

PART A

Regulations for the Award of Anglia Ruskin University's Degrees of Master of Philosophy, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Medicine by Research, Professional Master's and Professional Doctorates

SECTION A1

PRINCIPLES

Preamble

- 1.1 Anglia Ruskin University's Research Degrees Regulations are the definitive statement over all other Anglia Ruskin University documents of the regulations for Anglia Ruskin postgraduate research degrees. In the unlikely event of any discrepancy between the Research Degrees Regulations and any other Anglia Ruskin publication, the Research Degrees Regulations take precedence and will be applied in all cases.
- 1.2 All postgraduate research students and relevant university and Associate College staff are expected to be familiar with these regulations.

Consistency and Comparability of Academic Standards

- 1.3 Anglia Ruskin University's Research Degrees Regulations are the principal means through which we ensure consistency in the academic standards achieved across our research degree awards.
- 1.4 Anglia Ruskin University will ensure that its research degrees are comparable in standard with those conferred throughout higher education in the United Kingdom and consistent with the *QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications*. This is achieved through the appointment, where relevant, of external panel members with appropriate knowledge and expertise, to serve on Approval Panels and independent, experienced external examiners to examine candidates. For the taught modules of professional doctorate programmes independent, experienced external examiners are appointed. Approval Panel members are provided with copies of the QAA Qualification Descriptors for Master's and Doctoral degrees and the QAA Characteristics Statement: Doctoral Degree (September 2015). The Descriptors and Characteristics are also included in the Notes of Guidance for Examiners of Postgraduate Research Degree Examinations and Chairs of Postgraduate Research Degrees Examinations.

Award Titles

- 1.5 Anglia Ruskin University shall award the degrees of Master of Philosophy (MPhil), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Doctor of Medicine by Research (MD (Res)), Professional Doctorates, Professional Master's (MProf) and Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Research (PGDipProf) to registered candidates who successfully complete the approved programmes.
- 1.6 Programmes of research may be proposed in any field of study in which Anglia Ruskin University has expertise, subject to the requirement that the proposed programme is capable of leading to scholarly research and to its presentation for assessment by appropriate examiners. The written thesis may be supplemented by material in other than written form. All proposed research programmes shall be considered for research degree approval on their academic merits and without reference to the concerns or interests of any associated funding body.
- 1.7 The MPhil shall be awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended a thesis by oral examination to the satisfaction of the examiners.

- 1.8 A 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* and;
 - demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field,
- has presented and defended a thesis by oral examination to the satisfaction of the examiners.
- 1.9 A professional master's or doctorate shall be awarded to a candidate who has successfully passed the taught parts of the award and has presented and defended a thesis by oral examination to the satisfaction of the examiners. In advancing their understanding and practice within their profession, candidates must have demonstrated an awareness of research as a vehicle to integrate theory and practice.
- 1.10 A postgraduate diploma in professional research shall be awarded to a candidate who has successfully passed 120 credits at Level 7 as specified at approval.

Qualification Descriptors

- 1.11 Anglia Ruskin University's master's and doctoral degrees are awarded to candidates who have demonstrated the outcomes specified in the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. Examiners are provided with copies of the QAA Descriptors for Master's and Doctoral Degrees and the Doctoral Degree Characteristics within the Notes of Guidance for Examiners of Postgraduate Research Degrees Examinations. Examiners are asked to confirm in their final report that candidates have demonstrated the characteristics set out in the QAA Qualification Descriptors

Valuing Diversity and Promoting Equality

- 1.12 Anglia Ruskin University will consider applications to register as a research degree candidate in accordance with its published Equality Policy Framework. The aim of the policy is to provide a supportive environment in which to work and study, and where we will treat each other with dignity, courtesy and respect.
- 1.13 Reasonable adjustments will be made for all relevant candidates. For further guidance please visit our website: http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/student_services/study_support/summary-of-reasonable-adjustments.phtml.

Research Integrity

- 1.14 Anglia Ruskin University is compliant with the UUK Concordat to Support Research Integrity and continues to ensure that the principles expected therein are effectively embedded, evaluated and strengthened in our research endeavours, including in the pursuit of the postgraduate research degrees qualifications covered by these Regulations.

Research Committee

- 1.15 The Research Committee is responsible, on behalf of Senate, for the development and implementation of Anglia Ruskin University's Research, Innovation and Knowledge Exchange Strategy. The terms of reference and constitution of the Research Committee and its Subcommittees can be found in the 'Constitution of Senate and its Standing Committees' document.

Research Degrees Subcommittee

- 1.16 The Senate's Research Degrees Subcommittee (RDSC) is responsible, on behalf of the Research Committee, for the development of research degrees in Anglia Ruskin University and for developing, monitoring and reviewing Anglia Ruskin University's quality assurance and enhancement policies and procedures for monitoring and reviewing the quality of the student experience.
- 1.17 The implementation and development of these regulations, and their associated procedures, are overseen by the RDSC established within the academic committee structure of Anglia University's Senate. Some of the Subcommittee's responsibilities and procedures are devolved to Faculty Research Degrees Subcommittees (FRDSCs). The terms of reference and constitution of the RDSC and the FRDSCs can be found in the *Constitution of the Academic Committee Structure*.

Faculty Research Degrees Subcommittees

- 1.18 FRDSCs monitor the progress of all research degrees students within the faculty and receive and approve documents relating to various key stages in a student's progress.

Research Ethics Subcommittee

- 1.19 This Subcommittee of the Research Committee considers policies and procedures relating to the ethics of research investigations involving human participants, human tissue and organs, animals and other research that presents ethical issues (such as damage or disturbance to culturally, spiritually or historically significant artefacts or places, or human remains or research that may have a negative effect on the environment) undertaken by staff and students of Anglia Ruskin University and students at our Associate Colleges. Responsibility for the approval of individual research ethics applications is devolved by Research Ethics Subcommittee to Faculty Research Ethics Panels. Each faculty, apart from Medical Science, also has Departmental Research Ethics Panels, whose approval of ethics applications must be ratified by the relevant Faculty Research Ethics Panels. The terms of reference and constitution of Research Ethics Subcommittee, Faculty Research Ethics Panels and Departmental Research Ethics Panels can be found in the *Constitution of the Academic Committee Structure*.

Review of Regulations

- 1.20 These regulations are subject to review as and when appropriate, normally on an annual basis. They embody nationally recognised good practice as recommended from time to time in policies, codes of practice and regulations of the Quality Assurance Agency, funding bodies, and research funding councils.

Useful Publications for candidates and supervisors

- 1.21 A list of useful publications is shown in **Annex 1**.

Annual Faculty and Institutional Reports

- 1.22 The RDSC will receive an annual report from each faculty commenting on its postgraduate research activity. This report will include, inter alia, commentary on recruitment, retention, completion rates and times, and comments from Annual Review panels. The faculty reports will inform an annual institutional report which will also be tabled at the RDSC.

The University's Right to Discontinue a Candidate for Failing to Make Satisfactory Academic Progress

- 1.23 The University may discontinue a candidate if he or she fails to comply with any research degree regulation which makes specific requirements of him or her, or fails to make satisfactory academic progress as determined at a point of assessment.

SECTION A2

ADMISSION OF STUDENTS

General Entry Requirements for Research Study

2.1 An applicant may seek admission to study for any of the following awards:

- (a) Master of Philosophy
- (b) Doctor of Philosophy with progression from Master of Philosophy
- (c) Doctor of Philosophy (direct)
- (d) Doctor of Medicine by Research
- (e) Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Research
- (f) Professional Master's
- (g) Professional Doctorate

2.2 Entry is permitted in the months of September, January and April.

Entry Requirements for Master of Philosophy (MPhil) or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) with Progression from MPhil

2.3 An applicant seeking admission to the degree of MPhil or PhD with progression from MPhil shall normally hold a first or upper second class honours degree, in an appropriate cognate area, of a university or any other institution of higher education in the UK with degree-awarding powers or a qualification which is regarded by Anglia Ruskin University as equivalent to a first or upper second class honours degree.

Applications for Direct Entry to PhD

2.4 Direct entry to the degree of PhD may be permitted to an applicant who holds a Master's degree awarded by a UK University, or an overseas Master's degree of equivalent standard, provided that the Master's degree is recent and is in a closely related discipline which is appropriate to the proposed research and that it included training in research and the execution of a research project.

2.5 Exceptionally, a faculty may permit direct entry to a PhD for a candidate who, although lacking a Master's degree, has a first or upper second class honours degree (or equivalent) in an appropriate discipline and has had appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment.

2.6 The applicant must provide an academic justification for acceptance onto the direct entry PhD route with their application.

Applications for Entry to a Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Research or Professional Master's

2.7 An applicant seeking admission to the Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Research or the Professional Master's with the possibility of subsequent progression to the Professional Doctorate shall normally:

- hold a first or upper second class honours degree of a university or any other institution of higher education in the UK with degree-awarding powers or a qualification which is regarded by Anglia Ruskin University as equivalent to a first or upper second class honours degree;

AND

- have appropriate research and professional experience.

Applications for Entry to a Professional Doctorate

2.8 An applicant seeking entry to the Professional Doctorate shall normally, as a minimum entry requirement:

- hold a first or upper second class honours degree of a university or any other institution of higher education in the UK with degree-awarding powers, provided that the degree included training in research and the execution of a research project or dissertation, or a qualification which is regarded by Anglia Ruskin University as equivalent to a first or upper second class honours degree.

AND

- have appropriate professional experience

2.9 Any DProf programme that wishes to propose that the minimum entry requirement must be a Master's degree, in an appropriate cognate area awarded by a UK University or an overseas Master's Degree of equivalent standing is required to submit a case to the RDSC for consideration.

2.10 An applicant who does not have appropriate research experience will be required to demonstrate depth of understanding of research methods by successfully passing a programme of researcher development identified by the Programme Director, prior to registering.

Non Standard Entry Requirements

2.11 Applicants holding qualifications other than those indicated above shall be considered on their merits and in relation to the nature and scope of the programme of proposed work. In considering an applicant in this category, the Faculty shall look for evidence of the candidate's ability and background knowledge in relation to the proposed research. Professional experience, publications, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment shall be taken into consideration. An applicant may be required to pass an externally assessed qualifying examination at final year honours degree level before registration is approved. An applicant wishing to be considered under this regulation shall include in the application the names of two suitable persons whom Anglia Ruskin University may consult concerning their academic attainment and fitness for research.

2.12 Requests for recognition of previously acquired learning are dealt with under our agreed procedures.

English Language Competence

2.13 Where English is not an applicant's first language, they must demonstrate evidence of English language ability by holding an IELTS score of 6.5 (or equivalent) and have achieved a minimum of English language competence of at least IELTS 5.5 (or equivalent) across all four disciplines – writing, reading, speaking and listening.

2.14 These minimum requirements may be supplemented by additional requirements as determined by individual Faculties. This may include a requirement to complete Anglia Ruskin University's Postgraduate English Support Programme.

Student Access to Resources

- 2.15 Students must be able to access resources for their research, through the use of, for example, broadband to access our University Library, our virtual learning environment and online research skills courses.

Students Working as Part of a Research Group

- 2.16 An applicant whose work forms part of a larger group project may register for a research degree. In such cases each individually approved 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.
- 2.17 Where a research degree project is part of a piece of funded research, the Faculty 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.

Franchised and Associate Colleges

- 2.18 Resources to support doctoral students studying at our Franchised or Associate Colleges are provided in accordance with the signed Academic Agreement between Anglia Ruskin and the individual College.

Students Conducting Research Abroad

- 2.19 A faculty may approve an admission request from a candidate proposing to conduct research outside the UK, provided that:

- (a) the arrangements proposed enable regular face-to-face contact by the appointment of a local supervisor or adviser. Supervisors or advisers based abroad shall have a mentor at Anglia Ruskin who shall be either the First Supervisor or a colleague nominated by the First Supervisor who has supervised at least one postgraduate research student to successful completion at the level of the candidate. Where the appointment of a local supervisor or adviser is not possible provision must be put in place to provide regular supervisory contact through Skype or some other form of video contact. The form and frequency of contact must be specified at the point the supervisory team is approved. All new supervisors located overseas must attend either a) the appropriate staff development activity on-campus at Anglia Ruskin or b) an equivalent staff development activity for supervisors located overseas delivered by the Faculties and agreed by the Doctoral School. All supervisors must attend a relevant CPD session at least every two years;

AND

- (b) approval has been given for delivery of researcher development at individual Associate Colleges, all candidates conducting research abroad are required to attend an annual week-long generic researcher development programme at Anglia Ruskin on at least two occasions during their registration (see also Regulations 2.35-2.44 below on *the Researcher Development Programme*);

AND

- (c) there is satisfactory evidence as to the facilities and resources available to support the research both at Anglia Ruskin University and abroad;

Other issues that will need to be taken into consideration through the appropriate procedures include ethical approval, a health and safety audit, insurance arrangements and if the research contravenes any aspect of the laws in the host country (this is not an exhaustive list).

Previous Registration at Anglia Ruskin

2.20 Where an applicant has previously registered as a candidate for a postgraduate research degree at Anglia Ruskin but failed to gain an award, the relevant Faculty may take account of all or part of the previous registration time. This would only be appropriate where the proposed new research is sufficiently similar to that for which the applicant was previously registered.

2.21 Candidates who have been discontinued due to academic failure are permitted to apply for re-admission to a postgraduate research degree provided that:

- at least six months has lapsed between the date of discontinuation and the date of application for re-admission
- the candidate is able:
 - if appropriate, to provide clear evidence of a change in personal circumstances since the date of discontinuation
 - to demonstrate a positive commitment to resume study at postgraduate research degree level
 - to demonstrate an enhanced knowledge-base and/or relevant experience (for example, employment in the period since the date of discontinuation)
- the candidate has been formally interviewed by at least two members of academic staff whose decision to re-admit the candidate is unanimous

2.22 Candidates who voluntarily withdraw may apply for re-admission provided that:

- the candidate is able:
 - if appropriate, to provide clear evidence of a change in personal circumstances since the date of withdrawal
 - to demonstrate a positive commitment to resume study at postgraduate research level
 - to demonstrate an enhanced knowledge-base and/or relevant experience (for example, based on employment in the period since the date of withdrawal)
- the candidate has been formally interviewed by at least two members of academic staff whose decision to re-admit the candidate is unanimous

Applicants Transferring their Registration from Another Institution to Anglia Ruskin University

2.23 Where an applicant has previously undertaken research as a registered candidate for a postgraduate research degree at another institution the relevant Faculty 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.

2.24 An applicant transferring their registration from another institution to Anglia Ruskin University shall be required to provide the following information:

- (a) a letter of agreement from the institution where the candidate is currently registered;
- (b) a copy of the candidate's original research proposal to the other institution;

- (c) a current progress report from the candidate's First Supervisor (or equivalent) which should include any reports from Annual Review (or equivalent) and Upgrade/Transfer of Registration (or equivalent);
- (d) the date, and mode, of original registration and the period of registration time remaining under the regulations of their current institution (including detail of any intermissions and extension of registration time);
- (e) the title of the research project and the names and email-addresses of current supervisors;
- (f) an indication of the level of resources required to support the research project;
- (g) details of all researcher development activities attended.

2.25 Any application lacking the information set out in Regulation 2.24 above will be rejected.

Concurrent Study

2.26 The chair of the relevant FRDSC may permit a candidate to register for another course of study concurrently with the postgraduate research degree registration, provided that either the postgraduate research degree registration and/or the other course of study is by part-time study and the dual registration will not detract from the research. A candidate will not be permitted to register concurrently for two postgraduate research degrees, or to submit the same piece of work for assessment for more than one postgraduate research degree. However, in certain circumstances, related to his/her development needs, a postgraduate research candidate may be permitted to register for a postgraduate research degree and in addition to register concurrently for a taught course or module, in both cases leading to an Anglia Ruskin award.

Transferring Course

2.27 A candidate registered for a Professional Doctorate who wishes to transfer their registration to MPhil or PhD, or vice versa, is required to seek the support of their First Supervisor and discuss the proposed transfer with the relevant Professional Doctorate Programme Director, before applying in writing to the FRDSC for approval. The relevant form can be obtained from the appropriate FRDSC Secretary.

The Selection Process

2.28 The process of selecting appropriately qualified and/or experienced applicants for admission to a research degree is the responsibility of the appropriate Faculty.

2.29 The process will involve the judgement of at least two members of University academic staff who have been suitably trained or briefed. Normally this would be the faculty Director of Research Students and a member of the indicative supervisory team. An interview must occur before an offer of a place is made. At the interview the research proposal and any ethical considerations should be discussed with the applicant as should the likely total cost of the course. The interview will result in a decision to admit/not to admit an applicant to Anglia Ruskin University in the light of the following factors:

- (a) the academic profile of the applicant and his/her ability to achieve the standard of the appropriate degree within the permitted timescales;

- (b) the viability of the proposed research project, its aims and its suitability for the level of award identified;
- (c) the availability of supervisors with appropriate expertise, experience of supervision and time to supervise;
- (d) the availability of sufficient supporting resources for the conduct of research in the area of the proposed research project;
- (e) the ability of the applicant to pay ongoing annual tuition fees for a specified period of time (see Section 4.1 below for details of the minimum and maximum periods of registration).

Registration as a Student of Anglia Ruskin University

- 2.30 A formal offer letter is sent to successful applicants offering them a place to read for a postgraduate research degree at Anglia Ruskin University. On receipt of confirmation of acceptance of the offer, students are sent an induction pack which includes a registration form.
- 2.31 All applicants who have accepted the offer of a place at Anglia Ruskin University are required to register as a student of Anglia Ruskin University. This process involves completion of online registration and payment of the appropriate tuition fee, in return for access to Anglia Ruskin University's facilities and to the First Supervisor allocated provisionally to assist the candidate in developing their research proposal. The name of the First Supervisor, or Programme Director for Professional Doctorate programmes, are included in the offer letter sent to the prospective student. Registration as a student of Anglia Ruskin University occurs in the months indicated in Regulation 2.2 above.
- 2.32 All returning students are required to re-register in each year of their studies and pay the appropriate tuition fee, in return for access to Anglia Ruskin University's facilities and their supervisory team.
- 2.33 Students who have not paid their tuition fees are deemed to be a debtor of Anglia Ruskin University and will not be entitled to access Anglia Ruskin University's facilities or their supervisory team.

Additional Requirements for Registration as an International Student (non-EEA) of Anglia Ruskin University

- 2.34 Students who have been granted a visa to study in the UK are bound by the student immigration rules also known as Tier 4 of the Points Based System. It is a student's responsibility to ensure they comply with these rules at all times:
- All new students to Anglia Ruskin University must take their passport, visa and original qualification documents (including English language qualifications) to our University iCentre on arrival so that a copy of both documents can be made and stored on our student records system;
 - If a student visa is extended or a passport is renewed at any time during the period of registration the student must bring the new biometric ID card/passport to the iCentre so that their record can be updated;
 - Students must ensure their passport and student visa are valid throughout their period of registration;

- Attendance is monitored throughout the period of registration. If a student does not meet the attendance requirements or is suspended and excluded from Anglia Ruskin University for any reason, our University is required to inform the immigration authorities;
- Student visa holders are allowed to study on a full-time basis only. Part-time study is not permitted;
- Students must inform Anglia Ruskin University of any change of address and telephone number (UK and overseas). This can be undertaken via e-vision;
- Students must ensure that they re-register at the required time. Our University is required to inform the immigration authorities of any student who fails to re-register

The Researcher Development Programme and Other Training

- 2.35 Candidates are required by the RDSC to attend all of the compulsory sessions of the Researcher Development Programme. These are designed to support students during their programme of research and are part of the broader researcher development activity offered by the Doctoral School.
- 2.36 Stage 1 of the compulsory sessions is linked to the Research Proposal application. Stages 2a and 2b are linked to the application for Upgrade/Confirmation of Registration. Stage 3 is designed to help candidates prepare for their viva.
- 2.37 As part of the Stage 1 training, all students must pass the online module *Intellectual Property in the Research Context*.
- 2.38 All candidates must complete a Research Skills Training Needs Analysis to establish their skills development needs and create a personal development plan. This must be updated and submitted each year as part of the process of Annual Review.
- 2.39 Each Faculty offers additional researcher development events, some of which may be compulsory.
- 2.40 All postgraduate research degree candidates must attend either a) *Introduction to Research Ethics and Integrity (in Human Research)* development offered by the Doctoral School or b) pass the online module *Ethics 1 - Good Research Practice*. A copy of the relevant training certificate must be provided to the Researcher Development Programme Administrator in the Doctoral School.
- 2.41 All postgraduate research degree candidates whose research falls under risk categories yellow, red or purple (as determined by completing the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form), are also required to pass the online module *Ethics 2 - Research with Human Subjects in the Health and Social Sciences* or an equivalent course approved by the Chair of the appropriate Faculty Research Ethics Panel. A copy of the relevant training certificate must be provided to the Researcher Development Programme Administrator in the Doctoral School.
- 2.42 Postgraduate research students with an undergraduate medical qualification recognised by the General Medical Council in the UK may be exempt from Ethics 1 and Ethics 2 training, subject to providing evidence of an up-to-date ICH-Good Clinical Practice training record. ICH-Good Clinical Practice training needs to be renewed every two years. A copy of the training record must be provided to the Researcher Development Programme Administrator in the Doctoral School.

- 2.43 All candidates who are engaged in undertaking teaching on any Anglia Ruskin modules and who have not received approved training for that teaching must attend the *Learning and Teaching in Practice* programme.
- 2.44 As part of their research, a candidate may follow a programme of related studies where this is necessary for the attainment of competence in research methods and/or to broaden their disciplinary knowledge.

Intellectual Property (see also Regulation 2.37 above)

- 2.45 All postgraduate research degrees students are required to sign an undertaking that, in instances where they are formally notified as working on a project having commercial sponsors or commercial potential, they will enter into a confidentiality agreement, and assign their Intellectual Property rights to Anglia Ruskin university unless they are employed by the organisation funding the research. In return we will treat postgraduate researcher inventors on such projects on the same financial basis as staff inventors in respect of Intellectual Property-based income

SECTION A3

APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Approval of Research Proposal

- 3.1 All registered students for the award of MPhil, PhD and MD (Res) are required to seek approval of their research proposal by the following deadlines:

Month of Registration	Research Proposal Deadline	
	<i>Full-time candidates</i>	<i>Part-time candidates</i>
September	28 October	28 November
January	28 February	28 March
April	28 May	28 June
June (no longer in use)	28 July	28 August

All candidates for the award of a Professional Master's and a Professional Doctorate are required to seek approval of their research proposal normally no later than 12 months full-time and 24 months part-time after initial registration.

- 3.2 Any candidate missing the relevant deadline stipulated in Regulation 3.1 will be treated as a resubmission and the procedure in Regulation 3.9 below will apply.
- 3.3 All candidates are required to submit their Research Proposal to Turnitin and discuss the originality report with their First Supervisor prior to application.
- 3.4 The candidate's supervisors are formally appointed when the Research Proposal is approved.

Scrutiny of Research Proposal

- 3.5 Appropriate academic judgement is brought to bear on the viability of each candidate's research proposal as soon as the candidate and their First Supervisor (or programme director for Professional Doctorate candidates) are ready, but in accordance with the timescales indicated in 3.1 above. The research proposal will be reviewed by a minimum of two suitably experienced academics who have attended the relevant training provided by the Doctoral School. The reviewers will be independent of the student and supervisors. A candidate for a postgraduate research degree, except those submitting for a PhD by Published Work, shall be ineligible to act as a reviewer. The consideration of the research proposal will take into account:
- the viability of the proposed research within the permitted timescale;
 - the content and clarity of the research proposal;
 - the suitability and experience of the proposed supervisory team (as defined in these regulations);
 - the candidate's understanding of the ethical implications of their research;
 - if our University or Associate College is able to provide appropriate research facilities;
 - the identification of any required researcher development activity.

Approval of the research proposal may be subject to attendance at Stage 1 of the Researcher Development Programme (see Regulations 2.35-2.44 above).

- 3.6 The reviewers will produce a joint report for the FRDSC within 10 working days of agreeing a recommendation.
- 3.7 The reviewers will make one of the following recommendations to the FRDSC:
- the research proposal is approved;
 - the research proposal is not approved.
- 3.8 The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the reviewers and supplied with a copy of the joint report but the final decision rests with the FRDSC.
- 3.9 If a research proposal is not approved on first submission the student is allowed one opportunity to revise and resubmit it. The resubmission must occur within two months of the date of the letter notifying the student of the decision. The student will be provided with a statement of the deficiencies of the research proposal (the reviewer's joint report).
- 3.10 If the research proposal is not approved at second attempt the FRDSC will discontinue the student.
- 3.11 If a student fails to submit their research proposal by the required deadline this will be reported to the relevant FRDSC. If this failure to submit the proposal is at first submission the student will be treated as 'not approved' and will be required to resubmit. If the failure to submit the proposal is at resubmission the FRDSC will discontinue the student.
- 3.12 Where the reviewers are unable to reach a joint recommendation the research proposal itself, and the reviewer's reports, will be considered by the relevant FRDSC which will reach one of the conclusions stated in Regulation 3.7 above.
- 3.13 A candidate who subsequently needs to make a significant change to the focus, or context, of their approved research should seek the support of their First Supervisor before applying to the relevant FRDSC for re-approval using the procedure outlined in this Section. Where a significant change is occurring to the approved research late in the course it may be appropriate for the candidate to withdraw and reapply for admittance as outlined in Section 2.

Research Ethics Approval

- 3.14 Candidates need to consider ethical issues at an early stage and should consult the relevant web pages for further advice: <http://www.anglia.ac.uk/researchethics>.
- 3.15 A Research Proposal Ethics Checklist must be submitted with the Research Proposal. Submission of the checklist does not constitute applying for ethical approval, which is a separate process.
- 3.16 A Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form must be completed by all researchers, including those carrying out desk-based or secondary research¹. This will help determine the risk category of the research.

¹ There is a separate version of the Stage 1 form for research involving Animals and Habitats.

- 3.17 Where completion of the Stage 1 form indicates that institutional ethical approval is required, candidates should refer to the Research Ethics Policy and the relevant sections of the *Code of Practice for Applying for Ethical Approval at Anglia Ruskin University*. If the Stage 1 form indicates that institutional ethics approval is not required, the Stage 1 form must be submitted to the relevant Departmental Research Ethics Panel to demonstrate compliance with Institutional ethics procedures.
- 3.18 Candidates may need to apply for ethical approval on more than one occasion to cover different components of their research programme.
- 3.19 Approval from other entities (e.g. NHS, Ministry of Defence) is in some cases regarded as equivalent to our own. For further information please refer to the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form and Code of Practice for Applying for Ethical Approval, available from the Anglia Ruskin Research Ethics webpage.
- 3.20 Candidates must determine if their research is of such a nature to require additional insurance.
- 3.21 Candidates may also be required to complete a Risk Assessment and apply for Anglia Ruskin travel insurance if conducting research outside the UK.

SECTION A4

TIMESCALES FOR COMPLETION

Minimum and Maximum Periods of Registration

- 4.1 The minimum and maximum periods of registration are calculated from the initial date of registration. Entry onto the Writing Up Stage must take into account the following minimum and maximum periods of registration within which students must submit their thesis for oral examination:

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
MPhil		
<i>full-time</i>	12 months	36 months
<i>part-time</i>	24 months	48 months
PhD [via progression from MPhil registration and including that period of MPhil registration]		
<i>full-time</i>	30 months	60 months
<i>part-time</i>	42 months	72 months
PhD [direct]		
<i>full-time</i>	24 months	60 months
<i>part-time</i>	36 months	72 months
MD (Res)		
<i>full-time</i>	24 months	48 months
<i>part-time</i>	36 months	72 months
Professional Doctorate		
<i>part-time</i>	36 months	72 months
<i>part-time</i> (following full-time taught stage)	32 months	60 months
Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Research		
<i>part-time</i>	16 months	30 months
<i>full-time</i>	12 months	18 months
Professional Master's		
<i>part-time</i>	30 months	48 months
<i>part-time</i> (following full-time taught stage)	26 months	36 months

- 4.2 A full-time candidate should be ready to submit their thesis for MPhil after 2 years of registration and for PhD after 3.5 years. Part-time candidates should be ready to submit their thesis for MPhil after 3 years of registration and for PhD after 5 years. A professional doctorate candidate should be ready to submit their thesis after 5 years of registration. A Professional Master's candidate should be ready to submit their thesis after 3.5 years of registration. A full-time MD (Res) candidate should be ready to submit their thesis after 2 years of registration.

Shortening the Period of Registration

- 4.3 Where there is evidence that the research is proceeding exceptionally well, the FRDSC may approve a shorter minimum period of registration. An application for such shortening should be submitted before the application for approval of examination arrangements.

Extending the Period of Registration

- 4.4 A candidate is expected to submit their thesis before the expiry of the maximum period of registration. The FRDSC may extend a candidate's period of registration where evidence is submitted to support the request, normally for not more than 6 months at a time up to 12 months.
- 4.5 Only in exceptional and unforeseen circumstances will a further and final period of 6 months be permitted.
- 4.6 A candidate seeking an extension shall apply to the FRDSC on the appropriate form. In all cases an action plan demonstrating how the extension will enable the successful completion of the thesis must be submitted at the time of requesting the extension. This action plan must be agreed by the First Supervisor. In making their decision the FRDSC will take into account the progress made by the candidate and any previous requests for intermission or extensions.

International Candidates Requesting Extensions

- 4.7 If a candidate requires an extension to their current student visa they should seek advice from an International Student Adviser within Student Services at least two months before their current visa expires.
- 4.8 Anglia Ruskin University may refuse to support a student visa extension in the UK if a student is not making satisfactory progress, has outstanding debts, has breached their immigration conditions or has overstayed their visa.

Change of Mode of Study

- 4.9 Where a candidate changes mode of study the minimum and maximum registration periods shall be calculated on a pro-rata basis as a proportion of the stated minimum and maximum periods of registration, in accordance with the length of time spent as a full or part-time candidate. Before making a request students and their supervisors' should fully consider the implications.
- 4.10 When a candidate changes mode of study their remaining registration time will be arrived at by applying the following procedure:
- Take the maximum period of registration in the original mode;
 - Subtract from it the actual period of registration in the original mode to produce the original remaining period of registration;
 - Then take the original remaining period of registration and divide it by the maximum period of registration on the original mode multiplied by maximum period of registration on the new mode;
 - This produces the new remaining period of registration.

Note: Any periods of intermission or extension should be taken into account and all figures should be expressed in months.

Intermission of Study

- 4.11 Any period of intermission shall be subject to a candidate's immigration status.

- 4.12 Where the candidate is prevented, by ill-health or other cause, from making progress with the research, the candidate may request to intermit their studies for an initial period of up to a maximum of six months, excluding requests for maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoptive leave. This initial period of up to 6 months will be reported to the relevant FRDSC.
- 4.13 Any exceptional further requests will be considered by the RDSC. All applications will be considered on an individual basis. It should be noted that approval will not automatically be granted.
- 4.14 Candidates may intermit for no longer than 18 months in total.
- 4.15 Candidates who wish to intermit from their studies beyond the initial 6 months will be required to provide evidence to support the request.
- 4.16 Applications for further intermission are normally only considered if they are submitted before the intended start of the period of intermission and not retrospectively.
- 4.17 Where in exceptional cases a request for retrospective intermission is made the full application and supporting documentation must be submitted to the RDSC for consideration. The application must explain why the candidate was prevented from applying for intermission before the requested start date. The approval of applications for retrospective intermission cannot be guaranteed and if the committee is unable to approve the application, the candidate will be required to enrol and pay the appropriate fees for that period of time.
- 4.18 If a candidate applies for intermission due to illness lasting for a period longer than 4 weeks a medical certificate must be supplied with the application. This medical certificate will not be tabled at the relevant committee but must be provided.
- 4.19 During the period of intermission a student's registration on their research degree is suspended, and they will not receive supervision or have access to university resources.
- 4.20 As a consequence of intermission the end of the maximum registration period is delayed by a period equal to the duration of the intermission.
- 4.21 Any candidate eligible for maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoptive leave should discuss their situation with their First Supervisor well in advance of the leave period. Such leave does not count as intermission time but the provisions of Regulation 4.19 above will apply.
- 4.22 Student visa holders are required to leave the UK during the period of intermission. In addition Anglia Ruskin University is required to inform the immigration authorities of any Tier 4 student visa holder who is intermitting from their studies. Tier 4 visa holders will have their current visa curtailed (along with the visas for any of their dependants also resident in the UK) and will need to apply for a new student visa to return to the UK.
- 4.23 If a candidate requires a new visa to return to the UK after a period of intermission they should seek advice from an International Student Adviser within Student Services at least two months before they are due to return.
- 4.24 Any student visa holder considering intermitting from their studies should seek advice from an International Student Adviser on the likely impact to their immigration status in the UK.
- 4.25 On their return from intermission candidates are subject to the then current edition of the Research Degrees Regulations.

Holiday Entitlement

- 4.26 Students may take up to 35 working days holiday in each year (pro rata for parts of a year) inclusive of normal public holidays. The timing of their holidays must be agreed with their First Supervisor.

Withdrawal of Registration/Discontinuation of Registration

- 4.27 Where a candidate terminates their research the withdrawal of registration shall be notified to the FRDSC by the First Supervisor.
- 4.28 The FRDSC is responsible for monitoring students' progress. Where concern is expressed by the First Supervisor about a candidate's progress, or lack of contact, the chair of the FRDSC will write to the candidate at their last known address advising them that they need to make satisfactory progress by a given deadline or they will be discontinued. The letter will specify in detail what the candidate must do and give a deadline by which the work must be completed. If satisfactory progress is not made by the stipulated deadline the FRDSC will, at the next meeting, discontinue the candidate. Following the FRDSC meeting the Secretary will write to the candidate informing them of the decision.
- 4.29 In addition, the FRDSC can discontinue a candidate for any of the following reasons (the list is not exhaustive):
- (a) if the candidate's period of registration has expired, and an application for extension of registration has not been submitted and approved;
 - (b) the annual review panel has recommended discontinuation;
 - (c) if the candidate has not submitted their thesis on completion of their Write Up Status;
 - (d) if, on resubmission, the candidate has failed to submit a satisfactory, or any, research proposal or annual review;
 - (e) if the candidate on a Professional Doctorate programme has exhausted all available attempts to pass the taught modules of the programme;
 - (f) if the candidate has failed to submit a revised thesis for examination by the stated deadline and has not requested and had approved an extension.
- 4.30 A FRDSC may discontinue a candidate for any other valid reason (see Regulation 1.23 above).

SECTION A5

ANNUAL REVIEW

Process

- 5.1 Postgraduate research degrees candidates are required to attend an annual review meeting by the anniversary of their registration. The exceptions are those who have formally submitted their thesis to the Doctoral School and those registered for PhD by Published Work, for whom alternative monitoring arrangements exist (see Part B, Regulation 5.2 below).
- 5.2 The annual review meeting should normally be held face-to-face. However, where this is not possible it may take place using a video link.
- 5.3 The annual review meeting is conducted by a panel of at least two suitably qualified academics who are independent of the student and the supervisors and who have received appropriate staff development.
- 5.4 A candidate for a postgraduate research degree, except those submitting for a PhD by Published Work, shall be ineligible to act as a panel member.
- 5.5 The candidate and at least one member of the supervisory team (preferably the First Supervisor) must attend.
- 5.6 For MD (Res) students one of the supervisors attending the review meeting must be the medical practitioner.
- 5.7 Particular attention is given to a student's progress during the Annual Review at the end of their first year of registration.
- 5.8 The purpose of the Annual Review meeting is to decide if:
 - (a) the student is actively engaged on the research programme and is making good progress;
 - (b) the student and supervisors are maintaining regular and frequent contact;
 - (c) the student is likely to achieve the academic standards of the degree for which registered;
 - (d) the student is likely to gain their award within the normal permissible time scales;
 - (e) all issues raised by any previous Annual Review meeting have been successfully addressed
- 5.9 The documents required for Annual Review are:
 - (a) A submission by the candidate looking back over the previous year which will take the form of a self-evaluation of work undertaken, training undertaken, development of researcher skills, progress towards meeting research goals and the success of the supervisory arrangements;
 - (b) At least one piece of written work by the candidate derived from their current registered research (e.g. a draft chapter of the thesis). This work to have been written during the period under review. The written work must be submitted to Turnitin and the originality report discussed with the First Supervisor prior to submission;

- (c) The supervisory team will, having considered the candidate's submission, address the same matters in its own written submission which will include a confirmation that the required minimum number of supervision sessions has taken place and records of the meetings;
 - (d) A schedule for the coming year which will include a timetable for the completion of the thesis. This must be agreed by the candidate and the supervisory team. If appropriate it must include the timing for upgrade/confirmation of registration.
- 5.10 The panel will ensure that the student is offered time to meet with them without the supervisors being present.
- 5.11 The possible recommendations from annual review are that:
- (a) the student proceeds to the next year of their programme;
 - (b) the student resubmits their documentation for a reconvened review meeting to be held within two months of the date of the letter notifying them of this decision;
 - (c) the student should be discontinued for demonstrating lack of progress (this recommendation can only be made after a reconvened review meeting).
- 5.12 The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the reviewers and supplied with all reports but the final decision rests with the FRDSC.
- 5.13 Within 10 working days of a recommendation being reached the reviewers will produce a joint report for FRDSC concerning the Annual Review meeting (but see Regulation 5.17 below).
- 5.14 If a student is required to resubmit for annual review the reviewers will provide a statement of the deficiencies to be addressed (the joint report).
- 5.15 If a student fails to attend their annual review meeting or submit the required documents, they will be treated as a resubmission and the procedure outlined in Regulation 5.11(b) above will apply.
- 5.16 If a student fails to attend their reconvened review meeting or submit the required documents the FRDSC will be informed and will discontinue the student.
- 5.17 Where the reviewers are unable to reach a joint recommendation the chair of the FRDSC will arrange for an additional independent panel member to be appointed. The additional panel member will review the submitted documentation and meet with the student and supervisor(s) to discuss progress. They will then meet with the members of the original panel to produce a joint report for FRDSC. Any dissenting member of the panel may produce a minority report. All reports will be tabled at FRDSC with a recommendation that the majority report be approved.
- 5.18 For any academic year in which the candidate's Upgrade/Confirmation of Registration review occurs that process will also serve as Annual Review.
- 5.19 No candidate will come to the end of a 24 month period (intermissions exempted) without having an Annual Review.
- 5.20 Additionally to the normal requirements for all postgraduate research students enrolled with the University, special reporting or progress mechanisms may be put into place by the University in connection with the terms and conditions of the grant of an Anglia Ruskin University postgraduate research studentship (in any of the forms in which they may be offered), or in connection with the conditions of any externally sponsored studentship or 'fees only' bursary on the basis of which the University has enrolled the student.

- 5.21 As part of our processes for monitoring postgraduate research activity the RDSC will receive a report and action plan regarding Annual Review as part of the Annual Faculty Report (see Regulation 1.22 above).

SECTION A6

SUPERVISION

Responsibilities of the Supervisory Team

- 6.1 The primary role and responsibility of doctoral supervisors is to advise upon and guide candidates through the scholarly and technical processes that enable candidates to produce a Level 8 thesis.
- 6.2 One supervisor shall be designated as the First Supervisor with responsibility to supervise the candidate on a regular and frequent basis and to act as the principal point of contact on administrative matters. S/he will also be accountable to the Faculty in the first instance and to Anglia Ruskin University for the proper conduct of the research programme, including compliance with relevant University policies.
- 6.3 The First Supervisor shall be:
- either a full-time or fractional member of the academic staff of Anglia Ruskin University whose role includes full academic duties including research or;
 - an Emeritus Professor of Anglia Ruskin University, where this is in the best interest of the student, who must be based in the UK, but not a Visiting Professor nor the holder of any other visiting title conferred by Anglia Ruskin University (with the exception of candidates for the Doctor of Medicine by Research) or;
 - a full-time or fractional member of the academic staff of Cambridge Theological Federation or any other associate college where this arrangement has been agreed through the appropriate approval process.
- 6.4 A research degree candidate shall have at least two supervisors who **collectively** meet all of the following criteria:
- (a) hold a doctoral award;
 - (b) have previous supervision to completion up to the level of the award being supervised;
 - (c) recent involvement in externally funded research and/or relevant refereed publications.
- It is also preferable for the supervisory team to include members with experience of internal or external examining at the level of the award being supervised.
- 6.5 In addition, for candidates registered for the award of Doctor of Medicine by Research, one member of the supervisory team must be a medical practitioner.
- 6.6 All supervisors must attend Anglia Ruskin University's Supervisor Training Session within six months of their first appointment to that role.
- 6.7 First Supervisors must pass the online Epigeum course Ethics 2 - Research with Human Subjects in the Health and Social Sciences within six months of their first appointment to that role.

Nominations for Appointment as Supervisors

- 6.8 Nominations for appointment as supervisors are considered from all members of the academic staff whose role includes full academic duties including research or those who have a contract of employment with Anglia Ruskin University specifically to undertake research

supervision. The supervisory team should have appropriate subject expertise and the necessary skills and experience to monitor, support and direct candidates' work. Faculties may appoint, and pay for, an external supervisor where this is deemed necessary but s/he cannot act as the First Supervisor. At least one member of the supervisory team, preferably the First Supervisor, will be currently engaged in research in the relevant discipline so as to ensure that the direction and monitoring of the candidate's progress is informed by up to date subject knowledge and research developments.

- 6.9 Faculties may appoint, and pay for, an external supervisor where this is deemed necessary but s/he cannot act as the First Supervisor.
- 6.10 In allocating supervisors, FRDSCs will need to be aware of, and guided by, the overall workload of the individual, including teaching, research, administration and other responsibilities, for example, external examining duties and other professional commitments, such as consultancy or clinical responsibilities.
- 6.11 Members of staff located in the Professional Services are eligible to be nominated as a First Supervisor.

Exclusions from Supervisory Teams

- 6.12 A relative/partner of the candidate shall not be permitted to be appointed as a member of the candidate's supervisory team.
- 6.13 Supervisors who are related to each other will normally not be permitted to be appointed as a member of the supervisory team without explicit approval of the Chair of RDSC.
- 6.14 First Supervisors must have no line management relationship with any student they supervise. This would normally also be the case for other supervisors but where it cannot be avoided permission must be sought from the Director of the Doctoral School before the appointment is made.
- 6.15 A candidate for a research degree, except those submitting for a PhD by Published Work, shall be ineligible to act as First Supervisor for another research degree candidate but may act as a second supervisor or adviser.

Role of Adviser

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

Maximum Number of Candidates per Supervisor

- 6.17 On approval of the research proposal, the FRDSC shall ensure that individual supervisors are not overloaded, using the following allocation:

First Supervisor		Second or Subsequent Supervisor	
<i>Full-time student</i>	<i>Part-time student</i>	<i>Full-time student</i>	<i>Part-time student</i>
1.0 FTE	0.5 FTE	0.5 FTE	0.25 FTE

- 6.18 Supervisors may normally supervise up to 8 full-time equivalent (FTE) research degree students, to a total of 15 research degree students (head count).

- 6.19 In exceptional circumstances supervisors may supervise more students than given in 6.18. Prior approval for the additional students must be gained from the relevant Head of Department and the Director of the Doctoral School.

Change in Supervision Arrangements

- 6.20 A proposal for a change in supervision arrangements shall be made to the FRDSC on the appropriate form.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

- 6.21 All existing supervisors are required to attend a supervisor CPD session at least once every two years.

SECTION A7

UPGRADE OF REGISTRATION FROM MPhil TO PhD OR CONFIRMATION OF REGISTRATION AS A CANDIDATE FOR PhD (DIRECT), MD (Res) OR FOR A PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATE

Purpose

- 7.1 This process is designed to support the research candidate and provide constructive criticism of the research presented. Ideally at this stage candidates will have presented either posters and/or papers at appropriate research conferences.
- 7.2 A candidate registered for the degree of MPhil only may apply to upgrade their registration to PhD within the time limits specified in Regulations 7.8-7.14 below.
- 7.3 A candidate registered for the degree of MProf only may apply to upgrade their registration to DProf within the time limits specified in Regulations 7.8-7.14 below.
- 7.4 A candidate 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 RDSC for the registration to be transferred to that for MPhil.
- 7.5 A candidate who is registered for the degree of MD (Res) and who fails to meet the requirements of confirmation of registration will not be eligible for an award.
- 7.6 If a candidate fails to submit the required documentation or attend the first viva meeting they will be notified of a new submission deadline. This will be within two months of the original submission deadline.
- 7.7 If a candidate fails to submit the required documentation or attend the rescheduled viva meeting the panel chair will notify RDSC of this event and recommended that the student is discontinued.

Timing of Application

For students starting their programme in September 2015 onwards:

- 7.8 PhD (direct), PhD via MPhil and MD (Res) candidates are required to apply for upgrade or confirmation of their registration between 9-18 months after starting their programme for full-time and between 15-24 months for part-time candidates.
- 7.9 Professional Doctorate candidates are required to apply for confirmation of registration no later than three years after starting their programme for part-time candidates and no later than two years after starting their programme for part-time candidates studying the taught stage on a full-time basis.
- 7.10 Professional Doctorate candidates who enrol on the programme structure in Part C (a) are required to apply for confirmation of registration between 9-18 months after completing the taught part of their studies.

For students starting their programme prior to September 2015:

- 7.11 PhD (direct) candidates are required to apply for confirmation of registration normally no later than two years after starting their programme for full-time, candidates and no later than four years after starting their programme for part-time candidates.

- 7.12 PhD via MPhil candidates are required to apply for upgrade of registration normally no later than two years after starting their programme for full-time, candidates and no later than four years after starting their programme for part-time candidates.
- 7.13 MD (Res) candidates are required to apply for confirmation of registration normally no later than one year after starting their programme for full-time candidates and no later than two years after starting their programme for part-time candidates.
- 7.14 Professional Doctorate candidates are required to apply for confirmation of registration no later than three years after starting their programme for part-time candidates and no later than two years after starting their programme for part-time candidates studying the taught stage on a full-time basis.

Submission Requirements

- 7.15 To apply for upgrade or confirmation of registration all candidates are required to submit to the appropriate FRDSC Secretary:

For students starting their programme in September 2015 onwards:

- (a) A report, of normally no more than 6,000 words, that evidences achievements and progress following the submission of the research proposal. The report should include:
- an introduction;
 - a narrative account of the research (including any research question(s), research problem(s), working hypotheses, etc.) incorporating where appropriate a critical review of the research already completed;
 - a section on methodology;
 - substantial examples of work towards draft sections of the thesis;
 - a plan and timetable for the remainder of the work.
- (b) Completed form RD4. A copy of the Turnitin Originality Report must be submitted with the RD4 form.

For students starting their programme prior to September 2015:

- (c) A report, of no more than 3,000 words, that evidences achievements and progress following the submission of the research proposal. The report should include:
- the proposed title of the thesis;
 - a statement of the likely original contribution to knowledge;
 - an outline of the approach to the research/methodology/conceptual framework;
 - a critical review of the research undertaken to date;
 - an indicative thesis structure;
 - an action plan detailing the necessary steps to completion.
- (d) two examples of doctoral level work in progress. Where there is more than a single contributor to a publication, a signed statement by the candidate indicating the extent of the contribution by other collaborating researchers with reference to the contribution to design, analysis, conduct of the research and writing up of the publication, should be provided. Collaborators are asked to endorse this statement. These examples could take the form of extracts from publications or two draft chapters, or other material relevant to the discipline.
- (e) completed form RD4. A copy of the Turnitin Originality Report must be submitted with the RD4 form.

Process

- 7.16 There are two stages in the process:
- (a) a consideration of the written submission by the review panel;
 - (b) an oral presentation by the candidate to the review panel followed by a viva.
- 7.17 The panel will reach a view on the application at the end of the two stage process.

Panel

- 7.18 The report is considered by a panel of not fewer than two academics who have received appropriate staff development. At least one member of the panel shall have substantial knowledge in the subject area. All members of the panel must be independent of the student and supervisors. They will all individually have experience of supervising at doctoral level.
- 7.19 If there is no one within Anglia Ruskin University with the necessary knowledge and expertise an external panel member must be sought. The Chair of the relevant FRDSC shall be responsible for determining whether or not an external panel member is required.
- 7.20 The panel will consider the report and presentation for evidence that:
- (a) the candidate's research is developing into an appropriate doctoral research topic of sufficient scope and depth;
 - (b) the candidate has identified the context of the research and how it relates to other work in the discipline;
 - (c) the candidate is demonstrating independent critical thinking;
 - (d) the candidate is demonstrating that the research will lead to a significant contribution to knowledge in the discipline;
 - (e) the candidate is acquiring appropriate research skills and techniques;
 - (f) the candidate has provided a realistic programme of future activities.

Exclusions from the Panel

- 7.21 A relative/partner of the candidate or supervisors shall not be permitted to be appointed as a member of the panel.
- 7.22 A candidate for a postgraduate research degree, except those submitting for a PhD by Published Work, shall be ineligible to act as a panel member.

Presentation

- 7.23 Candidates make a 15 minute presentation of their work in progress to the review panel. The style of presentation is at the candidate's discretion. The presentation should cover the following:
- (a) a brief résumé of the candidate's achievements in their research to date;
 - (b) the candidate's plan for their research, together with a timescale, for achieving their doctorate;

- (c) justification that the research is at doctoral level.

The panel members will then put any questions that they have to the candidate.

The candidate's performance in the oral presentation, and the subsequent question and answer session, will form part of the overall consideration of the application by the panel.

- 7.24 Up to two members of the supervisory team may be invited to attend the oral presentation, as observers only and subject to the agreement of the candidate.

Institutional Approval

- 7.25 Within 10 working days of the meeting the review panel must provide a report on the application for consideration by RDSC.
- 7.26 The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the reviewers and supplied with a copy of the joint report but the final decision rests with the RDSC.
- 7.27 The RDSC will consider the joint recommendation of the Panel and the comments of the individual members of the Panel on the written submission (see Regulation 7.29 below).
- 7.28 In considering an application for upgrade/confirmation of registration, the RDSC will ensure that the review panel has followed due process.
- 7.29 Where the reviewers are unable to reach a joint recommendation the chair of the FRDSC will arrange for an additional independent panel member to be appointed. The additional panel member will review the submitted documentation and complete the appropriate form. They will meet with the student and supervisor(s) to receive an oral presentation and conduct a viva. They will then meet with the members of the original panel to produce a joint report for RDSC. Any dissenting member of the panel may produce a minority report. All reports will be tabled at RDSC with a recommendation that the majority report be approved.

Unsuccessful Applications for Upgrade/Confirmation of Registration

- 7.30 If a candidate fails to make a successful application for upgrade/confirmation of registration they are given one further opportunity to revise the application. The revised application must be submitted within 4 months (for full-time candidates) and within six months (for part-time candidates) of the date of the letter notifying the candidate of the decision. In exceptional, and evidenced, circumstances these time limits may be extended by up to two further months by RDSC.
- 7.31 If following resubmission the candidate's revised application for upgrade/confirmation of registration is not approved, the candidate will:
- if enrolled on the PhD (direct) be transferred to MPhil and be subject to the applicable registration maxima;
 - if enrolled on the PhD via MPhil, remain on the MPhil and be subject to the applicable registration maxima;
 - if enrolled on a professional doctorate be transferred to MProf and be subject to the applicable registration maxima;
 - if enrolled on the MD (Res) be discontinued.

SECTION A8

WRITE UP STATUS

Preamble

- 8.1 Write Up status is available to candidates for the awards of MPhil, PhD, MD (Res), MProf and Professional Doctorate (excluding PhD by Published Work). It is not compulsory for candidates to enter Write Up status.

Criteria to be met in Order to Enter Write Up Status

- 8.2 For the initial 12 months of Write Up status candidates apply to FRDSC confirming that:
- (a) they have completed the minimum period of registration as set out in Section 4 of the Research Degrees Regulations;
 - (b) they have completed all active research including lab work;
 - (c) they have completed all analysis of their data;
 - (d) they will not need access to university facilities such as laboratories, provision of a room or a desk. (N.B. On entering Write Up status candidate's access to services are limited to the Library, IT facilities and the supervisory team);
 - (e) they have completed all compulsory researcher development activity and attended any compulsory workshops;
 - (f) they have submitted to their First Supervisor a draft of their thesis;
 - (g) it is viable for their thesis to be submitted within 12 months.
- 8.3 Candidates wishing to enter Write Up status should discuss with their supervisory team the viability of submitting their thesis for examination within the permitted 12 months before they submit their application.
- 8.4 Supervisors must ensure that applications for Write Up status are not submitted retrospectively. Retrospective requests for approval to enter Write Up status will only be considered where the candidate can demonstrate that they were prevented from applying prospectively.
- 8.5 Where in exceptional cases an application for retrospective Write Up status is made the full application and supporting documentation must be submitted to the appropriate committee for consideration. The approval of applications for retrospective Write Up status cannot be guaranteed and if the committee is unable to approve the application, the candidate will be required to enrol and pay appropriate fees for that period of time.
- 8.6 Candidates submitting for a doctorate must have successfully completed upgrade/confirmation of registration before entering Write Up status.

Write Up Status Entry Points

- 8.7 Candidates may enter Write Up status at two points per year, determined by their month of entry (registration), as follows:

For candidates registering **prior** to September 2015:

Month of Entry (registration)	Month of Entry to Writing Up Stage	Thesis Submission Deadline
September	September	31 August
	January	31 January
October	October	30 September
	March	28 February
November	November	31 October
	April	31 March
January	January	31 January
	June	31 May
February	February	31 January
	July	30 June
April	April	31 March
	September	31 August
May	May	30 April
	October	30 September
June	June	31 May
	November	31 October
July	July	30 June
	December	30 November

For candidates registering **after** September 2015:

Month of Entry (registration)	Month of Entry to Writing Up Stage	Thesis Submission Deadline
September	September	31 August
	January	31 January
January	January	31 January
	June	31 May
April	April	31 March
	September	31 August
June	June	31 May
	November	31 October

Period for Which Write Up Status May Be Held

- 8.8 Both full-time and part-time candidates may remain in Write Up status for an initial period of 12 months.
- 8.9 Candidates may request a second and final Write Up status period of up to 12 months but extensions to the initial period are permitted only where there are documented, exceptional, and **unforeseen** circumstances which prevented submission of the thesis for examination.
- 8.10 Where in exceptional cases an application for an extension of the initial 12 months of Write Up status is made the full application and supporting documentation must be submitted to RDSC for consideration. The approval of applications for an extension cannot be guaranteed and if the committee is unable to approve the application, the candidate will be required to submit their thesis or withdraw.
- 8.11 Candidates who have not submitted their thesis for examination are discontinued at the end of their Write Up status period.
- 8.12 The maximum Write Up status period is 24 months.
- 8.13 A candidate may not return to full or part-time mode once they have entered write-up status.
- 8.14 Where any student visa holder is considering applying for Write Up status they should seek advice from an International Student Adviser on the likely impact to their immigration status in the UK.

SECTION A9

THE THESIS

Title of the Thesis

- 9.1 The thesis title will be institutionally approved when the RDSC appoints the examiners. Any request to change the title after this point must be made in writing to the RDSC and before the thesis is submitted for the viva.

Research Degrees Involving Creative Work

- 9.2 A candidate may undertake a programme of research in which the candidate's own creative work forms a substantive part of the intellectual enquiry. Such creative work may be in any field (for instance, 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 may be partly in other than written form.
- 9.3 The submission as a whole, creative work and associated commentary/documentation will form the thesis. The commentary, setting the creative work within its relevant theoretical, critical or design context shall conform to the usual scholarly requirements and be of an appropriate length (see Regulation 9.23 below).
- 9.4 For a PhD involving creative writing, the creative component will be volume or book length to suit the particular genre (e.g. novel, collection of poetry or stories, play, biography).
- 9.5 The final submission shall be accompanied by some permanent record of the creative work, to be submitted in digital format (as for example, video, photographic record, CD-ROM, DVD-ROM, musical score, diagrammatic representation).
- 9.6 Where the above conditions apply the research proposal and application for confirmation of registration shall set out the form of the candidate's intended submission and of the proposed methods of assessment for the creative work.

Treatment of Scholarly Work

- 9.7 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.
- 9.8 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.

Submission of the Thesis in a Language Other than English

- 9.9 Permission to present a thesis, and be examined, in a language other than English shall normally be sought at the time of application. Permission shall normally only be given if the subject matter of the thesis involves language and related studies.
- 9.10 Where the need arises to present a thesis and be examined in a language other than English subsequent to registration, approval must be sought from the RDSC.

- 9.11 Where a thesis is presented in a language other than English, a summary in English of a maximum of 1,000 words shall be included in the thesis.

The Abstract

- 9.12 There shall be an abstract of approximately 300 words on a single page bound into the thesis. The abstract should be single line spaced. The abstract should state the nature and scope of the work undertaken and of the contribution to knowledge in the discipline. The abstract should normally contain four separate paragraphs which shall clearly state:
- what was investigated and why;
 - how the topic was investigated;
 - what was found;
 - what conclusions were drawn from the evidence.

Candidates shall note, however, that there are other models of abstract writing that reflect the specific conventions of individual disciplines.

The Abstract shall conform to the specification in **Annex 2**.

Immediately after, but on the same page as the abstract, the candidate shall identify three to six key words.

Acknowledgements

- 9.13 The candidate should acknowledge any funding or other support received whilst undertaking their research.

Source Material – Referencing

- 9.14 All sources referred to in the thesis must be included in the reference list. In some subjects a bibliography may be appropriate.
- 9.15 Anglia Ruskin University would expect candidates to normally use the Harvard Referencing System (or other accepted methods of referencing appropriate to the discipline) for citations and referencing throughout the thesis. However, it is recognised that different disciplines have different conventions. A Guide to the Harvard System of Referencing is available at the following web address: <http://libweb.anglia.ac.uk/referencing/harvard.htm>.

Presentation of Collaborative Research

- 9.16 Where a candidate's research programme is part of a collaborative group project, the thesis shall indicate clearly each candidate's individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration.

Inclusion of Published Work

- 9.17 The candidate shall be free to publish material in advance of the thesis but reference shall be made in the thesis to any such work².

² It is acceptable to self-reference elsewhere in the thesis if a published article explores a topic in more detail than is shown in the thesis and it is acceptable to provide a list of published work. It is only the justification of one's own methods using publications that contain one's own methods that we will not accept

Copyright

- 9.18 Copyright in theses is normally held by the candidate unless an agreement has been made to transfer it, for example to a sponsor.
- 9.19 When a candidate submits a thesis for examination they are required to complete a Thesis Deposit Agreement form. By signing this form they agree that a digital copy of the thesis will be lodged in ARRO (Anglia Ruskin Research Online), in the library of any collaborating institution and in the British Library's collection of UK theses, EthOS.
- 9.20 When a candidate submits a thesis they can request that it is placed under limited access. This may be because of the commercially sensitive or confidential material it contains, or because of the copyright material it contains.
- 9.21 If a candidate includes copyright material belonging to someone else (third party copyright material), in their thesis they will need to assess if permission to include this in the digital version of the thesis is necessary (see separate guidance provided by the Library/Doctoral School).
- 9.22 If a candidate intends to include material in their thesis they have already published they must check if the publisher will permit this.

Maximum Word Limits

- 9.23 The text of the thesis should not exceed the following length:

Award	Length
MPhil in Science, Engineering	30,000 words
MPhil in Arts, Health, Social Sciences, Medicine, Medical Science and Education	60,000 words
PhD in Science, Engineering	60,000 words
PhD in Arts, Health, Social Sciences, Medicine, Medical Science and Education	80,000 words
MD by Research	50,000 words
Professional Master's	40,000 words
Professional Doctorate	60,000 words

The word lengths detailed above for Professional Master's and Professional Doctorate are for those programmes operating under the regulations approved by the Senate in June 2016 (see Part C (a)). Students on programmes operating under the regulations agreed by the Senate prior to June 2016 should consult Part C (b) for the relevant word lengths.

- 9.24 Applications to exceed these word limits may be made to RDSC. Applications will normally only be considered where the new total falls within the range of plus 10 percent of the word limits given in Regulations 9.23 and 9.26 below.
- 9.25 The abstract, main text, tables and quotations should be included in the maximum word length. Appendices, reference lists and footnotes should not be included in the maximum word length.

9.26 If appropriate to the field of study, and subject to approval by the Faculty Director of Postgraduate Research Students at the start of the Programme, a candidate may submit, for practice based research a portfolio (the creative work) of original artistic or technological work undertaken during his/her period of registration as part of a thesis. The creative work may take the form of, for example, objects, images, films, creative writing, performances, musical compositions, webpages or software, but must be documented or recorded in the portfolio by means appropriate for the purposes of examination. Data not stored in a digital format will be housed by the faculty in a secure location and available to be shared on request and in a timely manner. The submission must include written commentary on the creative work that sets it in its relevant theoretical, historical, critical, or technical context. For such creative work, the written commentary must be no longer than:

for an MPhil 20,000 words

for a PhD 40,000 words.

9.27 The nature of the submission (whether written thesis or creative work accompanied by a commentary) should be specified in the research proposal and also in the application for upgrade/confirmation of registration.

Formal Requirements for the Thesis

9.28 Examiners can request to be supplied with an electronic copy of the thesis instead of a printed copy. The preference of the examiners will be determined by the Doctoral School at appointment and communicated to the candidate.

9.29 Unless informed otherwise by the Doctoral School, the candidate will submit sufficient copies of the thesis in printed form to supply one for each examiner. An identical digital version – in Word or PDF/A³ format - must be supplied for the viva Chair. All copies of the thesis must be submitted to the Research Degrees Examination Officer in the Doctoral School. If the thesis falls under the definition of creative work the creative element may be submitted in portfolio or in digital format, as befits the material. The critical commentary will be treated as a thesis in this regard and the procedure regarding examiner preference for format will apply.

9.30 The printed copy of the thesis, must comply with the requirements detailed in 9.30 and 9.31. The printed copy of the theses should be submitted for examination in a temporary bound form such as perfect-binding (perfect-binding is a method of binding single pages by gluing them together on the spine of the document), which is sufficiently secure to ensure that pages cannot be added or removed.

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

(a) The thesis shall normally be in A4 format; the RDSC 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. Special arrangements may be needed for those candidates with a declared disability and may be made in accordance with the Summary of Reasonable Adjustments;

(b) The size of character used in the main text, including displayed matter and notes, shall be Arial 11 or Times New Roman 12 font unless RDSC has given permission for another font to be used;

³ PDF/A is a version of the Portable Document Format (PDF) specialised for the digital preservation of electronic documents. PDF/A differs from standard PDF in that it removes from the document those features ill-suited to long-term archiving

- (c) Double or one-and-a-half spacing shall be used in the typescript except for the abstract, indented quotations and footnotes where single spacing may be used;
- (d) Pages shall be numbered consecutively through the main text including photographs and/or diagrams included as whole pages;
- (e) The title page shall follow both the content and layout given in the specimen title page in **Annex 2**;
- (f) Between the title page and the first page of text a candidate must include:
 1. an acknowledgements page, numbered with Roman numerals as (i)
 2. the abstract, numbered page as (ii)
 3. a Table of Contents, whose pages are numbered with Roman numerals sequentially from (iii)
 4. the Table of Contents should show those parts and/or chapters and sections into which the work is divided. This should be followed by lists, with their respective page numbers, of tables and other appropriate supporting details in the order shown below:

List of Diagrams)	
List of Figures)	
List of Tables)	Numbered
Notation)	sequentially
Chronology of Events)	in Roman
Supplementary materials)	numerals
References)	
List of Appendices)	
 5. copyright declaration
- (g) start of main text;
- (h) following the main text - references, bibliography and appendices.

9.32 For the printed copy supplied to the examiners, the following additional requirements shall be adhered to in the format of the submitted thesis:

- (a) Copies of the thesis shall be presented in a permanent and legible form either in typescript or print;
- (b) The thesis shall be printed on one side of the page only; the paper shall be white and within the range 70 g/m² to 100 g/m²;
- (c) The margin at the left-hand edge of the page shall not be less than 40mm; other margins shall not be less than 15mm.

Final Version of the Thesis

9.33 Following examination and the incorporation of any amendments which the examiners require, the candidate will submit a final version in PDF/A format for the Anglia Ruskin University institutional repository. This copy will be:

- (a) Submitted within one calendar month of the date on the letter confirming the award;
- (b) Accompanied by the completed Thesis Deposit Agreement Form which confirms agreement for the thesis to be published in the institutional repository and for it to be 'harvested' from there by the British Library for inclusion in their British universities theses database, EThOS (Electronic Theses Online Service).

9.34 Once the thesis is deposited digitally the copyright agreement in the Thesis Deposit Agreement Form will come into effect.

Confidentiality (see also Regulation 10.9 below)

9.35 Where a candidate or Anglia Ruskin University wishes the thesis to remain confidential application shall normally be made to the RDSC at the time of seeking approval of the examiners. In cases where the need for confidentiality emerges at some other stage, a special application for the thesis to remain confidential must be made to the RDSC. While the normal maximum period of confidentiality is two years from the date of oral examination, in exceptional circumstances the RDSC may approve a longer period. Where a shorter period would be adequate the RDSC shall not automatically grant confidentiality for two years.

9.36 Where the confidential nature of the candidate's work is such as to preclude the thesis being made freely available in Anglia Ruskin University Library, collaborating establishment or Associate Colleges the thesis shall be retained by Anglia Ruskin University on restricted access and, shall only be made available to those who were directly involved in the project.

9.37 The RDSC 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.

SECTION A10

THE CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EXAMINATION

General

- 10.1 The Doctoral School of Anglia Ruskin University will 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 the examination) and any conditions to be satisfied before the candidate may be considered eligible for the examination (see Section 9).

Candidate's Exclusion from the Examination Arrangements

- 10.2 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 submission of the final version of the thesis following examination.

Eligibility for Examination

- 10.3 The candidate shall satisfy any conditions of eligibility for examination required by the RDSC.

Required Format for the Thesis at Examination

- 10.4 The candidate shall ensure that the format and presentation of the thesis, as submitted for examination, is in accordance with the requirements of Anglia Ruskin University's regulations.

Creative Work

- 10.5 In cases where the research degree involves creative work in addition to the written commentary, the application for approval of the examination arrangements shall contain a statement from the candidate of the scope and nature of the creative work and advice of the proposed method of assessment. All candidates are required to have a *viva voce* examination in addition to an examination of their creative work.

Declaration by Candidate

- 10.6 The candidate shall confirm, through the completion of a declaration form, 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. Candidates for the degree of PhD by Published Work may incorporate publications which have already been submitted for a degree or comparable award, provided they are listed on the declaration form and there is evidence within the thesis of additional work.

Submission of Thesis

- 10.7 Candidates shall be responsible for deciding whether to submit the thesis for examination. This decision should take account of the opinion of the supervisory team. The supervisory team's opinion is advisory only. An opinion that the thesis is ready for submission must not be taken as a guarantee that a degree will be awarded and a decision to award a degree

rests wholly with the examining team. The supervisor has the right to record onto the RD9 form that they do not support submission of the thesis in its current form.

Mitigating Circumstances

- 10.8 The candidate shall bring any mitigating circumstances which may have affected his/her research work to the attention of the examiners by writing to the Secretary of the RDSC prior to the oral examination. A statement of mitigating circumstances shall be supported by appropriate evidence. Mitigating circumstances which could have been brought to the attention of the examiners prior to the oral examination will only very exceptionally be admitted later as grounds for a review.

Where the Thesis is Confidential (see also Regulations 9.35-9.37 above)

- 10.9 Where Anglia Ruskin University's RDSC has approved a candidate's request for confidentiality of the thesis, the examiners and the chair are required to sign a Confidentiality Agreement and to return copies of the thesis to the candidate at the conclusion of the examination. These obligations do not apply to any information which is public knowledge at the time of its disclosure.

The Viva Voce Examination

- 10.10 Candidates are required to attend the *viva voce* examination on the agreed date unless there are exceptional and unforeseen circumstances which prevent attendance.
- 10.11 The *viva voce* examination must take place within 3 calendar months of the examiners receiving the thesis.
- 10.12 Candidates are permitted to give a presentation as part of their *viva voce* examination by prior agreement with the examiners. Candidates must make this request to the Doctoral School at least 10 working days' before the scheduled date for the viva.

SECTION A11

THE EXAMINERS

Appointment of the Examiners

- 11.1 Following a candidate's successful progression or confirmation of candidature, the examiners should be proposed by the supervisory team, in consultation with the candidate.

Size and Composition of Examining Team

- 11.2 A candidate shall normally be examined by one external and one internal examiner or two external examiners where no suitable internal examiner is available. Where more than two examiners are appointed, the majority are generally from outside Anglia Ruskin University.
- 11.3 Where the candidate is a member of staff of Anglia Ruskin University, or an associate college, there shall be two external examiners and no internal examiner.
- 11.4 A student employed on an hourly-paid, fixed term, contract will not be regarded as a member of staff in this respect. However, a student employed on a fractional FTE, fixed term contract will be regarded as a member of staff. In the latter case the student will continue to be considered a member of staff in this regard for 12 months after the end of the contract.

External Examiners

- 11.5 An external examiner shall be independent of Anglia Ruskin University, an Associate College and of the collaborating establishment and shall not have acted previously as the candidate's supervisor or adviser. Former members of staff and former doctoral candidates of Anglia Ruskin University shall not be approved as external examiners until three years after the termination of their employment or date of their award with Anglia Ruskin University.
- 11.6 A research student's external supervisor is not eligible to act as an external examiner for any research students during the term of their appointment as external supervisor or for three years after the end of their period of appointment.
- 11.7 As a minimum, one of the external examiners shall previously have examined at least one postgraduate research degree candidate.

Internal Examiners

- 11.8 An internal examiner shall be defined as an examiner who is:
- (a) a member of staff of Anglia Ruskin University or Associate College or;
 - (b) a member of staff of the candidate's collaborating establishment.

Examiners' Experience

- 11.9 Examiners shall normally possess a doctorate, 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.

- 11.10 The examining team shall have substantial experience of examining research degree candidates at, or above, the level of the award for which they have been appointed to examine (i.e. normally have examined at least three research degree candidates, one of which must have been for a UK Higher Education Institution). In addition each examiner shall normally have supervisory experience and normally one examiner will have supervised to completion at, or above, the level of award for which they have been appointed to examine.
- 11.11 In an examination for a Professional Doctorate normally at least one member of the examining team shall have experience of examining Professional Doctorate candidates.
- 11.12 In an examination for a Doctor of Medicine by Research the examining team shall have experience of examining Doctor of Medicine candidates (i.e. normally have examined at least one Doctor of Medicine candidate), and one examiner must be an appropriately qualified medical practitioner.

Exclusion from Examining Teams

- 11.13 No candidate for a research degree within Anglia Ruskin University or Associate Colleges shall act as an examiner.
- 11.14 No current or past supervisor can be appointed as an examiner for that candidate.
- 11.15 No relative of the candidate or of the members of the supervisory team can be appointed as an examiner for that candidate.
- 11.16 The RDSC shall ensure that the same external examiner is not approved so frequently that the examiner's familiarity with the department might prejudice objective judgement. Normally, an external examiner shall examine no more than three research degree candidates over a period of three years at Anglia Ruskin University.
- 11.17 Where two external examiners are required to be appointed for an individual candidate they may not be employed by the same institution.

Approval of Appointment of Examiners

- 11.18 The appointment of examiners shall be approved by the RDSC, or, in exceptional circumstances, the Chair acting on behalf of the RDSC.
- 11.19 Once approved the examiners are appointed for a period of 12 calendar months. If the viva has not taken place by the end of this period the examiners must be re-appointed.

Fees and Expenses for External Examiners

- 11.20 Anglia Ruskin University shall determine and pay the fees and reasonable expenses of the examiners.

SECTION A12

FIRST EXAMINATION

General

- 12.1 The examination for the MPhil, PhD and MD (Res) shall have two stages: firstly the submission and preliminary assessment of the thesis and secondly its defence by oral or approved alternative examination.
- 12.2 The examination for a Professional Doctorate or Professional Master's shall have three stages: first passing the taught modules which constitute Stage 1 of this award and which have to be passed before a candidate may progress to Stage 2; secondly in Stage 2, the submission and preliminary assessment of the thesis and, thirdly, its defence by oral examination or other approved alternative examination.
- 12.3 The RDSC shall ensure that all examinations are conducted, and the recommendations of the examiners are presented, wholly in accordance with Anglia Ruskin University's regulations. In any instance where the RDSC is made aware of failure to comply with all the procedures of the examination process, it may declare the examination null and void and appoint new examiners.
- 12.4 The RDSC (or its Chair, acting on behalf of the Committee) shall make a decision on the reports and recommendation(s) of the examiners in respect of the candidate. The power to confer the degree shall rest with the RDSC, acting on behalf of the Senate of Anglia Ruskin University.

Disability

- 12.5 Special arrangements may be needed for those candidates with a declared disability and may be made in accordance with the Summary of Reasonable Adjustments.

Posthumous Awards

- 12.6 The degree of Professional Master's, MPhil, PhD, MD (Res) or a Professional Doctorate may be awarded posthumously on the basis of a thesis completed by a candidate who is ready for submission for examination. In such cases the RDSC shall seek evidence that the candidate would have been likely to have been successful had the oral examination taken place before submitting a formal recommendation to the Academic Registrar for the attention of the Senate.

Assessment Criteria for Research Degrees

- 12.7 The following criteria are normally used in assessing research degrees candidates and their research and examiners will need to be satisfied that:
- (a) the candidate has identified a suitable postgraduate research topic and successfully completed a programme of training in research techniques and methodology (including, where appropriate, conformity with the ethics, legal and safety requirements, as set out by Anglia Ruskin University);
 - (b) the candidate has a satisfactory knowledge of the background literature and is able to relate the project to existing scholarship and research in the field;

- (c) the thesis is the candidate's own work and is presented in a satisfactory manner (grammar, punctuation, spelling, clarity of expression, logical argument and appropriate language);
- (d) the thesis contains technical apparatus (abstract, preface and acknowledgements, footnotes, references, appendices, statistical tables, diagrams, illustrations, bibliography) set out according to the conventions of the field of study;
- (e) the **MPhil thesis** displays appropriate evidence of:
 - originality and independent critical judgement and;
 - demonstrates an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field;
- (f) the **PhD thesis** displays appropriate evidence of:
 - originality and independent critical judgement and;
 - constitutes a contribution to subject knowledge in the research field;
- (g) the detailed assessment criteria for the award of the Doctor of Medicine by Research are set out in Part E of these Regulations;
- (h) the detailed assessment criteria for the awards of the Professional Doctorate, Professional Master's and Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Research are set out in Part C of these Regulations.

Preliminary Assessment of the Thesis

- 12.8 The Doctoral School, shall send a copy of the thesis to each examiner normally one to three months prior to the date of the viva, together with the examiner's preliminary report form (Form RD6 or RD7) and Anglia Ruskin University's Research Degrees Regulations and the Notes of Guidance for Examiners, and ensure that the examiners are properly briefed as to their duties.
- 12.9 Each examiner will read the thesis and provide an independent preliminary report on it to the RDSC 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 (as set out in Regulation 12.7 above) and where possible shall make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of an oral examination.
- 12.10 The Doctoral School will make contact with any examiner that fails to return their preliminary report at least ten working days before the oral examination takes place.
- 12.11 The Doctoral School will ensure that all examiners preliminary reports are distributed to the examination team prior to the viva. Examiners are required to keep the preliminary reports confidential to the examining team prior to the viva and any breach of confidentiality will invalidate the examination.

Dispensing with the Oral Examination

- 12.12 Where all the examiners are independently of the opinion that the thesis is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting an oral examination the RDSC shall dispense with the oral examination and refer the thesis for further work. In such cases the examiners shall provide the RDSC with written guidance for the candidate concerning the deficiencies of the thesis.

- 12.13 The resubmission will count as a re-examination and be treated under the provisions of Section 13.
- 12.14 The examiners shall not recommend that a candidate fail outright (see Regulation 12.26 (k) below) without holding an oral examination.
- 12.15 The RDSC will normally agree that the resubmitted thesis should be submitted within twelve months.

Outright Failure

- 12.16 Where the RDSC decides at the oral examination 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 Secretary to the RDSC.

The Oral Examination

- 12.17 It is the responsibility of the Doctoral School to make all the necessary arrangements for the oral examination. This will include agreeing the date of the oral examination and notifying the candidate, examiners, supervisors and independent Chair in writing of the date and the arrangements for the oral examination.
- 12.18 The oral examination shall not normally be arranged less than one month from the date of receipt of the thesis by the examiners in order to give the examiners a reasonable period in which to assess the work.
- 12.19 The oral examination shall normally be held in the UK (on University or Associate College premises). In exceptional and unforeseen circumstances the RDSC may give approval for the examination to take place elsewhere or abroad or by video conference.
- 12.20 Up to two members of the supervisory team (possibly for training purposes) and the Chair of the RDSC may, with the consent of the candidate, attend the oral examination as observers, but shall withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination. It is not permissible for any other persons to be present in the examination room, subject to the provisions of the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001.
- 12.21 At the end of the examination the candidate and supervisors will leave the room. The examiners or the Chair may however invite them back to clarify any outstanding issues arising from the examination.

The Role of the Chair

- 12.22 Each examination shall be chaired by an independent Chair who has attended the appropriate training. This training is provided to ensure that Chairs carry out their role rigorously, fairly, reliably and consistently. The Chair shall have a neutral role in the assessment process and take no part in the actual assessment of the thesis. The Chair will advise the examiners and/or the candidate on Anglia Ruskin University's regulations, procedures, policy and practice.

Examiners' Pre Meeting

12.23 Prior to the examination the examiners will meet with the independent Chair to consider their preliminary reports and the candidate's thesis. The examiners will also clarify the issues which they collectively, or independently, wish to raise with the candidate. The examiners should also agree the structure of their questioning and the time frame in which they hope to complete the oral examination.

Examiners' Action following the Examination

12.24 Following the oral examination the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit to the Doctoral School a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree within 10 working days.

12.25 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 the RDSC to satisfy itself that the recommendation chosen in Regulation 12.26 below is correct. Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted.

Recommendations Available to the Examiners

12.26 Following the completion of the oral or approved alternative examination the examiners may recommend that:

- (a) The candidate may be awarded the degree;
- (b) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to minor amendments being made to the thesis (see Regulations 12.28-12.30 below);
- (c) the candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree and be re-examined with an oral examination;
- (d) the candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree and be re-examined without an oral examination;
- (e) in the case of a PhD examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners and which must meet the criteria for the award of MPhil as set out in Regulation 12.7(e) above);
- (f) in the case of a DProf examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MProf subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners and which must meet the criteria for the award of MProf as set out in Section C(b), Regulation 10.2 below;
- (g) in the case of a PhD examination, the candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree of MPhil with an oral examination;
- (h) in the case of a DProf examination, the candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree of MProf with an oral examination;
- (i) in the case of a PhD examination, the candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree of MPhil without an oral examination;

- (j) in the case of a DProf examination, the candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree of MProf without an oral examination;
- (k) the candidate be not awarded the degree and be not permitted to be re-examined (see Regulation 12.34 below).

12.27 The examiners shall inform the candidate of their recommendations to the RDSC but must make it clear that the final decision rests with the RDSC.

Minor Amendments to the Thesis

12.28 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 additional explanatory information or some minor amendments and corrections not so substantial as to call for the submission of a revised thesis, they may 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) (Regulation 12.26 (b) above). They shall indicate to the candidate in writing what amendments and corrections are required within ten working days of the oral examination.

12.29 The candidate should be able to undertake minor amendments with minimal supervision. Minor corrections that are permissible include typographical errors, minor amendments and/or replacement of, or additions to the text, references or diagrams. Other more extensive corrections may be made as long as they do not require significant (as defined by the examiners) re-working or re-interpretation of the intellectual content of the thesis.

12.30 Where minor amendments are required (as in Regulation 12.26 (b), (e), and (f) above) the candidate must normally submit the corrected thesis within a maximum of six months from the date the examiners' feedback is sent to the candidate. The RDSC may, where there are exceptional reasons, approve an extension of this period. When candidates submit the corrected thesis they shall attach a summary of the changes they have made identifying where the changes can be found in the corrected thesis.

Other Amendments to the Thesis

12.31 For outcomes (c) – (j) above the candidate must submit the amended thesis within a maximum of twelve months from the date the examiners' feedback is sent to them.

Feedback from the Examiners to the Candidate Post-Viva

12.32 The examiners must supply the Doctoral School with a report detailing the amendments and corrections they require within ten working days of the date of the oral examination.

12.33 The Doctoral School will supply the report to the candidate within five working days of receipt from the examiners.

Failure at First Examination

12.34 Where the RDSC 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 Secretary to the RDSC.

Where Recommendations are not Unanimous

- 12.35 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the Faculty is invited to nominate an additional external examiner to consider the thesis. This nomination is considered by the Chair of the RDSC for approval by Chair's action.
- 12.36 Where an additional external examiner is appointed under Regulation 12.35 above, they shall prepare an independent report on the basis of the thesis and a further oral examination. That examiner will not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. The report from the additional examiner is considered by the Chair of the RDSC or the full Committee itself.

Conferment of the Award

- 12.37 The RDSC (or the Chair acting on behalf of the Subcommittee) shall receive the recommendations of the examiners and shall, if appropriate, endorse the decision to confer the award. The power to confer or not confer the award shall rest with the RDSC acting on behalf of the Research Committee and the Senate of Anglia Ruskin University.

Research Degree Certificates

- 12.38 Conferment of an award is withheld from any student who has not fulfilled a legitimate requirement of Anglia Ruskin University, including the settlement of any outstanding debt to Anglia Ruskin University or to an Associate College at which the student has studied in partial or complete fulfilment of the academic requirements of the course for which the student is registered.
- 12.39 Anglia Ruskin University provides an award certificate to each student on whom it confers an award.
- 12.40 Such certificates record:
- the name of Anglia Ruskin University;
 - the full name of the student as entered on Anglia Ruskin University's Student Record System. It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that his/her name is correctly entered;
 - the award title as defined in the Research Degrees Regulations;
 - the month and year that the RDSC, or Chair, endorses the recommendation to confer the award;
 - subject to the prior approval of the Senate, the name of any Associate College with whom Anglia Ruskin University has collaborated in relation to the named award; *[NB: this currently does not apply to any Associate College]*;
 - a reference to the existence of a transcript for Professional Doctorate awards conferred under Part C 9a) of these Regulations.
- 12.41 The certificate bears the signature of the Vice-Chancellor.
- 12.42 The Academic Registrar is responsible for the provision of all award certificates, prepared in secure conditions and in a format designed to minimise the risk of forgery.
- 12.43 The Academic Registrar is responsible for maintaining a record of the names of all recipients of an academic award conferred by Anglia Ruskin University.

- 12.44 Following the conferment of the award the candidate is invited by the Academic Registry's Assessment Service to attend a graduation ceremony.
- 12.45 For students registered for a Professional Doctorate award conferred under Part C (a) of these Regulations, Anglia Ruskin provides a transcript of taught Stage 1 performance. The transcript contains:
- the full name of the student as entered on Anglia Ruskin University's Student Record System. It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that this information is correctly entered;
 - the award title as defined in the Research Degrees Regulations;
 - a record of the outcome of every module in which the student has been assessed (whether or not the student has passed the module) with details of the module title, level, credit volume, module result and date of completion;
 - where appropriate, the award conferred on the student. This may be an intermediate award rather than the award for which the student was originally registered;
 - the date of publication of the transcript;
 - the name of any Associate College with whom Anglia Ruskin University has collaborated in relation to the named award;
 - a reference to the language of assessment for the award if this is not English⁴.

Retracting an Anglia Ruskin Award after Conferment

- 12.46 On rare occasions, it may become apparent that an Anglia Ruskin award has been conferred on a student who was admitted to Anglia Ruskin University on the basis of forged documents, or who has gained an unfair advantage in some other way. Alternatively, some other form of deception has occurred.
- 12.47 In the event that such evidence comes to light, the matter is referred to the Secretary and Clerk who considers the evidence and is responsible for determining whether a case exists against the holder of the award. Where the Secretary and Clerk considers there to be insufficient evidence, the matter is dropped and no further action is taken.
- 12.48 If the Secretary and Clerk considers that a case does exist, he/she discusses the matter with the Vice-Chancellor who together determine the most appropriate action to take. In reaching this decision, the Vice-Chancellor and Secretary & Clerk consider the need to maintain the integrity and reputation of Anglia Ruskin's awards and academic standards. Such action can include the retraction of any or all awards already conferred by Anglia Ruskin and formal notification of such action to relevant Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies. The Academic Registrar maintains a record of such decisions and these are reported to the next scheduled meeting of the Senate.

⁴ This reference is to satisfy the expectations contained within Section B10 of the QAA's UK Quality Code for Higher Education (December 2011). The requirement does not apply to courses (or their constituent modules) relating to the study of a foreign language where the principal language of assessment is also the language of study

SECTION A13

RE-EXAMINATION

Requirements for Re-Examination

- 13.1 One re-examination may be permitted by the RDSC, subject to the following requirements:
- (a) a candidate who fails to satisfy the examiners at the first examination may, on the recommendation of the examiners and with the approval of the RDSC, be permitted to revise the thesis and be re-examined;
 - (b) the examiners shall provide the candidate, through the RDSC, with written guidance on the deficiencies of the first submission. It is important that the examiners in their written guidance explicitly identify:
 - the deficiencies of the thesis;
 - the remedial action required (including any additional research or experimental work);
 - the agreed timescale to carry out this work (up to 12 months).

Examiners cannot require candidates to undertake any additional work which was not specified in their written guidance. Anglia Ruskin University reserves the right to seek further details on the remedial action, if this is deemed necessary;
 - (c) the candidate shall submit for re-examination within the period of one calendar year from the date the examiners' feedback is sent to the candidate. Where the RDSC has dispensed with the oral examination the resubmission of the thesis shall take place within one calendar year of the date of this dispensation (see Regulation 12.12 above). The RDSC may, where there are good reasons, approve an extension of the resubmission period;
 - (d) when candidates resubmit their thesis they shall attach a summary of the changes they have made identifying where the changes can be found in the resubmitted thesis.
- 13.2 Candidates who are required to resubmit their thesis must produce an action plan to address the issues raised by the examiners.
- 13.3 The RDSC may require that an additional external examiner be appointed for the re-examination.
- 13.4 The submission of the revised thesis, the re-examination process and the approval of the examiners recommendations shall be conducted in accordance with the timescales and requirements of the first examination (Section 12).
- 13.5 Examiners are required to submit their recommendations on the resubmitted thesis within four to six weeks of receiving it.
- 13.6 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous at the resubmission stage, the reports are shared with each examiner and the examining team is asked to consult and to make every effort to provide a joint recommendation to the RDSC.

Where the Examiners are Unable to Reach a Joint Recommendation

- 13.7 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the Faculty is invited to nominate an additional external examiner to consider the thesis. This nomination is considered by the Chair of the RDSC for approval by Chair's action.

13.8 Where an additional external examiner is appointed under Regulation 13.7 above, they shall prepare an independent report on the basis of the resubmitted thesis and a further oral examination. That examiner will not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. The report from the additional examiner is considered by the Chair of the RDSC or the full Subcommittee.

Forms of Re-Examination

13.9 There are six 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, the RDSC 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 satisfactory but the thesis was unsatisfactory, any re-examination shall include a re-examination of the thesis and may, on the recommendation of the examiners include an oral examination;
- (c) 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;
- (d) where on the first examination the candidate's thesis was so unsatisfactory that the RDSC dispensed with the oral examination, any re-examination shall include a re-examination of the thesis and an oral examination;
- (e) 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), subject to the time limits prescribed in Regulation 13.1 (c) above, without being requested to revise and re-submit the thesis;
- (f) where on the first examination the thesis was satisfactory but the candidate's performance in relation to the other requirements for the award of the degree was not satisfactory, the examiners may propose instead a different form of re-examination to test the candidate's abilities; such examination may take place only with the approval of the RDSC.

Outcomes on Re-Examination

13.10 Following 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 minor amendments being made to the thesis (see Regulations 12.28-12.30 above);
- (c) In the case of a PhD examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil with or without minor amendments and which must meet the criteria for the award of MPhil as set out in Regulation 12.7(e) above;

- (d) In the case of a DProf examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MProf with or without minor amendments and which must meet the criteria for the award of MProf as set out in Section C(b), Regulation 10.2 below.

13.11 For outcomes (c) and (d) the candidate must submit the amended thesis within a maximum of twelve months from the date the examiners' feedback is sent to them.

Failure on Resubmission

13.12 The RDSC may decide, on the recommendation of the examiners, that the degree be not awarded and that no re-examination be permitted. In such cases, 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 Secretary to the RDSC.

13.13 Normally a candidate shall have only one opportunity to resubmit their thesis and to be re-examined. In exceptional circumstances only and, on the recommendation of the examiners, a candidate may be permitted a second resubmission. The case shall require the approval of the RDSC (i.e. not by Chair's action).

SECTION A14

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Introduction

- 14.1 As an academic community, Anglia Ruskin University recognises that the principles of truth, honesty and mutual respect are central to the pursuit of knowledge. Behaviour that undermines these principles weakens the community, both individually and collectively, and diminishes Anglia Ruskin's values. Anglia Ruskin is committed to ensuring that every student and member of staff is made aware of the responsibilities he/she bears in maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and how those standards are protected.
- 14.2 This section of the Research Degrees Regulations describes Anglia Ruskin University's policy for managing an alleged assessment offence by students registered for an postgraduate research award conferred by Anglia Ruskin University, including all students registered at a UK or international Associate College. Students registered for (the taught) Part 1 of a Professional Doctorate programme are considered under Section 10 of the *Academic Regulations* (www.anglia.ac.uk/academicregs). All Associate Colleges are required to forward to the Academic Registrar any case of an alleged assessment offence for investigation by Anglia Ruskin University, as set out in these Regulations.
- 14.3 The Senate has approved procedures for dealing with an alleged assessment offence at postgraduate research level and these are conducted under the auspices of the Senate's RDSC which is formally responsible for the investigation of all such cases. Through the Academic Registrar (or nominee), the RDSC establishes a Panel to hear each case, where appropriate, chaired by a member of the RDSC.
- 14.4 The Academic Registry maintains a record of all assessment offences and penalties.
- 14.5 The principal method of communication with a student throughout the academic misconduct process is the student's Anglia Ruskin e-mail account. Written letters are sent as e-mail attachments. Communication is not conducted via postal services except for the final outcome.
- 14.6 If the behaviour of a student becomes threatening or abusive during Stage 1 or Stage 2 of the process detailed below, then the Director of Research Students or Panel Chair respectively is empowered to suspend the process and refer the matter to the Secretary & Clerk under the disciplinary procedures contained within the *Rules, Regulations and Procedures for Students*. The process may resume at a later date, pending the outcome of the disciplinary process.

Definitions

- 14.7 For the purpose of these Research Degrees Regulations an "assessment offence" is the generic term used to define cases where a student(s) has sought to gain unfair academic advantage in the assessment process for him/herself or another student(s).
- 14.8 An assessment offence may be committed in relation to work undertaken for any assessment method used by Anglia Ruskin University and its Associate Colleges.
- 14.9 There are many forms of assessment offence including (this is not an exhaustive list):
- impersonating another student;
 - submitting someone else's work as one's own (known as "plagiarism": see below for a definition);
 - falsifying data;

- the unauthorised and unattributed submission of an assessment item which has been produced by another student or person;
- the behaviour of one or more students which may result in the poor academic performance of another student or students;
- any attempt to bribe or provide inducements to members of Anglia Ruskin University staff, or to internal or external examiners in relation to the assessment process in its entirety;
- any attempt which, if enacted, is designed to undermine or breach the Research Degrees Regulations.

14.10 Plagiarism and collusion are common forms of assessment offence. They are defined as follows:

“Plagiarism”

Plagiarism is the submission of an item of assessment containing elements of work produced by another person(s) in such a way that it could be assumed to be the candidate’s own work. Examples of plagiarism are:

- (a) the verbatim copying of another person’s work without acknowledgement;
- (b) the close paraphrasing of another person’s work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation without acknowledgement;
- (c) the unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another person’s work and/or the presentation of another person’s idea(s) as one’s own.

Copying or close paraphrasing with occasional acknowledgement of the source may also be deemed to be plagiarism if the absence of quotation marks implies the phraseology is the candidate’s own.

Plagiarised work may belong to another candidate or be (purchased) from a published source such as a book, report, journal or material available on the internet.

“Collusion”

Collusion occurs when two or more individuals collaborate to produce a piece of work submitted (in whole or in part) for assessment and the work is presented as the work of one candidate alone.

Stage 1: Investigation and Making an Allegation

14.11 All candidates are expected to produce and submit a Turnitin report for their:

- (a) research proposal;
- (b) submissions for upgrade/confirmation of registration;
- (c) their thesis;
- (d) resubmitted thesis, where resubmission is required.

14.12 First Supervisors are required to confirm (on the form which is completed at the time of formal submission of work) that the Turnitin report has been discussed with the candidate and that any issues arising have been addressed.

14.13 Where a Supervisor, upgrade/confirmation of registration panel chair or Examiner is concerned that an assessment offence has been committed, the case is referred to the Faculty Director of Research Students. If the Faculty Director of Research Students believes that there is a case to answer he/she refers the matter to the Academic Registrar for further investigation.

- 14.14 On receipt of a suspected offence, the Academic Registrar nominates an Investigating Officer from amongst the RDSC membership, who is independent of the Faculty in which the candidate is registered.
- 14.15 The Investigating Officer is responsible for determining if there is sufficient evidence that an assessment offence has occurred and in so doing, determines the nature of the formal allegation to be put to the student (e.g.: plagiarism, collusion etc.). In reaching this conclusion, the Investigating Officer presents his/her findings to the Academic Registrar, within two weeks of being nominated to investigate the case.
- 14.16 If the Investigating Officer believes that no assessment offence of any nature has occurred, no formal allegation is made against the student and no further action is taken. If the Investigating Officer confirms that there is a case to answer, the allegation is put to the candidate by the Academic Registrar.
- 14.17 If a candidate denies the alleged assessment offence, the Academic Registrar convenes a Stage 2 Panel to hear the allegation and to give the candidate an opportunity to demonstrate that cheating has not occurred.
- 14.18 If a candidate admits to the allegation, the Academic Registrar applies the appropriate penalty in accordance with Regulations 14.25-14.28.

Stage 2: Panel Hearing

- 14.19 The Academic Registry is responsible for convening Stage 2 Panel Hearings. Membership of the Panel comprises:
- (a) two members of the RDSC who are not members of the Faculty in which the candidate is registered, and have not acted as the Investigating Officer (one of whom may act as chair);
 - (b) a member of Anglia Ruskin University's Academic Regulations Subcommittee;
 - (c) a postgraduate research student from another Faculty nominated by the president of the Students' Union, in consultation with the Executive Secretary;

The Academic Registry's Quality Assurance Service appoints an Executive Officer who minutes the Panel meeting and deliberations.

- 14.20 In addition, the following have the right to be in attendance:
- (a) the President of the Students' Union (or an elected representative of the Students' Union);
 - (b) the presenter of the case (Dean of Faculty or nominee);
 - (c) the student whose case is being heard and his/her friend or a representative of the Students' Union.
- 14.21 Neither Anglia Ruskin University nor the student whose case is being heard is legally represented during the conduct of a hearing.
- 14.22 The Hearing is formal and operates in accordance with the procedure set out in Section 10 of the *Academic Regulations*. The Hearing will take place as soon as possible and no later than two months after the student has responded to the formal allegation in Stage 1, requesting a referral to a Stage 2 Panel Hearing.

- 14.23 Exceptionally, in the event of the unavoidable absence of a Panel member (eg: due to illness), in order to reduce the inconvenience to the student, the Panel Hearing may proceed with three members provided that:
- One of the three members is a member of the RDSC or a member of staff approved to act as the chair of a hearing and;
 - The student whose case the Panel has been convened to hear has no objections to proceeding with a three member Panel.
- 14.24 A report of the Panel Hearing is submitted to the RDSC for information and to implement the outcome of the process.

Penalties

- 14.25 Where an allegation of an assessment offence has been proved or admitted, the Academic Registrar, following consultation with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) – as chair of the RDSC - recommends to the Vice-Chancellor that the student be expelled from Anglia Ruskin University. A student who is expelled under the Academic Misconduct process is not entitled to receive an intermediate award of any nature. For courses which attract academic credit, a transcript detailing the academic credit attained is issued.
- 14.26 If during the process the candidate provides evidence of extenuating circumstances that he/she asserts directly led to the assessment offence being committed, such information does NOT impact on the Investigating Officer's findings or the Panel's decision as to whether or not the assessment offence has occurred. However, if the Investigating Officer or the Panel believes that, as a result of the extenuating circumstances, the prescribed penalty is exceptionally inappropriate they can, at their discretion, refer the matter to the Academic Registrar for discussion with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation), to review the appropriateness of the penalty. The Investigating Officer and the Panel are not authorised to amend the penalty themselves.
- 14.27 The referral must be supported by relevant documentary evidence. The Academic Registrar and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) consider the case within ten working days of receiving the request to review the penalty and are authorised to impose an alternative penalty.
- 14.28 All assessment offences are formally notified to the student at the conclusion of the process, in writing, by the Academic Registrar. Such notifications are sent within 20 working days of notification of the conclusion of the process by the Academic Registry.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator

- 14.29 If a student is not satisfied with the decision of the Panel Hearing, the student may make representation to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). For these purposes, the final communication to the student under Regulation 14.28 above also serves as the 'Completion of Procedures Letter' required under OIA procedures.

SECTION A15

ACADEMIC APPEALS

[N.B. In this section of the Regulations all references to ‘the Academic Registrar’ should be taken to include ‘or nominee’, and all references to ‘Director of Research Students’ should be taken to include ‘or equivalent’.]

Introduction

- 15.1 This section of the Research Degrees Regulations describes Anglia Ruskin University’s academic appeals policy for all students registered on a postgraduate research (PGR) award conferred by Anglia Ruskin University, including all students registered at a UK or international Associate College. All appeals, including those from students registered at UK and international Associate Colleges are administered by Anglia Ruskin University. Appeals from students registered at international Associate Colleges may require special arrangements in order to administer the appeal.
- 15.2 The Research Degrees Regulations are applied fairly and consistently and in accordance with Anglia Ruskin University’s equal opportunities policy. The *Academic Regulations* (available at www.anglia.ac.uk/academicregs) provide an appeals process for taught provision and are applied in certain cases for PGR activity, as specified below.
- 15.3 In dealing with an academic appeal, privacy and confidentiality are assured unless disclosure is necessary to progress the appeal.
- 15.4 The principal method of communication with an appellant throughout the academic appeals process is the appellant’s Anglia Ruskin e-mail account. Written letters are sent as e-mail attachments. Communication is not conducted via postal services except for the final outcome.
- 15.5 If the behaviour of an appellant becomes threatening or abusive during the course of the internal resolution process or a Panel Hearing, then the Academic Registrar or Panel Chair respectively is empowered to suspend the process and refer the matter to the Secretary & Clerk under the disciplinary procedures contained within the *Rules, Regulations and Procedures for Students*. The appeal process may resume at a later date, pending the outcome of the disciplinary process.

Grounds for an Appeal

- 15.6 A candidate registered for a research degree has the right to appeal against a decision made at any of the three key assessment points:
 - a) assessment of the research proposal;
 - b) upgrade/confirmation of registration;
 - c) examination of the thesis.
- 15.7 In addition candidates may also appeal against decisions made relating to:
 - a) the decision that there is no *prima facie* case for the award of a PhD by Published Work;
 - b) discontinuation by the FRDSC due to lack of academic progress.
- 15.8 A candidate may appeal against the outcome of assessment for any taught module delivered as a constituent element of Part 1 of a Professional Doctorate programme by using the procedure in Section 9 of the *Academic Regulations* (www.anglia.ac.uk/academicregs).

15.9 Any appeal must be based on either or both of the following grounds:

- that performance was adversely affected by illness or other factors which the candidate was unable, or for valid reasons unwilling, to divulge before the decision was made. The candidate's request must be supported by medical certificates or other documentary evidence acceptable to the Appeals Panel, indicating clearly why such evidence was not previously presented;
- that there has been a material administrative error, or that the assessment(s) was not conducted in accordance with the Research Degrees Regulations, or that some procedural irregularity has occurred.

15.10 Candidates may not appeal on any ground which:

- has already been considered and rejected unless additional evidence in support of the appeal is provided and there is a valid reason (supported by evidence) why the additional evidence was not submitted originally;
- claims that academic performance was adversely affected by ill health, where there is no medical evidence certified by a recognised medical practitioner or hospital consultant or other evidence deemed appropriate to support the application;
- disputes only the academic judgement concerning the candidate's performance in any academic work.

Submitting an Appeal

15.11 Candidates wishing to exercise a right of appeal must give notice in writing, using the appropriate proforma which is obtainable from www.anglia.ac.uk/appeals, to the Academic Registrar within 20 working days of the date of the written notification of a decision of the Senate's RDSC.

15.12 Only in very exceptional circumstances and with the explicit agreement of the Chair of the Senate, acting on the advice of the Academic Registrar, is an appeal outside the normal time limits considered.

15.13 A candidate wishing to appeal on grounds of illness is required to send to the Academic Registrar supporting documented medical evidence, explaining the reasons why the evidence was not originally presented.

15.14 A candidate wishing to appeal on the grounds that there has been a material administrative error or that the assessments were not conducted in accordance with the Research Degrees Regulations is required to send to the Academic Registrar such documentary evidence as is appropriate to support the appeal. Such evidence must be sent to the Academic Registrar at the same time as the proforma is completed. The Academic Registrar will notify the candidate's Director of Research Students that an appeal has been submitted.

15.15 The Academic Registrar has the right to call for additional written evidence from the candidate and/or Anglia Ruskin University staff and to include any such additional evidence as s/he thinks is conducive to a better informed judgement.

Initial Scrutiny

- 15.16 The Academic Registrar acknowledges receipt of the formal notice of appeal. Two staff, from a pool of the Academic Registrar, Assistant Academic Registrar (Academic Governance), Head of the Quality Assurance Service and the Examinations and Academic Appeals Manager undertake an initial scrutiny of the appeal upon receipt by the Academic Registry. The Academic Registrar **dismisses the appeal** without further action where:
- (a) the criteria for grounds for an academic appeal are not satisfied;
 - (b) there is either no evidence provided to support the appeal, or that such evidence is clearly not timely.
- 15.17 All other appeals which satisfy the grounds for an academic appeal and for which timely and appropriate evidence has been provided are progressed to Stage 1 for investigation at Faculty level.
- 15.18 In exceptional circumstances the Academic Registrar may appoint an Investigating Officer from the Senate's Academic Regulations Subcommittee who has neither taught the appellant nor been closely associated with the appellant in any other way. The Investigating Officer has the right to call for additional written evidence from the appellant or Anglia Ruskin University staff and to include any such additional evidence as he/she thinks is in the interests of a just outcome. The Investigating Officer reviews the written evidence within 15 working days of the date of receipt of the notice of appeal.
- 15.19 The Academic Registrar notifies an appellant of the outcome of an appeal dismissed under Regulation 15.16 above in writing. This notification includes an explanation for why the appeal has been dismissed and confirms which staff undertook the initial scrutiny. The notification also informs the appellant that he/she can request a review of the decision to dismiss the appeal. Such requests are made by the appellant in writing to the Academic Registrar within ten working days of the date of the notification of the outcome.
- 15.20 On receipt of a request for a review of the initial scrutiny outcome, the Academic Registrar appoints a Director of Research Students from a Faculty which is not associated with the course on which the student is registered to review the original decision within ten working days of the request being made⁵.
- 15.21 If the outcome of the review supports the original decision made under Regulation 15.16 above, the Academic Registrar **dismisses the appeal** in writing within ten working days of the review being concluded.
- 15.22 If the outcome of the review does not support the original decision made under Regulation 15.16 above, the appeal is processed in accordance with Regulation 15.23 below.

Stage 1: Investigating an Appeal

- 15.23 All academic appeals which, following initial scrutiny, satisfy the grounds for an academic appeal and for which timely and appropriate evidence has been provided, are forwarded to the Director of Research Students for consideration.

⁵ At his/her discretion, the Director of Research Students may contact the student to discuss the appeal as part of the review

- 15.24 If the Director of Research Students agrees that there is a ground for an appeal, the Academic Registrar upholds the appeal and notifies the appellant of the decision within ten working days. In such cases, and where appropriate, the Chair of the RDSC (or nominee) arranges for the case to be reviewed in the light of the additional information provided through the appeals process within 15 working days of the date of the letter upholding the appeal.
- 15.25 If the Director of Research Students does not immediately uphold the appeal, an internal resolution process within the Faculty is initiated. Under the internal resolution process the Director of Research Students meets the appellant to discuss the appeal and to seek to resolve it at a local level. The appellant may be accompanied at the meeting by a friend. A written record of the discussion is kept by the Director of Research Students and the recommendation arising from that discussion is reported by the Director of Research Students to the Academic Registrar, whether or not the appeal is upheld.
- 15.26 The internal resolution meeting takes place within 20 working days of the date of receipt of the notice of appeal. If the appellant does not attend the meeting, the Director of Research Students is not required to re-arrange the meeting but proceeds to consider the appeal. The Director of Research Students is permitted to dismiss the appeal on the grounds that the appellant has not engaged with the internal resolution process.
- 15.27 If, following the conclusion of the internal resolution process, the appeal is no longer contested by the Director of Research Students, the Academic Registrar **upholds the appeal** and notifies the appellant of the decision within ten working days. In such cases, and where appropriate, the Chair of the Anglia Ruskin Awards Board (or nominee) arranges for the RDSC to review its decision in the light of the additional information provided through the appeals process within 15 working days of the date of the letter upholding the appeal.
- 15.28 If, following the conclusion of the internal resolution process, the appeal remains contested by the Director of Research Students, the Academic Registrar **dismisses the appeal** and notifies the appellant of the decision (including an explanation for why the appeal has been dismissed) within ten working days.
- 15.29 Following the dismissal of an appeal at Stage 1 (under Regulation 15.28 above), an appellant who wishes to continue to pursue the appeal has the right to request that the appeal is referred to a Stage 2 Appeals Panel Hearing if:
- the appellant has engaged with the internal resolution process
- and;**
- additional evidence, which was not presented previously, is subsequently submitted by the appellant. The additional evidence must be related to the grounds and reasons cited in the original submission of the appeal. The submission of additional evidence at this stage of the process cannot be used by the appellant as an opportunity to change the grounds of the appeal (eg: citing alternative material administrative error).
- 15.30 An appellant wishing to exercise the right to request a Stage 2 Appeals Panel Hearing is required to notify the Academic Registrar, in writing, and supply the required additional evidence, within 15 working days of the date of the communication confirming the Stage 1 outcome. No arrangements are made to conduct a hearing until the additional evidence is submitted. If no further evidence has been received by this deadline, the request for a hearing, and therefore the academic appeal, is dismissed.

Stage 2 - Appeals Panel

15.31 The membership of the Appeals Panel comprises:

- two academic members of the RDSC, one of whom acts as Chair. None may be members of the Faculty in which the appellant is registered nor have been associated with the appellant in any way;
- the Director or Deputy Director of the Doctoral School⁶;
- a postgraduate research student, nominated by the President of the Students' Union, who may not come from the same Faculty as the appellant.

15.32 The Examinations and Academic Appeals Manager in the Academic Registry acts as Executive Secretary to the Appeals Panel, but is not a Panel member. In addition, a Report Secretary shall be appointed by the Academic Registry.

15.33 The following have the right to be present and to speak at sittings of the Appeals Panel:

- the Director of Research Students from the appellant's Faculty
- the President of the Students' Union (or an elected representative of the Students' Union);
- the appellant and his/her friend or a representative of the Students' Union.

15.34 Neither Anglia Ruskin University nor the student whose case is being heard is legally represented during the conduct of a hearing of the Appeals Panel.

15.35 Exceptionally, in the event of the unavoidable absence of a Panel member (eg: due to illness), in order to reduce the inconvenience to the appellant, the Panel Hearing may proceed with three members provided that:

- one of the three members is a member of the RDSC and;
- the appellant has no objections to proceeding with a three member Panel.

Procedure

15.36 On receiving the request from the Academic Registrar to convene an Appeals Panel, the Report Secretary to the Panel will, within 30 working days convene a meeting of the Appeals Panel. Prior to the panel meeting they will:

- ascertain from the appellant whether s/he objects to the attendance of the President of the Students' Union at the Appeals Panel;
- give notice to the appropriate Director of Research Students and the President of the Students' Union of the date, time and place of the meeting;
- give notice in writing to the appellant by way of personal delivery or if this is not possible by recorded postal delivery to the appellant's last known address, such notice stating:
 - (a) the nature of the appeal;
 - (b) the date, time and place of the hearing of the Appeals' Panel and its membership;
 - (c) that the appellant has a right to be heard at the hearing accompanied, if the appellant so wishes by a friend;
 - (d) that in the appellant's unavoidable absence, the appellant may be represented by a proxy (who may be a member of the Students' Union) nominated ahead of the hearing by the appellant;

⁶ If the Director and/or Deputy Director of the Doctoral School are subjects of the academic appeal in any way then, to avoid comprising the integrity of the process, a third member of the RDSC is selected as a Panel member to replace the Director and/or Deputy Director of the Doctoral School.

- (e) that the appellant has a right to submit a written statement or written evidence for consideration by the Appeals Panel and that evidence may be presented by the Secretary;
 - (f) that the appellant is responsible for informing witnesses in support of the case of the details of the hearing of the Appeals Panel and for securing their attendance at the hearing;
 - (g) that the appellant is responsible for informing the Report Secretary of the Appeals Panel as soon as possible of the names of witnesses being called and whether the appellant wishes to be accompanied by a friend (and if so the name of the friend).
- provide members of the Appeals Panel, the appellant, the Director of Research Students and the President of the Students' Union (or elected representative) with copies of all relevant documentation.

Conduct of a Formal Hearing

15.37 Anglia Ruskin University reserves the right to involve such other individuals as it thinks appropriate to the presentation of the case.

15.38 Minutes are taken of all hearings. The minutes are kept by the Academic Registry.

15.39 The hearing is conducted in the following sequence:

- the appellant or friend in support of the case. The evidence may be in writing and/or witnesses may be called;
- witnesses in support of the appellant;
- the Director of Research Students with a view to demonstrating that the appeal should not be upheld. The evidence may be in writing and/or witnesses may be called;
- witnesses in support of the Director of Research Students;
- final statement by the appellant or friend or representative of the Students' Union;
- final statement by the Director of Research Students.

15.40 The Director of Research Students and witnesses, the appellant and his/her friend have the right to be present during the taking of evidence. All have the right to put questions to the witnesses and to each other, except that none has the right to put questions on the other's final statements.

15.41 If the appellant does not appear at the hearing, the Appeal Panel may proceed to deal with the appeal in the appellant's absence provided the Panel is satisfied that the Secretary has properly notified the appellant of the hearing.

15.42 The Secretary will inform the appellant of the decision within 10 working days.

Hearing Outcomes

15.43 The Appeals Panel sits in private and having heard the appeal decides:

- whether the appeal can be upheld;
- if so, the recommendation to make;
- if not, to dismiss the appeal.

Decisions Available to the Panel

15.44 The Appeals Panel, having heard the appeal, may, if satisfied:

For cases involving material administrative error or irregularity

- refer the matter to the relevant university committee with an instruction to reconsider its decision in the light of the findings of the Appeals Panel. The normal expectation is that the committee acts accordingly. If the committee is not prepared to reconsider its original decision, a formal written statement with its reasons for not doing so, must be submitted to the Academic Registrar by the chair of the committee;

For cases involving Illness or Other Factors

- if it is satisfied that the appellant's performance in the assessment was adversely affected by illness or other factors which s/he was unable, or unwilling for valid reason to divulge before the assessment, the Appeals Panel will refer the matter to the relevant university committee with an instruction to reconsider its decision. The normal expectation is that the committee will act accordingly. If the committee is not prepared to reconsider its original decision, a formal written statement of its reasons for not doing so must be submitted to the Academic Registrar by the chair of the committee;

For cases involving an examination decision

If the Appeals Panel decides that a candidate has valid grounds for an appeal then the following is recommended to the next meeting of the RDSC:

- that the candidate be given the opportunity to be examined as a first attempt. This may be with or without a viva voce examination;
- that the candidate be given the opportunity to resubmit. This may be with or without a viva voce examination.

Where there are no Grounds or Grounds of Insufficient Weight

- dismiss the appeal, if it is satisfied that the appellant has failed to establish the ground of the appeal.

15.45 The Secretary notifies the appellant of the Panel's decision within 10 working days. The Secretary forwards the Panel's recommendation to the RDSC for consideration. The appellant is, at the earliest possible opportunity, notified of the Subcommittee's decision.

15.46 A report of the hearing is submitted to the RDSC for information.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator

15.47 If an appellant is not satisfied with the decision of the Appeals Panel, the appellant may make representation to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). For these purposes, the final communication to the appellant under Regulation 15.45 also serves as the 'Completion of Procedures Letter' required under OIA procedures.

SECTION A16

COMPLAINTS

16.1 Anglia Ruskin University has a formal Student Complaints Procedure which is published in the *Rules, Regulations and Procedures for Students* document published at:

http://web.anglia.ac.uk/onet/staff/sec_clerk/rul_regs.phtml

16.2 Advice and guidance on the complaints process is also available at:

http://web.anglia.ac.uk/onet/staff/sec_clerk/feedback.phtml