the PGR Handbook.

D2.2 This word count is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In many instances supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length.

D2.3 Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

D2.4 In cases where a Professional Doctorate candidate requires an increase in the word limit owing to the nature of their research, they may use their second Progression Monitoring assessment to make a request for up to an additional 20,000 words. Details of the procedure that needs to be followed can be found in the PGR Handbook.

D3. Admission criteria

D3.1 In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

- A Master's degree from a UK university (or equivalent), normally with a classification of merit or distinction, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed; and
- A recognised professional qualification or equivalent for the title award (not applicable for the DBA / DPA); and
- A minimum of three years' postgraduate professional experience directly relevant to the named professional Doctorate degree for which enrolment is sought; OR for the DBA/DPA a minimum of three years' senior management experience relevant to the named professional Doctorate degree for which enrolment is sought.

D4. Period of Enrolment

D4.1 The standard, minimum and maximum periods of enrolment, including the taught element, are as follows. This does not include any periods of approved interruption that the candidate had been granted:

Mode of Study	Minimum Length	Standard Length	Maximum Length
Full-time	24 months	36 months	60 months
Part-time	48 months	72 months	96 months

D4.2 A Professional Doctorate candidate cannot submit their thesis for examination until the minimum period of enrolment specified above has been reached.

D4.3 The standard period of enrolment reflects the amount of time that a candidate will ordinarily spend in the taught phase and the research phase.

D4.4 No later than three months before the end of the active research period, candidates may:

- Apply for additional time to complete the research; or
- Apply to enrol for the writing-up period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis.

D4.5 Where a candidate fails to secure approval to enrol for the writing-up period or additional time, the candidate must submit work for examination no later than the end of the standard period for the award. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate's registration on the grounds of non-submission.

D4.6 The maximum period of enrolment is the total amount of time a candidate is permitted to have before they submit their thesis for examination. This includes the time spent in the taught and active research phases (standard period of enrolment), any writing-up period and an additional 12 months that could either consist of a period of additional time or an end extension owing to extenuating circumstances.

D4.7 In very exceptional extenuating circumstances, we may permit a candidate to exceed this maximum period of enrolment. This will be an evidence-based decision, determined on a case-by-case basis.

D5. Programme timeline and milestones

D5.1.1 The programme handbook for specific Professional Doctorates outlines the modules that candidates will follow during the taught-phase of their programme. The taught phase will typically cover the first year of the programme (or two years for part time), though this may vary between programmes.

D5.1.2 Candidates may only progress to the research phase when they have successfully completed the taught element.

D5.1.3 At the end of the taught phase, candidates may:

- Progress to the Doctoral research phase of the programme; or
- Request to transfer from the DBA to DPA, or vice versa and progress to the Doctoral research phase of the programme; or
- Progress to complete a shorter research project and submit for the Master of Research (MRes) award; or
- Withdraw from the doctoral programme and accept the exit award appropriate to the completed taught element (PGDip / PGCert), where available.

D5.1.4 The relevant programme handbook will detail specific progression requirements for candidates from the taught element to the research element. The timeline for the research phase of Professional Doctorate degrees is also outlined in the programme handbook.

D5.1.5 During the research phase of all Professional Doctorates, candidates will be required to successfully complete at least one progression monitoring assessment. Specific programme handbooks may stipulate additional compulsory progression assessments, and where they do, candidates must successfully complete these to be allowed to progress.

D5.1.6 In addition to progression monitoring assessments, the following deadlines apply:

Part-time	
By the end of month 69	Apply for writing-up period or Apply for additional time.
By the end of month 72	Submit thesis or Enter writing-up or Continue active research during additional time.
At least 4 months before thesis submission an 'on track to submit' meeting must take place between the student and the supervisory team	

D5.1.7 Part-time candidates will have a minimum of one formal supervision meeting every two months and must complete an online supervision log (currently thePGR Data Management System).

Full-time	
By the end of month 33	Apply for writing-up period or Apply for additional time.
By the end of month 36	Submit thesis or Enter writing-up or Continue active research during additional time.
At least 4 months before thesis submission an 'on track to submit' meeting must take place between the student and the supervisory team	

D5.1.8 Full-time candidates will have a minimum of one monthly formal supervision meeting and must complete and online supervision log (currently the PGR Data Management System).

D5.1.9 Candidates registered for a Professional Doctorate may register for a maximum of 60 credits of Master's level modules during the research-phase of their degree.

D5.2 Change of programme

D5.2.1 If a Professional Doctorate candidate is unable to complete the approved programme of work they may, apply for the enrolment to be changed to that for the degree of MPhil.

D5.2.2 Candidates enrolled on a Professional Doctorate are not permitted to transfer enrolment to submit for PhD.

D5.3 Transferring out of the University

D5.3.1 If you decide to transfer out of the University, you will normally be entitled to any credit you have passed as part of your taught phase before you transfer. Where your total credit achieved meets the requirements for the exit award of PGCert/ PGDip, you will be awarded this at the next available Course Assessment Board. You may be able to use this credit as part of your transfer to another institution's Professional Doctorate if they operate a Recognition of Prior Learning policy. Please note that this is not always possible and you should check with the specific institution upon your application.

D5.4 Progression monitoring

D5.4.1 Candidates will have a minimum of one progression monitoring assessment during the research phase of their programme. Individual Professional Doctorates may specify additional compulsory progression points. Candidates should refer to the relevant programme handbook.

D5.4.2 Progression is a formal process to monitor and assess the progress the candidate is making on the research project and their skills training. Candidates will be required to submit a report and review and update the skills audit. One referral is permitted at each progression assessment. The progression assessment will determine the suitability of the candidate to remain registered on a research award. Failure to complete progression monitoring satisfactorily will lead to the termination of the candidate's registration. Where a candidate's studies are terminated following a progression assessment, they are not be permitted to re-enrol for the same degree to undertake the same topic of research.

D5.4.3 Candidates may also be required to complete formal English language assessment and training in advance of, or as an outcome of, progression monitoring.

D5.4.4 Normally at least one member of the supervisory team will be present at the viva examination, but supervisors must withdraw prior to the deliberations of the progression monitoring panel on the outcome.

D5.4.5 Candidates who fail to submit progress reports on the required schedule will be administratively withdrawn, subject to consideration of any extenuating circumstances.

D5.5 Assessment of progression

D5.5.1 Progression assessments must be sufficiently rigorous to adequately test the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the research project, of progress made to date and future plans for the remainder of the programme.

D5.5.2 Satisfactory completion of progression monitoring is demonstrated by:

- A progress report completed by the candidate and submitted for assessment by a progression monitoring panel.
- Completion of training and development identified in the skills audit.
- Satisfactory engagement with the research support plan.
- Consideration of any security sensitive research.
- Confirmation of ethical approval.
- The defence of the progress report by viva examination in front of the progression monitoring panel.
- Confirmation by the progression monitoring panel that the candidate is able to proceed to the subsequent year of study.

D5.6 The progression panel

D5.6.1 The panel will comprise two members that have not had previous close association with the student's research project.

D5.6.2 Where the candidate is a member of staff, the progress report (at both initial consideration and following any amendments) must also be submitted for assessment to an external examiner, who satisfies the published criteria for appointment. The same external examiner may be used for the final thesis examination.

D5.6.3 The external examiner will complete a preliminary written report for consideration by the progression monitoring panel. If deemed necessary by the School or the external examiner, the external examiner may join the progression monitoring viva examination via video link or in person.

D5.6.4 Following progression, the candidate will be provided with written feedback and if necessary guidance on actions to be taken to support the progress of their candidature.

D5.7 The progression report

D5.7.1 Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual format of progression reports in their subject area, but the progress report should typically be equivalent to 3,000 to 6,000 words in length. As a minimum the report should include:

- A review and discussion of the work already undertaken.
- Defines the aims and objectives of the research project.
- Progress made since the last report; if progression has previously taken place.
- Any particular problems encountered by the candidate (e.g., access to resources / facilities or issues relating to language or disability support requirements).
- A brief statement of the intended further work, including an indication of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.
- The report should include confirmation that Research Integrity training has taken place (first progression only).

D5.8 Available outcomes following initial assessment (progression stage)

D5.8.1 Following the completion of the progression monitoring exercise, including a viva examination, the outcomes available are as follows:

- That the candidate be permitted to progress.
- That the candidate be required to make amendments and resubmit the progress report no later than six weeks (12 weeks for part-time candidates) from the date of notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination
- That the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring only) or MPhil (following second progression monitoring only).
- That the candidate is not permitted to proceed.

D5.9 Available outcomes following amendments (progression stage)

D5.9.1 Where a candidate has been required to complete amendments, the outcomes available following the completion of the examination, including a viva examination where required, are as follows:

- That the candidate be permitted to progress.
- That the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring) or MPhil (following second progression monitoring only).
- That the candidate is not permitted to proceed.

D.5.9.2 Upon their initial assessment of the referred work, if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed or downgraded, then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding and formalising the outcome.
.

D5.9.3 Candidates who do not receive permission to proceed or transfer will be deemed to have failed and their registration will be withdrawn. Any exit award for which the candidate is eligible, based on credits previously achieved as part of the taught element, will be conferred at this point.

D5.10 Final thesis examination

D5.10.1 The examination for Professional Doctorate has two stages:

- The submission and preliminary assessment of the written thesis.
- Defence of the work by viva examination.

D5.10.2 The examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright without holding a viva examination.

D5.10.3 On referral, the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners. However, following receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail without holding a second viva examination.

D5.11 Recommendations following examination:
5.11.1 Following examination, including a viva examination, the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. If the internal examiner is not satisfied that all corrections have been made, the examiner reserves the right to award an MPhil.

- **Referral to complete major amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Referral to re-write the submission.** The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within one year from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Referral to complete major amendments and re-submit for the award of MPhil.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.

D5.12 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections**. The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

D5.12.1 Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made. If the recommendation is to downgrade or fail at this stage, then a second viva should be invoked if this has not already taken place.

D5.13 Recommendations following the submission of referred work:

D5.13.1 No further opportunity will be permitted for referral to complete major amendments or referral to re-write the submission or referral to complete major amendments to the submission and to re-submit for the award of MPhil.

D5.13.2 Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the

examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Referral to complete minor amendments to the submission and to re-submit for the award of MPhil.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. This outcome is not available if there has been a previous referral to resubmit for MPhil. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.
  Any exit award for which the candidate is eligible, based on credits previously achieved as part of the taught element, will be conferred at this point.

D5.13.3 Upon their initial assessment of the referred work, if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed or downgraded to an MPhil, then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding the outcome.

D6. MRes Regulations

D6.1.1 The MRes is only available as an exit route from a Professional Doctorate degree.

D6.1.2 The MRes may be awarded to a candidate who, having successfully completed the compulsory taught element of a Professional Doctorate degree, has additionally presented a thesis to the satisfaction of the examiners.

D6.1.3 The requirement for a viva examination of the thesis is at the discretion of the examiners.

D6.1.4 The text of the thesis should not normally exceed 15,000 words (excluding ancillary data).

D6.2 Learning outcomes (MRes)

D6.2.1 Master's degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- A systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice.
- A comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship.

- Originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline.
- Conceptual understanding that enables the student to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline and to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.

D6.2.2 Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

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

D6.3 Period of enrolment (MRes)

D6.3.1 The maximum programme length following the successful completion of the compulsory taught element, are as follows. This does not include any periods of approved interruption that the candidate had been granted:

Mode of Study	Standard Enrolment
Full-time	8 months
Part-time	16 months

D6.3.2 No later than three months before the end of the active research period, candidates may:

- Apply for additional time to complete the research; or
- Apply to enrol for the writing-up period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis.

D6.4 Final Examination (MRes)

D6.4.1 The examination for the MRes usually consists of the assessment of the written thesis alone.

D6.4.2 The requirement for a viva examination of the work is at the discretion of the examiners.

D6.5 Recommendations following examination (MRes):

- **Award** (without amendments).
- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the

outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Referral to complete major amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within four months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Referral to re-write the submission.** The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months. On receipt of the resubmitted work the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

D6.6 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments (MRes):

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

D6.6.1 Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

D6.7 Recommendations following the submission of referred work (MRes):

D6.7.1 No further opportunity will be permitted for referral to complete major amendments or for referral to re-write the submission.

D6.7.2 Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission, addressing all amendments, must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.

D6.7.3 Any exit award for which the candidate is eligible, based on credits previously achieved as part of the taught element, will be conferred at this point.

Section E: Regulations for The Awards of PhD and EntD (Excluding PhD by Publication and PhD by Prospective Publication)

The following regulations govern the specific rules for the award of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Enterprise. They should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees.

These regulations are separate to the Regulations for the Award of PhD (4yr FT) (Projects only), and also do not apply to the PhD by Publication or the PhD by Prospective Publication.

E1. Learning outcomes

E1.1.1 Doctoral degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

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

E1.1.2 Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

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

E1.2 The PhD award

E1.2.1 The PhD is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended the work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

E1.3 The EntD award

E1.3.1 The EntD is awarded to a candidate who has demonstrated business innovation and/or development. They will have critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic, resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge associated with the development of a new business, or social enterprise, or an innovation within an existing business, and have presented and defended work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

E2. Thesis length

E2.1.1 The text of the thesis for these awards should not normally exceed 80,000 words (excluding references and appendices). Confirmation of what is included and excluded from the word count of the thesis can be found in the PGR Handbook.

E2.1.2 This word count is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In some instances supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length.

E2.1.3 Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

E2.1.4 In cases where a doctoral candidate requires an increase in the word limit owing to the nature of their research, they may use their second Progression Monitoring assessment to make a request for up to an additional 20,000 words. Details of the procedure that needs to be followed can be found in the PGR Handbook.

E2.2 Alternative formats of thesis submission

E2.2.1 Further details regarding the requirements for alternative formats of thesis submission can be found in Section A1.10.

E2.2.3 All existing approved guidelines are available in the Appendices.

E3. Admission criteria

E3.1 PhD award

E3.1.1 In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

- A Master's degree from a UK University or equivalent, normally with a classification of merit or distinction, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed, OR
- An upper second class honours degree from a UK university in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed, OR
- Appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level, which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment.

E3.2 EntD award

E3.2.1 In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

- Master's degree from a UK university or equivalent, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed; OR
- An upper second class honours degree from a UK university in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed; OR
- Appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level, which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment; OR
- Appropriate knowledge and experience of business planning and business start-up, and/or experience of starting up a new service requiring substantial project and financial planning.

E4. Period of enrolment

E4.1 The standard, minimum and maximum periods of enrolment are as follows. This does not include any periods of approved interruption that the candidate had been granted:

Mode of Study	Minimum Length	Standard Length	Maximum Length
Full-time	24 months	36 months	60 months
Part-time	48 months	72 months	96 months

E4.2 A PhD/ EntD candidate cannot submit their thesis for examination until the minimum programme length specified above has been reached.

E4.3 The standard period of enrolment reflects the amount of time that a candidate will ordinarily spend in the active research period.

E4.4 No later than three months before the end of the active research period, candidates may:

- Apply for additional time to complete the research; OR
- Apply to enrol for the writing-up period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis.

E4.5 Where a candidate fails to secure approval to enrol for the writing-up period or additional time, the candidate must submit work for examination no later than the end of the active research period for the award. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate’s registration on the grounds of non-submission.

E4.6 The maximum period of enrolment is the total amount of time a candidate is permitted to have before they submit their thesis for examination. This includes the time spent in active research (standard period of enrolment), any writing-up period and an additional 12 months that could either consist of a period of additional time or an end extension owing to extenuating circumstances.

E4.7 In very exceptional extenuating circumstances, we may permit a candidate to exceed this maximum period of enrolment. This will be an evidence-based decision, determined on a case-by-case basis.

E5. Programme timeline and milestones

E5a. Where approved, some awards may have additional compulsory assessment requirements which aren't referred to in the timeline below. Please refer to the specific Programme Specification Document (PSD) for information on these.

Full-time	**Milestone**		**Part-time**	**Milestone**
Month 1	Registration and Induction		Month 1	Registration and Induction
Every month (minimum)	Supervision meeting: complete online log		Every second month (minimum)	Supervision meeting: complete online log
Month 3	Research Support Plan complete		Month 6	Research Support Plan complete
By end of month 9	Submit progression report 1		By end of month 18	Submit progression report 1
By end of month 12	Complete progression viva and any corrections		By end of month 24	Complete progression viva and any corrections
By end of month 21	Submit progression report 2		By end of month 42	Submit progression report 2
By end month 24	Complete progression viva and any corrections		By end of month 48	Complete progression viva and any corrections
By end of month 33	Apply for Writing-up Period OR Apply for additional time		By end of month 69	Apply for Writing-up Period OR Apply for additional time
By end of month 36	Submit thesis OR Enter writing-up OR Continue active research during additional time		By end of month 72	Submit thesis OR Enter writing-up OR Continue active research during additional time
A least 4 months before thesis submission an 'on track to submit' meeting must take place between the student and the supervisory team.				
Examination Phase: see Thesis Examination below.				

E5.1 Change of programme

E5.1.1 Candidates who are enrolled for a PhD or EntD are not permitted to transfer enrolment to submit for a Professional Doctorate.

E5.1.2 Candidates who are enrolled for a Professional Doctorate are not permitted to transfer enrolment to submit for a PhD or EntD.

E5.2 Transfer from PhD or EntD to Master's

E5.2.1 A candidate who enrolled initially for the PhD or EntD, who is unable to complete the approved programme of work, may choose to transfer before the end of the first year (full time) or before the end of the second year (part-time) of their PhD or EntD to the MA, MEnt or MSc by Research. The timeline for the transferred programme must be calculated as outlined in section E5.2.2

E5.2.2 The MA/MSc by Research is a one-year full-time or two-year part-time programme. Normally a full-time candidate who chooses to transfer will be allowed one year, minus the time that has already elapsed on their Doctorate to complete the award when they transfer. Normally a part-time candidate who chooses to transfer will be allowed two years, minus the time that has already elapsed on their Doctorate to complete the award when they transfer. The time elapsed does not include any periods of approved interruptions that the candidate had been granted. Any requests for transfer after these times have elapsed will not be approved.

E5.2.3 Candidates may also apply for additional time and/or writing-up period.

E5.2.4 The Registrar and Secretary may, in exceptional circumstances, permit transfers after the end of the first year (full time) or after the end of the second year (part-time). Requests for exceptional transfers must be made in writing and with the full support of both the Doctoral College and appropriate Director of Graduate Education.

E5.3 Transfer from PhD to MPhil

E5.3.1 A candidate who enrolled initially for the PhD or EntD, and who is unable to complete the approved programme of work, may apply for the enrolment to be changed to that for the degree of MPhil before the end of the second year (full time) or before the end of the fourth year (part-time). The timeline for the transferred programme must be calculated as outlined in section E5.3.2

E5.3.2 The MPhil programme is a two year full-time or four year part-time programme. Normally a full-time candidate who chooses to transfer will be allowed two years, minus the time that has already elapsed on their Doctorate to complete the award when they transfer. Normally a part-time candidate who chooses to transfer will be allowed four years, minus the time that has already elapsed on their Doctorate to complete the award when they transfer. The time elapsed does not include any periods of approved interruptions that the candidate had been granted. Any requests for transfer after these times have elapsed will not be approved.

E5.3.3 Candidates may also apply for additional time and/or writing-up period.

E5.4 Transfer to or from a distance learning route

E5.4.1 Candidates who enrolled initially for PhD, and were based on campus, may be able to transfer to a distance learning route.

E5.4.2 Candidates who enrolled initially for a PhD and were studying by distance learning, may be able to transfer to a campus based research degree.

E5.5 Research support plan and skills audit

E5.5.1 The research support plan and skills audit is a formal requirement of the programme. It must be reviewed and signed off by the candidate's supervisory team and ratified by an academic who is external to the supervisory team. Approval of the plan should ensure the project is appropriate and viable.

E5.5.2 The submission deadlines for the Research Support Plan and Skills Audit are:

- Full-Time Students – submission by the end of month three.
- Part-Time Students – submission by the end of month six.

E5.5.3 The candidate and the supervisor must document the proposed research support plan. This plan must set out the programme of related studies necessary for the attainment of competence in research methods and of knowledge related to the subject of the work.

E5.5.4 The plan should include consideration of research ethics and integrity, Health and Safety and resources or facilities that are required in relation to the research project.

E5.5.5 The plan should include a completed skills audit where the candidate has assessed their individual training requirements. This should become a working document that reflects the candidate's skill level. Doctoral candidates must also include and update the skills audit as part of progression monitoring.

E5.5.6 Failure to complete the research support plan satisfactorily by the required deadline may lead to the termination of the candidate's registration.

E5.5.7 The plan may include registration for a maximum of 60 credits of Master's level modules.

E5.6 Progression monitoring

E5.6.1 Doctoral research students will undertake two progression monitoring assessments during their candidature. Progression is a formal process to monitor and assess the progress the candidate is making on the research project and their skills training. Candidates will be required to submit a report and review and update the skills audit. One referral is permitted at each progression assessment. The progression assessment will determine the suitability of the candidate to remain registered on a research award. Failure to complete progression monitoring satisfactorily will lead to the termination of the candidate's registration. Where a candidate's studies are terminated following a progression assessment, they are not be permitted to re-enrol for the same degree to undertake the same topic of research.

E5.6.2 Candidates may also be required to complete formal English language assessment and training in advance of, or as an outcome of, progression monitoring.

E5.5.3 The following deadlines apply to the Progression Monitoring Assessment:

		Full-time	**Part-time**
Progression Monitoring 1	Submission of report and Skills Audit	By end of month 9	By end of month 18
	Full examination, including viva and any amendments to be completed	By end of month 12	By end of month 24
Progression Monitoring 2	Submission of report and Skills Audit	By end of month 18	By end of month 42
	Full examination, including viva and any amendments to be completed	By end of month 24	By end of month 48

E5.6.4 It is normal, but not required, for at least one member of the supervisory team to be present at the viva examination. However, supervisor/s must withdraw prior to the deliberations of the progression monitoring panel on the outcome.

E5.6.5 Candidates who fail to submit progress reports on the required schedule will be administratively withdrawn for non-submission, subject to consideration of any extenuating circumstances.

E5.7 Assessment of progression

E5.7.1 Progression assessments must be sufficiently rigorous to adequately test the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the research project, of progress made to date and future plans for the remainder of the programme.

E5.7.2 Satisfactory completion of progression monitoring is demonstrated by:

- A progress report completed by the candidate and submitted for assessment by a progression monitoring panel.
- Completion of training and development identified in the skills audit.
- Satisfactory engagement with the research support plan.
- Consideration of any security sensitive research.
- Consideration of ethical approval at progression monitoring one.
- Confirmation that ethical approval has been obtained by progression monitoring two.
- The defence of the progress report by viva examination in front of the progression monitoring panel.

- Confirmation by the progression monitoring panel that the candidate is able to proceed to the subsequent year of study.

E5.8 The progression panel

E5.8.1 The panel will comprise two members that have not had previous close association with the student's research project.

E5.8.2 Where the candidate is a member of staff, the progress report (at both initial consideration and following any amendments) must also be submitted for assessment to an external examiner, who satisfies the published criteria for appointment. The same external examiner may be used for the final thesis examination.

E5.8.3 The external examiner will complete a preliminary written report for consideration by the progression monitoring panel. If deemed necessary by the School or the external examiner, the external examiner may join the progression monitoring viva examination via video link or in person.

E5.8.4 Following progression, the candidate will be provided with written feedback and if necessary guidance on actions to be taken to support the progress of their candidature.

E5.9 The progression report

E5.9.1 Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual format of progression reports in their subject area, but the progress report should typically be equivalent to 3,000 to 6,000 words in length. As a minimum the report should include:

- A review and discussion of the work already undertaken.
- Defines the aims and objectives of the research project.
- Progress made since the last report, for second progression only.
- Any particular problems encountered by the candidate (e.g., access to resources/ facilities or issues relating to language or disability support requirements).
- A brief statement of the intended further work, including an indication of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.
- The report should include confirmation that Research Integrity training has taken place (first progression only).

E5.10 Available outcomes following initial assessment (progression stage)

E5.10.1 Following the completion of the progression monitoring exercise, including a viva examination, the outcomes available are as follows:

- That the candidate be permitted to progress.
- That the candidate be required to make amendments and resubmit the progress report no later than six weeks (12 weeks for part-time candidates) from the date of notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination
- That the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring only) or MPhil

(following second progression monitoring only). In this case, the candidate will be allowed six months in total to complete the work.
- That the candidate not be permitted to proceed.

E5.11 Available outcomes following amendments (progression stage)

E5.11.1 Where a candidate has been required to complete amendments, the outcomes available following the completion of the examination, including a viva examination where required, are as follows:

- That the candidate be permitted to progress.
- That the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring only) or MPhil (following second progression monitoring only). In this case, the candidate will be allowed six months in total to complete the work.
- That the candidate not be permitted to proceed.

E5.11.2 Upon their initial assessment of the referred work, if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed or downgraded, then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding and formalising the outcome.

E5.11.3 Candidates who do not receive permission to proceed or transfer will be deemed to have failed and their registration will be terminated. Where a candidate's studies are terminated following a progression assessment, they are not be permitted to re-enrol for the same degree to undertake the same topic of research.

E5.12 Final thesis examination

E5.12.1 The examination for PhD / EntD has two stages:

- The submission and preliminary assessment of the written thesis.
- Defence of the work by viva examination.

E5.12.2 The examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright without holding a viva examination.

E5.12.3 On referral, the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners. However, the examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail without holding a second viva examination.

E5.13 Recommendations following examination

E5.13.1 Following examination, including a viva examination, the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. If the internal examiner is not satisfied that all corrections have been made the examiner reserves the right to award an MPhil.

- **Referral to complete major amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Referral to re-write the submission.** The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within one year from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Referral to complete major amendments and re-submit for the award of MPhil.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.

E5.14 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments

E5.14.1 Once a candidate has submitted minor amendments, the following may be recommended:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the

internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.

E5.14.2 Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made. If the recommendation is to downgrade or fail at this stage then a second viva should be invoked if this has not taken place already.

E5.15 Recommendations following the submission of referred work:

E5.15.1 No further opportunity will be permitted for referral to complete major amendments, referral to re-write and resubmit, or referral to complete major amendments ahead of a re-submission for the award of MPhil.

E5.15.2 Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Referral to complete minor amendments to the submission and to re-submit for the award of MPhil.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. This outcome is not

available if there has been a previous referral to resubmit for MPhil. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.

E5.15.3 Upon their initial assessment of the referred work, if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed or downgraded to an MPhil, then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding the outcome.

Section F: Regulations for the Award of PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only)

The following regulations govern the specific rules for the award of Doctor of Philosophy via the 4-year 'Projects only' route. They should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees.

These regulations are separate to the Regulations for the Award of PhD, and also do not apply to the PhD by Publication or the PhD by Prospective Publication.

F1. Learning outcomes

F1.1.1 Doctoral degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

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

F1.1.2 Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

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

F1.2 The PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) award

F1.2.1 The PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended the work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

F2. Thesis length

F2.1.1 The text of the thesis for these awards should not normally exceed 80,000 words (excluding references and appendices). Confirmation of what is included and excluded from the word count of the thesis can be found in the PGR Handbook.

F2.1.2 This word count is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In some instances supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length.

F2.1.3 Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

F2.1.4 In cases where a doctoral candidate requires an increase in the word limit owing to the nature of their research, they may use their second Progression Monitoring assessment to make a request for up to an additional 20,000 words. Details of the procedure that needs to be followed can be found in the PGR Handbook.

F2.2 Alternative formats of thesis submission

F2.2.1 Further details regarding the requirements for alternative formats of thesis submission can be found in Section A1.10.

F2.2.2 All existing approved guidelines are available in the Appendices.

F3. Admission criteria

F3.1.1 In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

- A Master's degree from a UK University or equivalent, normally with a classification of merit or distinction, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed, OR
- An upper second class honours degree from a UK university in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed, OR
- Appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level, which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment.

F3.1.2 External funding bodies may also require additional criteria to be satisfied prior to admission. Any additional criteria will be advised upon application, if necessary.

F4. Period of enrolment

F4.1 The standard, minimum and maximum periods of enrolment are as follows. This does not include any periods of approved interruption that the candidate had been granted:

Mode of Study	Minimum Length	Standard Length	Maximum Length
Full-time	24 months	48 months	60 months

F4.2 A PhD candidate cannot submit their thesis for examination until the minimum programme length specified above has been reached.

F4.3 The standard period of enrolment reflects the amount of time that a candidate will ordinarily spend in the active research period.

F4.4 No later than six months before the end of the active research period, candidates may:

- Apply for additional time to complete the research; OR
- Apply to enrol for the writing-up period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis.

F4.5 Where a candidate fails to secure approval to enrol for the writing-up period or additional time, the candidate must submit work for examination no later than the end of the active research period for the award. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate's registration on the grounds of non-submission.

F4.6 The maximum period of enrolment is the total amount of time a candidate is permitted to have before they submit their thesis for examination. This includes the time spent in active research (standard period of enrolment), any writing-up period and an additional 12 months that could either consist of a period of additional time or an end extension owing to extenuating circumstances.

F4.7 In very exceptional extenuating circumstances, we may permit a candidate to exceed this maximum period of enrolment. This will be an evidence-based decision, determined on a case-by-case basis.

F5. Programme timeline and milestones

F5a. Where approved, some awards may have additional compulsory assessment requirements which aren't referred to in the timeline below. Please refer to the specific Programme Specification Document (PSD) for information on these.

F5b. Any additional project or engagement requirements set by funding bodies may also form part of a candidate's compulsory engagement with their approved programme of study. Non-engagement with these requirements can therefore be considered, where applicable, under the University's procedures.

Month 1	Registration and Induction
Every month (minimum)	Supervision meeting: complete online log
Month 9	Research Support Plan complete
By end of month 21	Submit progression report 1
By end of month 24	Complete progression viva and any corrections
By end of month 33	Submit progression report 2
By end month 36	Complete progression viva and any corrections

By end of Month 45	On track to submit' meeting between student and supervisory team
By end of Month 48	Final thesis submission deadline
A least 3 months before thesis submission an 'on track to submit' meeting must take place between the student and the supervisory team. **Examination Phase: see Thesis Examination below.**	

F5.1 Change of Programme

F5.1.1 Candidates who are enrolled for a PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) are not permitted to transfer enrolment to submit for a Professional Doctorate.

F5.1.2 Candidates who are enrolled for a Professional Doctorate are not permitted to transfer enrolment to submit for a PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only).

F5.2 Transfer from PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) to Masters

F5.2.1 A candidate who enrolled initially for the PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only), is not permitted to transfer to an MA/MSc by Research.

F5.2.2 A candidate enrolled on the PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) who is unable to complete their funded and approved programme of study may be eligible to exit their award with an MA/MSc by Research, depending on the amount of progress that has been made. Candidates in this position will be advised on a case-by-case basis by the Doctoral College.

F5.3 Transfer from PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) to MPhil

F5.3.1 A candidate who enrolled initially for the PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only), is not permitted to transfer to an MPhil.

F5.3.2 A candidate enrolled on the PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) who is unable to complete their funded and approved programme of study may be eligible to exit their award with an MPhil, depending on the amount of progress that has been made. Candidates in this position will be advised on a case-by-case basis by the Doctoral College.

F5.4 Transfer to or from a distance learning route

F5.4.1 Candidates who enrolled initially for PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only), and were based on campus, may be able to transfer to a distance learning route. This would be subject to approval from the appropriate funding bodies, and on the condition that permission to transfer was sought before the transfer is processed.

F5.5 Research support plan and skills audit

F5.5.1 The research support plan and skills audit is a formal requirement of the programme. It must be reviewed and signed off by the candidate's supervisory team and

ratified by an academic who is external to the supervisory team. Approval of the plan should ensure the project is appropriate and viable.

F5.5.2 The submission deadline for the Research Support Plan and Skills Audit, for the PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only), is by the end of month Nine.

F5.5.3 The candidate and the supervisor must document the proposed research support plan. This plan must set out the programme of related studies necessary for the attainment of competence in research methods and of knowledge related to the subject of the work and where required, detail training and development and/or any placement activity.

F5.5.4 The plan should include consideration of research ethics and integrity, Health and Safety and resources or facilities that are required in relation to the research project.

F5.5.5 The plan should include a completed skills audit where the candidate has assessed their individual training requirements, established how and where they will access training and development courses to fulfil skills gaps. This should become a working document that reflects the candidate's training and development needs. Doctoral candidates must also include and update the skills audit as part of progression monitoring.

F5.5.6 Failure to complete the research support plan satisfactorily by the required deadline may lead to the termination of the candidate's registration.

F5.5.7 The plan may include registration for a maximum of 60 credits of Masters level modules where available.

F5.6 Progression monitoring

F5.6.1 Doctoral research students will undertake two progression monitoring assessments during their candidature. Progression is a formal process to monitor and assess the progress the candidate is making on the research project and their skills training. Candidates will be required to submit a report and review and update the skills audit. One referral is permitted at each progression assessment. The progression assessment will determine the suitability of the candidate to remain registered on a research award. Failure to complete progression monitoring satisfactorily will lead to the termination of the candidate's registration. Where a candidate's studies are terminated following a progression assessment, they are not be permitted to re-enrol for the same degree to undertake the same topic of research.

F5.6.2 Candidates may also be required to complete formal English language assessment and training in advance of, or as an outcome of, progression monitoring.

F5.6.3 The following deadlines apply to the Progression Monitoring Assessment:

Full-time		
Progression Monitoring 1	Submission of report and Skills Audit	By end of month 21
	Full examination, including viva and any amendments to be completed	By end of month 24

Full-time		
Progression Monitoring 2	Submission of report and Skills Audit	By end of month 33
	Full examination, including viva and any amendments to be completed	By end of month 36

F5.6.4 It is normal, but not required, for at least one member of the supervisory team to be present at the viva examination. However, supervisor/s must withdraw prior to the deliberations of the progression monitoring panel on the outcome.

F5.6.5 Candidates who fail to submit progress reports on the required schedule will be administratively withdrawn for non-submission, subject to consideration of any extenuating circumstances.

F5.7 Assessment of progression

F5.7.1 Progression assessments must be sufficiently rigorous to adequately test the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the research project, of progress made to date and future plans for the remainder of the programme.

F5.7.2 Satisfactory completion of progression monitoring is demonstrated by:

- A progress report completed by the candidate and submitted for assessment by a progression monitoring panel.
- Completion of training and development identified in the skills audit.
- Satisfactory engagement with the research support plan.
- Consideration of any security sensitive research.
- Consideration of ethical approval at progression monitoring one.
- Confirmation that ethical approval has been obtained by progression monitoring two.
- The defence of the progress report by viva examination in front of the progression monitoring panel.
- Confirmation by the progression monitoring panel that the candidate is able to proceed to the subsequent year of study.

F5.8 The progression panel

F5.8.1 The panel will comprise two members that have not had previous close association with the student's research project.

F5.8.2 Where the candidate is a member of staff, the progress report (at both initial consideration and following any amendments) must also be submitted for assessment to an external examiner, who satisfies the published criteria for appointment. The same external examiner may be used for the final thesis examination.

F5.8.3 The external examiner will complete a preliminary written report for consideration by the progression monitoring panel. If deemed necessary by the School or the external

examiner, the external examiner may join the progression monitoring viva examination via video link or in person.

F5.8.4 Following progression, the candidate will be provided with written feedback and, if necessary, guidance on actions to be taken to support the progress of their candidature.

F5.9 The progression report

F5.9.1 Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual format of progression reports in their subject area, but the progress report should typically be equivalent to 3,000 to 6,000 words in length. As a minimum the report should include:

- A review and discussion of the work already undertaken.
- Defines the aims and objectives of the research project.
- Progress made since the last report, for second progression only.
- Any particular problems encountered by the candidate (e.g., access to resources/ facilities or issues relating to language or disability support requirements).
- A brief statement of the intended further work, including an indication of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.
- The report should include confirmation that Research Integrity training has taken place (first progression only).

F5.10 Available outcomes following initial assessment (progression stage)

F5.10.1 Following the completion of the progression monitoring exercise, including a viva examination, the outcomes available are as follows:

- That the candidate be permitted to progress.
- That the candidate be required to make amendments and resubmit the progress report no later than six weeks (12 weeks for part-time candidates) from the date of notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination
- That the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring only) or MPhil (following second progression monitoring only). In this case, the candidate will be allowed six months in total to complete the work.
- That the candidate is not permitted to proceed.

F5.11 Available outcomes following amendments (progression stage)

F5.11.1 Where a candidate has been required to complete amendments, the outcomes available following the completion of the examination, including a viva examination where required, are as follows:

- That the candidate be permitted to progress.
- That the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring only) or MPhil

(following second progression monitoring only). In this case, the candidate will be allowed six months in total to complete the work.

- That the candidate is not permitted to proceed.

F5.11.2 Upon their initial assessment of work that required amendments ("referred" work), if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed or downgraded, then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding and formalising the outcome.

F5.11.3 Candidates who do not receive permission to proceed will be deemed to have failed and their registration will be terminated. Where a candidate's studies are terminated following a progression assessment, they are not be permitted to re-enrol for the same degree to undertake the same topic of research.

F5.12 Final thesis examination

F5.12.1 The examination for PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) has two stages:

- The submission and preliminary assessment of the written thesis.
- Defence of the work by viva examination.

F5.12.2 The examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright without holding a viva examination.

F5.12.3 On referral, the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners. However, the examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail without holding a second viva examination.

F5.13 Recommendations following examination

F5.13.1 Following examination, including a viva examination, the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied

that all corrections have been made. If the internal examiner is not satisfied that all corrections have been made the examiner reserves the right to award an MPhil.

- **Referral to complete major amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Referral to re-write the submission.** The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within one year from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Referral to complete major amendments and re-submit for the award of MPhil.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.

F5.14 Recommendations following the submission of minor amendments

F5.14.1 Once a candidate has submitted of minor amendments, the following may be recommended:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree**.

F5.14.2 Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made. If the recommendation is to downgrade or fail at this stage, then a second viva should be invoked if this has not taken place already.

F5.15 Recommendations following the submission of referred work

F5.15.1 No further opportunity will be permitted for referral to complete major amendments, referral to re-write and resubmit, or referral to complete major amendments ahead of a re-submission for the award of MPhil.

F5.15.2 Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Referral to complete minor amendments to the submission and to re-submit for the award of MPhil.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. This outcome is not available if there has been a previous referral to resubmit for MPhil. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Award the degree of MPhil subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree

F5.15.3 Upon their initial assessment of the referred work, if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed or downgraded to an MPhil, then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding the outcome.

Section G: Regulations for the Award of PhD by Publication

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Publication. They should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees.

This award may only be offered in Schools where published guidelines exist, that have been through validation and subsequently been approved by the University Research Committee and the Senate.

G1. The Award

G1.1.1 Doctoral degrees are awarded to candidates who have demonstrated:

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

G1.1.2 Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

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

G1.2 PhD by Publication

G1.2.1 The PhD by Publication is awarded to a candidate who has:

- Submitted a series of peer-reviewed academic papers, books, cited works or other materials that have been placed in the public domain as articles that have been published, accepted for publication, exhibited or performed, prior to enrolment.
- Presented a substantial commentary linking the published work, putting it in context and outlining its coherence and significance in terms of knowledge creation
- Demonstrated the acquisition and utilisation of research skills equivalent to those of a traditional PhD student.
- Included a literature review in the submission.

- Successfully presented and defended the body of work by viva examination to the satisfaction of examiners.

G2. Thesis length

G2.1 The work as a whole should be equivalent in length or volume to the work required for a full Doctoral thesis.

G2.2 It is expected that the majority of publications presented will be recent.

G2.3 Examples of work which might be suitable for PhD by Publication could include:

- Four or five articles which have been published in quality academic journals;
- One or more academic books, chapters, monographs, scholarly editions of a text.

G2.4 The text of the commentary should be a minimum of 15,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

G3. Period of enrolment

Mode of Study	Length
Full-time	6 months
Part-time	12 months

G3.1 Candidates must submit their work at the end of the permitted period of enrolment. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate's registration on the grounds of non-submission.

G3.2 PhD by Publication candidates are not permitted to apply for additional time or a writing-up period.

G3.3 Interruptions are not normally available to PhD by Publication candidates, but they may apply in very exceptional circumstances.

G4. Admission criteria

G4.1 In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

- A body of published work which, prima facie, is appropriate for the award of a Doctorate; AND
- A Master's degree from a UK University or equivalent, normally with a classification of merit or distinction, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed; AND
- An upper second class honours degree from a UK university in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed; AND
- Appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level, which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment.

G5. Final thesis examination

G5.1 Final thesis examination

G5.1.1 A PhD by Publication candidate shall be examined by at least two external examiners and one internal examiner who has undergone University training for the role.

G5.1.2 The examination for PhD by the publication route has two stages:

- The submission of the actual publications with a commentary and an abstract.
- Its defence by viva examination.

G5.1.3 On referral, the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners. However, the examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail without holding a second viva examination.

G5.2 Recommendations Following Examination:

G5.2.1 Following examination including a viva examination, the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Referral to complete major amendments.** The candidate may be required to make amendments to the commentary and/or possible additions to the publications. Any additions must be from a body of work published prior to enrolment for the award. The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

G5.3 Recommendations Following the Submission of Minor Amendments:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

G5.3.1 Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

G5.4 Recommendations Following the Submission of Referred Work:

G5.4.1 Only one opportunity for referral is permitted (referral to complete major amendments).

G5.4.2 Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).

- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

G5.4.3 Upon their initial assessment of the referred work, if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding the outcome.

G5.4.4 Where the outcome of an examination (either at initial consideration or following referral) is that the candidate should not be awarded the degree, candidates are not

permitted to submit a new application within two years from the date of the original examination. A second or subsequent application must include evidence of additional work.

Section H: Regulations for the Award of PhD by Prospective Publication

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Prospective Publication. They should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees.

This award may only be offered in Schools where published guidelines exist, that have been through validation and subsequently been approved by the University Research Committee and the Senate.

H1. The Award

H1.1 A PhD by Prospective Publication involves the submission of a thesis containing submitted (and accepted for publication) or fully published articles (in peer-reviewed academic papers, books, cited works or other materials that have been placed in the public domain) published within the student's period of registration only. The award is only available to members of staff of the University who are employed in academic roles, but who do not possess a PhD.

H1.2 PhD by Prospective Publication

H1.2.1 The PhD by Prospective Publication is awarded to a candidate who has:

- Submitted a series of peer-reviewed academic papers, books, cited works or other materials that have been placed in the public domain as articles that have been published, accepted for publication, exhibited or performed, prior to enrolment.
- Presented a substantial commentary linking the published work, putting it in context and outlining its coherence and significance in terms of knowledge creation
- Demonstrated the acquisition and utilisation of research skills equivalent to those of a traditional PhD student.
- Included a literature review in the submission.
- Successfully presented and defended the body of work by viva examination to the satisfaction of examiners.

H2. Thesis length

H2.1 The work as a whole should be equivalent in length or volume to the work required for a full Doctoral thesis.

H2.2 It is expected that the majority of publications presented will be recent.

H2.3 Examples of work which might be suitable for PhD by Prospective Publication could include:

- Four or five articles which have been published in quality academic journals;
- One or more academic books, chapters, monographs, scholarly editions of a text.

H2.4 The text of the commentary should be a minimum of 15,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

H3. Period of enrolment

Mode of Study	Length
Full-time	36 months
Part-time	72 months

H3.1 Candidates must submit their work at the end of the permitted period of enrolment. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate's registration on the grounds of non-submission.

H3.2 PhD by Prospective Publication candidates are not permitted to apply for additional time or a writing-up period.

H3.3 Interruptions are not normally available to PhD by Prospective Publication candidates, but they may apply in very exceptional circumstances.

H4. Admission criteria

H4.1 In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

- A body of published work which, prima facie, is appropriate for the award of a Doctorate; AND
- A Master's degree from a UK University or equivalent, normally with a classification of merit or distinction, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed; AND
- An upper second class honours degree from a UK university in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed; AND
- Appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level, which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment.

H5. Final thesis examination

H5.1 Final thesis examination

H5.1.1 A PhD by Prospective Publication candidate shall be examined by at least two external examiners and one internal examiner who has undergone University training for the role.

H5.1.2 The examination for PhD by the publication route has two stages:

- The submission of the actual publications with a commentary and an abstract.
- Its defence by viva examination.

H5.1.3 On referral, the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners. However, the examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail without holding a second viva examination.

H5.2 Recommendations Following Examination:

H5.2.1 Following examination including a viva examination, the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).
- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner only, normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.
- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.
- **Referral to complete major amendments.** The candidate may be required to make amendments to the commentary and/or possible additions to the publications. Any additions must be from a body of work published prior to enrolment for the award. The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.
- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

H5.3 Recommendations Following the Submission of Minor Amendments:

- **Award** (without amendments).
- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.
- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

H5.3.1 Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

H5.4 Recommendations Following the Submission of Referred Work:

H5.4.1 Only one opportunity for referral is permitted (referral to complete major amendments).

H5.4.2 Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

- **Award** (without amendments).
- **Award subject to the completion of editorial, presentational and minor corrections.** The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within one month from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made. Any further editorial corrections, given as an outcome of the revised resubmission, must be completed within 2 weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.
- **Award subject to minor amendments.** The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination. No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.
- **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

H5.4.3 Upon their initial assessment of the referred work, if the examiners are of the view that the candidate's work should be failed then they are required to invoke a viva examination before deciding the outcome.

H5.4.4 Where the outcome of an examination (either at initial consideration or following referral) is that the candidate should not be awarded the degree, candidates are not permitted to submit a new application within two years from the date of the original examination. A second or subsequent application must include evidence of additional work.

Section I: Regulations for the Award of Higher Doctorates

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award of Higher Doctorates. They should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees.

I1. Awards available

I1.1.1 The University awards the following Higher Doctorates:

- Doctor of Letters (DLitt).
- Doctor of Science (DSc).
- Doctor of Music (DMus).
- Doctor of Laws (LLD).

I1.1.2 Candidates are required to state the Higher Doctorate for which they wish their work to be considered.

I1.2 Criteria

I1.2.1 The work submitted must be of high distinction, must constitute an original and significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge or to the application of knowledge or to both and must establish that the applicant is a leading authority in the field or fields of study concerned.

I2. Regulations for candidature

I2.1 Candidates should normally be:

- Graduates of the University of Huddersfield, graduates of the CNAA who took their degrees as a registered student of the Polytechnic of Huddersfield or graduates of another degree awarding body of not less than 10 years' standing following conferment of an appropriate first degree or not less than seven years' standing from conferment of the degree of MPhil or PhD, or;
- Current or former members of the University of Huddersfield staff of not less than 10 years' standing from conferment of an appropriate first degree who have served for at least three years on the academic staff of the University of Huddersfield

AND

- Persons who can demonstrate exceptional and original contribution to the enhancement of knowledge or to the application of knowledge or both and have a demonstrable connection to the University and/or the town of Huddersfield.

I3. Application for candidature

I3.1 Persons who wish to be accepted as candidates for a Higher Doctorate must submit a formal written letter via email to The Registrar and Secretary's Office and must submit a

full curriculum vitae, including attachments of any published work on which they propose to base their application.

I3.2 The candidate must identify under which entry criteria the request is being made. Candidates may not submit work previously submitted for a Higher Doctorate.

I3.3 The Registrar and Secretary or nominee will circulate the application to members of the Higher Doctoral Board for consideration. Applications will be considered within 20 working days.

I3.4 The Higher Doctoral Board acting on behalf of the Senate, shall decide whether a person shall or shall not be accepted as a candidate. In order for a candidate to be accepted, support is required from a simple majority of Board members.

I3.5 Where a recommendation for formal examination to proceed is made, The Registrar and Secretary's Office, acting on behalf of the Higher Doctoral Board shall arrange for the issue of a registration form and guidance document to the candidate.

I3.6 Where an application is deemed not suitable for examination, The Registrar and Secretary's Office shall advise the candidate of this recommendation. A candidate may not re-apply for candidature of a Higher Doctorate until 24 months have elapsed from the date of this original request.

I3.7 Registration will be on a part-time basis and the normal period of study will be one year.

I4. Form of submission

I4.1 Applications from persons whose candidature has been accepted for the degree must be submitted by email to registryresearch@hud.ac.uk and must be accompanied by an electronic submission of the following:

- A copy of the published work indicating key publications on which the application is based and a list of this work; for the award of DMus the candidate will normally submit a body of published musicological research or a folio of between five and seven compositions, comprising scores, primary documentation or recorded performances and electronic or other recorded material, or a mix of the above. If the candidate is permitted to submit a hard copy of their published work, then four copies must be provided for the panel.
- An abstract related to the submission of approximately 250 words.
- A brief overview of approximately 1000 words in length, of their research career and their perspective of the significance of their published work and its wider importance, together with an indication of their role in the research.
- The registration fee if appropriate.

I4.2 The submission, normally in English, may take the form of books, contributions to journals, patent specifications, reports, specifications and design studies or other relevant evidence of original work. Where possible, these are required to be submitted electronically.

I4.3 Candidates submitting work of which they are not the sole authors must also submit a statement explaining their contribution to the work in such a way that it relates to each publication included in the submission. The extent of the contribution of others will be taken into account by the examiners in assessing how far the candidate's work meets the criterion for award of the degree.

I4.4 Work which has not been published shall not normally be taken into account by the examiners.

I5. Examination

I5.1.1 A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Laws, Doctor of Letters, Doctor of Music or Doctor of Science shall be examined by three examiners appointed for the purpose by the Higher Doctoral Board acting on behalf of the Senate.

I5.1.2 The candidate will propose three examiners which will be approved by the Higher Doctoral Board acting on behalf of the Senate.

I5.1.3 Not more than one examiner may be a member of the academic staff of the University of Huddersfield, except in the case of candidates who are themselves members of the academic staff of the University of Huddersfield who shall be examined by three external examiners.

I5.1.4 Candidate's must have no contact with the examiners, in connection with their work, between the appointment of the examiners and receiving their examination outcome.

I5.1.5 Candidates may be required by the examiners to present themselves for oral and other examinations.

I5.1.6 The examiners shall recommend that the result of the examination shall be pass or fail. No resubmission is permitted. The report and recommendation of the examiners shall be approved by the Higher Doctoral Board on behalf of the Senate.

I5.2 Outcome

I5.2.1 If the examiners decide that the candidate's work merits the awarding of a Higher Doctorate, the Higher Doctoral Board on behalf of the Senate will consider the examiner reports and may recommend that the degree be awarded.

I5.2.2 If after considering the examiner reports, the Higher Doctoral Board on behalf of the Senate, decide that the candidate's work does not merit the awarding of a higher doctorate, the Higher Doctoral Board may recommend that the degree not be awarded.

I5.2.3 Whether the degree outcome is positive or negative, all candidates will be informed of the outcome which will be signed by the Registrar and Secretary on behalf of the Senate.

I6. Retention of work submitted

H6.1 A copy of the publications submitted by a successful candidate for the degree of Doctor of Letters, Doctor of Music or Doctor of Science may be retained by the University Library and will in that event become the property of the University.

I7. Appeal of Outcome

I7.1 Candidates who are unhappy with the outcome of the examination for a Higher Doctorate award may submit an appeal providing they can evidence a material irregularity within the approved process. Candidates cannot challenge the academic judgement of the examiners or the Higher Doctoral Board.

I7.2 Candidates should submit their appeal to the Registrar and Secretary, in writing to registryresearch@hud.ac.uk, within 10 working days from the date of the outcome letter, giving reasons and supporting evidence where possible for the appeal.

I7.3 The Registrar and Secretary or assigned nominee will establish if grounds for appeal have been evidenced within the appeal. If grounds for appeal exist, the appeal shall be referred to the Vice-Chancellor for review. If no grounds exist, the student will be informed by the Registrar Secretary or nominee with an explanation as to why.

I7.4 The student will receive a response providing reasons for the decision normally no later than 20 working days from the date the appeal was submitted.

I7.5 The decision of the Vice-Chancellor is final.

Appendix A

Guidelines for alternative format research degree theses using practice as research: School of Arts and Humanities

NB:
Specific to the School of Arts and Humanities only. This document is intended to act as an exemplar for the development of similar subject-specific guidelines on alternative format research degrees in other schools, and potentially initiate the development of some shared guidance on alternative format research degrees for all schools.

Contents

1. Introduction 92
2. What constitutes an alternative format thesis? 92
3. General principles for submission 93
4. Contents which make up an alternative format thesis 93
5. Progression Points for alternative format thesis research degrees 94
6. Word counts 94
7. Submission 94
8. The role of the supervisor 95
9. Criteria for judging the originality, impact, 'contributions to knowledge' pertinent to doctoral research 96
10. Subject specific guidelines on contents which make up an alternative format thesis with practical components 96
Subject specialism: creative writing 96
Subject specialism: History 97
Subject specialism: Drama, Theatre, and Performance 98
Subject specialism: Music Performance 99
Subject specialism: Music composition 102
Subject specialism: art and design, fashion and textiles, architecture and the built environment 103
Subject specialism: art and design, fashion and textiles 105
Subject specialism: architecture and the built environment 107

1. Introduction

QAA Characteristics statements for research degrees
The UK Quality Code for Higher Education provides the following characteristics for subject specialist doctorates (Doctor of Philosophy) with practical components:

- Practical work, such as in the creative and performing arts, may well form part of a candidate's output. The form of artefacts and outputs of a practical nature, sometimes involving multimedia, relates to the candidate's subject area rather than to the form of the degree programme.
  (Category 1: Subject Specialist Doctorates, p.6)

- In the final assessment, candidates are assessed on their thesis, portfolio, artefact or composition (the latter two normally, and the portfolio sometimes, are accompanied by a critical commentary on the work), and by an oral examination
  (Category 1: Subject Specialist Doctorates, p.6)

Please read the QAA Doctoral Degree Characteristics statement for more information.

The UK Quality Code for Higher Education provides the following characteristics for subject specialist master's research degrees (MA by Research) with practical components:

- Assessment is specific to the individual and usually requires a dissertation or thesis, or other output, such as an artefact, performance or musical composition.
  (Category 1: Research master's degrees, p.4)

Please read the QAA Master's Degree Characteristics statement for more information.

The guidance listed below is for *research degree students who are undertaking research with a practical component*. This is specific to subject specialisms in Music, Humanities, Media, Art, Design and Architecture. *The guidance is for supervisors and students who are considering an alternative format thesis research degree submission.*

2. What constitutes an alternative format thesis?

A research degree submission with a substantial practical component is considered an alternative format thesis. The knowledge presented as part of the research may constitute forms that accompany the written elements of a research degree. An alternative format thesis allows for subject specialist practices of research to be represented within the frameworks of PhD and MA by Research.

Subject to the agreement of the appropriate academic School, a candidate for the award of the degree of PhD or MA by Research may submit a project on a research topic which includes two elements:

- A written thesis/critical commentary and;

- A substantial practical component. This may take the form of outputs appropriate to the subject specialist field of study and include: artefacts, film, performance,

creative writing, music composition, photography, art, design, design-prototypes, curation, multi-media and architectural outputs.

Please note:

- The research outcomes must form a coherent whole. Research proposals required to undertake the research will be carefully reviewed with the candidate at the beginning of the research journey.

- In keeping with the Doctoral Degree Characteristic Statement (4.3), 'the body of work presented [must] demonstrate the research question and [provide] a critical evaluation of the extent to which it has been addressed.'

3. General principles for submission

The general principles for submission to a higher research degree (PhD or MA by Research) apply. Examiners will assess all submissions in accordance with the criteria for the award of PhD and MA by Research as set out in Section E and Section B respectively of the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees)

The maximum word count for a research degree is 25,000 words (MA by Research) or 80,000 words (PhD). However, the balance between written and practical components in an alternative format thesis varies across subject specialisms. School specific guidelines outline subject specialist conventions where the practical and written components may vary in weighting. Both written and practical elements together should address the research question, the methodology adopted, the critical and theoretical framework for the research and demonstrate original research, analytical skill and rigour. School guidelines on subject specific submissions will carefully review these components as part of the alternative format submission.

The mode of submission for an alternative format thesis would normally be appropriate in the School of Arts and Humanities. The practical work must be undertaken on a registered research programme and in accordance with University and School subject specific guidelines.

The written and practical elements of the submission shall be submitted for examination in accordance with the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees)

A record of the practical element of thesis will be deposited along with the written thesis in the University's Repository. The record of the practical element must be in a digital form (e.g., portfolio format). Please see Section A4 of the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees) and School subject specific guidelines on the submission of alternative format theses with practical components.

4. Contents which make up an alternative format thesis

Research with practical components may include:

- Portfolios of artworks/artefacts/designs/performance/creative writing and pieces of music. (*These guidelines are only applicable to disciplines in Schools that accept practice as a key element of research approaches.)*

5. Progression points for alternative format thesis research degrees

The progression points for Research Degrees (PhDs) using practice as research are the same as for standard format theses. However, the content of the submission would normally incorporate examples of the practice components (see subject-level guidance) alongside a written critical commentary.

The progression monitoring documentation will normally include:

- A critical review of appropriate literature and relevant practice;
- A critical methodology appropriate to the subject area;
- Discussion and analysis of research outcomes, including contextualisation of the practical components of the project;
- Critical evaluation of the outcomes in light of the literature and methodology.

At each progression point for Research Degrees with a practice component, the documentation should also outline and account for the following:

- How the practical and/or creative components are situated in relation to relevant historical, theoretical, critical and visual contexts;
- How the practical component is to be accompanied by written text;
- Where appropriate to the project, students may submit a sample of creative or practical work alongside a written text; please refer to school-based guidelines on word counts for progression.
- The word count of the thesis, indicating the relationship between the written and practice component. Please refer to subject-based guidelines.
- Any significant changes to structure and word count percentages should be addressed at the second progression point. These can be part of the supervisory team and panel assessor feedback.

6. Word counts

The maximum word count for a research degree is 25,000 words (MA by Research) or 80,000 words (PhD). However, the balance between written and practical components in an alternative format thesis varies across subject specialisms. Please refer to the School-based guidance (below) on the word count conventions for your subject specialism.

7. Submission

- Alternative format theses may include a portfolio of components appropriate to the field of study, for example, artefacts, film, performance, photography, music compositions, creative writing, architectural outputs, design prototypes.

- Submissions with a practical component (in the form of a portfolio) should provide a permanent record, stored in a way that is retrievable.

- Arrangements for an alternative format thesis should be approved by the Exam Arrangements team in consultation with the Director of Graduate Education and the supervisory team. This can include the public exhibition, display and/or performance of practical components of the project and be embedded into the examination process.

- Documenting practice – practice components included in a portfolio should be integral to the thesis development. This documentation should ideally be cross-referenced in the written work accompanying the project.

- Pre-existing work/compositions must not be included in the submission, except in accordance with Recognition of prior research under Section A2 of the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees).

- The written and practical elements of the project should be realised as a whole. The whole submission should meet the standards of doctoral level research as identified by the QAA Qualifications Descriptor for FHEQ level 7 or 8 as applicable.

- Please see school-based guidelines for advice on preparing a portfolio for submission.

8. The role of the supervisor

In addition to the University's standard guidelines on supervisor responsibilities, for alternative format theses the supervisor will be expected to:

- Ensure that any practical work is reviewed as part of the admissions process to assess suitability for research degree level study.

- Oversee, in consultation with the student, the practice and written components that make up an alternative format thesis.

- Advise the student, using school-based guidelines, on the submission of progression monitoring documentation and on the final submission of PhDs.

- Prepare suitable examination arrangements in line with agreed alternative format components in a timely manner, ensuring all examiners who attend a practice-based event have been formally approved.

9. Criteria for judging the originality, impact, 'contributions to knowledge' pertinent to doctoral research

The standard criteria for research degrees apply and can be located in the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees).

10. Subject specific guidelines on contents which make up an alternative format thesis with practical components

Subject specialism: Creative Writing

(MA by Research and PhD)

The MA by Research and PhD in Creative Writing are made up of creative and critical written components. Though the creative component may take a variety of forms, it is usually entirely in written form (for example, a novel, collection of poetry, or a number of short stories). The exact nature of the critical written component will depend upon the research aims of the project, but it will operate in dialogue with the creative work, reflecting on the creative practice and exploring the work in a critical context. The creative and critical elements together make up the thesis and are examined as a whole.

Word counts

For both MA by Research and PhD, the balance between creative and critical components is expected to be major/minor (creative/critical):

- For the MA by Research, the critical exegesis will typically be 5-10,000 words. There may be cases where a critical component longer than this is desired. This should be discussed with and approved by the supervisory team. The exegesis should not be below 5000 words. The creative component must be the equivalent of 15-20,000 words. The total of both components must not exceed 25,000.

- For the PhD, the critical exegesis will typically be 15-25,000 words. There may be cases where a critical component is longer than this. This should be discussed with the supervisory team and a rationale for the decision approved by the examination team at progression points. The rationale should explain how and why the divergence from existing subject convention is key to the specific underlying aims of the research project. The exegesis must not be below 15,000 words. The total of both components would not normally exceed 80,000.

Submission

- If the creative work is not, or is not entirely, in a standard written form (e.g., has online or performative elements) then the plan for the work must be approved by the supervisor and, in the case of a PhD, approved by the examination team at the first and second progression vivas.

- Submission of non-standard creative elements should be in line with University regulations and processes.

Subject specialism: History

(MA by Research and PhD)

These guidelines are for supervisors and students who are considering including practice-based elements as a part of a PhD or MA by Research portfolio submission in History. Students may include a practice-based element as part of their PhD or MA by Research submission if it directly relates to the written research component of their submission. Normally this would take the form of audio, or audio-visual, recordings, film, and/or a live performance (or performances), or a public exhibition (either online or for public display).

Word counts

Ordinarily, the PhD thesis: practice ratio will be 60,000 word written thesis: 20,000 word equivalent practice-based output

For the MA by Research, assessment will take one of the following forms, in relation to the above:

1. A written dissertation of 12,000 words

2. A reflective piece of 3,000 words (this can be submitted as a stand-alone piece or incorporated as a section of the dissertation)

3. A practice-based element of the research such as a film, exhibition or public workshop, or combination thereof, of 10,000 words equivalent, accompanied by a folio of evidence (see below on the content of the portfolio)

Submission

For the MA by Research and the PhD, practice and thesis should always be related, and should not be considered as two entirely distinct components. The alternative format thesis comprises practice AND thesis, to be considered and assessed as a whole, such that the practice supports the written work and vice versa. The final result will then be a reflection of the whole portfolio.

The reflective piece must demonstrate consideration of the ways in which the practice has informed the content of the written dissertation (for example in terms of methodology, research questions, source-base and findings), and the way in which the research has informed the public output (for co-produced practice-based outputs this must demonstrate the ways in which the candidate's individual research contributed to the final output). It must comment and reflect upon the evaluation data. It must also critically engage with contemporary research and writing in the fields of public history/public engagement/ impact and situate the portfolio of written dissertation and practice-based element within this broader literature.

For the MA by Research, the portfolio should normally contain the following:

1. a log of work undertaken in preparing and delivering the practice-based element of the portfolio (in cases of co-produced outputs, this log must demonstrate the candidate's individual contribution to the practice-based element)
2. an audio/visual recording or photographic record of a production or public event; or a copy (supplied on a memory stick) of supporting written / visual material such as exhibition panels or the programme / materials for a public workshop
3. copies of evaluation materials (e.g., surveys, recorded interviews, questionnaires) and summaries of evaluation data

Assessment is undertaken by an internal and external examiner through viva voce. The examiners must have access to the practice-based element. Where appropriate, examiners are to be invited by the supervisor to attend a practice-based event such as a theatre performance or an exhibition. It is the main supervisor's responsibility to ensure all examiners who attend a practice-based event have been formally approved.

The expected minimum standard is that all audio/visual recordings, that form part of the portfolio for final examination, are available for consideration by all examiners. It is the postgraduate researcher who is responsible to ensure there are audio/visual recordings available.

Additional information

The student is responsible for obtaining ethical clearance from the university where relevant for practice-based elements of the portfolio. They must obtain consent from all the participants for a recording of a public event such as a public workshop to be made. They must also obtain permission to share with the examiners any individuated evaluation data (such as recorded interviews) from the participants, and must anonymize any written responses to evaluation material (such as questionnaires).

Subject specialism: Drama, Theatre, and Performance

(MA by Research and PhD)

These guidelines are for supervisors and students who wish to include an assessed practical component as part of their submission for an MA by Research for PhD. They apply in all such instances whether the methodology is referred to as Practice Research (PR), Practice-as-Research (PaR) or any other related term. This practical element might consist of, *inter alia,* live performance, video, creative writing, workshops, choreography, installations, or any combination of these.

Word counts

The maximum word count for an MA by Research thesis is 25,000 words. Where there is a significant practice research component the length of the thesis may be reduced. The precise reduction in thesis length will depend on the nature of the research project but the final submission should not normally fall below 12,500 words. The submission of practical and written elements will be treated as an integral whole and components will not be individually marked.

The maximum word count for PhD thesis is 80,000 words. Where there is a significant practice research component the length of the thesis may be reduced. The precise reduction in thesis length will depend on the nature of the research project but the final submission should not normally fall below 40,000 words. The submission of practical and written elements will be treated as an integral whole and components will not be individually marked.

Submission

Where live performance work is integral to the MA by Research or PhD submission it will normally be observed by both internal and external examiners. For this reason, it is imperative that the dates for examined live performances are agreed at least three months in advance. For the PhD, in some circumstances it may be necessary for the examiners to observe live performance work in each of the three years and, on each occasion the three-month guideline is to be applied. It is the main supervisor's responsibility to ensure all examiners who attend a practice-based event have been formally approved.

The expected minimum standard is that all live performances, that form part of the portfolio for final examination, are recorded and can be considered by all examiners. It is the postgraduate researcher who is responsible to ensure the live performance is recorded.

All practical work should be documented in a format agreed between the student and the supervisory team whether or not it has been observed live by the examiners.

Subject specialism: Music Performance

(MA by Research and PhD)

These guidelines are for supervisors and students who are considering including performance elements as a part of a PhD or MA by Research submission in Music. Students may include performance as part of their MA by Research or PhD submission if it directly relates to the written research component of their submission. Normally this would take the form of either audio, or audio-visual, recordings, and/or a live performance (or performances). In the PhD, performances might range from substantial performances, such as performances of complete works, to short extracts serving as audio examples of ideas expressed in the thesis. Recordings should *always* be included as hard copy (CD, DVD, USB stick, etc.) with the submitted thesis but hyperlinks within the thesis text may also be used to point to the same performances on-line.

Admissions

In addition to the standard admissions requirements for MA by Research or PhD, those expecting to include their own performance within a research degree – as part of its methodology or final submission – will be expected to provide evidence of their practical qualifications. This will take the form of a live or recorded example relevant to the proposed research, and will be arranged as part of the admissions process, with the advice of the admissions team.

Word counts and submission

For the PhD in Music Performance, for performances of music composed by someone other than the performer, the expected length of thesis should be 40,000–50,000 words, which would ordinarily be accompanied by 90–120 minutes recorded and/or live performance. Other thesis: performance ratios might typically be:

Length of written thesis	Duration of performance (minimum)
60,000 words	60 minutes
65,000 words	45 minutes
70,000 words	30 minutes

Where the performance element might be considered to involve collaborative work, or original/improvisatory components, then further reductions in the written component might be considered, to be negotiated with the supervisor. The thesis must not be less than 15,000 words, and in such cases, it is assumed that the performance element is entirely original work, akin to a composition portfolio.

Performances may involve other musicians, as part of an ensemble/band. In such cases it is understood that where the contribution of the student is impossible or very difficult to isolate from the performance as a whole, the submitted recording/performance is likely to serve more as demonstration of ideas explored more thoroughly in the thesis and the thesis: performance ratios cited above should be adjusted accordingly in agreement with the supervisor.

Performances should be of a professional standard. Where audio/audio-visual recordings are submitted, these should be of the highest quality possible. Published recordings may be included, as long as permissions and credits have been provided and included within the thesis text.

Where live performances are included, assessment is undertaken by an internal and, where possible, external examiner. Where appropriate, examiners will be appointed earlier than usual in order that examiners might view the performance (or the final performance). All live performances should be filmed and stored on the University server for future reference, and, where the external examiner was not present, available for the external examiner to view. It is the main supervisor’s responsibility to ensure all examiners who attend a practice-based event have been formally approved

The expected minimum standard is that all live performances, that form part of the portfolio for final examination, are recorded and can be considered by all examiners. It is the postgraduate researcher who is responsible to ensure the live performance is recorded.

Whilst a mark is not awarded for live performances, feedback should be written and saved ready to contribute to the final examiners’ report for the portfolio as a whole. Informal feedback on a first recital may be provided at the examiners’ discretion. It is expected that performances, both live and recorded, will be evaluated in relation to the aims and context of the portfolio.

For the MA by Research in Music Performance, assessment will likely take one of the following forms, in relation to the above:

- Two recitals, totaling ca. 80-90 minutes, or recorded materials, totaling ca. 80-90 minutes, or combination of live and recorded performances, totaling ca. 80-90 minutes; plus dissertation ca. 7,000-10,000 words

- One or two recitals, totaling ca. 40-60 minutes, or recorded materials, totaling ca. 40-60 minutes, or combination of live and recorded performances, totaling ca. 40-60 minutes; plus dissertation ca. 11,000-13,000 words

- One recital, totaling ca. 20-30 minutes, or recorded materials, totaling ca. 20-30 minutes, or combination of live and recorded performances, totaling ca. 20-30 minutes; plus dissertation ca. 16,000-18,000 words

Additional information: PhD in Music Performance

Instrumental tuition is not provided as a part of the PhD programme. However, the student may apply for funds available through different University schemes in support of consultation lessons with named instrumentalists as appropriate to the knowledge and/or training requirements of the research.

Additional information: MA by Research in Music Performance

Whilst the relationship between performance and other (usually written) components of the portfolio is to be negotiated between the supervisor and student it is recommended that one of the following three divisions is adopted:

- Major performance, minor dissertation

- Equal performance and dissertation

- Minor performance, major dissertation

Other options may be adopted in agreement between the student and supervisor, including possibilities for lecture recitals, ensemble/band performance, or unusual performance requirements as confirmed and recorded at the point of progression.

Instrumental tuition is not provided as a part of the MA by Research. However, the student may apply for funds available through different University schemes in support of consultation lessons with named instrumentalists as appropriate to the knowledge and/or training requirements of the research.

Assessment is undertaken by an internal and external examiner. Whilst there is no requirement for a viva voce, it is expected that the external examiner will be present for at least one of the live performances where live performance is part of the portfolio of work. The internal examiner should be present at all live performances. It is the main supervisor’s responsibility to ensure all examiners who attend a practice-based event have been formally approved. All live performances should be filmed and stored on the University server for future reference, and, where the external examiner was not present, available for the external examiner to view.

The expected minimum standard is that all live performances, that form part of the portfolio for final examination, are available for consideration by all examiners. It is the postgraduate researcher who is responsible to ensure the live performance is recorded.

There is no set time in the year when performances will be scheduled. However, it is strongly recommended that the examination periods scheduled for undergraduate students in May and late June/early July be also used for one or both of the performances. It may be, however, that a final performance in September (or at the end of the programme of study) is more appropriate. Live performances are planned and scheduled in consultation with the student, as well as with internal and external examiners. Where appropriate the supervisor should consult the Head of Performance to arrange for the inclusion of performances within the undergraduate performance exam schedule.

Whilst a mark is not awarded for live performances, feedback should be written and saved ready to contribute to the final examiners report for the portfolio as a whole. Informal feedback on a first recital may be provided at the examiners' discretion. It is expected that performances, both live and recorded, will be evaluated in relation to the aims and context of the portfolio. However, it is recommended that examiners make use of the criteria used for all undergraduate performances to guide their assessment, namely the elements of technique, style, individuality and communication.

Subject specialism: Music Composition

(MA by Research and PhD)

These guidelines relate to the integration of composition within an MA by Research or PhD portfolio of work. Students may include a practice-based element as part of their research degree submission if it directly relates to the written research component of their submission. Normally this would take the form of either a portfolio of compositions and/or audio/audio visual recordings. Other types of work, such as software-based analysis and software development, may also be offered.

Admissions

In addition to the standard admissions requirements for MA by Research or PhD, those expecting to include their own creative work within a research degree – as part of its methodology or final submission – will be expected to provide evidence of their previous compositions. This will take the form of a sample folio of work (in hard copy or digitally), relevant to the proposed research, and will be arranged as part of the admissions process, with the advice of the admissions team.

Word counts

Whilst the precise relationship between the composition and thesis components of the portfolio is to be negotiated, ordinarily the thesis: practice ratio will be:

MA by Research
5,000–10,000 word written thesis: 15,000–20,000 word equivalent practice-based output

PhD

20,000–30,000 word written thesis: 60,000–50,000 word equivalent practice-based output

The PhD thesis should not be less than 15,000 words, and the MA by Research thesis should not be less than 5000 words.

Submission

The MA by Research and PhD using an alternative format are examined by portfolio. Compositions and/or recordings may form a part of this portfolio and will be accompanied by a written thesis.

Practice and thesis should always be related and should not be considered as two entirely distinct components. The portfolio of work comprises practice AND written work, to be considered and assessed as a whole, such that the practice supports the written work and vice versa. The final result will then be a reflection of the whole portfolio.

For the MA by Research, whilst there is no requirement for a viva voce, the external examiner must have access to the practice-based element in the form of submitted scores and/or accompanying recordings. Recordings should always be included as hard copy (CD, DVD, USB stick, etc.) with the submitted thesis but hyperlinks within the thesis text may also be used to point to the compositions online.

Presentation of the practice-based output should be of a professional standard. Where audio/audio-visual recordings are submitted, these should be of the highest quality possible. Published recordings may be included, as long as permissions and credits have been provided and included within the thesis text. Software or computer-based analyses should be presented in the most appropriate way for examination; online work should be presented in a format that captures it in a fixed and stable way for the examination, rather than in live form.

The expected minimum standard is that all audio/visual recordings, that form part of the portfolio for final examination, are available for consideration by all examiners. It is the postgraduate researcher who is responsible to ensure there are audio/visual recordings available.

Subject specialism: Art and Design, Fashion and Textiles, Architecture and the Built Environment

PhD (Art and Design)
PhD (Fashion and Textiles)
PhD (Architecture and the Built Environment)

These guidelines are for supervisors and students who are considering including practice elements as a part of a PhD research portfolio submission in the areas of art, design, fashion and/or textiles, architecture and the built environment.

Word counts

- The maximum word count for a thesis is 80,000 words. The % weightings between practice and written are to be negotiated between the student and the supervisory team.

- The aims, objectives and methodology of a research project will dictate the structure of the submission.

- Practice-orientated PhD projects in the subject specialist areas of art, design, fashion and/or textiles, architecture and the built environment in the School of Art, Design and Architecture are normally balanced between 50% Practice and 50% written (approx. 40,000 words).

- The supervisory team in consultation with the student should discuss the percentage equivalents between the practice and the written elements of the PhD project at the start of the research journey.

- At the first progression point, the student should outline the balance between practice and written components. This will be subject to approval by the supervisory team and the Progression Panel assessors.

- The sector wide equivalents for PhDs that are practice-orientated vary across the disciplines. Therefore, a clear rationale is needed for the % weightings. The rationale should explain how and why any divergence from existing subject convention is key to the specific underlying aims of the research project.

- **Please see section 5** Progression Points for alternative format thesis research degrees **for further guidance.**

Submission

- Students may include practice components as part of their PhD submission if it directly relates to the written research elements of the submission. Alternative format theses may include a portfolio of components appropriate to the field of study, for example, artefacts, film, photography, design prototypes, technical samples, research-curation, multi-media designs, etc.

- Research in, with and through practice ranges from substantial portfolios featuring research processes and completed artefacts or prototypes, to short practical extracts serving as examples of research ideas expressed in the thesis.

- The documentation of the portfolio must *always* be included as part of the submission using encrypted files (e.g., USB, CD, DVD) alongside the written part of the thesis, but hyperlinks within the written text may also be used to point to the practice on-line. Images of practice may also be embedded with the written element of the thesis.

- Portfolios of practice and written elements must be related. The portfolio of work comprises practical elements AND written documentation. They should not be considered as two entirely distinct components, but rather sit together as a critical thesis or exegesis of the research undertaken. To be considered and assessed as a whole, the practice and the written work should inform each other and lead to new research insights. The submission of practical and written elements will be treated as an integral whole and components will not be individually marked.

- The structure of a PhD with practical components are informed by the existing conventions and accepted academic practices of subject specialist fields of study (e.g., aspects of art, design, fashion and/or textiles, architecture and the built environment). It is expected that the supervisory team will work with the student to develop a suitable structure for the research practice.

- The research practice outcomes should be of a professional standard. Where documentation is submitted, these should be of the highest quality possible. Published outcomes/exhibitions may be included, as long as permissions and credits have been provided and included within the written text.

Please refer to the standard university regulations on submission of PhDs under Section A4 of the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees)

Additional information

The supervisory team should oversee all aspects of the student's progress, submission and examination. The supervisors should ensure the following:

- That the balance between practice and written elements of the thesis are discussed at the first progression monitoring point and agreed and reported in the Progression Feedback Form. Any revisions to the agreed structure should be further reviewed by the supervisor and progression monitoring point assessors, and any changes agreed must be recorded in the Feedback Form.

- Exhibitions/live exhibits should be carefully planned and scheduled in consultation with the student, as well as with internal and external examiners and with The Registrar and Secretary's Office as part of the Examination arrangements.

- Examiners understand the agreed relationship between the practice and written components. This includes the research aims of the portfolio, and the general criteria used for all PhD submissions at the University of Huddersfield.

Subject specialism: Art and Design, Fashion and Textiles

MA/MSc by Research (Art and Design)
MA/MSc by Research (Fashion and Textiles)

These guidelines are for supervisors and students who are considering including practice elements as a part of a research portfolio submission in the subject specialist fields of art, design, fashion and/or textiles.

Word counts

- The maximum word count for an MA/MSc by Research is 25,000 words. The % weightings between practice and written are to be negotiated between the supervisory team and the student.

- Practice-orientated MA/MSc projects are normally balanced between 50% Practice and 50% written.

- The aims, objectives and methodology of a research project will dictate the structure of the submission.

- The supervisory team in consultation with the student should discuss, agree and record the percentage equivalents between the practice and the written elements of the project at the start of the research journey (in the Research Support Plan and Skills audit phase).

Submission

- Students may include practice components as part of their MA/MSc by Research submission if it directly relates to the written research elements of the submission. Alternative format theses may include a portfolio of components appropriate to the field of study, for example, for example, artefacts, film, photography, design prototypes, technical samples, research-curation, multi-media designs, etc.

- Research in, with and through practice ranges from substantial portfolios featuring research processes and completed artefacts or prototypes, to short practical extracts serving as examples of research ideas expressed in the written submission.

- The documentation of the portfolio must *always* be included as part of the submission using encrypted files (e.g., USB, CD, DVD) alongside the written part of the thesis, but hyperlinks within the written text may also be used to point to the practice on-line. Images of practice may also be embedded with the written element of the thesis.

- Portfolios of practice and written elements should always be related. The portfolio of work comprises practical elements AND written document. They should not be considered as two entirely distinct components, but rather sit together as a critical thesis or exegesis of the research undertaken. To be considered and assessed as a whole, the practice and the written work should inform each other and lead to new research insights. The submission of practical and written elements will be treated as an integral whole and components will not be individually marked.

- The structure of an MA/MSc by Research with practical components are informed by the existing conventions and accepted academic practices of subject specialist fields of study (e.g., art, design, fashion, textiles, etc.). It is expected that the supervisory team will work with the student to develop a suitable structure for the research practice.

- The research practice outcomes should be of a professional standard. Where documentation is submitted, these should be of the highest quality possible. Published outcomes/exhibitions may be included, as long as permissions and credits have been provided and included within the written text.

Please refer to the standard university regulations on submission of Master's research degrees under Section A4 of the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees)

Additional information

The supervisory team should oversee all aspects of the student's progress, submission and examination. The supervisors should ensure the following:

- That the balance between practice and written elements of the thesis are discussed with the student and agreed and recorded at the research plan and skills audit phase. Any revisions to the agreed structure should be further reviewed by the supervisor, and any changes agreed must be recorded.

- Exhibitions/live exhibits should be carefully planned and scheduled in consultation with the student, as well as with internal and external examiners and with The Registrar and Secretary's Office as part of the Examination arrangements.

- Examiners understand the agreed relationship between the practice and written components. This includes the research aims of the portfolio, and the general criteria used for all research master's degree submissions at the University of Huddersfield.

Subject specialism: Architecture and the Built Environment

MA /MSc by Research (Architecture and the Built Environment)

These guidelines are for supervisors and students who are considering including practice elements as a part of a research portfolio submission in the subject specialist fields of architecture and the built environment.

Word counts

- The maximum word count for an MA/MSc by Research is 25,000 words. The % weightings between practice and written are to be negotiated between the supervisory team and the student.

- Practice-orientated MA/MSc projects are normally balanced between 50% Practice and 50% written.

- The aims, objectives and methodology of a research project will dictate the structure of the submission.

- The supervisory team in consultation with the student should discuss the percentage equivalents between the practice and the written elements of the project at the start of the research journey (Research Plan and Skills audit phase).

Submission

- Students may include practice components as part of their MA/MSc by Research submission if it directly relates to the written research elements of the submission. Alternative format theses may include a portfolio of components appropriate to the field of study, for example, architectural designs, design prototypes, technical samples, research-curation, multi-media designs, etc.

- Research in, with and through practice ranges from substantial portfolios featuring research processes and completed artefacts or prototypes, to short practical extracts serving as examples of research ideas expressed in the written submission.

- The documentation of the portfolio must *always* be included as part of the submission using encrypted files (e.g., USB, CD, DVD) alongside the written part of the thesis, but hyperlinks within the written text may also be used to point to the practice on-line. Images of practice may also be embedded with the written element of the thesis.

- Portfolios of practice and written elements should always be related. The portfolio of work comprises practical elements AND written document. They should not be considered as two entirely distinct components, but rather sit together as a critical thesis or exegesis of the research undertaken. To be considered and assessed as a whole, the practice and the written work should inform each other and lead to new research insights. The submission of practical and written elements will be treated as an integral whole and components will not be individually marked.

- The structure of an MA/MSc by Research with practical components are informed by the existing conventions and accepted academic practices of subject specialist fields of study (e.g., architecture and the built environment). It is expected that the supervisory team will work with the student to develop a suitable structure for the research practice.

- The research practice outcomes should be of a professional standard. Where documentation is submitted, these should be of the highest quality possible. Published outcomes/exhibitions may be included, as long as permissions and credits have been provided and included within the written text.

Please refer to the standard university regulations on submission of Master's research degrees under Section A4 of the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees)

Additional information

The supervisory team should oversee all aspects of the student's progress, submission and examination. The supervisors should ensure the following:

- That the balance between practice and written elements of the thesis are discussed with the student, agreed and recorded at the research support plan and skills audit phase. Any revisions to the agreed structure should be further reviewed by the supervisor and agreed changes must be recorded.

- Exhibitions/live exhibits should be carefully planned and scheduled in consultation with the student, as well as with internal and external examiners and with The Registrar and Secretary's Office as part of the Examination arrangements.

Examiners understand the agreed relationship between the practice and written components. This includes the research aims of the portfolio, and the general criteria used for all research master's degree submissions at the University of Huddersfield.

Appendix B

Guidance for journal format PhD thesis within the School of Human and Health Sciences

This guidance is for theses which present a programme of research, conducted during the period of doctoral registration, as a series of papers formatted according to the usual requirements of academic journals or scholarly book chapters. It is not to be confused with *Alternative Format Thesis* in other Schools where the research submission includes a practical component alongside a shorter thesis, for example the Alternative Thesis Format within the School of Arts and Humanities. Neither is it to be confused with PhD by Publication which is a shorter programme for candidates who begin their doctoral registration with a portfolio of published research and then write a short doctoral thesis about this pre-existing body of research. The Journal Format thesis must be the result of work done whilst registered and supervised as a PhD candidate.

What constitutes a journal format thesis and how does this differ from a standard monograph thesis?

Expectations for the programme of doctoral research follow the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees), regardless of whether the thesis follows a standard monograph format or a Journal Format. The difference lies only in the structure of the final thesis. A Journal format thesis should encompass the same breadth, depth and originality of research as would be presented in a standard monograph thesis.
A standard monograph thesis includes different sections which: review previous literature, outline the rationale for and aims of the empirical work, explain methodology and methods, report and analyse findings and discuss the significance of these. If there is more than one study incorporated within the thesis, then there may be more than one of each of the above sections.

In comparison with this, a journal format thesis presents the doctoral work as a portfolio of papers suitable for publication in an academic journal or as academic book chapters, encompassing a common or unified theme or topic. Each of these papers could stand alone without reference to other parts of the thesis. Therefore, any one of these papers might include explanation of rationale, aims, methods, findings and conclusions in relation to prior literature, rather than these different aspects of the work being discussed in separate sections of the thesis. The papers may or may not have already been published or submitted for publication. They can be publishable rather than published. They should be supplemented by additional chapters or shorter sections contextualising and linking the papers, so that the final product is a coherent thesis.

Reasons for choosing journal format rather than a standard monograph format

Journal format is becoming increasingly popular across HE institutions because it encourages the development of skills in writing for publication and the development of a portfolio of publications during the period of doctoral registration. The output of the doctoral work is therefore closer to the expectations of a future research career and, as such, it can enhance the future employability of PhD students and improve their confidence as researchers. Particularly for staff PhD candidates, the Journal Format can streamline the

demands of doctoral work alongside the demands of making a published contribution to their discipline, as time is not required for rewriting published material into chapter format or vice versa. If work has already been submitted for publication, it will also have benefited from the critique of journal reviewers.

However, PGRs should discuss the value of Journal Format carefully with supervisors from early in their period of registration. Reasons to avoid Journal Format might include part-time candidature within a fast-moving field of research, so that papers published early in the period of registration require considerable supplementation to ensure the final submitted thesis is up to date. Some programmes of research may include conceptual work that would benefit from the lengthier exploration afforded by a standard monograph thesis, prior to succinct presentation within a journal paper. There may be other reasons why it may be difficult to segment some of the work into a series of journal papers or the candidate may prefer to work on a coherent account of the research as a whole before making decisions about which aspects to publish. For more exploratory research, it may be difficult to decide on the focus of publications until the data have been analysed. Some candidates may feel that their academic writing skills are more suited to the requirements of a thesis and may feel less daunted by this due to its familiarity from final year undergraduate or master's work. It is worth noting, though, that Journal Format may sometimes be avoided unnecessarily because it is less familiar to both candidates and supervisors when in fact there could be advantages to this approach. Therefore, thorough discussion of the advantages and disadvantages is recommended.

What is expected for a quality journal format thesis that meets the PhD learning outcomes?

Journal articles or book chapters are often more succinct than the chapters of a standard monograph thesis and their relationship to the overall body of doctoral work is likely to need explaining. Journal papers may also not include the reflexive element that would be expected with some methodologies. Therefore, in order to convey the programme of doctoral research fully, the Journal Format thesis is likely to need an introductory chapter, some short bridging or commentary sections, a fuller account of methods and a short discussion, drawing together the conclusions from the research programme as a whole. It may also be necessary to include additional literature or findings that do not easily fit within the scope of any of the published/publishable papers. Importantly, clear linking of each of the papers/chapters with the overall aim(s) and research questions/objectives is essential; this can be achieved by listing of these and stating which paper(s) address each.

A thesis consisting only of a series of papers formatted according to the usual requirements of academic journals or scholarly book chapters with little or no contextualising, linking or commentary is not likely to meet doctoral requirements.

When completed, the portfolio as a whole should provide a comprehensive and understandable account of a coherent programme of doctoral research that meets the learning outcomes for PhD as specified in the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees).

If papers aimed at a practitioner journal or practice-orientated text are incorporated, particular attention should be paid, across the thesis as a whole, to meeting PhD learning outcomes related to the creation of new knowledge, advanced scholarship and demonstrating *'detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research'.* It is not

usually appropriate to include chapters from textbooks, as these rarely offer the depth and critical analysis necessary for doctoral level work. However, book chapters from an edited scholarly edition may be appropriate.

The number of journal papers or book chapters included in the thesis will depend on the nature of the research, the typical length of papers within journals from that discipline and the extent of the supplementary commentary within any bridging and discussion chapters. However, it would be unusual to have fewer than two or more than five publishable/published papers. A typical Journal Format thesis might include an introductory chapter, one or two publishable literature review papers, a bridging chapter explaining the rationale for the development of the empirical work from the literature review and including any additional literature considered, two or three publishable empirical papers, and a final chapter expanding on methodological choices and drawing conclusions about the overall body of work. The thesis portfolio as a whole is subject to the maximum word count for PhD of 80,000, as outlined in the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees). However, due to the requirements for succinct writing within journals, it is expected that Journal Format theses may less often reach the maximum word count. However, to meet the requirements of PhD learning outcomes, Journal Format theses would not usually be less than 50,000-words in total where 4-5 papers are included within this word count. Where fewer papers are incorporated within the thesis, and therefore a larger proportion of the writing is not the succinct style required for journal papers, the word-count would usually be closer to the 80,000-word maximum.

Part-time candidates who have published one of the incorporated papers early in their period of registration should be mindful of the need to present a thesis that is up-to-date at the point of submission. This might mean, for example, that a bridging chapter would need to extend the earlier literature review or that a final discussion chapter would need to acknowledge research published since the published discussion of the empirical findings.

Can co-authored papers be included?

The thesis must be based on the candidate's own research conducted under supervision within the School and during the period of doctoral registration. Therefore, the expectation is that any published papers included will either be co-authored with supervisors (where this is the disciplinary norm for publishing doctoral research) or be sole-authored accounts of supervised research in situations where a supervisor does not wish to act as co-author. Where previously published papers have been co-authored with supervisors, the PhD candidate would normally be first author and they should be able to defend this paper at viva as an integral part of their independent doctoral work. The expectation is that the supervisor's contribution to any co-authored paper included in a Journal Format thesis should not exceed the usual supervisor contribution to a standard thesis i.e., assisting with the development of research ideas, guiding with regard to analysis and conclusions, and providing feedback on drafts of work. The PGR should therefore write the first draft of all sections of any co-authored publications included. A list of publications at the beginning of the thesis should clarify this by listing the contribution of authors to all co-authored publications, and this should be indicated where appropriate in the commentary.

Any attempt to pass off other people's work within co-authored publications as the candidate's own work will be treated as research misconduct and dealt with according to the research conduct regulations.

Recording the choice of thesis format

Candidates are encouraged to record discussion of thesis format in supervision records (e.g., the PGR Data Management System) and refer to this in the Research Support Plan and Progression Reports. This does not commit them to a particular thesis format but helps to ensure that those supporting them and reviewing their work understand the intended outputs. The final decision on thesis format should be declared before examiners are appointed.

Formatting of the thesis

Formatting should follow the general University of Huddersfield requirements. For improved readability and continuous page numbering, copies of publisher formatted versions of papers should not be included. Instead, the final author version should be used.

If papers have already been published, the publication should be listed at the beginning of the thesis and cited as a footnote where the paper begins within the thesis. Where previously published papers have been co-authored, a declaration should be included at the beginning of the thesis, explaining the contribution of each author.

For unpublished papers, it is good practice to indicate which journals the paper would be suited to, in order to support their presentation as credible academic papers.
It is expected that there may be some limited overlap between papers, for example if reference is made to similar literature or similar methods. This is not problematic, so long as the thesis as a whole discusses sufficient novel material to be comparable with a standard thesis.

As well as a reference section at the end of each journal paper (not included in the word count) there should also be a combined reference section at the end of the thesis, including all references cited in the thesis across both journal papers/book chapters and linking chapters.

Due to the variations in structure permitted for a Journal Format thesis, it is strongly advised that the introductory chapter explains the structure of the thesis.

Agreements with publishers

Candidates planning to use published work within a thesis portfolio should check that this does not infringe any copyright agreement. Where papers incorporated are still under review by a journal or pending publication, candidates should check whether their thesis will need to be embargoed until the paper is published. If so, they should indicate this at the point of thesis submission.

Examination of the thesis

The viva voce examination will take the same form as examination of a standard thesis. Candidates should note that inclusion of peer reviewed published material into a thesis does not guarantee a successful examination outcome, as peer reviewed publications can

vary in standards and requirements. Examiners are permitted to request the usual revisions to any part of the submitted thesis, even if the work being revised has previously been published. However, for previously published work it may be more appropriate for revisions to be addressed via the commentary on the published papers within the bridging or discussion chapters.

These guidelines should be made available to examiners of all theses submitted in Journal Format and familiarity with the format should be discussed when examiners are initially invited to examine.

Appendix C

Guidelines for alternative format research degree theses using practice as research: School of Computing and Engineering

Subject specialism: Music Technology and Games Design

(PhD - Music Technology)
(PhD - Games Design)

These guidelines are for supervisors and students who are considering including non-standard text-format presentation of research and practice elements as a part of a PhD research portfolio submission in the areas of music technology and games design. These guidelines should also be made available to the examiners of alternative thesis submissions.

Word counts

- The maximum word count for a thesis is normally 80,000 words. The exact percentage weightings between non-standard text format presentation, practice, and written elements are to be negotiated between the student and the supervisory team.
- The aims, objectives and methodology of a research project will dictate the structure of the submission.
- Practice-orientated PhD projects or non-standard text format thesis elements in the subject specialist areas of music technology and games design are normally balanced between 50–75% practice or non-standard text format and 25–50% written (20,000–40,000 words).
- The supervisory team, in consultation with the student, should discuss the percentage equivalents between the different elements of the PhD project. This will normally be done at the start of the research journey and reviewed in the Research Support Plan and at Progression Monitoring.
- At the first progression point, the student should outline the balance between practice/non-standard text format and written components. This will be subject to approval by the supervisory team and the Progression Monitoring assessors.
- The sector wide equivalents for PhDs that are practice-orientated and non-standard text format elements vary across the disciplines. Therefore, a clear rationale is needed for the percentage weightings. The rationale should explain how and why any divergence from existing subject convention is key to the specific underlying aims of the research project. This will normally be done at the start of the research journey and reviewed in the Research Support Plan and at Progression Monitoring.
- Candidates are encouraged to record discussion and agreement of the weightings and rationale in the online supervision recording system (currently the PGR Data Management System).

Submission

- Students may include practice components as part of their PhD submission if it directly relates to the written research elements of the submission. Alternative

format theses may include a portfolio of components appropriate to the field of study; for example: artefacts, film, photography, design prototypes, technical samples, software, code, multi-media designs, games, etc. These may be included alongside a written thesis or within a or non-standard text format such as a website or other multimedia presentational format. In all instances the rigour of the academic research must fulfil the criteria for the award regardless of the means of presentation.

- Research in, with and through practice ranges from substantial portfolios featuring research processes and completed artefacts or prototypes, to short practical extracts serving as examples of research ideas expressed in the thesis.
- The documentation of the portfolio must *always* be included as part of the submission alongside the written part of the thesis, but hyperlinks within the written text may also be used to point to the practice on-line. Images of practice may also be embedded with the written element of the thesis.
- Portfolios of practice and written elements must be related. The portfolio of work comprises practical elements AND written documentation. They should not be considered as two entirely distinct components, but rather sit together as a critical thesis or exegesis of the research undertaken. To be considered and assessed as a whole, the practice and the written work should inform each other and lead to new research insights. The submission of practical and written elements will be treated as an integral whole and components will not be individually marked.
- The structure of a PhD with practical components are informed by the existing conventions and accepted academic practices of subject specialist fields of study (for example, game design, audio technology component design, software development, APP development, spatial sound). It is expected that the supervisory team will work with the student to develop a suitable structure and presentational format for the research practice.
- The research practice outcomes should be of a professional standard. Where documentation is submitted, these should be of the highest quality possible. Published outcomes/exhibitions may be included, so long as permissions and credits have been provided and included within the written text and previous publications listed within the thesis.

Please refer to the standard university regulations on submission of PhDs under Section A4 of the Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees)

Please note: A thesis submitted in alternative format and/or consisting of a portfolio of practical artifacts is considered as a standard PhD. For submissions consisting of a substantial body of published work such as high-impact academic and creative literature, they will be considered under the award framework for PhD by Publication.

Additional information

The supervisory team should oversee all aspects of the student's progress, submission and examination. The supervisors should ensure the following:

- That the balance between practice, non-standard text format components, and written elements of the thesis are discussed at the first progression point and agreed and reported in the Progression Feedback Form. Any revisions to the agreed structure should be further reviewed by the supervisor and Progression

Monitoring assessors and any changes agreed must be recorded in the Feedback Form.

- That the submission any code, tools, games, technology or other artefacts to be considered alongside the written elements of the thesis should be carefully planned in consultation with the student, as well as with internal and external examiners along with The Registrar and Secretary's Office as part of the Examination arrangements. For example, this may include: the "locking" of a website so that it remains exactly as it was at the point of submission; the physical delivery of artefacts to the examiners; or the secure online hosting of large data files so that they are accessible to the examiners.
- That any demonstration of the code, tools, games, technology or other artefacts at the viva voce examination should be carefully planned and scheduled in consultation with the student, as well as with internal and external examiners along with The Registrar and Secretary's Office as part of the Examination arrangements.
- That examiners understand the agreed relationship between the practice, non-standard text format elements, and written components. This includes the research aims of the portfolio, and the general criteria used for all PhD submissions at the University of Huddersfield.

Document Sign-off, Ownership Details and Revision History

DOCUMENT SIGN-OFF AND OWNERSHIP DETAILS	
Document name:	Regulations for Awards (Research Degrees) 2023/24
Version Number:	V9.0
Equality Impact Assessment:	Yes
Privacy Impact Assessment:	Not applicable
Approved by:	The Senate
Effective from:	01 August 2026
Date for Review:	Annually
Author:	Head of Student Regulations and Casework
Owner (if different from above):	Registrar and Secretary
Document Location:	https://www.hud.ac.uk/policies/registry/awards-pgr/
ComplianceChecks:	Completed

REVISION HISTORY			
Version	Date	Revision description/Summary of changes	Author
9.0	01 August 2026	**Throughout the regulations** • Insertion of missing words and small spelling or grammatical changes throughout. • Small clarification and formatting changes throughout. • Updated references from 'Director of Registry and Academic Development' to 'Registrar and Secretary'	Registrar and Secretary's Office

		• References to SkillsForge replaced with references to the PGR Data Management System. • Updated references to 'Registry and Academic Development' to 'The Registrar and Secretary's Office'. • Some larger areas of re-wording providing additional clarity, which does not impact a regulatory or material change • Updated references from 'Graduate School' to 'Doctoral College' • Clarification added on where PhD/EntD regulations apply, and where others apply instead, in relation to newly added awards. • Sections updated and reordered where required to reflect addition of new awards. **Section A: General Regulations Governing All Research Degrees** • Information on new awards added to sections on eligibility for extra time and thesis word counts. (A4.2.3 / A4.5.1) • Clarifying information added on where candidates holding an MPhil may be able to take up recognition of prior research, provided they have not previously been failed and exited with a lower award. (A2) **Section E: Regulations for The Awards of PhD and EntD (Excluding PhD by Publication and PhD by Prospective Publication)** • Information added on exceptional transfers between PhD and MA/MSc by Research. (E5.2.4) **Section F: Regulations for the Award of PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only)** • New section added to reflect the validation and addition of the Award of PhD (4 Year FT) (Projects only) **Section H: Regulations for the Award of PhD by Prospective Publication** • Placeholder information for 2025/26 regulations removed. • Full section added to reflect the validation and addition of the Award of PhD by Prospective Publication	

8.0	01 August 2025	**Throughout the regulations** ▪ Insertion of missing words and small spelling or grammatical changes throughout. ▪ Small clarification and formatting changes throughout. ▪ Updated references to 'Director of Registry' to 'Director of Registry and Academic Development' ▪ Some larger areas of re-wording providing additional clarity, which does not impact a regulatory or material change ▪ Change of terminology from 'interim award' to 'exit award' ▪ Change of frequency of 'on track to submit' meetings from at least three months prior to at least four months prior (sections A, C, D, and E) **Section A: General Regulations Governing All Research Degrees** • Change of criteria recorded where independent chairs are appointed where the collective number of UKPGR examinations examined by the examination team falls below 3. (Previously below 6) • Amendment made to 'Associate supervisors' to now reflect 'External supervisors and external advisors', with clarification on role included. (s. A3.5) **Section G - Regulations for the Award of PhD by Prospective Publication** • Section added to reflect the new addition of the Award of PhD by Prospective Publication • Previous Section G (related to Higher Doctorates) has been moved to Section H. **Document Sign-off, Ownership Details and Revision History** • **'**Approved by' box amended to 'Senate' from 'UTLC and URC' to reflect practise.	
7.0	01 August 2024	**Throughout the regulations** ▪ Insertion of missing words and small spelling or grammatical changes throughout.	Registry

		▪ Small clarification and formatting changes throughout. **Section A – General regulations governing all research degrees** • Amendment and clarification provided within A1.10 Alternative formats of thesis submission, specifically in relation to requests made by PGRs with a disability • Slight amendments made the requirements of the supervisory team in section A3 **Section D - Professional Doctorate, incorporating the Master in Research** • Amendment to D5.8 to state that following initial assessment (progression stage), that the examination team reserve the right to request a further viva after resubmission • Amendment to D5.9 and D5.12 to state that following amendments, if the PGR has failed/been downgraded the examination team must hold a viva before decision is finalised. **Section E - PhD and EntD** • Amendment to E5.10 to state that following initial assessment (progression stage), that the examination team reserve the right to request a further viva after resubmission • Amendment to E5.11 and E5.14 to state that following amendments, if the PGR has failed/been downgraded the examination team must hold a viva before decision is finalised • Guidance to alternative thesis format altered to reflect that included in A10. **Section G: Higher Doctorates** ▪ Clarity provided on appeal procedure	
6.0	1 August 2023	**Throughout the regulations** ▪ Insertion of missing words and small spelling or grammatical changes throughout. ▪ Small clarification and formatting changes throughout. **Section A – General regulations governing all research degrees** ▪ Clarity provided around dual enrolment	Registry

		▪ Introduction of 'fit to submit' regulation ▪ Introduction of the record of achievement (under 50 credits only) ▪ Clarification of revocation of award process ▪ Emphasis on student visa implications of student's requesting additional time to complete ▪ Clarity on process for the request to increase wordcount ▪ Introduction of A.4.9 'The Examination Team'. The information used to sit in Section N within the Quality Assurance Regulations but has been moved to the Award Regulations for parity and process ownership by the PGR Team. **Section B: Masters by Research** ▪ Clarity on the period required for further editorial corrections to be submitted, given as an outcome of the revised submission. **Section C: Master of Philosophy** ▪ Clarity on the period required for further editorial corrections to be submitted, given as an outcome of the revised submission. **Section D: Professional Doctorate, incorporating the Master in Research** ▪ Clarity of the progression panel membership ▪ Introduction of second discretionary PM viva ▪ Clarity on the period required for further editorial corrections to be submitted, given as an outcome of the revised submission. **Section E: PhD and EntD** ▪ Clarity on the period required for further editorial corrections to be submitted, given as an outcome of the revised submission ▪ Clarity of the progression panel membership ▪ Clarity on restrictions of change of programme for PhD and EntD candidates **Section F: PhD by Publication** ▪ Clarity on the period required for further editorial corrections to be submitted, given as an outcome of the revised submission **Section G: Higher Doctorates**	

		▪ Insertion of outcome appeal outcome window ▪ Clarity provided on qualifying criteria ▪ Insertion of the usual requirement to submit all work electronically.	
5.0	1 August 2022	**Throughout the regulations** ▪ Insertion of missing words and small spelling or grammatical changes throughout. ▪ Small clarification and formatting changes throughout. ▪ Some larger areas of re-wording to address providing additional clarity, which does not impact a regulatory change. ▪ Some areas of duplication have been deleted. ▪ Insertion of hyperlinks.	Registry
5.0	1 August 2022	**Section A – General regulations governing all research degrees** A1.10 Alternative formats of thesis submission ▪ Links provide to guidance that is now found in the appendices. ▪ Change of approval procedure from through validation to School Dean and Dean of Graduate School. ▪ Alternative formats should normally be declared at research support plan submission and be formalised at progression monitoring one. ▪ Inclusion that an alternative format may be required to provide a reasonable adjustment for a PGR with a disability. ▪ Confirmation that the appropriate guidelines will be made available to examiners. A2.5 Candidates enrolled on a campus based research degree ▪ Updated to clearly define what is a campus based research degree to differentiate between research degrees that are delivered via distance learning. A4.1 Examination and assessments – candidate responsibilities ▪ Clarity provided to explain 'fit to sit' in relation to submitting work for assessment and for attendance at progression and final viva examinations.	Registry

		A4.4 Application for the writing-up period Removal of point A4.4.10 which states that no further time will be allowed at the end of the writing-up period, as this contradicts that end extensions are permitted at this stage. A5 Revocation of a research degree ▪ New section created to support the revocation of degree	
5.0	1 August 2022	**Section B – Master's by Research** B1.4 Alternative formats of thesis submission ▪ Condense to reduce duplication from section A1.10. B5.3 Transfer to or from a distance learning route ▪ Addition section added to permit transfer to distance learning from a campus based degree or vice versa B5.4 Final thesis examination ▪ Change to the editorial outcome to allow minor content changes and one month allowed for corrections.	Registry
5.0	1 August 2022	**Section C – MPhil** C4 Final thesis examination ▪ Change to the editorial outcome to allow minor content changes and one month allowed for corrections	Registry
5.0	1 August 2022	**Section D – Prof Doc** D3 Admission criteria ▪ Updated to reflect change to the admissions policy which requires a master's degree would normally be a merit of distinction classification D5.5 Assessment of progression ▪ Ethical approval will need to be confirmed at progression monitoring. D5.10 Final thesis examination ▪ Change to the editorial outcome to allow minor content changes and one month allowed for corrections	Registry

5.0	1 August 2022	**Section E – PhD and EntD** E2.2 Alternative formats of thesis submission ▪ Condensed to reduce duplication from section A1.10E5.6.1 Assessment of progression ▪ Confirmation that ethical approval will be considered at progression monitoring one and will need to be approved by progression monitoring two. E3 Admission criteria ▪ Updated to reflect change to the admissions policy which requires a master's degree would normally be a merit of distinction classification E5.4 Transfer to or from a distance learning route ▪ Addition section added to permit transfer to distance learning from a campus based degree or vice versa E5.12 Final thesis examination ▪ Change to the editorial outcome to allow minor content changes and one month allowed for corrections	Registry
5.0	1 August 2022	**Section F – PhD by Publication** F4 Admission criteria ▪ Updated to reflect change to the admissions policy which requires a master's degree would normally be a merit of distinction classification F5 Final thesis examination ▪ Change to the editorial outcome to allow minor content changes and one month allowed for corrections	Registry
5.0	1 August 2022	**Section G – Higher Doctorates** G3 Application for candidature ▪ Addition that registration will be on a part-time basis and normally for one year ▪ Addition that applications will be considered within 20 working days	Registry

		▪ Addition that fees will be payable after the application is approved and before the work is submitted for examination G5 Examination ▪ Clarification that the candidate will propose three examiners which will be approved by the Higher Doctoral Board ▪ Clarification that the candidate must have no contact with the examiners between their appointment and receiving their examination outcome	
5.0	1 August 2022	**Appendix** ▪ Creation of new pages (as an appendix) which include all approval alternative format thesis guidelines	Registry