

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



**HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL
P.O.BOX 6311 KIGALI**

**FRAMEWORK AND REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD
OF HIGHER DEGREES BY RESEARCH, AND
REGULATIONS ON CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM IN
RESEARCH DEGREES**

Revised April, 2007

INDEX

A GENERAL FRAMEWORK	2
A1 AWARDS.....	2
A.2 Registration	3
A.3 Transfer	3
A.4 Examination	3
A.5 Review of an Assessment Decision	4
B RESEARCH DEGREE REGULATIONS	5
B 1 ENROLMENT AND REGISTRATION	5
B.2 SUPERVISION.....	11
B.3 TRANSFER OF REGISTRATION FROM MASTERS TO DOCTORATE	12
B.4 EXAMINATION.....	13
B.6 Award of MPhil or PhD by Completed Work.....	29
B.7 ASSESSMENT REVIEW	31
<i>Appendix A</i> INSTITUTION RESEARCH DEGREES FORMS	41
<i>Appendix B</i> REGULATIONS ON CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM IN RESEARCH DEGREES	42
<i>Appendix c</i> FORMAT FOR THE PREPARATION AND CONDUCT OF A FORMAL HEARING	48

FRAMEWORK AND REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF HIGHER DEGREES BY RESEARCH

A GENERAL FRAMEWORK

A1 AWARDS

1.1 Awards

Institutions shall award the degrees of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), to registered candidates who have successfully completed approved programmes of supervised research.

1.2 Masters' Level

- i) The degree of **MPhil** shall be awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic, has produced work at the forefront of knowledge, has demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, and has presented and defended a thesis in oral examination to the satisfaction of the examiners. The candidate must present and defend the thesis to the satisfaction of examiners in oral examination, the conduct of which will be in accordance with the regulations for the award of MPhil.
- ii) The degree of **MPhil by Completed Work** shall be awarded to a candidate whose previously completed submitted work has demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the overall theme, to the satisfaction of the examiners, and an assessment of its context in relation to the developing state of the art in the subject concerned and has produced work at the forefront of knowledge. The candidate must present and defend the thesis to the satisfaction of examiners in oral examination, the conduct of which will be in accordance with the regulations for the award of MPhil.

1.3 Doctoral Level

- i) The degree of **PhD** shall be awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge, has demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, and has presented and defended a thesis in oral examination to the satisfaction of the examiners.
- ii) The degree of **PhD by Completed Work** shall be awarded to a candidate whose submitted work has demonstrated an independent and original contribution to knowledge, to the satisfaction of the examiners and an understanding of the research methodology employed in its creation, and assessment of its context in relation to the developing state of the art in the subject concerned.

The candidate must present and defend the thesis the satisfaction of examiners in oral examination to, the conduct of which will be in accordance with the regulations for the award of PhD.

A.2 Registration

- 2.1 Candidates enrolled for a research degree may apply to register for MPhil, MPhil with the possibility of transfer to PhD (MPhil/PhD), or PhD direct.
- 2.2 Registration may take place only with the approval of the Institution's Senate, acting on behalf of the Institution, in relation to the following:
 - (i) The suitability of the candidate to undertake research;
and
 - (ii) The programme of research;
and
 - (iii) The supervision arrangements and research facilities.

(Since this approval requires appropriate academic judgement to be brought to bear on the viability of each research proposal, the Standing Committee advising Senate shall be composed of persons who are, or have recently been, engaged in research and who have appropriate experience of successful supervision of research degrees.)

- 2.3 First consideration of applications is undertaken by a Standing -Committee of Senate which will make recommendations to the Institution Senate.
- 2.4 All candidates must have at least two approved supervisors, including a Director of Studies with responsibility for regular and frequent supervision.

A.3 Transfer

Students initially registering for an MPhil with possibility of transfer to PhD may apply for such a transfer on submission of a progress report on the work undertaken.

A.4 Examination

- 4.1 The examinations for MPhil and PhD have two stages;
 - (i) Submission and preliminary assessment of the thesis,
 - (ii) Defence of the thesis by oral examination (or an approved alternative).
- 4.2 It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that the thesis is submitted before the expiry of the registration period, and to ensure that any conditions of eligibility required by Senate are met.
- 4.3 A candidate will be examined by at least 2 examiners, of whom at least one will be external to the institution

- 4.4 The Institution Senate will consider the reports and recommendations of the examiners before coming to a decision on the result of the examination.
- 4.5 The Institution Senate may, subject to its requirements, permit one re-examination.

A.5 Review of an Assessment Decision

A candidate may, in certain circumstances, request a review of an examination decision. Such a review may be requested only in relation to a decision of Senate after consideration of the recommendation of the examiners. (See Research Degrees Regulations section B.7).

B RESEARCH DEGREE REGULATIONS

B 1 ENROLMENT AND REGISTRATION

B1.1 Enrolment

Candidates for enrolment as a research degree student should make an application to the Registrar, who will pass on the application to the relevant Faculty. Candidates shall be interviewed by a panel consisting of the potential Director of Studies, possibly other potential supervisors, and the Director of Research and Consultancy (or equivalent). The panel shall satisfy itself that candidates have a sound idea on which MPhil or PhD research could be based, that they are appropriately qualified to undertake a research degree, that their personal circumstances are not such as to make successful completion unlikely, that they understand what it is that they would be taking on, and that adequate expertise can be mobilised to offer effective supervision. The candidate's admission shall be recommended to the Dean, who shall make a formal application to Senate for the candidate's enrolment.

B.1.2 Registration and Entry Qualifications

Programmes of research may be proposed in any field of study subject to the requirements that the proposed programme is capable of leading to scholarly research and to its presentation for assessment by appropriate examiners and that the Institution can offer adequate supervision (perhaps drawing to some extent on external resource). The written thesis may be supplemented by material in other than written form. All proposed research programmes shall be considered for research degree registration on their academic merits and without reference to the concerns or interests of any associated funding body.

i) Qualifications Offered

A person may apply to register, by completing the appropriate form for the following degrees:

- a) Master of Philosophy, (MPhil);
- b) Master of Philosophy with possibility of transfer to Doctor of Philosophy, (MPhil/PhD); or
- c) Doctor of Philosophy, (PhD).

ii) Registration Criteria

In approving an application for registration, Senate shall satisfy itself that:

- a) The candidate is suitably qualified;
- b) The candidate is embarking on a viable research programme;
- c) In framing their programmes of work, candidates and their supervisory teams have give consideration to the "M" (level 6)

and “D” (level 7) level descriptors of the outcomes of study in the Qualifications Framework

- c) Supervision is adequate and likely to be sustained; and
- d) The Institution is able to provide appropriate facilities for the conduct of scholarly research in the area of the research programme.

iii) Entry Qualifications

An applicant for registration for the degree of MPhil or MPhil/PhD shall normally hold a first or upper second class honours degree of the Institution or a qualification which is regarded by Senate as equivalent to such an honours degree.

iv) Direct Registration to Doctoral Level

Direct registration for the degree of PhD may be permitted to an applicant who holds a Master's degree provided that the Master's degree is in a discipline which is appropriate to the proposed research and that the Master's degree included training in research and the execution of a research project.

v) Group Projects

- a) An applicant whose work forms part of a larger group project may register for a research degree. In such cases each individually registered project shall in itself be distinguishable for the purposes of assessment and be appropriate for the award being sought. The application shall indicate clearly each individual contribution and its relationship to the group project.
- b) Where a research degree project is part of a piece of funded research, Senate shall 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.

vii) Registration deadline and backdating

Registration should be submitted within 6-9 months of enrolment (or part-time equivalent). However, Registration may be backdated by up to six months (or part-time equivalent) from the date of receipt of the application. Longer periods of backdating may be permitted exceptionally, at the discretion of Senate.

viii) Advanced Standing Registration periods

Where a candidate has previously undertaken research as a registered candidate for a research degree, Senate may approve a shorter than usual registration period which takes account of all or part of the time already spent by the candidate on such research.

ix) Review

A candidate may request a review of all decisions concerning registration made by the Committee, in accordance with the Assessment Review Regulations.

B.1.3 Initial Registration

i) Research Methods Training

Unless a candidate can show evidence of prior and appropriate research methods training, he/she shall follow a programme of related studies where this is necessary for the attainment of competence in research methods and of knowledge related to the subject of the thesis. This programme shall be intended:

- a) To provide the candidate with the skills and knowledge necessary for the pursuit of the proposed research;
- b) To provide a body of knowledge normally associated with a degree in the field of study of the proposed research; and
- c) To provide breadth of knowledge in the related subjects.

ii) Creative Work

A candidate may undertake a programme of research in which the candidate's own creative work forms, as a point of origin or reference, a significant part of the intellectual enquiry. Such creative work may be in any field (for instance: fine art, design, engineering and technology, architecture, creative writing, musical composition, film, dance and performance), but shall have been undertaken as part of the registered research programme. In such cases, the presentation and submission may be partly in other than written form.

The creative work shall be clearly presented in relation to the argument of a written thesis and set in its relevant theoretical, historical, critical or design context. The thesis itself shall conform to the usual scholarly requirements and be of an appropriate length.

The final submission shall be accompanied by some permanent record (for instance, video, photographic record, musical score or diagrammatic representation) of the creative work, bound with the thesis where practicable. The application for registration shall set out the form of the candidate's intended submission and of the proposed methods of assessment.

iii) Scholarly Editions

A candidate may undertake a programme of research in which the principal focus is the preparation of a scholarly edition of a text or texts, musical or choreographic work or other original artefacts.

The final submission shall include a copy of the edited text(s) or collection of artefact(s), appropriate textual and explanatory annotations, and a substantial introduction and critical commentary which set the text in the relevant historical, theoretical or critical context. The thesis itself shall conform to the usual scholarly requirements and be of an appropriate length.

iv) Portfolio of Professional Work

The work submitted must constitute a coherent whole and must incorporate an abstract; introduction and conclusion which puts the total work submitted into context, and may also involve the writing of intermediate connecting passages. Where reports and briefing papers form the body of the submission, the Supervisors and candidate should refer to Regulations B.5.1 vi) to consider the number of papers which are required to accomplish this objective. These will form part of the material to be examined.

v) Language of Thesis and Oral

Except where permission has been given for the thesis and the oral examination to be in another language, the Senate shall satisfy itself that the candidate has sufficient command of the English or French language to complete the programme of work satisfactorily and to prepare and defend a thesis in English or French. Permission to present a thesis in another language shall normally be sought at the time of application for registration. Permission to present a thesis in a language other than English or French shall normally be given only if the subject matter of the thesis involves language and related studies in a language other than English or French.

vi) Research Effort

A candidate may register on a full-time or a part-time basis. A full-time candidate shall normally devote on average at least 35 hours per week to the research and a part-time candidate on average at least 12 hours per week.

vii) Confidentiality Agreements

Where a candidate or the Institution wishes the thesis to remain confidential for a period of time after completion of the work, application for approval shall normally be made to Senate at the time of registration. In cases where the need for confidentiality emerges at a subsequent stage, a special application for the thesis to remain confidential after submission

shall be made immediately to Senate. The period approved shall normally not exceed two years from the date of the oral examination.

viii) Application for Registration

The application for Registration for the research degree programme shall be submitted on form RDREG07. Candidates should pay careful attention to the “Notes for Guidance”, and in particular, the normal upper limit (1000 words) for the outline of the “Proposed Plan of Work”.

B.1.4 Research Ethics

i) Personal Responsibility

The Institution subscribes to an ethic of personal responsibility by which individual researchers, and, in the case of students, their supervisors, should have some degree of autonomy and take personal responsibility for their research.

ii) Research Ethics and Ethics Clearance

The responsibility for overseeing research ethics in research degrees shall be given to a Research Ethics Committee (which may in a given institution be a subset or all the members of an existing standing committee). The Committee will consider ethical issues raised by individual projects which involve human subjects through either experimentation or the collection of data or which impinge on people’s lives and might cause harm or embarrassment. The Director of Studies shall signify on the Registration Form that Ethical Release has been certified by the Committee.

B.1.5. The Registration Period

i) Minimum and Maximum Registrations

The normal minimum and maximum periods of registration shall be as follows:

	Minimum	Maximum
Masters Level		
Full-time (MPhil only)	18 months	36 months
Part-time	30 months	48 months
Doctorate level (via transfer from Masters’ registration and including that period of Masters’ registration)		
Full-time (MPhil/PhD)	33 months	60 months

Part-time	45 months	72 months
Doctorate level (direct)		
Full-time (PhD only)	24 months	60 months
Part-time	36 months	72 months

ii) Expected completions

Full-time candidates shall normally submit their MPhil dissertation within two years of registration or their PhD thesis within three years .

iii) Monitoring and Review

The requirements for periodic monitoring and review are set out in the *Research Degree Log Book*

iv) Extension of Registration

a) A candidate shall submit the thesis to the Registrar of Senate before the expiry of the maximum period of registration. A candidate may apply for an extension to the period of registration, normally for not more than one year at a time. A candidate seeking such an extension shall apply on the appropriate form (RDEXT07) giving adequate reasons.

b) A candidate may request the review of a decision not to permit Extension to Registration, in accordance with the Assessment Review Regulations.

v) Withdrawal of Registration

Where a candidate has discontinued the research, the withdrawal of registration shall be notified to Senate on the appropriate form (RDWDR07), either by the candidate or, if that cannot be arranged, then by the Director of Studies.

vi) Enrolment and Annual Re-enrolment

Subject to satisfactory progress assessed through Annual Monitoring, a candidate shall enrol initially and re-enrol annually and pay such fees as may be determined from time to time by the Institution.

B.1.6 Intellectual Property Rights

Copies of the Institution's "*Regulations Relating to Intellectual Property Rights in Students' Course Work*", including programmes of research or study leading to a higher degree, shall be made available.

B.2 SUPERVISION

i) Number of Supervisors

A research degree candidate shall have at least two and normally not more than three supervisors.

ii) Supervisory Experience

A supervision team shall normally have had a combined experience of supervising not fewer than two candidates to successful completion. This may be achieved as follows:

Either at least one supervisor shall have had experience of supervising at least two candidates to successful completion of a research degree, **or** at least one supervisor shall have had experience of supervising one candidate to successful completion of a research degree and one shall have taken an approved and certified course of Research Supervisors' Training.

iii) Research Supervisor Training

Academics who wish to become research supervisors must normally successfully complete an approved supervisory training programme, before they undertake any supervisory role. Only in exceptional circumstances will a member of staff be allowed to undertake supervision without such training and in that event the training programme must be successfully completed within twelve months of the uptake of such a duty.

iv) Director of Studies

One supervisor shall be the Director of Studies, responsible to the Institution for the ethics of the student's research and that the institution's procedures are followed. The Director of Studies must be a member of the institution's staff. Normally he or she will be the first supervisor, with responsibility for supervising the candidate on a regular and frequent basis, but sometimes or at some stages of the degree this role may pass to another supervisor.

v) Additional Advisers

In addition to the supervisors, an adviser or advisers may be proposed to contribute some specialised knowledge or a link with an external organisation.

vi) Supervisors Registered for Research Degrees

A candidate for a research degree (except for a degree of PhD by Completed Work) shall be ineligible to act as supervisor or adviser.

vii) Change of Supervisory Arrangements

A proposal for a change in supervision arrangements shall be made to Senate on the appropriate form RDCHS07. A change may be instigated either by the Student or by a member of the Supervisory Team, in consultation with the relevant Faculty Dean and all parties concerned.

B.3 TRANSFER OF REGISTRATION FROM MASTERS TO DOCTORATE

B.3.1 Transfer Procedures

i) Application to Transfer

A candidate registered initially for MPhil/PhD who wishes to transfer to PhD, shall apply to Senate to do so on the appropriate form (RDTRN07) when he/she has made sufficient progress on the work to provide evidence of the development to PhD (normally after about 9 -15 months of full-time study or the part-time equivalent).

ii) Length of Transfer Reports

In support of the summary of progress on the application form, the candidate shall prepare for Senate supporting material on the work undertaken. The supporting materials should normally be at least 2,500 and not more than 5,000 words in length. The material should normally include

- a) A brief review and discussion of the work already undertaken; and
- b) A statement of the intended further work, including details of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge

Supporting materials/progress reports submitted in excess of the normal length will not be accepted.

iii) Transfer Criteria and Independent Assessment

Before approving transfer from MPhil to PhD Senate shall be satisfied that the candidate has made sufficient progress and that the proposed programme provides a suitable basis for work at PhD standard which the candidate is capable of pursuing to completion.

Senate will seek advice of two independent experts. Except in cases of doubt whether the appropriate independent expertise exists in-house, these experts may be internal to the institution, but neither should be connected with the student's project or supervision.

Assessors' reports should be submitted in writing, and Students and their Supervisors will be given an opportunity to comment in writing on them, but the identities of the Assessors will remain confidential to Senate.

An oral assessment may be used by Senate in appropriate circumstances as part of its assessment of the case for transfer.

iv) Ethical considerations

Before approving a transfer from MPhil to PhD, Senate shall be satisfied that any substantial changes in the nature of experimentation/data collection since the original approval of the proposal has been considered through the appropriate Research Ethics procedures.

v) Transfer of candidates registered only for MPhil

A student registered for the degree of MPhil only may apply to transfer the registration to PhD retrospectively. In such cases the candidate's full progress report shall be submitted to Senate along with the application for transfer.

vi) Submission at Masters level by candidates registered at Doctoral level

A student who is registered for the degree of PhD and who is unable to complete the approved programme of work may, at any time prior to the submission of the thesis for examination, apply to Senate for the registration to revert to that for MPhil.

vii) Non-approval of Transfers, and Review

A student whose transfer to Doctorate level is not approved may submit only at Masters level, and within the normal maximum registration period for Masters.

B.4 EXAMINATION

B.4.1 Examinations - General

(i) Stages of Examination

The examination for the MPhil and PhD shall have two stages: firstly the submission and preliminary assessment of the thesis, and secondly its defence by oral or approved alternative examination

(ii) Exemption from Oral or arrangement of Alternative Examination

A candidate shall normally be examined orally on the programme of work and on the field of study within which the programme lies. Where for reasons of sickness, disability or comparable valid cause Senate is satisfied that a candidate would be under serious disadvantage if required to undergo an oral examination, an alternative form of examination may be approved. Such approval shall not be given on the grounds that the candidate's knowledge of the language in which the thesis is presented is inadequate.

iii) Location and Language of Oral

An oral examination shall normally be held in Rwanda. Except with the specific permission of Senate, the oral shall be conducted in English or French.

iv) Non-Examiners permitted at Oral

With the consent of the candidate, one supervisor may attend the oral examination, and he or she may participate in the discussion to the extent permitted by the examiners, but he or she shall withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination.

In cases where a supervisor is unable to be present, and the candidate wishes to be accompanied in the viva, arrangements should be made for a member of academic staff with supervisory experience to be present.

v) Appointment of Independent Chairs

An Independent non-examining Chair will be appointed for all oral examinations.

vi) Aegrotat Awards

An aegrotat degree may be awarded on the basis of a thesis completed by a candidate which is ready for submission for examination but where the candidate, for reasons of illness or other valid cause, is unable to proceed with examination. In such cases Senate shall seek evidence that the candidate would have been likely to have been successful had the oral examination taken place or, in the case of an oral examination having been held, that the candidate would have been able successfully to address any amendments required by the examiner. If no other evidence is available then the Supervisory Team might be invited to make an oral or written submission on the candidate's behalf.

In these circumstances the student (or his/her parent, spouse or other appropriate individual) must have signified that s/he is willing to accept the award, and must acknowledge that acceptance of such an award implies waiver of the possibility of re-assessment.

Aegrotat awards will be listed as one of the following:

Aegrotat MPhil
Aegrotat PhD

vii) Posthumous Awards

The degree of MPhil or PhD may be awarded posthumously on the basis of a thesis completed by a candidate which is ready for submission for examination. In such cases Senate shall seek evidence that the candidate would have been likely to have been successful had the oral examination taken place.

viii) Ratification of Examiners' Recommendations

Senate shall make a decision on the reports and recommendation(s) of the examiners in respect of the candidate. .

ix) Cheating or Plagiarism suspected in the thesis.

Where evidence of cheating or plagiarism in preparation of the thesis, or other irregularities in the conduct of the examination come to light during, or subsequent to the recommendation of the examiners, Senate shall consider the matter, if necessary in consultation with the examiners, and take action in accordance with the Regulations on Cheating and Plagiarism in Research Degrees in Appendix B.

x) Conduct of Examinations

Senate shall ensure that all examinations are conducted and the recommendations of the examiners are presented wholly in accordance with the Institution's regulations and Code of Practice for Research *Viva Voce* Examinations. In any instance where Senate 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.

B.4.2 Examination Procedures

i) Nomination of Examination Team

The Director of Studies in consultation with the Dean of Faculty shall propose to Senate, on the appropriate form (RDARG07), the arrangements for the candidate's examination. The examination may not take place until the examination arrangements have been approved. In special circumstances Senate may act directly to appoint examiners and arrange the examination of a candidate.

iii) Notifications to Candidate of Procedures

The Registrar shall make known to the candidate the procedure to be followed for the submission of the thesis (including the number of copies to be submitted for examination) and any conditions to be satisfied before the candidate may be considered eligible for examination.

iv) Notification of Date of Oral Examination

The Registrar shall notify the candidate, all supervisors and the examiners of the date of the oral examination.

v) Circulation of Theses to Examiners

- a) The Registrar shall send a copy of the thesis to each examiner, together with the examiner's preliminary report form and the Institution's regulations, and shall ensure that the examiners are properly briefed as to their duties.
- b) The Registrar shall ensure that all the examiners have completed and returned the preliminary reports to the Institution before the oral examination takes place.

B.4.3 The Candidate's Responsibilities in the Examination Process

i) Submission prior to Expiry of Registration

The candidate shall ensure that the thesis is submitted to the Registrar of the Institution before the expiry of the registration period, and shall ensure that each copy of the thesis is complete before submission.

ii) Conditions of Eligibility

The candidate shall satisfy any conditions of eligibility for examination required by Senate.

iii) Examination Arrangements

The candidate shall take no part in the arrangement of the examination and shall have no formal contact with the External Examiner(s) between the appointment of the examiners and the oral examination.

iv) Candidate's discretion in Submission

The submission of the thesis for examination, for the level of award for which they are registered, shall be at the sole discretion of the candidate.

v) Submission Declaration

The candidate shall confirm, through the submission of a declaration form RDSUB07, that the work is their own, or that certain parts were undertaken in collaboration with others, and whether any other persons undertook any interviews, data collection, or experimentation on their behalf, and that the thesis has not been submitted for a comparable academic award. The candidate shall not be precluded from incorporating in the thesis, covering a wider field, work which has already been submitted for a degree or comparable award, provided that it is indicated, on the declaration form and also in the thesis, which work has been so incorporated.

The candidate shall also obtain the signatures of the Supervisors indicating that they have been consulted about the submission. Where the supervisors do not think the thesis ready for examination, this shall not be a bar to the candidate submitting it if he or she is determined to do so. The declaration form shall be forwarded to the Examiners.

vi) Thesis format

The candidate shall ensure that the thesis format is in accordance with the requirements of the Institution's regulations. Theses may be submitted for examination either in a permanently bound form or in a temporarily bound form which is sufficiently secure to ensure that pages cannot be added or removed. The thesis shall be presented in a permanent binding of the approved type before the degree may be awarded. A thesis submitted in a temporarily bound form shall be in its final form in all respects save the binding. In such cases the candidate shall confirm that the contents of the permanently bound thesis are identical with the version submitted for examination, except where amendments have been made to meet the requirements of the examiners.

vii) Binding Costs

Except where a specific budget has been allocated within a research project for the costs associated with binding a thesis, the candidate shall be responsible for costs incurred in the submission of the thesis for examination and the final binding.

B.4.4 Examiners

i) Composition of Examination Team

A candidate shall be examined by at least two and normally not more than three examiners, of whom at least one shall be an External Examiner.

ii) Definition of Internal Examiner

An Internal Examiner shall be defined as an examiner who is a member of staff of the Institution. No member of the candidate's supervisory team may act as an internal examiner.

iv) Examination of Staff Candidates

Where the candidate and the Internal Examiner are both on the permanent staff of the same establishment, a second External Examiner shall be appointed. A candidate who is on a fixed short-term employment contract (for instance, a research assistant) shall be exempt from the requirements of this regulation.

v) Definition of External Examiner

An External Examiner shall both be independent both of the Institution and not have acted previously as the candidate's supervisor or adviser, or normally, as transfer assessor, or research collaborator. Any prior connection with the candidate must be declared at the point of nomination as an Examiner on the Examiner Contract form. An External Examiner shall normally not be either a supervisor of another candidate or an External Examiner on a taught course in the same department at the Institution.

Former members of staff or former students of the Institution shall normally not be approved as External Examiners until three years after the termination of their employment or completion of their studies with the Institution.

Senate shall ensure that the same External Examiner is not approved so frequently that his/her familiarity with the academic unit might prejudice objective judgement.

vii) Experience of Examiners

- a) Examiners shall be experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's thesis and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined.
- b) Within the limits of a maximum of three examiners, every effort should be made to appoint examiners to cover the academic content of interdisciplinary theses.
- c) At least one External Examiner shall have experience (normally two or more previous examinations) of examining research degree candidates.

vii) Ineligibility of Research Students to act as Examiners

No candidate registered for a research degree shall act as an Examiner.

viii) External Examiners Fees and Expenses

The Institution shall determine and pay the fees and expenses of the examiners.

B.4.5 First Examination

i) Examiners' Confidential Independent Preliminary Reports

Each examiner shall read and examine the thesis and submit an independent preliminary report on the appropriate form (RDPRE07) to the Registrar seven days before any oral or alternative form of examination is held, for exchange between the Examiners. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the thesis provisionally satisfied the requirements of the degree and where possible make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of any oral examination. Except where otherwise authorised by the Examiners, the content of the reports will be held in confidence between the Examiners and (following the oral examination) Senate.

ii) Examiners' Final Reports on First Examination

Following the oral examination the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit, on the appropriate form (RDEXE07), a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree to the Registrar. The preliminary reports and joint recommendation of the examiners shall together provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to enable Senate to satisfy itself that the recommendation is correct.

Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted.

iii) Examiners' Recommendations

Following the completion of the examination the examiners may recommend:

- a) That the candidate be awarded the degree;
- b) That the candidate be awarded the degree subject to amendments being made to the thesis;
- c) That the candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree and be re-examined, with or without an oral examination;
- d) That the candidate not be awarded the degree, with no possibility of re-examination;
- e) In the case of a PhD examination, that the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil, perhaps subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.

iv) Amendments

Where the examiners are satisfied that the candidate has in general reached the standard required for the degree, but consider that the thesis requires some amendments and corrections not so substantial as to call for the submission of a revised thesis, and recommend that the degree be awarded subject to the candidate amending the thesis to the satisfaction of the internal and/or the External Examiner(s,) they shall indicate to the candidate in writing what amendments and corrections are required.

Amendments constitute spelling or typing errors, minor textual corrections, reordering of material, further analysis and/or further clarification of the research but not requiring further research to be undertaken. The time limit for submission of amendments shall be at the discretion of the examiners, subject to a maximum of 4 months.

The candidate shall submit the amended thesis within the time limit specified by the examiners from the date of delivery to the candidate of the list of amendments and corrections required.

v) Non-unanimous Recommendations

Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, Senate may

- a) Accept a majority recommendation (provided that the majority recommendation includes at least one External Examiner);
- b) Accept the recommendation of the External Examiner; or
- c) Require the appointment of an additional External Examiner.

vi) Appointment of Additional External Examiner

Where an additional External Examiner is appointed under sub-paragraph B.4.5 (v) c) above, he/she shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the thesis and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further oral examination. That examiner should not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. On receipt of the report from the additional examiner Senate shall complete the examination as set out in paragraph B.4.1 (vi).

viii) Referral prior to Oral

Where the examiners are of the opinion that the thesis is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting an oral examination, they may recommend that Senate dispense with the oral examination and refer the thesis for further work. In such cases the examiners shall provide Senate with written guidance for the candidate concerning the deficiencies of the thesis. The examiners shall not recommend that a candidate fail outright (see sub-paragraph B.4.5 (iii) d))

without holding an oral examination or other alternative examination (see paragraph B.4.1 (iii)).

ix) Notification of deficiencies of Theses

Where Senate decides that the degree be not awarded and that no re-examination be permitted, the examiners shall prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the thesis and the reason for their recommendation, which shall be forwarded to the candidate by the Registrar.

B.4.6 Re-examination

i) Criteria and Deadlines

One re-examination may be permitted by Senate, subject to the following requirements:

- a) a candidate who fails to satisfy the examiners at the first examination, including where appropriate the oral or approved alternative examination may, on the recommendation of the examiners and with the approval of Senate, be permitted to revise the thesis and be re-examined;
- b) the examiners shall provide the candidate, through Senate, with written guidance on the deficiencies of the first submission; and
- c) *Deadline for Re-submission of revised thesis*
the candidate shall submit for re-examination within the period of one calendar year from the date of the latest part of the first examination. Where Senate has dispensed with the oral examination the re-examination shall take place within one calendar year of the date of this dispensation. Senate may, where there are good reasons, approve an extension of this period.

ii) Appointment of Additional Examiner

Senate may require that an additional External Examiner be appointed for the re-examination.

iii) Forms of re-examination

There are four forms of re-examination:

- a) where the candidate's performance in the first oral or approved alternative examination was satisfactory but the thesis was unsatisfactory and the examiners on re-examination certify that the thesis as revised is satisfactory, Senate may exempt the candidate from further examination, oral or otherwise;
- b) where the candidate's performance in the first oral or approved alternative examination was unsatisfactory and the thesis was also unsatisfactory, any re-examination shall include a re-examination of the thesis and an oral or approved alternative examination

- c) where on the first examination the candidate's thesis was so unsatisfactory that Senate dispensed with the oral examination, any re-examination shall include a re-examination of the thesis and an oral or approved alternative examination;
- d) where on the first examination the candidate's thesis was satisfactory but the performance in the oral and/or other examination(s) was not satisfactory the candidate shall be re-examined in the oral and/or other examination(s) without being requested to revise and re-submit the thesis;

iv) Examiners' Confidential Independent Preliminary Reports on Re-Examination

In the case of a re-examination under sub-paragraphs B.4.6 (iii) a), b) or c), each examiner shall read and examine the thesis and submit, on the appropriate form (RDPRR07), an independent preliminary report on it to the Registrar before any oral or alternative form of examination is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the thesis provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree and where possible make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of any oral examination.

Except where otherwise authorised by the Examiners, the content of the reports will be held in confidence between the Examiners and (following the oral examination) by Senate.

v) Examiners' Final Report on Re-Examination

Following the re-examination of the thesis a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree shall be made to the Registrar on Form RDEXE07. The preliminary reports and joint recommendation of the examiners shall together provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to enable Senate to satisfy itself that the recommendation is correct.

Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted.

vi) Examiners' Recommendations following Re-Examination

Following the completion of the re-examination the examiners may recommend that:

- a) The candidate be awarded the degree;
- b) The candidate be awarded the degree subject to amendments being made to the thesis;
- c) The candidate not be awarded the degree, and not be permitted to be re-examined;
- d) In the case of a PhD re-examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil, perhaps subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.

vii) Amendments following Re-Examination

Where the examiners are satisfied that the candidate has in general reached the standard required for the degree, but consider that the candidate's thesis requires some amendments and corrections not so substantial as would constitute the submission of a considerably revised thesis (which in the context of a re-examination would constitute a failure), and recommend that the degree be awarded subject to the candidate amending the thesis to the satisfaction of the internal and/or the External Examiner(s), they shall indicate to the candidate in writing what amendments and corrections are required.

Amendments constitute spelling or typing errors, minor textual corrections, reordering of material, or additional paragraphs for further clarification of the research, but not requiring further research to be undertaken.

The time limit for submission of amendments shall be at the discretion of the examiners, subject to a maximum of 4 months, and should not be used as criteria for determining what constitutes such amendments.

The candidate shall submit the amended thesis within the time limit specified by the examiners from the date of delivery to the candidate of the list of amendments and corrections required

viii) Non-unanimous Recommendations following Re-Examination

Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, Senate may:

- a) Accept a majority recommendation (provided that the majority recommendation includes at least one External Examiner);
- b) Accept the recommendation of the External Examiner; or
- c) Require the appointment of an additional External Examiner.

ix) Appointment of additional External Examiner following Re-Examination

Where an additional External Examiner is appointed, he/she shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the thesis and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further oral examination. This examiner should not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. On receipt of the report from the additional examiner Senate shall complete the examination.

xi) Recommendation for Failure without oral Re-Examination

In the case of a re-examination where an oral examination has already been held and the examiners are of the opinion that the thesis is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by a further one,

they may recommend that Senate dispense with the oral examination and not award the degree.

xii) Notification of Deficiencies of the thesis following Re-Examination

Where Senate decides that the degree be not awarded, the examiners shall prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the thesis and the reason for their recommendation, which shall be forwarded to the candidate by the Registrar.

B.4.7 Candidate's Temporary Absence from Viva

i) Permission for temporary absence

Examiners may, if circumstances warrant, and they are in agreement, permit a candidate to be absent temporarily from a viva.

ii) Candidate Accompanied

When leaving a viva, candidates will be accompanied by the Internal Examiner, or Observer. In the absence of either, the Examiners are required to contact the Registrar who would accompany the candidate.

iii) Time limit for temporary absence

Candidates will normally be allowed up to 20 minutes' absence before returning to the *viva*.

iv) Circumstances for temporary absence

A candidate may request permission to leave a *viva*, or for the viva to be halted under the following circumstances:

a) *Illness*

- i) If a candidate is taken ill during a *viva*, an Examiner (or Observer, if present) must contact the Registrar so that arrangements may be made for appropriate action to be taken and First Aid advice obtained if necessary.
- ii) The Registrar should inform the Chair or Vice-Chair of Senate, if available.

b) *For personal reasons*

- i) A candidate wishing to leave the examination room for any other urgent reason (e.g. to visit the toilet).
- ii) When a candidate visits the toilet, the extent of supervision is left to the discretion of the person accompanying the candidate who must ensure, as far as possible, that the candidate does not have access to unauthorised material and does not communicate with any other person.

iii) In the above circumstances, a candidate will be given 20 minutes to return to the *viva*.

c) *Other absences from the Viva*

i) In the event of a candidate withdrawing from the examination room for reasons other than b) above, the Examiners shall contact the Registrar who will attend the examination room for a briefing on the events.

ii) The Observer or Registrar should try to find the Candidate and to elicit the reason for the absence and report the circumstances to the Examiners.

iii) Through the Observer or Registrar, the Examiners should try to encourage the candidate back to the examination room.

iv) The Registrar should inform the Chair or Vice-Chair of Senate, if available.

v) Recommencement of the *Viva*

When the candidate returns to the examination room the Examiners should ensure that the candidate is at ease and must summarise the last question answered, to help reset the agenda

vi) Failure to return to the *Viva*

Failure to return to the *Viva* shall not in itself cause a candidate to be failed for the award of the degree for which the candidate is being examined.

However, if the candidate fails to return within the deadline, or leaves without the unanimous agreement of the Examiners, the Examiners may act as follows:

a) Recommend that the remaining part of the *viva* be dispensed with if they are satisfied that a recommendation on the award can be made in accordance with Regulations

b) Recommend that the *viva* be rearranged within one month, except if Regulation B.4.1 iii) applies (*Exemption from oral*), or

c) Deem the candidate to have failed the *viva* and require that a further *viva* be rearranged within one month.

vii) Rearrangement of *Viva*

a) In the case of B.4.7 vi) b) a record must be made so that the examiners can refer back to the earlier discussion and take note of it during the reconvened *viva* .

b) In the case of B.4.7 vi) c) and subject to Regulation B.4.1 iii) (*Exemption from Oral*), a rearranged *viva* will be conducted as if for the first time.

viii) Reporting of incidents

The circumstances of any illness, or other reason for leaving the examination room, including the duration of any absence, must be reported in the Examiners' Report Form on the Recommendations for the *Viva*.

B.5 Thesis Requirements

B.5.1 i) Language of Thesis and Oral

Except with the specific permission of Senate the thesis shall be presented and defended in English or French, as previously agreed.

ii) Abstracts

There shall be an abstract of approximately 300 words bound into the thesis which shall provide a synopsis of the thesis stating the nature and scope of the work undertaken and of the contribution made to the knowledge of the subject treated. Three loose copies of the abstract shall be submitted with the thesis. The loose copies of the abstract shall have the name of the author, the degree for which the thesis is submitted, and the title of the thesis as a heading.

iii) Statement of objectives, sources and assistance

The thesis shall include a statement of the candidate's objectives and shall acknowledge published or other sources of material consulted (including an appropriate bibliography) and any assistance received.

v) Pre-Publication of work

The candidate shall be free to publish material in advance of the thesis but reference shall be made in the thesis to any such work. Copies of published material should either be bound in an Appendix, or placed in an adequately secured pocket at the end of the thesis.

vi) Thesis length

The text of the thesis should normally not exceed the following length (excluding ancillary data):

For PhD in Science, Engineering, Art & Design	40,000 words
For MPhil in Science, Engineering, Art & Design	20,000 words
For PhD in Arts, Social Sciences and Education	80,000 words
For MPhil in Arts, Social Sciences and Education	40,000 words

Where the thesis is accompanied by material in other than written form or the research involves creative writing or the preparation of a scholarly

edition, or portfolio of professional work, the written thesis should normally be within the range:

For PhD	30,000 - 40,000 words
For MPhil	15,000 - 20,000 words

Candidates are warned that theses exceeding the maximum word length by 20% will not be examined.

vii) Copies of Thesis for Examination

- a) The Registrar shall notify the candidate of the number of copies of the thesis to be submitted
- b) The copies of the thesis submitted for examination shall remain the property of the Institution but the copyright in the thesis shall be vested in the candidate.

viii) Format of Thesis

The following requirements shall be adhered to in the format of the submitted thesis

- a) Theses shall normally be in A4 format; Senate may give permission for a thesis to be submitted in another format where it is satisfied that the contents of the thesis can be better expressed in that format;
- b) copies of the thesis shall be presented in a permanent and legible form either in typescript or print; where copies are produced by photocopying processes these shall be of a permanent nature; where word processor and printing devices are used, the printer shall be capable of producing text of a satisfactory quality; the size of character used in the main text, including displayed matter and notes, shall not be less than 2.00mm for capitals and 1.5mm for x-height (that is, the height of lower-case x).
- c) The thesis shall be printed on the recto side of the page only; the paper shall be white and within the range 70 g/m to 100 g/m;
- d) The margin at the left-hand binding edge of the page shall not be less than 40mm; other margins shall not be less than 15mm;
- e) Double or one-and-a-half spacing shall be used in the typescript except for indented quotations or footnotes, where single spacing may be used;
- f) Pages shall be numbered consecutively through the main text, including photographs and/or diagrams included as show pages;
- g) The title page shall give the following information:
 - 1. The full title of the thesis;
 - 2. The full name of the author;
 - 3. That the degree is awarded by the Institution;
 - 4. The award for which the degree is submitted in partial fulfilment of its requirements;

5. The month and year of submission.

ix) Binding of Thesis submitted for Examination

The copies of the thesis submitted for examination may be in a temporary but fixed binding. Ring binding or spiral binding is not acceptable. Wherever possible, the thesis should be in one volume. However, should it be necessary because of size to split the thesis in order to bind in a temporary format (at an appropriate point, perhaps keeping Appendices in Volume 2), both volumes must show a title page and front cover indicating volume number.

x) Final Thesis copies

Following the award of the degree the Registrar shall lodge one copy of the thesis in the library of the Institution and in the library of any collaborating establishment.

xi) Binding of Final Copies of Thesis

The Institution library copy shall be bound as follows:

- a) The binding shall be of a fixed type so that leaves cannot be removed or replaced; the front and rear boards shall have sufficient rigidity to support the weight of the work when standing upright; and
- b) In at least 24pt type the outside front board shall bear the title of the work, the name and initials of the candidate, the qualification, the year of submission, and the volumes numbered if the work has been split; the same information (excluding the title of the work) shall be shown on the spine of the work, reading downwards.

xii) Confidentiality Agreements

Where Senate has agreed that the confidential nature of the candidate's work is such as to preclude the thesis being made freely available in the library of the Institution, the thesis shall, immediately on completion of the programme of work, be retained by the Institution on restricted access and, for a time not exceeding the approved period shall only be made available to those who were directly involved in the project.

Senate shall normally only approve an application for confidentiality in order to enable a patent application to be lodged or to protect commercially or politically sensitive material. A thesis shall not be restricted in this way in order to protect research leads. While the normal maximum period of confidentiality is two years, in exceptional circumstances Senate may approve a longer period. Where a shorter period would be adequate Senate shall not automatically grant confidentiality for two years.

B.6 Award of MPhil or PhD by Completed Work

Candidates may obtain an MPhil or PhD on the basis of previously completed or published work. This is a retrospective assessment of the work submitted, of the research methodology employed in its creation, and assessment of its context in relation to the developing state of the art in the subject concerned, and is offered subject to the conditions outlined below:

i) Entry Qualifications

To be eligible to register for an MPhil or PhD by this mode, candidates must meet the normal entry requirements for MPhil/PhD, and normally have at least three years' relevant experience at postgraduate level in the case of applications for MPhil by Completed Work, or five years relevant experience at postgraduate level in the case of applications for PhD by Completed Work.

ii) Prima Facie Case

Senate will initially establish whether the candidate has a *prima facie* case for the award of an MPhil or PhD as applied for, or in the case of applicants for the award of PhD, may establish that there is a *prima facie* case only for the award of MPhil

As the assessment of the award is retrospective consideration of work already undertaken, there is no facility to apply for transfer from MPhil to PhD.

iii) Appointment of Adviser

The Senate shall approve an adviser, normally based in the Institution, who shall have specialist knowledge of the subject concerned and who has had experience of supervising candidates to successful completion of an MPhil or PhD as appropriate. The role of the adviser shall be to guide the candidate in preparing his/her work for submission, giving guidance on how to construct the arguments, ensuring that the submission is in accordance with the format required by Senate and advising on fulfilling the requirements of the Qualifications Framework.

iv) Deadline for Submission

Final submissions must be made within one year from the date on which the Institution's Senate ratifies the recommendation that a *prima facie* case exists for MPhil, and two years from the date on which the Institution's Research Degrees Sub-Committee ratifies the recommendation that a *prima facie* case exists for PhD.

v) Content of submission

The submitted work should normally consist of one or more of the following (in published or unpublished form):

- a) A completed book;
- b) A series of articles on a coherent theme;
- c) Research reports;
- d) Other media formats approved by Senate together with the necessary written work.

The work submitted must constitute a coherent whole and must incorporate an Abstract, Introduction and Conclusion which together put the total work submitted into context, and may also involve the writing of intermediate connecting passages. Where papers form the body of the submission, the adviser and candidate may wish to consider the number of papers that are required to accomplish this objective.

Co-authored work may form part of the submission, but the candidate must include an account of the extent and scope of his or her own contribution to such work, signed, if possible, by the co-author(s). The additional material which forms part of the submission over and above the previously completed work must be the candidate's original and individual production.

vi) Format of submission

Senate may, as appropriate, accept for examination a wholly published version or require that the work be submitted in the form of a thesis. In either case the copies submitted for examination shall remain the property of the Institution but the copyright shall be vested in the candidate or other previous holder.

The work submitted for PhD must constitute an independent and original contribution to knowledge. The work submitted for MPhil or PhD should not have been previously submitted for any other award.

vii) Academic Standards

The academic standards associated with the degree of MPhil by Completed Work will be the same as those that apply to the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) by traditional approved programme of supervised research.

The academic standards associated with the degree of PhD by Completed Work will be the same as those that apply to the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by traditional approved programme of supervised research.

viii) Assessment of submission

- a) The submitted work will be assessed by a team of at least two examiners, one of whom must be external, appointed by Senate in accordance with the research degrees regulations. The examination will be in accordance with sections B.4.1 to B.4.5 (ii) subject to B.6 (viii) b) below.
- b) The examiners may recommend:
 - i) The candidate be awarded the degree;
 - ii) The candidate be permitted to revise the contextualisation component of the work and resubmit for the degree and be re-examined within 12 months, with or without an oral examination;
 - iii) The candidate not be awarded the degree and not be permitted to be re-examined; or
 - iv) In the case of a PhD examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil, perhaps subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners
- c) Where the examiners recommend under sub-clause b) iv) that the degree be not awarded and sub-clause b) v) cannot be recommended, the candidate may not re-submit for an MPhil or PhD by completed work within a period of two years from the date of the original examination in the case of MPhil, or three years from the date of the original examination in the case of PhD. Any further submission must include evidence of additional work.

B.7 ASSESSMENT REVIEW

B.7.1 Constitutional Basis

- 7.1.1 The authority of an Assessment Board is established through a chain of delegation. The Institution's Board of Directors has formal authority to determine the academic progress of Students because of the status of the Institution as a degree-awarding authority. Subject always to retaining ultimate responsibility for the exercise of such authority, the Board of Directors delegates academic authority to its Senate. In turn, Senate

delegates to each Assessment Board authority and responsibility for determining the academic progress of Students.

7.1.2 Decisions of an Assessment Board should not be overturned if the Assessment Board has been properly constituted, has acted within its terms of reference and has applied current regulations. However, in the exercise of its overall responsibility for academic matters on behalf of the Institution, Senate may ask an Assessment Board to reconsider a decision.

7.1.3 Constitution of Assessment Board

Senate is the Assessment Board in matters relating to the final award of degrees of MPhil, PhD, and PhD by Completed Work. Senate will appoint an Examination Team, appropriately constituted under terms of Section B.4 of the "Framework and Regulations for the Award of Higher Degrees by Research" to undertake the examination of a candidate through assessment of a thesis and conduct of an oral examination, for one of the above degrees, and following examination, to make recommendations on the outcome, to the Board of Directors for ratification.

7.1.5 The Assessment Review Committee may ask the Assessment Board to reconsider a decision at the request of a candidate, in the following circumstances:

a) If the Assessment Review Committee is satisfied, on evidence produced by a candidate, that his or her performance in an examination (or other assessment) was adversely affected by illness or other factors which he or she was unable to divulge before the Examiners made recommendations or the Assessment Board reached its decision. [The candidate's request must be supported by medical certificates or other documentary evidence acceptable to the Assessment Review Committee];

and/or

b) If the Assessment Review Committee is satisfied, on evidence produced by a candidate or any other person that the candidate's performance in an examination (or other assessment) was adversely affected by a material irregularity or material administrative error, or by the fact that the examination (or other assessment) was not conducted in accordance with the regulations in force for Research Degrees in such a manner as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result might have been significantly different had there not been such irregularity;

and/or

c) If the Assessment Review Committee is satisfied, on evidence produced by a candidate or any other person, that there is *prima*

facie evidence of unfair or improper assessment on the part of one or more of the Examiners.

7.1.6 The Assessment Review Committee may ask the Assessment Board to reconsider a decision at the request of a candidate for research degrees at the following stages in the candidate's study:

- a) Registration
- b) Annual Monitoring
- b c) Transfer from MPhil to PhD
- d) Extension of Registration
- e) Final Examination
- c f) Re-Examination

B.7.2 Academic Judgement

A candidate may not challenge the academic judgement of the Examiners or of the Assessment Board.

B.7.3 The Assessment Review Committee

7.3.1 There shall be an Assessment Review Committee (the Committee) appointed by Senate and normally acting with the full powers of the Senate to intervene in the proceedings of the Assessment Board.

7.3.2 The Committee will consist of:

The Vice Rector Academic, who shall Chair the Committee:

One representative of the Students' Union

Two Professors who have experience of supervising research degrees. No person registered as a candidate for a Research degree, either at this or another Institution, shall be a member of a Research Degree Assessment Review Committee.

7.3.3 The Committee shall be convened by the Director of Academic Quality on the basis that no member shall be otherwise interested in the Student or have previously participated in the proceedings under consideration.

7.3.5 The Director of Academic Quality shall act as Secretary of the Committee.

7.3.6 The Committee shall receive and consider written applications for review of assessment decisions or other decisions by the Assessment Board which could have the effect of retarding progress, terminating studies or affecting the level of award for Students. It may intervene at the request

of a Student, on behalf of Senate in the circumstances outlined in Paragraph 7.1.5, at stages of assessment outlined in 7.1.6.

7.3.7 After consideration of the available evidence relating to an application, the Committee may:

a) Reject the application;

or

b) Refer the application, and all relevant documentation available to the Assessment Review Committee, to the Assessment Board, inviting reconsideration of the earlier decision in the light of the documentation now available.

or

c) Refer the application and all relevant documentation available to the Assessment Review Committee, to the Assessment Board, directing the Board to assess implications and act on any consequences, within the Regulations.

or

d) Refer the application, and all relevant documentation available to the Assessment Review Committee, to the Assessment Board, directing rectification of specified matters, assessment of implications and action on any consequences within the Regulations.

or

e) In the case of Final Examination or Re-Examination, direct the Assessment Board to:

(i) invite the examiners to reconsider their decision;

or

(ii) Appoint new examiners.

7.3.8 An Assessment Review Committee shall not be constituted as an Examination board and shall not have the authority to set aside the decision of the Assessment Board and thereby to recommend the award of the degree.

7.3.9 Urgent meetings of the Committee will be held as soon as it proves possible to obtain relevant papers and convene a meeting of members. During the vacations this may necessitate some delay. The person seeking review will be advised of the date of the meeting and the date will also be communicated to the Chair of the Assessment Board. The date will be at

least 14 days after receipt of the submission of the case for review notification of the application to the Chair of the Assessment Board.

- 7.3.10 The Committee shall take minutes of its proceedings and decisions, and these shall be retained by the Director of Quality. Minutes shall be made available to Senate in exceptional circumstances.

B.7.4 Applications for Review

- 7.4.1 Any notice of intention to seek a review of a decision made by an Assessment Board following the stages of assessment outlined in Paragraph 7.1.6, and in the circumstances outlined in Paragraph 7.1.5 must be made in writing to the Registrar, within 14 days from the date of notification of the Assessment Board's decision that he/she wishes to request a review, and shall submit the case for review within a further 14 days from the date of giving notice.

Given the existence of procedures for complaint and grievance during the study period, alleged inadequacy of supervisory or other arrangements during the period of study shall not constitute grounds for requesting a review of the assessment decision.

- 7.4.2 The notice of application shall state in writing:-

- a) The actual decision to be reviewed,
- b) The grounds for the application for the review, which should be as complete as practicable. A proforma is available to assist individuals in preparing an application. Comments in support of the application should be confined to matters directly related to the grounds for the application. The application must be supported by such documentary evidence as is appropriate for the circumstances indicated in the application.

- 7.4.3 A Student will be entitled to make one application only to the Assessment Review Committee in respect of any one assessment decision at the stages outlined in Paragraph 7.1.6. That application may relate to one or more of the grounds indicated in Paragraph 7.1.5 above.

- 7.4.4 As soon as possible after receipt of the notice of application, and in any event within seven calendar days, the Secretary of the Assessment Board shall make a written report to the Director Academic Quality (the "Chair's Report"). The Chair's Report shall contain:

- a) His/her comments,

and

- b) A copy of the relevant Assessment Board minutes, and in the case of the following:

- i) Annual Monitoring - Annual Monitoring Report.
- ii) Transfer from MPhil to PhD - the Transfer Report and the Independent Transfer Assessors' Reports.
- iii) Final Examination - the Examiners' Preliminary and Final Reports & Recommendations.
- iv) Re-Examination - the Examiners' Preliminary and Final Reports & Recommendations.

and

- c) A clear statement of the information known to the Board at the time of the decision which is the subject of the application. Comments in the Chair's Report should be confined to the matter directly at issue.

7.4.5 Upon receipt of the Chair's Report, if it appears to the Director Quality that the Student's application may be well founded, he/she shall consult with the Chair of the Assessment Board and with the Chair of the Committee or his/her nominee, and if they all agree, the application will be upheld and will be referred back to the Assessment Board forthwith, in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 4 below, as if the full Assessment Review Committee had met and upheld the application. The Director Quality shall provide outline information regarding such referrals to the member of the Committee who is the representative of the Students' Union.

7.4.6 Alternatively, the following procedure applies if it appears to the Director Quality that the Student's application is misconceived or out of time, or if the Chair of the Committee and the Chair of the Assessment Board do not agree to reconsideration in accordance with Paragraph 7.4.5:

- a) The Director shall consult with the Chair of the Committee, and the member who is the representative of the Students' Union.
- c) The persons so consulted shall have the power to request the Student, the Chair of the Assessment Board, or any other person, including, in the case of Transfer from MPhil to PhD, the Independent Transfer Assessors, and in the case of the Final Examination, the Examiners, to supply them with further details, and may request such persons to attend a meeting to supply such details, but no person shall have the right to attend.
- c) If the Director of Quality and the Chair of the Committee agree that the application is misconceived, they shall have the power to dismiss the application, in which event the provisions of Paragraph 6.5 below shall apply as if the full Assessment Review Committee had met and had dismissed the application.
- d) If the persons so consulted agree that the application is out of time and that the Student has failed to show why it was not reasonably

practicable for him/her to submit the application in time, they shall have the power to dismiss the application, in which event the provisions of Paragraph 6.5 below shall apply as if the full Assessment Review Committee had met and had dismissed the application.

- e) If the persons so consulted agree that the application is out of time but that the Student has established that it was not reasonably practicable for him/her to submit the application in time, they shall allow the application to be considered by the full Assessment Review Committee.
- f) In all other cases, the persons so consulted shall allow the application to proceed and to be considered by the full Assessment Review Committee.

7.4.7 The Director of Quality may ask the full Assessment Review Committee to consider an application without reference to the procedure set out in Paragraph 7.4.6.

7.4.8 The Director of Quality shall provide a written report regularly to the Assessment Review Committee detailing the applications for review which have been considered in accordance with Paragraph 7.4.5 and Paragraph 7.4.6 since the previous report, and the Registrar shall indicate the outcome of each application.

7.4.9 Officers of an Assessment Board must ensure that a Student's studies are treated in such a way as not to prejudice the final outcome of the application and to ensure equity during the consideration stage. This may necessitate attendance at lectures, tutorials, laboratory sessions, and the provision of other appropriate academic support, but this special arrangement does not extend to ancillary services, which normally are dependent on re-enrolment, such as assistance with residential accommodation or the provision of financial services.

7.4.10 In preparing papers for the Committee, there must be no involvement of external examiners, in case this may prejudice any later involvement with the full Assessment Board.

7.4.11 In considering the application, the Assessment Review Committee may call the applicant concerned, the Chair of the Assessment Board and/or other appropriate persons to give evidence. If it is expected that the attendance of a member of staff may be required by the Committee, normally 7 calendar days' notice of the meeting should be given.

7.4.12 No person has the right to be present except the applicant concerned (with a Friend if so desired), who shall have the right to address the Committee, and remain only to give that address, and the Chair of the Assessment Board, who shall have the right to address the Committee, and remain only to give that address.

- 7.4.13 No adverse conclusion will be drawn where an applicant chooses not to attend.
- 7.4.14 Normally the Director of Quality will obtain all relevant papers from the persons concerned before the meeting and normally, these papers will include the application and any supporting papers, comments of the Chair of the Assessment Board (or of his/her deputy, or of the relevant Dean of School), the relevant Assessment Board's minute, and a clear statement of the information known to the Board at the time of the decision under review.
- 7.4.15 Information given in writing to the Director of Quality prior to the meeting will be communicated to the Committee. Information given orally may not be communicated to the Assessment Review Committee.
- 7.4.16 The deliberations of the Assessment Review Committee and any documents produced before it are confidential to it and the relevant Assessment Board.

B.7.5 Post-Review Procedures

- 7.5.1 The applicant shall be informed, in writing, within three working days, of the Assessment Review Committee's decision.
- 7.5.2 Where an application is not upheld, the decision of the Assessment Review Committee shall be effective immediately.
- 7.5.3 When it is decided that an assessment matter shall be referred back to the Assessment Board, the Director of Quality will advise the Student that some delay is inevitable before a final decision is reached.
 - a) The terms of referral to an Assessment Board will not be communicated to the Student, but the Director of Quality will inform the Student of the means by which his/her case may be presented to the Assessment Board.
 - b) An Assessment Board will not allow a Student to make an oral presentation. Consequently, it is in the Student's interest to provide the Chair of the Assessment Board, in writing, with any new information presented orally to the Assessment Review Committee, if the Student wishes that information to be known to the Assessment Board. (If the Student asks a member of the Assessment Board to provide an oral report to the Board, there is no mechanism through which the accuracy of such a statement may subsequently be challenged by the Student.)
 - c) All papers considered by the Assessment Review Committee shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Assessment Board (together with the relevant Assessment Review Committee minute) unless the

Committee or the Student decides that it would be appropriate to hold back some of the documentation.

- 7.5.4 Where an application is referred back to an Assessment Board, that Board's ultimate decision shall be final, except in the exceptional circumstances outlined in Paragraph 7.8.
- 7.5.5 The Assessment Board shall meet as promptly as possible (normally within 14 days of the meeting of the Assessment Review Committee) to consider a reference back and make a decision. The Director of Quality shall be notified of the date of the meeting he/she or his/her nominee may attend the meeting of the Assessment Board. The Officers of the Assessment Board are responsible for communicating the decision to the Student and to the Director of Quality in writing. The notification should state that the papers referred back were considered by the Assessment Board, and should outline the decision of the Board. There is no requirement to advise the Student of the reasons leading to the decision reached.
- 7.5.6 The Chair of the Assessment Board shall ensure that the proceedings of the Assessment Board do not commence or continue unless attendance is satisfactory in his/her opinion, bearing in mind the necessity of an appropriate balance among those in attendance, in addition to the necessity of achieving the formal quorum requirement. In the case of Final Examination or Re-Examination, the views of Examiners must have been ascertained before the meeting of the Board and all Examiners must be invited to attend the meeting, but their absence will not invalidate the decision of a Board which is properly constituted in other respects.
- 7.5.7 The Assessment Review Committee may nominate an Observer to attend any Assessment Board's meeting. The name of any Observer so nominated will be communicated to the officers of the Assessment Board by the Director of Quality so that the Assessment Board's meeting is not convened at a time inconvenient to the Observer. The Observer will submit a written report, via the Registrar, to the Chair of the Assessment Review Committee.

B.7.6 Exceptional Procedures

- 7.6.1 In exceptional circumstances, a Student may ask the Rector to reconvene the Assessment Review Committee for reconsideration of the Student's application, but only on the following grounds:
- a) That the decision reached was wholly unsupported by the evidence provided in the Application for Review, supporting documents or other evidence;
- or**

- b) That there was a material procedural irregularity by the Assessment Review Committee which has prejudiced the Student's case.

The decision of the Rector as to whether or not to reconvene the Assessment Review Committee is not subject to further appeal.

- 7.6.2
- a) A participant in a meeting of an Assessment Board has the right to request a Review by the Academic Board of the Assessment Board's conduct or of a particular decision.
 - b) Normally, the Academic Board will not consider such requests unless it has become apparent that a complaint cannot be swiftly and satisfactorily resolved informally by the relevant Dean, Chair of an Assessment Board or other appropriate authority in conformity with the *Framework & Regulations for the Award of Higher Degrees by Research* and with, where appropriate, the approval of internal and external examiners.
 - c) Where such resolution is unacceptable to the person seeking Review, or it is not practicable for the Chair of an Assessment Board to arrange a sufficiently rapid resolution to serve a candidate's interests, a request may be made to the Academic Board by way of the Director of Quality. Such a request for Review by the Academic Board will be directed to the Assessment Review Committee in the first instance and, normally, thereafter, unless Paragraph 7.6.3 applies.

7.6.3 If an Assessment Board does not, or becomes unable to, act as directed by the Assessment Review Committee, the Committee has the right and duty so to inform the Academic Board. If, after enquiry, the Academic Board finds that an Assessment Board will not, or cannot, conduct itself appropriately in the light of the relevant constitution, terms of reference and current regulations, the Academic Board shall consider and institution any necessary reforms of an Assessment Board and/or any emergency arrangements and procedures necessary to ensure equity for affected Students. In circumstances where the Assessment Board does not heed the advice of the Academic Board, the Academic Board may annul decisions of the Assessment Board.

7.6.4 Where an applicant claims that the Academic Board has acted *ultra vires* – outside *the* authority delegated by the Board of Governors - by operating outside the terms of these Regulations or by committing a material administrative irregularity in its consideration of matters under Paragraph 6.6.3, an application for Final Review may be made to the Board of Governors, via the Registrar. The application will be considered by a Procedure Review Tribunal (consisting of the Chair of the Board, Deputy Chair of the Board, and an independent external assessor of appropriate academic standing). Decisions of this Tribunal are not subject to further appeal.

Appendix A INSTITUTION RESEARCH DEGREES FORMS

Staff and Students are advised not to store blank copies of forms in anticipation of use in following years, but ensure that they use the most up-to-date version of the relevant proforma required at the time. This is signified by the last two digits of the File Code.

PURPOSE OF FORM	FILE CODE
1. APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION	RDRE G07
2. APPLICATION FOR TRANSFER FROM MPhil to PhD	RDTRN07
3. ANNUAL MONITORING FORM	RDMON07
4. APPLICATION FOR SUSPENSION OF REGISTRATION	RDSUS07
5. APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF REGISTRATION	RDEXT07
6. APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF MODE OF STUDY	RDCHM07
7. APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF SUPERVISORY TEAM	RDCHS07
8. NOTIFICATION OF WITHDRAWAL	RDWTD07
9. THESIS ENTRY SUBMISSION FORM	RDSUB07
 <i>FOR STAFF USE ONLY:</i>	
10. RECOMMENDATION OF PRIMA FACIE CASE FOR MPhil OR PhD BY COMPLETED WORK, AND NOMINATION OF ADVISOR	RDPCW07
11. APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF EXAMINATION ARRANGEMENTS	RDAR G07
12. EXAMINER'S PRELIMINARY REPORT, EXAMINATION	RDPRE07
13. EXAMINER'S FINAL REPORT, EXAMINATION	RDFRE07
14. EXAMINER'S PRELIMINARY REPORT, RE-EXAMINATION	RDPRR07

Appendix B REGULATIONS ON CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM IN RESEARCH DEGREES

These regulations deals with plagiarism and associated aspects of cheating in the assessment of *research degrees* other than examination situations on taught courses which form part of an assessment for research degrees. All references to plagiarism in the text that follows should be understood as referring to plagiarism and associated aspects of cheating.

D.1 Preface

- 1.1 The assessment of students as regards their achievement of learning outcomes is based on the principle that, unless clearly stated otherwise in the assessment instructions, the work submitted by a student for assessment has been carried out by that student and is their own work. Where an element of group work is an appropriate part of the research work leading to the thesis, this will specifically and explicitly have been agreed at the start of the work. In the absence of such explicit agreement, any papers or dissertations submitted must **be the student's own work** and any passages quoted, paraphrased or opinions relied upon must be properly attributed.
- 1.2 The Institution accepts that the student's writing will be inspired by what he or she has read, but students must not copy or paraphrase whole sentences or paragraphs of someone else's work without proper acknowledgement. If a student is in any doubt as to how to handle material, he or she should consult the Supervisors.

D.2 Introduction

- 2.1 The two concepts of Cheating and Plagiarism overlap to some extent, but it is necessary to draw up broad distinctions appropriate to Research Degrees so that the most appropriate action can be taken.
- 2.2 "**Cheating**" May be defined as engaging in any action with the intent of gaining an unfair advantage.
- 2.3 "**Plagiarism**" May be defined as the deliberate incorporation of another's work as the work of the plagiariser and, in the context of Research Degrees, could consist, for example, of the omission of reference to another's work, whether published or unpublished. Plagiarism, therefore, is a specific form of Cheating.
- 2.4 Allegations of infraction of coursework regulations involving Plagiarism or cheating **in non-research coursework or examination elements of taught course components** which form part of Research Methods Training will be dealt with under the Institution's *General Academic Regulations*. The outcome should be notified to the Vice Rector

Academic. The rules that follow apply specifically to cheating on the research/thesis component of research degrees.

2.5 Collusion in or conspiracy to cheat will be regarded as the same offence as the cheating itself and will be subject to the same penalty.

2.6 Any member of staff who is proven to have colluded in cheating will be dismissed from employment and may face criminal proceedings.

D.3 Guiding Principles for the Regulations

3.1 Students accused of Plagiarism or Cheating shall be innocent until judged to be guilty following process as set out below. They shall have the right to be made aware of the accusation and challenge that accusation.

3.2 The burden of proof shall rest with the persons making the accusation.

3.3 The burden of proof shall be that the case is proven *beyond reasonable doubt*.

3.7 Where, following due investigation, a student is found guilty of (or admits to) plagiarism or cheating (or colluding in such activity), the outcome and recommendation for action will be reported to Senate for confirmation.

3.8 The final decision as to whether or not and to what extent, a Student is guilty of Plagiarism or Cheating in research must be that of Senate. The decision as to what penalty is appropriate for Plagiarism or Cheating must also be that of Senate.

3.9 Since an allegation of plagiarism or cheating is an allegation of misconduct, the normal Institution rules relating to such serious allegations should apply – that is:

- i) At least 5 working days notice of any hearing should be given to the Student.
- ii) Notice of the hearing and the allegation must be put formally, in writing
- iii) The Student should be invited to seek advice and, if appropriate, representation from the Students' Union or from the Department of Student Services before the Hearing; and
- iv) The Hearing should be conducted formally and a record taken and the decision should be communicated in writing to the student and his/her representative (as appropriate).
- v) The Student should be entitled to be accompanied by a Friend at the Hearing (and so informed prior to the Hearing).

3.13 A designated representative of the Students' Union has the right to attend, as an observer, any stage of the procedures as set out below (see D.5) .

D.4 Considerations

4.1 The following are examples of cheating (See also *Appendix I*):

4.1.1 Fraud

4.1.2 Falsification of results

4.1.3 Misrepresentation

4.1.4 Attempting to influence an examiner or an officer of the institution by threat or inducement.

4.2 The following are examples of plagiarism:

4.2.1 Word-for-word match between the student's effort and a particular source or sources;

4.2.2. Work which is, effectively, a compilation of relevant material from identifiable but unacknowledged sources;

4.2.3 Work which is closely modelled on the work of another and does not acknowledge any source for quotation or origin.

4.3 The fact that Plagiarism or Cheating can occur suggests that one necessary step to eradicate it, is to provide Students with clear guidelines as to what is (and is not) acceptable. Parameters might differ for different subjects but as long as parameters are given there is no need for uniformity across subject areas.

However, it is considered that by the time a candidate has reached the level of study of research leading towards a degree at Masters or Doctoral level he/she should understand the seriousness of Plagiarism or Cheating. Therefore it is necessary to take severe action against a student who breaches the regulations – except in those cases where an element of copying is so minor that it may reasonably be judged inadvertent, where common sense shall prevail.

4.4 At the commencement of their studies Research Students should be advised of the Institution's procedure for dealing with suspected Plagiarism or Cheating in research and the penalty which may be imposed if they are found guilty of Plagiarism or Cheating.

4.6 There are a number of stages where suspected Plagiarism or Cheating might be discovered:

4.6.1 by the Supervisory team during the course of the research or when reading draft material. Strictly, no offence has been committed at this point, and disciplinary proceedings shall not be initiated, but the supervisor will warn the student, check that the offence does not occur in the submitted version of the thesis or dissertation and

inform the internal examiner of his or her suspicions if this is not clear.

- 4.6.2 By the Examiners during the preliminary assessment of the thesis,
- 4.6.3 By the Examiners during the viva voce examination,
- 4.6.4 After the award of the degree has been conferred.

D.5 Procedures for Dealing with Suspected Plagiarism or Cheating in Research degrees

- 5.1 If a case of Plagiarism or Cheating in research is suspected by an **Examiner(s) in the Preliminary Report(s)**:
 - 5.1.1 The matter should be reported to the vice Rector Academic (See also 5.1.6).
 - 5.1.2 The Vice Rector and Chair of Research and Consultancy Committee will undertake a preliminary investigation of the alleged plagiarism.
 - 5.1.3 The Student should be advised by the Registrar as to the range of services available from the Students' Union and should be encouraged to consult with the Students' Union if he/she so wishes.
 - 5.1.4 The Student should also be advised as to the range of services available from the Institution's Department of Student Services, including counselling and should be encouraged to obtain advice and assistance from these Services.
 - 5.1.5 A meeting of the Institution Panel (serviced by the Registrar) will normally be convened within 10 working days of the notification of discovery of alleged Plagiarism or Cheating. The Student should be provided with at least 5 working days' written notice of the date and time of the meeting of the Panel.
 - 5.1.6 The Panel will comprise Vice Rector Academic (Chair), Chair of Research and Consultancy Committee, the Dean of the Faculty in which the student is registered and another senior member of that Faculty appointed by the Vice Rector (who shall not be a supervisor or examiner of the student). Where the Vice Rector is a supervisor or examiner, he or she shall be replaced on the panel by another senior member of the institution appointed by the Rector. Where the Dean or Chair of Research and Consultancy is a supervisor or examiner, he or she shall be replaced by another senior member of the institution appointed by the Vice Rector. The Chair may request the Director of Quality or his/her nominee to attend the meeting as an adviser to the Panel

- 5.1.7 The Registrar should inform the Student, the Supervisory Team and the Examiner(s) who made the allegations of Plagiarism or Cheating of the reasons for the hearing in a written instruction to attend, notifying the Student and the Supervisory Team that they may be accompanied by a Friend if they wish.
 - 5.1.8 At the start of the hearing the Chair of the Panel should inform the Student of the allegations of Plagiarism or Cheating and ask him/her for his/her explanation.
 - 5.1.9 The Panel will hear the allegation of the Examiner(s). The Student or his/her Friend will be entitled to ask questions of the Examiner(s) and the Supervisory Team, the Examiner(s) and his/her Friend will be entitled to ask questions of the Student and the Supervisory Team, and the Supervisory Team or their Friend will be entitled to ask questions of the Student and the Examiner(s). The Panel may ask questions of the Examiner, the Student or the Supervisory Team.
 - 5.1.10 At the conclusion of the hearing the Panel will decide whether the Student is guilty of Plagiarism or Cheating and, if so, the nature and extent of the Plagiarism or Cheating and this decision will be communicated to Senate and to the Student, the Supervisory Team and to the Examiner.
 - 5.1.11 The Student and/or the Supervisory Team should be advised that he/she/they can also write to the Rector on the matter if he/she/they wish(es).
 - 5.1.12 Senate should make the final decision as to whether the Student is guilty of Plagiarism or Cheating and the penalty that shall be applied to the Student and the action to be taken.
- 5.2 If a case of Plagiarism or Cheating in research is suspected by an **Examiner(s) during the viva voce examination:**
- 5.2.1.1 The Examiners shall continue with the viva voce examination and shall make recommendations to be ratified in the event that the alleged Plagiarism or Cheating is not proven by a subsequent hearing of the Panel, but the matter shall be reported to the Vice Rector Academic as soon as possible.
 - 5.2.2 The procedures outlined in Section 5.1 above shall be followed.
- 5.3 If a case of Plagiarism or Cheating in research is suspected **after the Examiners' recommendations have been ratified.**
- 5.3.1 The matter shall be reported to the Vice Rector Academic.

- 5.4.2 The Institution will make every attempt to follow the procedures outlined in Section 5.1.
- 5.4.3 In the event of the unavailability of the former student, the institution will make strenuous efforts to investigate the case and will retain the powers to proceed with a hearing.
- 5.4.4 If the case is proven, Senate shall withdraw the award and remove the thesis from the Library/ The thesis shall be held securely in case of subsequent appeal.

D.6 Penalties

Except where plagiarism is so minor as to be plausibly represented as inadvertent, the penalty for plagiarism or cheating is failure of the degree and permanent exclusion from the institution.

D.7 Non-Attendance

- 7.1 A student is deemed to have been informed of the disciplinary hearing to investigate a charge of plagiarism or cheating when notification has been delivered to his or her address as registered with the institution and an attempt has been made to contact him or her by email and/or telephone, if these contact details have been provided by the student.
- 8.2 Where a student fails to attend a hearing then the Chair may write to the student, if the Panel believes that evidence is sufficiently clear, indicating the decision that the Panel has arrived at on the basis of the evidence it has available, including the recommendation that will, on this basis, be made to Senate.

D.9 Right of Appeal

The student shall have the Right of Appeal through the Assessment Review Regulations for Research Degrees.

***Appendix c* FORMAT FOR THE PREPARATION AND CONDUCT OF A FORMAL HEARING**

The following format outlines the sequence of events which should be followed once a decision has been taken that a Formal Hearing is necessary.

1. The student concerned should be informed in writing of:
 - i) The precise nature of the alleged plagiarism and the fact that the Panel is Formal
 - ii) The place, date and time of the Panel;
 - iii) Their right to be accompanied by a friend.

This should be at least five calendar days before the date of the Panel in order to allow the student to prepare their case.

2. Once all parties have been assembled for the hearing, the procedure to be followed should be:

- i) Those present should be introduced and an explanation given for their attendance;
- ii) The precise nature of the alleged plagiarism by the student should be stated;
- iii) The case against the student should be outlined by the presentation of evidence that has been collected;
- iv) The student should be allowed to respond to the allegation and make any relevant statements.
- v) If at any time evidence is brought forward which needs further investigation, the hearing should be adjourned and a time and date agreed for it to be reconvened;
- vi) A period for general discussion should be allowed, during which both sides can ask questions and provide explanations of points which have been raised. The Panel may also ask questions as they see fit;
- vii) If it becomes apparent that there is no firm basis for the allegation of plagiarism, or the student has provided an adequate explanation, then the proceedings should be stopped;
- viii) The main points concerning the alleged plagiarism and the statements provided by both sides should be summarised to ensure that nothing has been overlooked by either side;
- ix) When a decision has been reached, the meeting should be reconvened. The student should be informed of the Panel findings and the recommendation to be made to Senate. The student should be provided with an opportunity to seek clarification.

3. A Panel report itemising the nature and extent of the plagiarism, the Panel decision and its recommendation to Senate regarding the appropriate penalty will be circulated to the student and the lecturer within three working days of the Panel meeting.

4. The student will be advised that they can write to the Rector if they so wish.