



**CODE OF PRACTICE FOR EXAMINERS AND CHAIRS  
OF RESEARCH DEGREES  
Academic Year 2009-2010**

**Effective from 1<sup>st</sup> August 2009**

© 2009 Bournemouth University

Document date: September 2009

Circulation: General

Bournemouth University undertakes to encourage the recognition, protection and exploitation of intellectual property rights generated by participants in this programme, to the benefit, as appropriate, of students, staff, industrial/other third parties/partners and the university.

The Graduate School  
Bournemouth University  
Talbot Campus  
Poole  
BH12 5BB

## **Contents**

1	INTRODUCTION	5
2	THE RESEARCH DEGREE AWARDS	5
3	THE EXAMINING TEAM	7
3.1	Appointment of examiners	7
3.2	Roles and responsibilities of examiners	8
4	THE INDEPENDENT CHAIR	9
4.1	Appointment of the independent chair	9
4.2	Roles and responsibilities of the independent chair	9
5	TRANSFER VIVA VOCE PROCESS	11
5.1	Transfer Policy	11
5.2	Transfer report	11
5.3	Transfer <i>viva voce</i>	12
5.4	Resubmission of transfer report	13
6	THE EXAMINATION PROCESS	13
6.1	Approval of examiners and thesis title	13
6.2	Pre- <i>viva voce</i> arrangements	15
6.3	Issues arising on reading the thesis	15
6.4	Arrangements for <i>viva voce</i>	16
6.5	The outcome of the examination	18
6.6	Re-examination for a research award	20
6.7	Disagreement between the examiners	21
6.8	Issues arising regarding the <i>viva voce</i>	22
6.9	Release of examiners' reports to the candidate	22
7	AFTER THE VIVA VOCE	22

7.1	Post-viva voce arrangements	22
7.2	Appeals against examination decisions	23
8	CONTACT	24
	APPENDIX 1 – MASTERS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS	25
	APPENDIX 3 – PRELIMINARY REPORT FORM	27
	APPENDIX 5 – CHAIRS REPORT FORM	33

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

---

This Code of Practice provides guidance and regulations on the examination of research degrees, in particular for independent chairs and internal and external examiners

For further information consult the Code of Practice for Research Degrees and Bournemouth University Rules, which includes all policies, procedures and regulations and associated documentation.

## **2 THE RESEARCH DEGREE AWARDS**

---

The criteria for assessing research degrees are defined by the academic standards of each research programme. These are outlined in Appendices 1 & 2 and follow the qualification descriptors for Doctoral and Master's degrees in the *Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications*.

Examiners should use these criteria when assessing the candidate's thesis to safeguard the academic integrity of the research award, both internally and externally. If a candidate's work fails to meet the required level for the award in question, the examiners should examine the assessment criteria to explore the appropriateness of conferring an alternative award for positive achievement by the candidate.

When assessing the candidate's work, examiners should take into account the subject of the research and also the different types of research programmes, including traditional and practice base doctorates, professional doctorates and doctorates by published work.

The research degrees awarded by Bournemouth University are set out below:

---

### **Master of Philosophy (MPhil)**

---

The MPhil is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended a thesis, by viva voce, to the satisfaction of the examiners. Candidates may register to study for an MPhil on a full- or part-time basis.

---

---

### **Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by Thesis**

---

The PhD involves a more complex and advanced project and is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended a thesis by viva voce, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

---

### **Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by Creative or Performance Works**

---

The nature, scope and progression of the PhD by creative or performance works is the same as described above. The creative/performance works forms the main focus of the body of work with supporting synthesis.

Details of the process for undertaking a PhD by Creative or Performance Works will be set out in *Research Degrees at BU: a Guide to the PhD by Creative/Performance Works* [in prep].

---

### **Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by Publication**

---

The PhD by Publication is awarded to a candidate on the basis of publications or other creative/performance work, together with an accompanying synthesis in which the candidate must demonstrate a critical investigation, providing an original contribution to knowledge, and an understanding of appropriate research methodology for the chosen field. The candidate must also present and defend their thesis, incorporating publications or other creative/performance work appropriate to the candidate's field of research and synthesis, by viva voce, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

The PhD by Publication is normally only available to members of BU staff. Details of the process and the eligibility criteria for undertaking a PhD by Publication are set out in *Research Degrees at BU: a Guide to the PhD by Publication*.

---

### **Engineering Doctorate (DEng or EngD)**

---

An Engineering Doctorate is awarded to a candidate who having critically investigated and evaluated an approved, or series of approved, topics resulting in an original contribution to knowledge, theory or practice within an industry context, and demonstrated an understanding of appropriate research methods has presented and defended a thesis, by viva voce, to the satisfaction of the examiners. Engineering Doctorates are designed to provide researchers with technical and business competencies by applying new knowledge to industrially relevant research.

Details of the process for undertaking a Engineering Doctorate are set out in the programme handbook, which is available from the programme research administrator. In addition, PGRs should refer to the relevant rules and regulations and the support and facilities set out in this Code.

---

### **Professional Doctorates (DProf & DBA)**

---

A Professional Doctorate is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved organisation-centred topic resulting in

---

---

a fundamental advance in organisation-centred performance, or professional practice topic resulting in a fundamental advance in theory and practice, and demonstrated an understanding of appropriate research methods, has presented and defended a thesis, by viva voce, to the satisfaction of the examiners. The Professional Doctorates are designed to encourage practising professionals to pursue formal qualifications through in-depth research related to activities performed in the workplace.

Details of the process for undertaking a Professional Doctorate are set out in the relevant programme handbook (DProf or DBA), which is available from the programme research administrator.

---

### **3 THE EXAMINING TEAM**

---

#### **3.1 Appointment of examiners**

The nomination of both the internal and external examiners is considered by the Academic School and their recommendations are referred to the Graduate School and ADQ for ratification (see Section 6.1). The supervisory team must discuss the timescale for examination with the candidate as soon as submission of the thesis is imminent.

When appointing an examining team, the following criteria must be satisfied:

- the examination team must comprise at least two examiners, one of whom must be external;
- members of BU staff must have two external examiners, an internal examiner may also be present;
- both examiners should be experienced in the candidate's area of research, and may, where appropriate, have relevant industrial or professional expertise;
- the external examiner must have examined at least once at the appropriate level for the examination;
- both examiners should normally hold a doctorate and at least one must hold a doctorate.
- the candidate must not have been formally advised, supervised, or had any close association with the examiners however, they may have been involved in the Transfer process;

- the candidate shall have no formal contact with any examiner(s) between their appointment and the *viva voce*;
- the external examiner should be independent of the supervisory team and, if relevant, any collaborating establishment;
- no person who is registered for a research degree at Bournemouth University may act as an examiner.
- the same external examiner should not be proposed so frequently that their familiarity with the University might prejudice objective judgement (e.g. not more than three times in a five year period).

Where the examining team (or individual examiner) does not fully satisfy the above criteria, the Academic School should provide a detailed rationale for their appointment when seeking approval (see Section 6.1). The candidate will be notified of the examination team when their nomination has been approved.

### **3.2 Roles and responsibilities of examiners**

The examiners are jointly responsible for ensuring that the thesis meets the criteria for the award of the qualification and that the thesis is the candidate's own work. As such they will:

- read the thesis
- prepare a preliminary report form
- examine by *viva voce* the candidate
- prepare a joint report on the outcome
- make recommendation relating to the award

The full examination process is set out in Section 6.

Both examiners have a duty to acquaint themselves with the Bournemouth University Rules and Regulations and have a responsibility to ensure that the *viva voce* is conducted in accordance with these rules. Clarification of any issues that arise can be sought from the independent chair (see Section 4).

The examiners should make every effort to ensure that the candidate feels at ease during the examination and explore the strengths as well as the weaknesses of the candidate's work.

Both examiners should examine the candidate's work in detail and share any major concerns that arise from their reading of the thesis with the other examiner prior to the *viva voce* examination.

## **4 THE INDEPENDENT CHAIR**

---

### **4.1 Appointment of the independent chair**

The independent chair of the *viva voce* should be appointed by the Deputy Dean (Research & Enterprise) from the candidate's registered school.

The role of the independent chair is purely procedural and non-examining and should ensure that the *viva* is conducted in an appropriate manner, in accordance with the Code of Practice, ensuring fairness and consistency throughout. The chair will also provide an additional viewpoint if the conduct of the *viva voce* should become the subject of a candidate's appeal.

To meet the "independent" status, the chair must not have had prior involvement with the candidate, either in a supervisory or advisory capacity, during their research. The independent chair should be selected from across the University and/or different subject area.

The Graduate School holds a central list of independent chairs. Training for independent chairs will ensure consistency between different *viva voce* examinations.

### **4.2 Roles and responsibilities of the independent chair**

The roles and responsibilities of the independent chair are primarily:

- to safeguard the candidate's interests, to ensure they are treated fairly and that their interests are safeguarded

- to ensure that regulations and procedures are adhered to and that a permanent record of the proceedings is produced;
- to have ultimate responsibility for the way in which the viva voce is conducted, and for the completion of the associated paperwork.

In addition, the independent chair should:

- have knowledge of and provide accurate information and guidance on regulations and procedures of the University governing a viva voce;
- outline the nature of the viva, introduce those present, clarify arrangements and ensure the candidate understands the nature and purpose of the viva;
- explain that their role is neutral within the examination process and that their presence is to ensure that the examination is conducted in accordance with the Codes of Practice and equal opportunities policy of BU;
- ensure that the candidate is provided with oral and written comments, and understands the outcome of their viva and what is required of them in terms of any corrections;
- forward all documentation to the research administrator promptly which includes:
  - the written Chair's report of the viva voce (see Appendix 5);
  - the completed final joint examiners report with signatures;
  - a report of any relevant recommendations;
  - the completed checklist.

The chair must **not** participate in the examining of the candidate.

## 5 TRANSFER VIVA VOCE PROCESS

---

### 5.1 Transfer Policy

The transfer *viva voce* is a formal process that should mirror the candidate's final *viva voce* experience. PGRs should transfer to a higher award (usually MPhil to PhD) after 18 months registration full-time study (36 months part-time study). The transfer process is an important milestone to ensure that the PGR and their research meet the required academic standards to continue at doctoral level. Whilst acknowledging that some degree of flexibility across BU is essential, the best practice for this process is recommended below.

The transfer process (report and viva voce) is an examination of progress and, as such, is conducted under the normal University rules applied to examinations. Progress is monitored by the Academic School and the Graduate School. If PGRs fail to meet this milestone on time, a formal process will be triggered. Under exceptional circumstances, formal requests for extensions should be made and passed to the Academic School for approval. An extension of 6 months for full-time PGRs (12 months part-time) may be granted.

### 5.2 Transfer report

The supervisory team will give guidance and clarify the purpose of the report, what is required and the consequences of outcomes. PGRs will also be made aware that this is part of a continuing process and not a stand alone document - the content of this report should be written for eventual incorporation within the final thesis.

The transfer report will normally have an upper word limit of 10,000 words (including any appendices, draft chapters, literature review etc), although this may vary across different disciplines, and be accompanied by a separate 500 word abstract. A typical report should include:

<b>an introduction</b>	including the research project question, aims and objectives
<b>a literature review</b>	a review of the academic literature, its relation and

	context to the research
<b>a research plan</b>	a description of the methodology and approach used in the research
<b>progress to date</b>	a summary of findings, results and discussions to date and any problems encountered
<b>conclusion</b>	a summary of progress to date plus a revised plan for completing the research project
<b>a reference list</b>	and bibliography

The above is for guidance only and the transfer report should be tailored to reflect the requirements of the school or subject area. It is important that PGRs should discuss this with their supervisory team and reflect the progress of the research at the point of transfer (i.e. it may be possible to include draft chapters of the final thesis in the report).

### 5.3 Transfer *viva voce*

The transfer *viva voce* will normally be scheduled to take place within 4-6 weeks of submission of the transfer report. The transfer *viva voce* will be carried out by a transfer panel, which will include:

- an independent Chair;
- two independent academics;
- a supervisor may also attend, if the PGR agrees, but may only contribute to the discussion for clarification purposes, if invited to do so.

Where appropriate, an external reviewer may also be asked to read and comment on the transfer report.

The transfer *viva voce* and its outcome is a formal process that mirrors that of the final *viva voce* experience. The subsequent recommendations of the panel may be that the PGR either:

- transfers and becomes registered onto the programme of PhD;

- transfers and become registered onto the programme of PhD subject to consideration of specific recommendations of the transfer panel;
- does not transfer but remains registered at MPhil to carry out further work to resubmit the transfer report;
- does not transfer but continues to work to the submission of an MPhil;
- does not transfer and is withdrawn.

All PGRs should receive clear, written feedback on the transfer report and viva voce.

The outcome of the transfer process will be presented to the Academic School for final confirmation and reported to the Graduate School.

#### **5.4 Resubmission of transfer report**

Where transfer has been deferred, the PGR should also be advised on what further work should be carried out prior to resubmission or the reasons why transfer has not been approved.

The timeframe for resubmission of the transfer report will normally be within 2 months for full-time PGRs and 4 months for part-time PGRs.

If the PGR fails to satisfy the transfer panel following resubmission, a further opportunity is provided to re-submit within 6 months full time (12 months part time). If the PGR then fails to meet the necessary level on the second resubmission, they may:

- continue to work to the submission of an MPhil;
- be withdrawn.

## **6 THE EXAMINATION PROCESS**

---

### **6.1 Approval of examiners and thesis title**

The approval of the examiners is a formal process which follows

<b>The Examiner Approval Process</b>	
Supervisors propose examining team which meets the criteria set out in Section 3.1	Supervisors
Academic School considers nominations and rationale	Academic School (usually School Research Committee or equivalent)
Nominations forwarded to the Graduate School and Academic Development & Quality	Graduate School / ADQ
Nominations reviewed by independent experienced researchers and comments fed back to ADQ	Reviewers / ADQ
Reviewers comments may be fed back to Supervisors for comment or, in exceptional circumstances, may be considered by a panel chaired by Graduate School.	Supervisors / ADQ / GS
Final examiner nominations sent to ASC for ratification by Chairs action and School notified of outcome	ASC / ADQ
Once ratified by ASC , letters must be sent to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the external and internal examiners confirming their appointment</li> <li>to the candidate advising them of the examining team.</li> </ul>	Academic School

Examination arrangements will not normally be considered outside ASC meetings and proposals should be sent to ADQ at least six weeks in advance of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) meetings held during the academic year.

If there is any change to the title of the thesis following the submission of examination arrangements for ASC approval, the candidate must make a formal application to amend the title.

The candidate should submit one soft bound copy of the thesis for each examiner together with an abstract. The candidate must complete and sign a **Declaration Form** and hand it in with the thesis. Copies of the bound thesis must be submitted to their research administrator, who sends the thesis and Preliminary Report Form to the examiners.

## 6.2 Pre- *viva voce* arrangements

Prior to the *viva voce*, each examiner should read the thesis and complete the **Preliminary Report Form** (see Appendix 3) to ensure that there is documented evidence that the thesis has been independently examined.

The Preliminary Report should be treated as confidential and not be available to anyone other than the examiners and chair. The reports should normally be submitted to the research administrator prior to the *viva voce*.

Supervisory teams may be allowed to see the reports on the day of the *viva voce*, although this would be at the discretion of the examiners and on the understanding that the information would not be divulged to the candidate.

Section 3 of the examiner's Preliminary Report form should include specific comments on:

- the literature review;
- application of research methods;
- literary, or other, form and presentation;
- the candidate's contribution to research;
- the extent of any collaboration.

In completing the Preliminary Report, each examiner must:

- consider whether the thesis provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree;
- if possible, make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of any subsequent examination.

On the day of the examination, the examiners will be provided with an opportunity to discuss their reports prior to the *viva voce*.

## 6.3 Issues arising on reading the thesis

Where the examiners are of the opinion that the thesis submitted by an MPhil, PhD, DBA or DProf candidate is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting a *viva voce* examination, they may recommend

that the *viva voce* examination be postponed and the thesis referred for further work.

If either examiner has any significant issues or concerns, they should ensure that these are brought to the attention of the independent chair in advance of the date set for the *viva voce*.

The independent chair may recommend one of the following actions is taken:

- in the unlikely event that the examiner(s) deem that thesis is not presented in a form appropriate for examination (e.g. the English language needs further improvement), the candidate should be informed that the *viva voce* will be postponed until the thesis meets the required standard;
- in the unlikely event that the examiner(s) suspect academic misconduct (e.g. plagiarism) has occurred, the *viva voce* should continue as planned and the candidate questioned on the alleged misconduct as part of his/her defence. In this instance, neither the candidate nor the supervisory team should be made aware of the concerns of the examiner(s).

In either instance, the recommendations open to the examiners when the *viva voce* takes place, are set out in Section 6.5.

#### **6.4 Arrangements for *viva voce***

The *viva voce* is normally held in the UK. However, in exceptional cases the Graduate School may give approval for the examination to take place abroad, or via video conferencing.

Where for reasons of sickness, disability or comparable valid cause and the University is satisfied that a candidate would be under serious disadvantage if required to undergo a *viva voce* examination, an alternative form of examination may be approved. Such approval shall not be given on the grounds that the candidate's knowledge of the language in which the thesis is presented is inadequate.

The research administrator is the main point of contact throughout and is responsible for the *viva voce* arrangements, including:

- arranging the date and time of the *viva voce* in conjunction with the examiners and the candidate and notify the examining team, supervisory team and the candidate of the final arrangements for the *viva voce*.
- arranging a room for the *viva voce*, making sure that it is appropriate and in a quiet location;
- organising meals and refreshments;
- arranging travel and hotel accommodation for the examiners, if applicable;
- in conjunction with the Deputy Dean (Research & Enterprise), appointing an independent chair;
- providing the independent chair with a pack containing copies of the following:
  - University Rules for the Awards of Degrees by Research;
  - Preliminary Report and Examiners' Report Forms;
  - Code of Practice for Examiners & Chairs of Research Degrees;
  - Checklist.
- ensuring that all the arrangements are in place to meet and greet the external examiners and the candidate on the day of the *viva voce*.

Members of the supervisory team may, with the consent of the candidate, attend the *viva voce* examination. However, they:

- may only offer comments when invited to do so by the examiners;
- may also request permission from the examiners to clarify a particular point for the candidate during the *viva voce*;
- must withdraw from the examination prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome.

If the supervisory team is not in attendance at the *viva voce*, they should, be contactable during the examination so that the examiners may seek clarification on any specific issue.

## 6.5 The outcome of the examination

### 6.5.1 Report on the *viva voce*

After the *viva voce*, the examiners are jointly responsible for completing the **Examiners' Joint Recommendation Form** (see Appendix 4). Both examiners should sign the completed report, however, in the case of a disagreement between the examiners, independent reports are required (see Section 6.7).

The Preliminary Reports and Examiners Joint Recommendation Form must together provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to enable the University to satisfy itself that the criteria for the award of the degree have been met.

### 6.5.2 Examiners' recommendations

The recommendations open to the examiners following the *viva voce* are set out in the University Rules, which state:

Recommendations for outcome of the <i>viva voce</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that the appropriate award be made;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that the appropriate award be made subject to</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>MINOR amendments being made to the thesis</b></li> </ul> <p>Timescale: 3 months FT 6 months PT</p> <p>Amendments: The nature of these would <i>normally</i> be: typographical, grammatical, reformatting, restructuring or a</p>	<p>If examiners are satisfied that the candidate has in general reached the standard required for the degree, but consider that the candidate's thesis requires some minor amendments 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).</p> <p>In such circumstances, the examiners must indicate to the candidate in writing what amendments and corrections are required.</p> <p>The time scale should be agreed with the candidate and communicated to them in writing. In such cases a statement certifying that the amendments and corrections made are satisfactory must be submitted</p>

<p>minor clarification.</p>	<p>with the recommendation of the examiners. The statement must be signed and dated by the internal and/or external examiner(s) as decided by the examiners after the viva voce.</p>
<p>• <b>MAJOR amendments being made to the thesis</b></p> <p>Timescale: 6 months FT 12 months PT</p> <p>Amendments: The nature of these would <i>normally</i> be: major clarification of points, additional references in addition to typographical, grammatical, reformatting, and restructuring.</p>	<p>If the examiners are satisfied that the candidate has in general reached the standard required for the degree, but consider that the candidate's thesis requires some major 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).</p> <p>In such circumstances, the examiners must indicate to the candidate in writing what amendments and corrections are required.</p> <p>The time scale is to be agreed with the candidate following the examination and communicated to the candidate in writing. In such cases a statement certifying that the amendments and corrections made are satisfactory must be submitted with the recommendation of the examiners. The statement must be signed and dated by the internal and/or external examiner(s) as decided by the examiners after the examination.</p>
<p>• <b>that the candidate be permitted to re-submit for the degree and be re-examined (see paragraph 132);</b></p>	
<p>Timescale: 12 months FT 24 months PT</p>	<p>If the examiners recommend a resubmission of the thesis, the candidate may be required to review methodological approaches, re-examine data and/or analyses etc.</p> <p>A resubmission of the thesis would normally be expected to be completed within a maximum of twelve months for a full time student (24 months part time). The time scale is to be agreed with the candidate following the viva voce and communicated to the candidate in writing.</p> <p>Where the thesis has previously been examined, a second resubmission is not permitted – i.e. a candidate may only resubmit once.</p>
<p>• <b>that the candidate not be awarded the degree and not be permitted to be re-examined</b></p>	
	<p>In such cases the examiners must provide written guidance concerning the deficiencies of the thesis for the candidate. The examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright without holding a viva</p>

	voce or other alternative examination. Where Senate decides, on the recommendation of the examiners, that no award is made and no re-examination be permitted, the examiners must prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the thesis and the reason for their decision, to be given to the candidate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the case of a PhD, DBA or DProf examination, <b>that the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil</b></li> </ul>	
	The award must be subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.

### ***6.5.3 Assessment Offences***

Where evidence of an assessment offence in the preparation of the thesis, or other irregularities in the conduct of the examination comes to light subsequent to the recommendation of the examiners, the Graduate School shall consider the matter, if necessary in consultation with the examiners, and take the necessary action, in accordance with the University policy on assessment offences.

### **6.6 Re-examination for a research award**

The University Rules permit **one re-examination**, subject to the following requirements:

- a candidate who fails to satisfy the examiners at the first examination of the thesis, including where appropriate the *viva voce*, may on the recommendation of the examiners, and with the approval of the University, be allowed to revise and re-submit the thesis for re-examination;
- the examiners must provide the candidate, via the independent chair, with written guidance on the deficiencies of the first submission;
- the candidate must re-submit the revised thesis within 12 months full time (24 months part time) from the date of the last part of the examination. The Graduate School may, where there are good reasons, approve an extension of this period;

- Senate, at the recommendation of the Graduate School, may require that an additional external examiner be appointed for the re-examination.

The outcome of a re-examination should be reported on the **Examiner's Joint Recommendation for Resubmission Form** and the examiners may recommend:

- that the appropriate award be made:
- that the appropriate award be made subject to minor or major amendments being made to the thesis, to the satisfaction of the Examiners;
- that the candidate be not awarded the degree;
- that, in the case of a PhD, DBA or DProf examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MPhil subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the Examiners.

Where the thesis has previously been examined, a second resubmission is **NOT** permitted.

## 6.7 Disagreement between the examiners

The examiners should submit a joint recommendation report on the outcome of the *viva voce* however, where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations may be submitted to the University.

In such cases, where the examiners recommendations are not unanimous, Senate may:

- accept the (unanimous) recommendation of the external examiner(s); or
- require the appointment of an additional external examiner.

Where an additional external examiner is appointed, he/she shall assess the thesis and prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the thesis and, if considered necessary, conduct a further *viva voce*.

This additional external examiner should not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. On receipt of the report from the additional examiner, the University shall complete the examination as set out in the University Rules.

## **6.8 Issues arising regarding the *viva voce***

In the unlikely circumstances that the original examination has to be postponed or terminated, a further examination may be required and in such cases the approval of the Graduate School must be sought without delay.

Where such an examination is arranged, it must normally be held within two calendar months of the original examination date unless the Graduate School has given permission otherwise. Any such examination is deemed to be part of the candidate's first examination.

## **6.9 Release of examiners' reports to the candidate**

Under normal circumstances, the examiners' reports are confidential and will not be shown to the candidate prior to examination. However, examiners should note that all information held on the student file may be released to the candidate if requested under the Data Protection Act, this includes the Preliminary, Joint Examiners and Chairs Reports. If there is an appeal following the outcome of the *viva voce*, all paperwork relating to the examination will need to be submitted to the Registrar together with statements from those present. Examiners therefore may wish to prepare separate independent reports/notes prior to, and during, the *viva voce*.

# **7 AFTER THE VIVA VOCE**

---

## **7.1 Post-*viva voce* arrangements**

After the *viva voce* has been held, the research administrator should ensure that:

- the independent chair copies and provides them with all the forms pertaining to the outcome of the *viva voce*;
- if the thesis is subject to amendment, the independent chair informs the candidate of the examiners' recommendations and provides a date for re-submission of the revised thesis;

- a copy of the recommendations letter be sent to the supervisory team;
- once the revised thesis has been received it should be forwarded to the examining team for comment;
- if the examiners are satisfied with the re-submission they should inform the research administrator who provides all the necessary information to the Graduate School;
- the candidate must submit hard bound copies of their final thesis and an abstract as outlined in the Code of Practice for Research Degrees.

After conferral has been recommended, the Graduate School will write to the candidate congratulating them and informing them that Registry will be in touch regarding the Awards Ceremony.

The research administrator will check that the examiners have returned their expense forms and process them accordingly.

## **7.2 Appeals against examination decisions**

A request for a review may only be made in relation to the decision of Senate on the recommendation of the examiners. Given the existence of procedures for complaint and grievance during the study period (as set out in the University Academic Rules), alleged inadequacy of supervisory or other arrangements during the period of study do not constitute grounds for requesting a review of the examination decision.

Requests for a review are permitted only on the following grounds:

- that there is evidence of **procedural irregularity** in the conduct of the examination (including administrative error) of such a nature as to cause doubt as to whether the result might have been different had there not been such irregularity;
- that there is evidence of **unfair or improper assessment** on the part of one or more of the examiners. candidates may not otherwise challenge the academic judgement of the examiners;

- that there are **circumstances affecting the candidate's performance** of which the examiners were not aware at the viva voce.

Requests for a review should be made in writing to the Registrar and, if granted, will be considered in accordance with the procedures set out in the Student Academic Appeals Policy of the University Rules.

## **8 CONTACT**

---

If you have any queries or wish to seek advice about any of the procedures relating to the examination process, do not hesitate to contact the Graduate School or Academic School Research Administrator.

## **APPENDIX 1 – MASTERS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**

---

### **Descriptor for qualifications at Masters (M) level: Masters degree**

#### **Masters degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:**

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

#### **Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:**

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

#### **and will have:**

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

## APPENDIX 2 – DOCTORAL LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

### Descriptor for qualifications at Doctoral (D) level: Doctoral degree

#### Doctorates are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

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

#### Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

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

#### and will have:

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

## APPENDIX 3 – PRELIMINARY REPORT FORM



### RD14: EXAMINERS PRELIMINARY REPORT

*Notes: Each examiner is required to make an **independent** preliminary report and provisional recommendation on the thesis and to submit it either i) prior to the viva voce to the research administrator or ii) on the day of the viva voce examination to the independent chair..*

#### Preliminary report of the examiner on a candidate for the award of:

Master of Philosophy (MPhil)                       Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)                       Doctor of Professional Practice (DProf)

#### 1 Examination arrangements

Candidate's name						
Title of thesis						
Date of submission						
Date of viva voce						
External examiner(1)						
External examiner(2)						
Internal examiner (1)						
School / Institute	CS	DEC	BS	HSC	MS	SM

#### 2a Report of the examiner on the research thesis (all candidates) *The examiner is requested to give a reasoned assessment of the candidate's thesis.*

Does the thesis demonstrate: i) competence in the investigation of the chosen topic(s) and/or ii) competence in undertaking a critical study of the chosen topic(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Is the thesis satisfactory as regards literary presentation and succinctness?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:

Is the abstract of the thesis submitted acceptable?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
In the case of a candidate whose research programme is part of a collaborative group project, does the thesis indicate clearly the individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
<b>2b Additional comments for a <u>PhD</u> thesis only</b>	
Does the thesis represent a significant contribution of knowledge of the subject by: i) the discovery of new facts, and/or ii) the exercise of independent critical powers?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Does the thesis show evidence of a sound understanding of methodology?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Does the thesis provide evidence of originality?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
<b>2c Additional comments for a <u>DBA</u> thesis only</b>	
Does the thesis represent: i) substantive theoretical and informed contribution to an area of business management?, and/or ii) an original application of knowledge to further understanding of business management practice?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Does the thesis contain a comprehensive and critical literature review relating to the area(s) of investigation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Does the thesis show: i) a sound appreciation of the assumptions and rationale forming the bases of the research approaches and the techniques used in the thesis?, and/or ii) appropriate research skills in the development and undertaking of the research investigation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Does the thesis show i) a comprehensive appreciation of the strategic implications of the area of	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:

investigation?, and/or ii) an ability to reflect on issues addressed and incorporated within the thesis?	
Does the thesis provide evidence of originality?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
<b>2d Additional comments for a <u>D</u>Prof thesis only</b>	
Does the thesis represent: i) substantive theoretical and informed contribution to the candidate's area of professional practice? and ii) a narrative and critical reflections on practice with evidence of practice development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Does the thesis contain a comprehensive review of literature and evidence related to the area of investigation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Does the thesis show: i) sound understanding of the selected methodology to the research approach? and ii) appropriate and effective skills in the development and undertaking of the research enquiry?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Does the thesis provide: i) evidence of originality? and ii) an integrated approach to synthesising the contributions to knowledge and practice that their work makes?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
<b>3 Examiner's Report</b> <i>A report of about 300 words should suffice</i>	
<b>4 Provisional Recommendations</b> <i>Note: If the Examiner wishes to suspend judgement until after the oral examination this should be stated below. If the candidate's performance in the oral is such as to necessitate an amendment to the recommendation made on this form, the final recommendation should be stated on the Examiners' Report Form.</i>	
<b>Signature</b>	
Signature of examiner	Date

## APPENDIX 4 – JOINT EXAMINERS RECOMMENDATION FORM



### RD15: EXAMINERS' JOINT RECOMMENDATION

<p><b>Notes:</b>  <i>The Examiners are required, where possible, to complete a joint recommendation on this form on the viva voce, the result of the examination as a whole and the recommendations to the University's Senate.</i>  <i>If the provisional recommendations of the Examiners in their independent preliminary reports were not in agreement, an explanatory statement of the final joint recommendation must be made below.</i>  <i>If an agreed joint recommendation cannot be submitted, each Examiner should therefore complete separate copies of this form, and details of the disagreement should be stated below and, where appropriate, related to the preliminary report.</i></p>							
<b>Joint recommendation of the examiners on a candidate for the award of:</b>							
<input type="checkbox"/> Master of Philosophy (MPhil)				<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)				<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Professional Practice (DProf)			
<b>1 Examination arrangements</b>							
Candidate's name							
Title of thesis							
Date of submission							
Date of viva voce							
External examiner(1)							
External examiner(2)							
Internal examiner (1)							
School / Institute	CS	DEC	BS	HSC	MS	SM	
<b>2 Report of the examiners on the <i>viva voce</i></b>							
<i>The examiners are requested to give a report on the viva voce of the candidate, giving a reasoned assessment of the candidate's performance.</i>							
Are you satisfied that the thesis presented is the candidate's own work?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:			

Did the candidate show a satisfactory knowledge and understanding of matters relating to the thesis?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
Did the candidate show a satisfactory knowledge and understanding of background studies to the subject of the thesis?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
In the case of a candidate whose research programme is part of a collaborative group project, did the <i>viva voce</i> indicate clearly the individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If NO, please explain why:
<b>3 Additional Comments on the <i>Viva Voce</i></b> <i>A report of about 300 words should suffice</i>	
<b>3 Additional Comments on the <i>Viva Voce</i></b> <i>A report of about 300 words should suffice</i>	
<b>4 Recommendation</b> <i>The examiners are requested to indicate which recommendations apply and to delete those that do not.</i>	
<b>4.1 The Candidate be granted the award for which they have been examined with no amendments:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Master of Philosophy (MPhil)	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)
<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Professional Practice (DProf)
<b>4.2 The Candidate be granted the award for which they have been examined subject to MINOR amendments and corrections to the thesis to the satisfaction of the Internal Examiners <input type="checkbox"/> and/or the External Examiners(s) <input type="checkbox"/> [please tick as appropriate]. Instructions have been given to the Chair <input type="checkbox"/>.</b>	
<b>4.3 The Candidate be granted the award for which they have been examined subject to MAJOR amendments and corrections to the thesis to the satisfaction of the Internal Examiners <input type="checkbox"/> and/or the External Examiners(s) <input type="checkbox"/> [please tick as appropriate]. Instructions have been given to the Chair <input type="checkbox"/>.</b>	
<b>4.4 The Candidate be permitted to re-submit for the award for which they have been examined and be re-examined as follows [tick as appropriate and delete those which do not apply]:</b>	

<input type="checkbox"/>	i) the thesis must be revised and if deemed satisfactory by the Examiners, the candidate will be exempt from further examination, oral or otherwise;		
<input type="checkbox"/>	ii) the thesis must be revised and the candidate undergo a further oral or alternative examination;		
<input type="checkbox"/>	iii) the thesis is satisfactory, but the candidate must undergo a further oral or alternative examination;		
<input type="checkbox"/>	iv) the thesis is satisfactory, but the candidate must undergo a further examination, to take the form of: <i>(as specified by the Examiners)</i>		
The above amendments/revisions are to be completed by: ..... <i>(please specify date)</i> . Instructions have been given to the Chair <input type="checkbox"/> .			
<b>4.5 The Candidate not be granted the award for which they were examined but be granted the lower award of <input type="checkbox"/> Master of Philosophy (MPhil) subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the Examiners by: .....<i>(please specify date)</i>. Instructions have been given to the Chair <input type="checkbox"/>.</b>			
<b>4.6 The candidate fail the examination and not be granted the award indicated below and not be permitted to be re-examined (if Section 3 does not explain why this recommendation is made, a short report must be made in Section 5 below).</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Master of Philosophy (MPhil)	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctor of Professional Practice (DProf)		
<b>5 Additional comments on the thesis or any other aspect of the examination</b>			
<b>Signature</b>			
Signature of external examiner		Date	
Signature of external examiner		Date	
Signature of internal examiner		Date	

## APPENDIX 5 – CHAIRS REPORT FORM

---



### RD16: CHAIR'S REPORT

*For further guidance, please see the Code of Practice for Independent Chairs, Internal & External Examiners of Candidates for Research Degree Awards.*

#### 1 Candidate's Details

Candidate's name				
Title of thesis				
Award for which thesis is examined	MPhil	PhD	DBA	DProf

#### 2 Examination Arrangements

Examination date	
Examination time	
Location	
Chair of <i>viva voce</i>	
External examiner(s)	1. 2.
Internal examiner(s)	1. 2.
Supervisor(s) ( <i>if present</i> )	1. 2.

#### 3 Outcome of viva voce

Award Made ( <i>RD15 recommendation 4.1</i> )
Minor Amendments requiring Internal Verification Only ( <i>RD15 recommendation 4.2</i> ) by
Minor Amendments requiring Internal & External Verification ( <i>RD15 recommendation 4.2</i> ) by
Major Amendments requiring Internal Verification Only ( <i>RD15 recommendation</i>

4.3) by	
Major Amendments requiring Internal & External Verification ( <i>RD15 recommendation 4.3</i> ) by	
Candidate to resubmit & be exempt from further oral or alternative examination ( <i>RD15 recommendation 4.4</i> ) by	
Candidate to resubmit & undergo further oral or alternative examination ( <i>RD15 recommendation 4.4</i> ) by	
Lower Award Made subject to amendments ( <i>RD15 recommendation 4.5</i> )	
Fail – no re-submission ( <i>RD15 recommendation 4.6</i> )	
<b>4 Report on of viva voce</b>	
Please provide a brief report on the pre- <i>viva voce</i> discussion	
Please provide a brief report on the <i>viva voce</i>	
Please provide a brief report on the post <i>viva voce</i> discussion	
Please provide any other comments on the <i>viva Voce</i>	
<b>5 Documentation checklist</b>	
Chair's Report attached	
Examiner's Preliminary Reports attached	
Examiner's Joint Recommendation form attached	
Instructions of amendments for candidate attached	
If thesis title changed:	(new title)
<b>Signature</b>	
Signature of chair	Date

## **Acknowledgements**

This code of practice has been written taking account of University rules and regulations and existing handbooks and information for PGRs. The QAA Code of Practice has been referred to for guidance and we have taken into account the many valuable views gained at events organised by UKCGE, SW & W Hub and Vitae where we have had the opportunity to share best practice with other institutions.