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This Code of Practice relates to all students taking supervised research degree programmes within Keele University, specifically those on PhD, MD, DM and MPhil programmes, and those in the research stage of professional doctorate programmes such as EdD, DBA, DSW, DPharm and DMedEth*.

* Last entry into the DMedEth was 2012.

It should be read in conjunction with the University's Ordinances and Regulations for research degrees (primarily Ordinances III, IV, V, and XVIII and Regulations 2D and 26, and Research Institute Handbooks for Research Students, which constitute supplements to the Code of Practice. Together these documents set out the regulations, support and procedures for research students.

SECTION 1: Roles & Responsibilities

- The University
- The University Postgraduate Research Committee
- Administrative Directorates
- Research Institutes
- Schools
- Research Students
- Supervisors and Supervisory Teams.

1.1 The University

The University sets the institutional framework for the management of research degree programmes, designed to comply with the QAA Quality Code chapter B11: Research Degrees, HEFCE good practice guidance, and the requirements of good research governance. The specific areas for which it sets out requirements are:

- The roles and responsibilities of the key parties (university, research institutes, the Graduate School, research students, supervisors and supervisory teams)
- The facilities, resources, support and training which should be available to research students
- The processes and procedures for managing and monitoring student admission and progress
- Examination and appeal processes and procedures
- Quality assurance processes and procedures
- Mechanisms for obtaining feedback from students and for students to make complaints.
University–level requirements are set out in the University Regulations (“Regulations”) and in this Code of Practice (“COP”).

1.2 University Oversight of Postgraduate Research Matters

1.2.1 The University Postgraduate Research Committee has the overarching strategic responsibility for all research degree programmes and students, including policy development and quality assurance.

1.2.2 In carrying out this role the University Postgraduate Research Committee has oversight of the following specific areas:

- Generic marketing and recruitment in relation to research degrees (including production of marketing materials and website), and oversight of targeted Research Institute marketing and recruitment activities
- Oversight of all studentships and bursaries to support research students, and management of any university-funded studentship schemes
- Management of the university’s external relations as they affect research students, and in particular close liaison with research councils
- Identifying issues relating to research degrees and students which need to be improved and developed, and taking these forward (including recruitment, curriculum issues, quality assurance, facilities, research training, etc)
- Responsibility for monitoring quality assurance in relation to research degree programmes and driving up standards as necessary
- Ensuring that Research Institutes are adequately meeting their responsibilities towards postgraduate research education
- Overseeing the research training programme, including commissioning and approving research training modules, courses and workshops
- Overseeing supervisor training and the career development of contract research staff.

1.3 University Support Services

1.3.1 The University Administrative Directorates are the primary administrative departments which supports postgraduate research students and programmes, and the processes and procedures regulating them. They are also the principal central source of information about research student and degree matters, ensuring that information for all parties is accessible, clear, accurate, comprehensive and up-to-date. This includes the following:

- Managing the studentship applications process
- Induction and admission processes
- Enrolment and re-registration
- Maintaining student records
- Managing the examination processes
- Managing Research Degrees Committee (RDC) processes
- Managing the award processes
- Liaising with Research Institutes.
1.4 Research Institutes (RI)

1.4.1 The Research Institute is responsible to students, the Faculty and the University for student recruitment, for their students’ research degree programmes and for monitoring and supporting their progress on those programmes, within the institutional framework. The Research Institute reports formally to the Faculty and will agree recruitment targets each year with the Dean of the Faculty.

1.4.2 Postgraduate Committees: Each Research Institute has a Postgraduate Committee through which it exercises its responsibilities for research degree programmes and students (or such other arrangements as best suit the needs of students and the organisation of the Research Institute). All such arrangements must be approved by the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise.

a) It is expected that this role will normally be carried out by a distinct Postgraduate Committee (though in some RIs the role may be carried out by another committee within the RI structure)

b) The Postgraduate Committee should be chaired by a Director of Postgraduate Research (who reports to the Director of the RI), and should include RI members who are experienced researchers and supervisors

c) The Postgraduate Committee should meet at least 4 times a year (not virtual meetings), and should record its arrangements for formal delegation in respect of those matters (‘chair’s action’) which fall between meetings

d) The creation of sub-committees of the Postgraduate Committee reflecting, for example, disciplinary interests or other structures within the RI are permissible provided they report to a RI-wide Postgraduate Committee

e) As a minimum, all decisions of the Postgraduate Committee (including decisions taken under delegated arrangements between meetings) should be clearly recorded in the Minutes of the meeting.

1.4.3 Research environment and context: By the start of the academic year each Postgraduate Committee is required to undertake a review of its work and record its objectives for postgraduate research education within the Research Institute for the coming year.

a) This planning and review activity may be undertaken as part of the routine cycle of meetings of the Postgraduate Committee but should, as a minimum, be clearly recorded in the Minutes. The Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise should be invited to comment on the plans of the Research Institute and may request further details be provided

b) The review and planning process should be one that best suits the needs of the particular RI but may include the following:

- Recruitment strategy for the coming year, including recruitment targets
- Plans for securing bursaries during the year to support the recruitment process and processes for allocating them
- Criteria and procedures for managing and monitoring student admission
- Allocation of resources to support postgraduate education
- The research environment: facilities, resources, support and training available
- Arrangements for student supervision
- Training needs of supervisors
- Development of good supervisory practice
- Procedures for managing and monitoring student progress, including for students required to resubmit
• Format of the Personal Development and Learning Plans to be used by the RI (see Annex B for minimum requirements)
• Procedures for ensuring compliance with the requirements of appropriate research governance systems and procedures
• Mechanisms for student liaison, feedback and complaints
• Communication and liaison arrangements for MRes students linked to the RI
• Mechanisms for maintaining oversight of research council funded students.

See also Annex D2 (Normal expectations of Research Institute facilities and resources for research students).

These arrangements, as a minimum, must comply with the Code of Practice.

1.4.4 Monitoring admission and progress of individual students: In relation to specific students, the Postgraduate Committee has the responsibility for the following, keeping the University Administrative Directorates informed as necessary:

- Authorising the admission of each student, including identifying an appropriate Lead Supervisor and second supervisor and whether the Research Institute has appropriate and sufficient resources for the specific project
- Allocating any bursaries or other form of student support available to the Research Institute
- Supporting applications for studentships
- Approving the initial Personal Development and Learning Plan for each student no later than 3 months after the student’s start date
- Monitoring and reviewing the progress and training of each student periodically, including the updated Personal Development and Learning Plan, and specifically confirming progression in accordance with established criteria and procedures at different stages of their programme, and alerting the Research Degrees Committee to any concerns about student progress
- Ensuring that sponsored students meet the conditions of their sponsorship and in particular ensuring that research council funded students comply with research council requirements
- Approving administrative matters, such as changes of registration status or Lead Supervisor, thesis titles
- Administration of 30 month review and report to Research Degrees Committee
- Administration and approval of transfer to continuation status and report to Research Degrees Committee for final approval
- After consultation with supervisors and students making recommendations to Research Degrees Committee about examiners.

1.4.5 Each Research Institute is required to agree with the Faculty Dean their target submission rate. For details of how this is to be calculated see COP section 3.2. The effectiveness of Research Institute procedures for monitoring and managing student progression will be evaluated in part by their success in meeting their agreed submission rate target.

1.4.6 Each Research Institute shall produce a RI Handbook for Research Students (approved by the Postgraduate Committee and updated and distributed annually), which shall include all information which students need to know about the RI’s research environment, processes and procedures, and expectations of research degree study. A check list of contents for RI Handbooks is given in Annex B3. RIs may, of course, add to this, but should not attempt to replicate University-wide
guidance, instead referring to the original documents (primarily this Code of Practice and the Regulations) so that information is consistent and up-to-date.

RI Handbooks form a supplement to this Code of Practice, and should be authoritative and definitive.

1.4.7 Postgraduate Committees are required to maintain accurate records relating to student progress, specifically relating to work and training completed, and to the academic progress of students.

1.4.8 Postgraduate Committees should ensure that their formal procedures are fair, and made explicit to all students.

1.5 Schools

1.5.1 Research Training may be delivered by various different organisational units, but it is likely that most in-house training will be delivered by Schools, Research Institutes and the Learning and Professional Development Centre.

1.5.2 In addition, Schools have the principal responsibility for MRes students (who are formally postgraduate taught course students) and for delivering all aspects of MRes programmes. While MRes students are associated mostly with Schools, they may also be affiliate members of Research Institutes, in preparation for application to a research degree after completion of the MRes. This is likely to include the identification of a future Lead Supervisor.

1.6 Research students

1.6.1 Students are expected to familiarise themselves at an early stage with all the relevant Regulations (particularly Regulation 2D) and the provisions of this Code of Practice.

1.6.2 Students must ensure that they read their Keele email messages in a timely fashion. Members of the University will communicate with students via the Keele email and it is the student’s responsibility to respond as appropriate.

1.6.3 The research and the thesis are the work of the student, and the student is expected to take responsibility for the progress of their work. During the progress of a research degree, students are expected increasingly to become independent thinkers and researchers.

1.6.4 Having taken such informed advice as they consider appropriate, students have responsibility for determining the time of submission of their theses, within the time limits established by University Regulations (see section 3.2). It is generally considered best practice for the student and Lead Supervisor jointly to agree that the thesis is ready for submission.

1.6.5 Students should ensure from the outset that they conduct their research and present the findings in their thesis in accordance with good research practice. On submitting the thesis a student will be required to sign a Declaration to confirm this as set out in Annex B1.

If the research degree is set within a broader programme of work involving a group of investigators – particularly if this programme of work predates the candidate’s registration – the candidate should provide an explicit statement (in an ‘Acknowledgments’ section) of the respective roles of the candidate and these other
individuals in relevant aspects of the work reported in the thesis. For example, it should make clear, where relevant, the candidate’s role in designing the study, developing data collection instruments, collecting primary data, analysing such data, and formulating conclusions from the analysis. Others involved in these aspects of the research should be named, and their contributions relative to that of the candidate should be specified (this would not apply to the ordinary supervision process, only if the supervisor or supervisory team has had greater-than-usual involvement).

Students should consult the University guidance on avoidance of plagiarism and academic dishonesty (see Annex D1).

1.6.6 Students are required to develop (with their supervisory team) and keep up-to-date a Personal Development and Learning Plan. Annex B2 describes the minimum requirements of a Personal Development and Learning Plan. Each Research Institute will develop its own format to incorporate these requirements.

1.6.7 Students are expected to have regular contact with supervisors, to discuss a programme of practical and written work and training, and keep to an agreed schedule as set out in the Personal Development and Learning Plan. Students should consider seriously any guidance provided by the supervisory team, and should address any concerns expressed about their academic progress. Work should be of an appropriate standard for the degree. Any problems should be raised with the Lead Supervisor (or another member of the supervisory team) in the first instance.

1.6.8 Students are required to complete and submit Progress Report Forms in accordance with the timescale required by the Research Institute. Failure to do this may result in a low progress grade (see COP section 3.5).

1.6.9 Under the terms of Regulation 2D (12) Keele University owns any Intellectual Property arising from the student's studies for a research degree at the University. Arrangements for ownership and management of intellectual property rights are set out in Annex B11.

1.6.10 Additional guidance on the responsibilities of the student is given in Annex D3.

1.7 Supervisors and supervisory teams

1.7.1 All research students shall have one lead supervisor (“the Lead Supervisor”) and normally at least one other member of a supervisory team. The Lead Supervisor shall have the primary accountability for the student. The supervisory team shall include individuals (who may be proposed by the Lead Supervisor, the student or the Research Institute, and will be approved by the Postgraduate Committee) who provide specific identified expertise or support for the student to draw on. The roles of each member of the supervisory team shall be specified in the Personal Development and Learning Plan.

1.7.2 Subject to provisions set out below in 1.7.5, both the Lead Supervisor (who must be a full member of the relevant Research Institute) and the second supervisor should normally be Keele staff (including honorary clinical staff), not from an external body, and they must have been approved as supervisors by Research Degrees Committee using the procedures and criteria set out in Annex B6 (Approval of supervisors and mentors).

Where there is collaboration with another organisation (a university, company or other organisation) there may be additional members of the supervisory team from that
organisation, not subject to the same formal approval procedures. (Where the student’s primary registration is at another university, the student will be subject to the regulations and requirements of the university making the award.)

1.7.3 The Lead Supervisor should be selected primarily on the basis of appropriate subject expertise, and will normally have the necessary skills and experience to monitor, support and direct research students’ work. Where the most appropriate Lead Supervisor lacks supervisory experience, the Postgraduate Committee will arrange for the Lead Supervisor to be allocated a mentor to provide support and guidance, and the Lead Supervisor will also be offered supervisor training. (Mentoring and training are requirements of approval as Associate Supervisor – see Annex B6.)

A research student should not be supervised by a member of staff who is currently studying for a research degree at the same level, except in exceptional circumstances such as where the member of staff concerned had previously attained approved supervisor status and has already been supervising the student for some time.

1.7.4 The second (or other additional) supervisor does not need to have core subject expertise, but may bring other qualities to the supervisory team (e.g. experience, complementary expertise, methodological advice, etc). Note, however, that the second supervisor should not be the Lead Supervisor’s Mentor if there is one, as this would be a confusion of roles.

When selecting the second supervisor it should be borne in mind that there will be a need for an internal examiner, and the most appropriate person for that role (normally next closest in subject expertise) should not normally be selected as the second supervisor.

The function of the second supervisor is to act as an alternative source of advice for the student (on all kinds of matters, not just the precise subject), to ensure that a second person is aware of the student’s progress and any issues arising, generally to open up the supervisory relationship, and to provide for continuity if the Lead Supervisor leaves for any reason (temporarily or permanently). Therefore it may be positively beneficial if the second supervisor is not in the precise subject area of the research project.

1.7.5 In a restricted number of circumstances it may be possible for individuals who are not employees of the university (or honorary clinical staff) to act as Lead or second supervisors for research students. In such circumstances the individuals so appointed will need to have been approved as supervisors using the normal procedures set out in Annex B6, and will also need to sign an Agreement for the Provision of Supervision Services, approved by the Director of Planning and Academic Administration in order to ensure appropriate accountability to the University. (See Annex B12 for the form of the Agreement.)

Circumstances already identified where this procedure may be appropriate are where a student’s Lead Supervisor leaves the University. The following conditions should normally apply:

- no alternative appropriate supervisor with the relevant subject expertise can be found for the student within the University
- the student is realistically expected to submit his or her thesis within 12 months
• the options have been fully discussed with the student, including the possibility of transferring registration to another institution
• the Research Institute appoints a Lead Supervisor who is a member of Keele staff to take overall responsibility for the student and to ensure that the terms of the Agreement for the Provision of Supervision Services are met.

In any other circumstances, such arrangements need to be approved by the Research Degrees Committee.

1.7.6 The Lead Supervisor will ensure that the student has access to the support and direction necessary for the satisfactory completion of the research degree. This includes supervisory advice and guidance, Research Institute and university resources and facilities, and research training. In particular the Lead Supervisor will ensure that the student is aware of any inadequacy of progress or of standards of work below that expected (and provide written confirmation of what has been discussed).

1.7.7 Lead Supervisors are accountable to the Postgraduate Committee, the Research Degrees Committee and the University (and to any external sponsor) for providing such reports as are required on the work, training and academic progress of research students (see COP section 3.5).

1.7.8 Where at all possible, continuity of supervision should be maintained. If Lead Supervisors are on sabbatical leave, or temporarily absent for other reasons, where possible they should maintain continuity of supervision, but otherwise clear arrangements should be made for the period of absence and approved by the Postgraduate Committee.

1.7.9 Where a change of Lead Supervisor is unavoidable, the circumstances should be fully discussed with the student, and changes approved by the Postgraduate Committee.

1.7.10 All supervisors have a responsibility to ensure that they are trained in supervision and that they continue to develop their supervision skills through continuing professional development as appropriate.

1.7.11 Additional guidance about the role of the supervisory team is given in Annex D3.
SECTION 2: Resources & Support

- Academic facilities and resources
- Research training
- Student support services
- Bursaries and studentships.

2.1 Academic facilities and resources

As a minimum, Research Institutes shall provide to research students (or ensure that research students have access to) appropriate and necessary facilities and resources. The level of access depends on the student’s registration status (full-time, part-time, continuation, or leave of absence). Normal expectations are set out in Annex D2. Research Institutes may enhance these levels as appropriate and as resources allow.

These facilities relate to the status of being a research student, and do not relate to the requirements for carrying out any particular project. Project resources and facilities need to be separately identified, and availability and access agreed with students.

2.1.3 University academic resources are available to research students primarily through the Library, and relate to computing and library facilities, including direct and remote access.

2.2 Research training

For further details, please refer to Regulation 2D (4), (6) and (10)

2.2.1 Research training for research students is an integral part of a research degree programme, as set out in Regulation 2D. Students initially registered prior to August 1st 2013 must take approved Research Training modules to meet the formal minimum modular credit requirements for research training. Students initially registered on or after August 1st 2013 must meet the minimum subject-specific training requirements set by their Research Institute and the institutional requirement to engage with personal development and employability skills training at a level at least consistent with Research Council expectations. More detailed information and guidelines on Research Training are provided in the Research Training Handbook (http://www.keele.ac.uk/)

2.2.2 Engagement with personal development and employability skills training is required by the universities’ funding council (HEFCE) and the research councils as well as the university. Compulsory subject-specific training may be required by your Research Institute and will be defined in your Research Institute Handbook. The expectation is that you will evaluate your needs against the Vitae Researcher Development Statement (RDS) – to be found as Annex D5. This evaluation will form part of your Personal Development and Learning Plan (PDLP) to be found at Annex C10.

2.2.3 The objectives of the research training programme are to develop skills and understanding in a number of key areas, some related specifically to research, some relating to personal development and employability, also referred to as generic skills. The key areas as set out in the Vitae Researcher Development Statement are:
- Knowledge and intellectual abilities
- Personal effectiveness
Research governance and organisation
Engagement, influence and impact

2.2.4 In addition to the appropriate research skills and techniques, all students need to have acquired, by the end of their programme, the range of skills associated with personal development and employability set out in the Vitae Researcher Development Statement. The normal expectation is that all research students will need to include some ‘generic’ skills modules to achieve this.

2.2.5 The University provides a number of Research Training modules, courses and workshops designed to help students gain the skills they need to design and complete their programmes effectively and to help prepare themselves for their subsequent career. These Research Training opportunities are listed in the Research Training Handbook each year.

2.2.6 Students initially registered prior to August 1st 2013 must take approved Research Training modules to meet the formal minimum modular credit requirements for research training. All approved Research Training modules are available to all research students. Modules should be selected on the basis of need, as discussed with the Lead Supervisor and recorded in the Personal Development and Learning Plan. Any individual module may be seen as developing either transferable and employability (generic) skills or subject-specific research skills, depending on the needs of the student and the nature of the research project. Students may take additional Research Training modules as considered appropriate provided this is agreed in advance with the Postgraduate Committee in the RI.

2.2.7 The minimum requirements for Research students initially registered prior to August 1st 2013 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral level – PhD, MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before doctoral progression (and a requirement of doctoral progression)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After doctoral progression and before submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (a requirement of submission) At least 20 of these credits must relate to research skills and techniques (RCUK skills category A) and at least 20 to the broader (generic) skills associated with personal development and employability (RCUK skills categories B-G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masters level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (a requirement of submission) At least 10 of these credits must relate to research skills and techniques (RCUK skills category A) and at least 10 to the broader (generic) skills associated with personal development and employability (RCUK skills category B-G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Level - DM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>University-based modular Research Training</strong> (as for PhD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before doctoral progression (and a requirement of doctoral progression)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After doctoral progression and before submission

Total (a requirement of submission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 20 of these credits must relate to research skills and techniques (RCUK skills category A), and at least 20 to the broader (generic) skills associated with personal development and employability (RCUK skills categories B-G)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Clinical research training in speciality**

Prior to submission (and a requirement of submission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.8 Research students initially registered on or after August 1st, 2013 are required to engage with subject-specific research training as specified by their Research Institute, and with personal development and employability skills training at a level at least consistent with Research Council expectations, currently around 2 weeks per year or 200 hours over 3 years of a FT PhD. Skills may be developed through accredited Keele modules (10 credits is equivalent to 100 hours), non-accredited courses in a variety of formats, or a mixture of both. Engagement will be assessed by the RI PG Committee, who may require additional training to be undertaken. For PhD students, formal assessment will take place at Doctoral Progression (see 3.6) and the pre-submission review (see 3.7). Appropriate engagement at each of these stages will be reported to Research Degrees Committee as part of the progression and pre-submission review processes. No student may submit their thesis unless and until he or she has fulfilled the relevant research training requirements as set out here (see section 4.1 and Regulation 2D(10)).

2.2.9 Exceptions, exemptions or credits to the research training requirements may be made for students who have already successfully completed the whole or parts of an equivalent programme. Students are required to apply to their RI PG Committee for exemption using the form provided on the Postgraduate Research webpages. For Research students initially registered prior to August 1st, 2013 and therefore on a compulsory credit-based module training programme, no more than 40 credits of research training exemptions will be granted before doctoral progression; subject to satisfactory doctoral progression and the completion of the procedures for applying for module exemptions, up to a further 20 credits of exemption may be requested.

2.2.10 All research training agreed and/or taken (and approved exemptions) must be recorded by the student in the student’s Personal Development and Learning Plan, including a critical review of what the student has learned and how this will contribute to the development of the research project or to the acquisition or development of ‘generic’ or subject-specific research skills.

2.3 Student support services

2.3.1 The University provides a range of student support services, all of which are available for research students who wish to make use of them. Services include learning support, disability, careers, and counselling. Information on these services can be found at [http://www.keele.ac.uk/sll/keelelifeenewslettersissue1/ssdswelcomesyou/](http://www.keele.ac.uk/sll/keelelifeenewslettersissue1/ssdswelcomesyou/).

2.3.2 The Keele Postgraduate Association (KPA) is the body responsible for promotion of the general interests of postgraduate students and for giving a recognised channel of communication between postgraduate students and the University authorities. It provides additional support services geared to the needs of postgraduate students,
and has elected officers including Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, Welfare Officer, and both Postgraduate Research Degree (PGR) and Postgraduate Taught Course (PGT) representatives for each faculty.

2.3.3 Keele University Students' Union (KeeleSU) is responsible for promoting the general interests of all students (including postgraduates) and, again, gives a recognised channel of communication between students and the University authorities. KeeleSU provides a variety of support services such as the Independent Advice Unit, and elected officers who can help students with academic and welfare advice.

2.4 Bursaries and studentships

2.4.1 The University normally has a number of bursaries and studentships (“awards”) available for research degree study. They may be funded by the University centrally, the Research Institute, or by an external sponsor (following competition, negotiation or an allocation process).

2.4.2 All awards will be advertised, at least on the Postgraduate Research Studentships website (http://www.keele.ac.uk/pgresearch/choosingaresearchdegree/studentships/). Eligibility and selection criteria will be clear in all further particulars of awards, application processes and closing dates clearly identified, and the processes used for selection will be mindful of equal opportunities issues.

2.4.3 In some cases, the University may require that recipients of awards undertake some hours’ work experience, which may be teaching, research or administration. The precise nature of the work experience may be a condition of the award (as set out in the further particulars), or it may be subject to negotiation. Some forms of work may also be subject to training requirements.
SECTION 3: Managing & Monitoring Student Admission & Progress

- Admission, registration and arrival
- Period of registration until submission
- Requirement to remain in good academic standing
- Academic warnings
- Regular progress monitoring
- Formal doctoral progression procedures
- Progression to continuation mode of attendance
- Withdrawal from research degree study
- The student record.

3.1 Admission, registration and arrival
For further details, please refer to Regulation 2D (2), (3)

3.1.1 The minimum requirement for admission to a research degree shall be as specified in Regulation 2D (2). Research Institutes may have additional criteria which they apply in selecting candidates for research degrees. Where the applicant’s first language is not English, the applicant will be required to demonstrate proficiency in English language which meets UK Borders Agency (UKBA) requirements.

3.1.2 No applicant will be accepted unless the University is confident that they have the capacity to complete a research degree successfully, and that the University has the expertise and facilities to support the applicant’s proposed research.

3.1.3 No project will be approved unless it is appropriate for the degree concerned, and it can reasonably be undertaken within the required timescale with the resources available.

3.1.4 All applications will be considered by a Postgraduate Administrator in the RI and by at least two academic staff within the relevant Research Institute, representing the Postgraduate Committee. Selection will be made on the basis of all information available, including the application form, proposed area of research, qualifications, references and (where used) interview. Applicants will be accepted only if the University believes that they are likely to be successful in completing the research degree for which they have applied.

3.1.5 Equal opportunities information will be collected from all applicants, using a form separate from the application form. This information will not be used in the selection process, except in so far as the University will wish to ascertain that it has the appropriate facilities to support applicants with disabilities.

3.1.6 All offers of a place will be made by the University following positive assessment and recommendation by the relevant Director of Postgraduate Research.

3.1.7 Any student wishing to change course from MPhil to PhD should make a formal request to the Research Institute Postgraduate Committee for permission to transfer from MPhil to PhD and permission to submit for PhD progression. The Committee will consider the following issues in relation to the request:

- Does the student have the appropriate qualifications and experience for the PhD programme?
- Is the scale and nature of the project appropriate for a PhD?
• Is the student’s MPhil work to date likely to meet PhD progression criteria (see 3.6)?
• Does the time spent and training completed on the MPhil meet, in part, PhD timescale and training requirements?
• What allowance should be made towards PhD requirements in light of the time, work and training completed on the MPhil?

If the RI Postgraduate Committee finds that the student meets the criteria for the PhD programme, the student will be permitted to submit for PhD progression. The Committee should arrange for a PhD progression as soon as possible. If the student passes PhD progression, the Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students in consultation with the Research Institute will record the change of course approved, together with the time allowance agreed towards the PhD period, the date of transfer, and PhD submission deadline.

3.1.8 For as long as students are pursuing their programmes of study, they must remain formally registered with the University and pay the appropriate level of fees. Although the normal expectation is that students will retain the same mode of attendance throughout their periods of study, they may choose to change their mode of attendance. Possible mode of attendance options are as follows:

• Full-time
• Part-time
• Leave of absence
• Continuation.

More information about mode of attendance is given in Annex A3. Approval needs to be obtained from the Postgraduate Committee for any change of mode of attendance. There are additional requirements and procedures for Leave of Absence (see 3.1.9), transfer to continuation status (see 3.8) and for transfer from Full-time to Part-time (see Annex A3).

3.1.9 Any student who wishes to transfer from PhD to MPhil should make a formal request to the Research Institute Postgraduate Committee for permission to transfer from PhD to MPhil stating the reasons for the request and the expected time to completion and submission of the MPhil thesis. This request may be accompanied by a request to transfer to Continuation status (see 3.8 and Annex A3) if appropriate. The time allowed to complete and submit the MPhil from the transfer date shall not exceed the maximum continuation period (see 3.2.1 and Regulation 2D) of 1 year for FT and 2 years for PT, and will normally be significantly less. Any request for transfer that includes a submission date beyond that allowed for MPhil (calculated from initial registration, see 3.2.1 and Regulation 2D), will be subject to approval of an extension (see 3.2.7) by Research Degrees Committee.

3.1.10 Fees for research degree study are set annually for a 12 month period from 1 October. Research students are required to pay the level of fee appropriate to their Research Institute and mode of attendance, on a pro rata basis.

3.1.11 At least once a year there will be a University induction programme to introduce new research students to the University and key staff, to postgraduate research study, and to one another. In addition, Postgraduate Committees shall arrange their own induction programmes for new students.
3.2 **Period of registration until submission**
For further details, please refer to Regulation 2D (4), (7)

3.2.1 The time limits for completion of a research degree are set out in Regulation 2D. In summary, the requirements are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree registered for</th>
<th>Mode of attendance (registration status)</th>
<th>Minimum period of supervision from initial registration</th>
<th>Expected time to submission from initial registration</th>
<th>Maximum time to submission from initial registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree (MPhil)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>36 months</td>
<td>48 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree (PhD, DM, MD)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>36 months</td>
<td>48 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>48 months</td>
<td>72 months</td>
<td>96 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected time to submission will be extended appropriately where an external funder provides a studentship for a longer period, but will not exceed the maximum period listed above. The normal expectation is that for all or part of any period of study beyond the expected time to submission the student will be on continuation mode of attendance, but this is subject to the student meeting the requirements for continuation mode of attendance (see 3.8 below).

3.2.2 The University will be paying particular attention to the percentage of students who submit their thesis for examination within the maximum timescales allowed.

a) Each Research Institute is required to agree with their Faculty Dean their target submission rate, which is unlikely to be less than 100% for any Research Institute, and will be 100% for all research council funded students

b) Statistics will be calculated on the basis of the full-time and part-time cohorts of students starting in any academic year (1 August–31 July), and the percentage who submit within the maximum time allowed, which will be an anniversary of their start date

c) Periods of leave of absence agreed by Research Degrees Committee and where appropriate the research council will be taken into account when determining the percentage of students meeting the submission rate target.

3.2.3 Students will be required to pay full-time or part-time fees for the full period of their registration until submission; unless and until they are permitted by the Postgraduate Committee and Research Degrees Committee to progress to continuation mode of attendance (see 3.8).

3.2.4 For further information, please see section 3.11. Any agreed periods of leave of absence will automatically extend the student’s maximum period for submission by an equivalent period.

3.2.5 Any student who fails to submit their thesis by the due date for any reason will be withdrawn from the University.
3.2.6 In exceptional circumstances the maximum period may be extended by the Research Degrees Committee, on behalf of Senate, by not more than 12 months. The procedure for requesting an extension is as follows:

- Any request for an extension to the maximum time must come from the Research Institute's Postgraduate Committee
- A case needs to be made on the basis of the whole period of study since initial registration, explaining why the student has not been able to complete within the normal maximum time, estimating the time which the student will need to complete, and advising on an appropriate extension. [Note: The case should include such factors as: Has there been a history of illness? Is there a record of non-submission of work? Has the student always been hampered by heavy work loads in their employment? Research Degrees Committee needs to see the full picture, as set out by the department, so that it can make a reasonable decision on the specific case]
- Research Degrees Committee will normally allow only one extension.

3.2.7 Students who fail to maintain satisfactory academic progress, in accordance with university requirements, may be required to withdraw (see 3.3).

3.3 Requirement to remain in good academic standing

For further details, please refer to Regulation 2D (8)

3.3.1 In order to remain in good academic standing, all students are required to maintain active study and a satisfactory standard of work, and failure to do so may result in a requirement to withdraw from the University.

3.3.2 In order to demonstrate that students are actively studying they will be expected to keep in regular contact with their Lead Supervisor, and submit work regularly in accordance with the schedule agreed with the Lead Supervisor and set out in the Personal Development and Learning Plan. It is the responsibility of students to ensure that Lead Supervisors are kept informed about any barriers to their satisfactory progress.

3.3.3 Students will be informed of any concerns about the standard of their work, either by their Lead Supervisor (during normal supervision sessions or in written comments on work submitted) or as a result of formal progress reviews by Postgraduate Committees. Students should take such concerns expressed seriously and ensure that they take steps to improve the standard of their work. If comments from supervisors are not made in writing, students should request that such feedback be put in writing.

3.3.4 There are a number of mechanisms available to Research Institutes to manage the progress of research students, as set out in the following paragraphs of this section. However, there may be circumstances where it is clear that the student does not have a realistic likelihood of successful completion of a research degree within the permitted time limits, and the student may be required to withdraw. It should be noted that it is no one's interests for the student to continue to pursue a research degree in such circumstances.

3.3.5 There are three ways in which a student may be required to withdraw on the basis of failure to maintain good academic standing:

a) Procedures under the academic warning process (see 3.4 below) can give rise to a recommendation for a student to withdraw. This would arise should
a student be issued a third and final warning and fail to comply with the terms of the warning

b) Procedures under regular progress monitoring (see 3.5 below) can give rise to a recommendation for a student to withdraw. Specifically, if a student receives two successive grade E grades (unsatisfactory) on progress reports, the Postgraduate Committee can recommend to the Research Degrees Committee that the student be required to withdraw.

c) Procedures under doctoral progression (see 3.6 below) can give rise to a recommendation for a student to withdraw. Following the doctoral progression procedure the Postgraduate Committee can recommend to the Research Degrees Committee that the student be required to withdraw.

3.3.6 The student has the right of appeal against the decision taken by Research Degrees Committee that the student be required to withdraw.

3.4 Academic warnings

3.4.1 At any time, where the Postgraduate Committee, on advice from a Lead Supervisor, is dissatisfied with the amount or quality of work submitted or undertaken by the student, the Director of Postgraduate Research may issue a formal warning to the student under the terms of Regulation 2D (8), specifying the work which must be undertaken during the following 4 weeks.

3.4.2 Failure to comply with the requirements may give rise to a second formal warning from the Director of Postgraduate Research.

3.4.3 If the student has still failed to comply sufficiently with the terms of the second warning, the Director of Postgraduate Research can issue a third and final warning to the student.

3.4.4 If the student fails to comply with the terms of the third warning, the Postgraduate Committee can recommend to the Research Degrees Committee that the student be required to withdraw.

3.4.5 Students under warning are not in good academic standing. Once the terms of a warning have been fulfilled, the student will return to being in good academic standing. Any further problems would be subject to another initial warning.

3.4.6 Where the supervisors have serious concerns about the standard of work, or the student’s level of active study, Directors of Postgraduate Research should not delay seeking the approval of the Postgraduate Committee for the issuing of a first warning since the period from issuing the first warning until the expiry of the third and final warning is a minimum of 12 weeks.

3.4.7 Research Institutes should ensure that warning letters to students are very clear about the nature of the work which is required to be completed and/or submitted within the 4-week timescale in order to fulfil the terms of the warning.

3.4.8 Copies of all warning letters should be sent to the Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students.
3.5 **Regular progress monitoring**

3.5.1 All Postgraduate Committees shall have procedures for the regular formal monitoring of research students’ progress, to take place no less frequently than 6-monthly (in Spring and Autumn). Postgraduate Committees may find it useful to specify in the RI Handbooks the deadlines in the year for submission of progress reports.

   a) Note that if doctoral progression for a student falls at the same time the RI is not required also to conduct a progress review at that time

   b) Students on leave of absence at the time the progress review is due should have their Personal Development and Learning Plan reassessed on their return to study, and then be reviewed at the next due date after their return.

3.5.2 Postgraduate Committees should devise two report forms for completion separately by the Supervisor and student, to suit their own requirements. However, as a minimum they should include the sections and questions set out in Annex B5.

3.5.3 It is the Lead Supervisor’s responsibility to ensure that Supervisor progress report forms are completed and submitted to the Postgraduate Committee in a timely manner.

All Supervisor progress reports will include a recommended grade of the student’s progress in accordance with the scale set out in Annex B5. Any student who receives an Unsatisfactory six-monthly progress report (grade E) is considered to be failing to meet the requirements for maintaining good academic standing and will be issued with a formal warning which clearly states that if the subsequent progress report is also unsatisfactory, then the student may be required to withdraw from the University.

3.5.4 It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that Student progress report forms are completed and submitted to the Postgraduate Committee in a timely manner, together with the most up-to-date version of the Personal Development and Learning Plan if required by the Postgraduate Committee. Failure by the student to complete their progress report form or to keep their Personal Development and Learning Plan up to date is likely to lead to the student receiving a low grade.

3.5.5 Postgraduate Committees should consider together the reports from the Lead Supervisor and the student, informed where appropriate by the most up-to-date Personal Development and Learning Plan, and determine an overall grade as well as any action required. Students should be informed of the outcome of the progress review.

3.5.6 Postgraduate Committees are required to update the student record when students have been reviewed. Where the Postgraduate Committee requires the University to take any action, this should be notified separately in a memo from the Director of Postgraduate Research to the Research Degrees Committee.

3.5.7 All recommendations from Postgraduate Committees that students be required to withdraw for not remaining in good academic standing must be sent to the Research Degrees Committee for approval.

3.6 **Formal doctoral progression procedures**

   For further details, please refer to Regulation 2D (6)
3.6.1 For intending doctoral candidates, all Postgraduate Committees shall have formal procedures for determining a student's suitability for doctoral study, normally within the first 10-12 months' full-time study (or equivalent for part-time). If appropriate this will replace the normal 6-monthly progress review (see 3.5.1). At this stage, the Postgraduate Committee should have sufficient information to be able to determine one of the following:

- The student is suitable for doctoral study and may progress
- The student is not suitable for doctoral study, but is suitable for masters level study and should now be required to prepare a thesis for submission for a research masters' degree
- The student is unlikely successfully to complete a research degree and should be required to withdraw
- The student is not yet suitable for progression and, following review, has been given a programme of work to complete over a period not exceeding 2 months (or equivalent part-time) at which time the student's suitability for doctoral study will be reassessed.

3.6.2 Following Assessment or Reassessment, the Research Institute Postgraduate Committee will recommend the appropriate final outcome to the Research Degrees Committee which will issue formal approval.

3.6.3 In exceptional circumstances only, the Postgraduate Committee may choose to give the student an additional period of time beyond the initial 12 months before being assessed for progression.

3.6.4 No student may pass doctoral progression unless and until he or she has fulfilled the relevant research training requirements as set out in COP section 2.2.

3.6.5 Confirmation of doctoral progression should be a formal process which includes both a written report (up to 5,000 words) and an oral discussion with the panel considering the case. It may also include a presentation. Further information about appropriate procedures and criteria, and the constitution of the panel, is given in Annex B4.

3.6.6 Postgraduate Committees are required to make recommendations to the Research Degrees Committee about the outcome of the process (giving full details in cases where the recommendation is that students should either submit for a masters' degree or withdraw). Postgraduate Committees should also inform students of their recommendations immediately, making it clear that the recommendations need to be confirmed by Research Degrees Committee.

3.7 30 Month review procedures

3.7.1 All PhD students must undergo a pre-submission review at no later than 30 months (FT) or 60 months (PT). The presubmission statement (countersigned by the supervisor) must be submitted to the relevant RI postgraduate committee who may require action to be taken to address any potential difficulties with either missing the agreed submission date or fulfilling the relevant research training requirements as set out in section 2.2 The RI postgraduate committee will forward the pre-submission statement to Research Degrees Committee.

3.8 Progression to continuation mode of attendance
3.8.1 In order to transfer registration to continuation mode of attendance students must have completed the minimum period of supervision and also be formally evaluated by the Postgraduate Committee to ensure that they have satisfied the criteria for such status. Postgraduate Committees must have procedures in place for such evaluation.

a) 3.8.2 In order for a student to be allowed to register as a continuation student, Postgraduate Committees must be satisfied that the student will submit the thesis within a maximum of 12 months (24 months PT) and

b) that the 30 month review has been completed to a satisfactory standard for FT students (60 months for PT) and

c) that a Personal Development and Learning Plan and thesis plan with clear timescales for completion of chapters / sections is in place and

d) that the work still required to be completed up to submission of the thesis is such that it can be satisfactorily completed using only the following level of resources:

- Minimal supervision, primarily related to reading and commenting on draft thesis chapters
- Access to the library and other facilities
- Use of computing facilities in the Research Institute.

If additional resources are required, particularly project-related resources or a higher level of supervision, then Postgraduate Committees should not recommend registration as a continuation student.

3.8.3 Postgraduate Committees should report the outcome of the process to Research Degrees Committee. Research Degrees Committee will approve all transfers to continuation status.

3.9 Withdrawal from research degree study

3.9.1 At any stage of research degree study, students may wish to, or be required to, withdraw from their studies (subject to due process as set out above).

3.10 The student record

3.10.1 All parties associated with a student must recognise their responsibility for ensuring that accurate and complete student records are maintained, with recognition and understanding of the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act.

3.10.2 The Directorate of Planning and Academic Administration will have the primary responsibility for maintaining the electronic student record, recording student personal details, qualifications, and registration details. Research Institutes are required to inform the Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students of any changes of which they become aware. Students are required to keep the Records & Exams Officer informed of any changes which affect their record, including changes of address or other contact details. The Records & Exams Officer will also maintain a paper file on each student to include essential documents and correspondence.
3.10.3 Research Institute Postgraduate Committees are required to maintain accurate records of their meetings, recording all decisions relating to students.

3.10.4 Supervisors are required to maintain records of formal supervisory meetings with students, noting the dates, a brief outline of the issues discussed and any decisions taken. Supervisors may delegate this responsibility to the students provided both parties have a copy of the meeting note and agree to it. Students are required to maintain records of all supervisory meetings in their Personal Development and Learning Plan.

3.10.5 All parties should recognise that in the case of any disagreement, a full record of meetings, decisions and actions will be to everyone’s benefit in determining whether the parties have behaved reasonably.

3.11 Leave of Absence
For further details, please refer to Regulation 2D (9)

3.11.1 Students may be permitted to take leave of absence from their programmes for a minimum of 1 month and a maximum of 12 months. Students can request a leave of absence for the following reasons:

i. Medical reasons, as recommended by the Campus GP and/or their doctor
ii. Maternity/paternity/adoption leave
iii. Bereavement
iv. Other valid personal reasons
v. Personal Financial Hardship

3.11.2 Students may be requested to support their leave of absence request with documentary evidence, for example:

i. Medical certificate
ii. Birth certificates/adoption certificates
iii. Death certificates/divorce decrees
iv. Bank statements

3.11.3 Requests for a leave of absence should initially be discussed with your supervisor. If your supervisor supports your request, an application should be made to your Research Institute Postgraduate Committee, where a decision will be taken. Applications should be made using the approved form at Annex C7. All leaves of absence will be reported to Research Degrees Committee.

3.11.4 During periods of approved leave of absence, students will not be expected to maintain active study on their research; therefore you will not have access to University facilities during this period, although you will have access to your email account and other IT resources.

3.11.5 No fees will be payable during this period. If you are sponsored you should inform your sponsor and ensure that they are willing to support you through the extended submission date. If the sponsor is a UK Research Council then any approval of a leave of absence will be subject to approval by the Research Council if such approval is required. The University will then seek Research Council approval, provide current information via JeS as appropriate and inform the student of the outcome.
3.11.6 International students will need to speak to International Student Support regarding their visa before requesting a leave of absence. Students who apply for, and are granted, a leave of absence will have their Visa curtailed and will need to return to their home country for the duration of the leave of absence. Near to the end of the leave of absence they will be contacted by their RI to confirm that you wish to return to your studies. If the student wishes to return, the University will need to apply for a new CAS for you. Owing to its responsibilities as a Highly Trusted Sponsor of international students, the University is unable to support retrospective leave of absence. Therefore it is imperative that the student raises any issues they are experiencing with your supervisor at the earliest possible stage.

3.11.7 It is possible to take a break from active study of no more than 28 days with the agreement of the supervisor and the written agreement of the Research Institute. The University has specific procedures in place for notification of a student’s whereabouts during periods of active study away from the University. Information is available at:

http://www.keele.ac.uk/immigration
‘Research or Writing Up Thesis/Dissertation away from Keele – Postgraduate Students’

3.11.8 The Case Conference Process:
A case conference process exists to assist the University in managing emerging concerns related to a student’s physical and mental health, and to identify appropriate measures to support the student. It involved two stages:

Stage 1: Identifying and addressing emerging concern at RI level:
• Staff within a Research Institute, normally via the Postgraduate Committee, will consider information regarding the health and wellbeing of the student and its potential impact on their research programme
• The designated body considers the options available to the student and makes a recommendation on whether the student should be asked to take a compulsory leave of absence or whether an initial support plan can be put in place to assist the student.

Stage 2: Managing continuing cases of concern:
• In complex cases (e.g. severe mental or physical health) or in cases where emerging concerns identified at Stage 1 have been realised and progress is not being made, a wider case review meeting would normally be convened by Student Support and Development Services (SSDS) in consultation with the RI. A wider case review meeting would also be convened for students who had taken a leave of absence following a Stage 1 meeting and were seeking to return to study.

It is expected that students will be made aware that the wider case review meeting is taking place via their research supervisor or their nominee. It is proposed that student representation at the case review meeting other than that of the student concerned should not be allowed on the basis of student confidentiality.

The wider case review meeting would provide individuals concerned an opportunity to discuss whether a student should be requested to take a compulsory leave of absence and follow transition arrangements on return from a leave of absence.

3.11.9 In exceptional cases the University may require a student to take a compulsory leave of absence in the interests of their wellbeing. This step would only be taken if all other routes have been exhausted to assist the student with any issues that they are
experiencing. Any request to take a compulsory leave of absence would be made on the basis of expert advice.

3.11.10 Identification of students requiring additional support would normally be made through the University’s Critical Incident Support Team (CIST). Once CIST has been informed and handled the initial evaluation of the case through its established procedures a student may be further referred for consideration for a compulsory leave of absence.

3.11.12 A compulsory leave of absence can be triggered through a Case Conference process.

3.11.13 Any student required by the University to take a compulsory leave of absence would have the right of appeal. Further information on the appeals procedure is included in Regulation 2D.
SECTION 4: Examinations & Appeals
For further details, please refer to Regulation 2D (4), (7), (10) and (11)

• Submission
• Examination
• Research Degrees Committee (RDC) and Senate
• Appeals
• Resubmission.

4.1 Submission

Students are expected to submit their thesis in accordance with the time limits set out Regulation 2D (see also 3.2 above) as amended by any formal extensions granted by the Research Degrees Committee or as granted automatically following periods of leave of absence.

4.1.2 Within those time limits, it is the student’s responsibility to decide when to submit the thesis. When submitting a thesis for examination, the student will be required to sign a Part 1 Declaration about the conduct of the research and the presentation of the research in the thesis (see 1.6.5 above). Lead supervisors will be notified that students have submitted their theses.

4.1.3 Prior to submission it is essential that the Postgraduate Committee has approved the final thesis title (see Annex D4 section 14 for details) and that the Research Degrees Committee has subsequently approved the examiners for the thesis and the chair of the oral examination (see Annex B7 for details). It is recommended that these processes be initiated at least 3 months prior to expected submission date.

4.1.4 No student may submit their thesis unless and until he or she has fulfilled the relevant research training requirements as set out in COP section 2.2.

4.1.5 When preparing a thesis for submission, students should follow the guidance set out in Annex D4. In particular students should note that the following sections of Annex D4 are formal requirements which must be complied with if students are not to jeopardise the acceptance of their thesis or the award of their degree:
- Format for presentation of a thesis (sections 12-20)
- Submitting your thesis for examination (sections 21-24).

4.1.6 Students should submit their thesis to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities). There are some circumstances in which the Quality Assurance Officer will refuse to accept a thesis for examination, as set out below:
- Where the student has not successfully completed the required research training
- Where a student fails to sign the Declarations required on submission
- Where the Part 1 Declaration is not bound into the submission
- Where there is no Abstract
- Where no thesis title has been approved
- Where the thesis title on the thesis differs from the approved title
- Where the thesis is over the word limit
- Where the thesis does not comply significantly with the guidance on preparation and presentation of a research thesis (see Annex D4 on Preparation and presentation of a research thesis, sections 12-24).
As a general principle, if the failure relates to faults on the part of the University rather than the student, the student will not in any way be penalised for this.

4.2 Examination

4.2.1 There will normally be two examiners for a research thesis, one external and one internal. In some circumstances (e.g. where the candidate is a member of staff, or if no appropriate internal examiner can be found, or at the discretion of Research Degrees Committee), a second external examiner will take the place of the internal examiner. Exceptionally there may be a third examiner. In no circumstances will a member of the candidate’s Supervisory team be an examiner.

4.2.2 All oral examinations will have an Independent Chair. The Independent Chair, who will be provided with the abstract of the thesis rather than the entire thesis, will be responsible for the conduct of the viva and the timely submission of all reports.

4.2.3 Both examiners, the Independent Chair and the candidate must be present during the oral examination. All examinations normally take place on the premises of Keele University (including off campus research facilities which are part of the Keele RI structure) but in exceptional circumstances video-conferencing of vivas and other locations may be employed. Prior permission for video conference vivas and non Keele University venues must be approved by Research Degrees Committee. Under no circumstances will a viva be conducted by telephone.

4.2.4 The examination of the thesis will be conducted in reference to the criteria for awards (see Annex A1).

4.2.5 The thesis will be sent to each of the examiners with a request for an independent report, to include a preliminary recommendation. (In a few cases, where the thesis contains confidential material, examiners may be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement.) The report (known as the “Part I report”) should normally be submitted no later than one month after receiving the request, and at least one week before the oral examination.

4.2.6 The supervisor may exceptionally be present if all parties wish it.

4.2.7 The aim of the oral examination is to evaluate whether the candidate has met the standards for the award. It has the following specific objectives:
- To confirm or revise the examiner’s initial views about the standard of the candidate’s research, based on the thesis
- To identify and discuss any amendments to the thesis which may be required to meet the standard for the award
- To determine as far as possible whether the Declaration Part 1 made by the candidate on submission of the thesis is true.

4.2.8 On conclusion of the oral examination the examiners will agree a recommendation (see Annex A2 for available recommendations) and write a joint report (which will include details of any required revisions to the thesis). The joint report must normally be completed after the examination and normally submitted within a week of the examination to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) by the Independent Chair.
4.2.9 The expectation is that the whole examination process, from date of submission of thesis to receiving the joint recommendation from the examiners and Part II of their reports after the oral examination, should take no longer than three months.

4.2.10 The candidate will have the right, after completion of the examination process, to receive a copy of all the examiners’ reports. These will be sent to the student as a matter of course.

4.2.11 Full details of oral examination procedures and format for examiners’ reports are given in Annexes B8 and B9.

4.3 Research Degrees Committee and Senate

4.3.1 Examiners’ reports and recommendations are considered by the Research Degrees Committee, which makes recommendations to Senate. (Available recommendations listed in Annex A2.)

4.3.2 Where an award is recommended (recommendations 1, 2, 4), no recommendation will be made to Senate until all required revisions have been completed and signed off, and the thesis has been lodged in the Library.

4.3.3 Where the recommendation is 3 (resubmission for PhD), 5 (resubmission for MPhil) or 6 (fail), the recommendation will be made to the Senate following the meeting of Research Degrees Committee.

4.3.4 Where the recommendation is 2 (minor revisions), if the candidate fails to complete the minor revisions within the period allowed the candidate will be failed. There is a right of appeal.

4.3.5 Where the recommendation is 3 (resubmission for PhD) or 5 (resubmission for MPhil), if the candidate fails to resubmit within the period allowed the candidate will be failed. There is a right of appeal.

4.3.6 The procedures to be followed after examination are set out in the following sections of Annex D4, and will vary according to the Recommendation being made by the Research Degrees Committee:

• After examination (sections 25-29)
• Lodging the thesis in the library and copyright issues (sections 30-45).

4.4 Appeals

For further details, please refer to Regulation 7

4.4.1 Candidates have the right to appeal to the University Academic Appeals Committee against decisions of Research Degrees Committee concerning the following:

• Doctoral progression procedures (see 3.6)
• Requirement to withdraw for not maintaining good academic standing (see 3.3-3.6)
• Award following examination (see 4.3 and Annex A2).

All appeals will be conducted in accordance with procedures set out in Regulation 7.

4.4.2 Doctoral progression procedures
Students have the right to appeal against the decision of the Research Degrees Committee concerning doctoral progression only on the following grounds:

- Procedural irregularities during the process of considering the request for doctoral progression
- Extenuating Circumstances exist affecting the student's progress of which the Research Degrees Committee was not aware at the time it made its decision, that these circumstances can be substantiated, and that there is a valid reason for not notifying the Research Degrees Committee
- Inadequacy of supervision, training, facilities or resources, contrary to the requirements set out in the Code of Practice including the Research Institute Handbook or other written agreement between the Research Institute and the student.

Appeals will be heard by the University Academic Appeals Committee.

4.4.3 Requirement to withdraw for not maintaining good academic standing

Students have the right to appeal against the decision of the Research Degrees Committee that they be required to withdraw for not maintaining good academic standing only on the following grounds:

- Procedural irregularities in relation to recording and reporting the student's academic progress
- Extenuating Circumstances exist affecting the student's academic progress of which the Research Degrees Committee was not aware at the time it made its decision, that these circumstances can be substantiated, and that there is a valid reason for not notifying the Research Degrees Committee
- Inadequacy of supervision, training, facilities or resources, contrary to the requirements set out in the Code of Practice including the Research Institute Handbook or other written agreement between the Research Institute and the student, including the Personal Development and Learning Plan.

Appeals will be heard by the University Academic Appeals Committee.

4.4.4 Award following examination

Students have the right to appeal against the recommendation of Research Degrees Committee to Senate about an award only on the following grounds:

- If there were procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination
- If Extenuating Circumstances exist affecting the candidate's performance at oral examination of which the examiners were not aware.

Appeals will be heard by the University Academic Appeals Committee.

4.4.5 For clarification, the following are NOT eligible grounds for appeal:

- The academic judgement of examiners does not constitute grounds for appeal
- For award following examination: alleged inadequacy of supervisory or other arrangements during the period of study – any concerns must be raised during the period of active supervision, and do not constitute grounds for appeal against award following submission of the thesis (though students are permitted to submit a complaint at this stage).

4.4.6 All appeals must be lodged with the secretary to the University Academic Appeals Committee in accordance with timescales and procedures set out in Regulation 7.
4.5 **Resubmission**

4.5.1 If the student is invited to resubmit the thesis (Recommendation 3 or 5) resubmission may be at any time within two years of the date of Senate approving the recommendation. The normal expectation is that the original examiners will be used also for the resubmission. Candidates should not consult the examiners between completion of the original examination process and resubmission but will be guided by their supervisors in the light of the examiners’ reports and any other feedback.

4.5.2 Examination of the resubmitted thesis shall focus upon whether the revisions required after the first examination have been completed satisfactorily. Examiners may not introduce new requirements at this stage. In other respects the thesis will be examined in the same way as the original submission, except that examiners may choose not to require a second oral examination if the resubmitted thesis is satisfactory. Only one resubmission is allowed.

4.5.3 Where a recommendation of Resubmission is due to be confirmed by Senate, the Director of Postgraduate Research in the student's Research Institute will discuss the implications of the decision with the student as soon as possible but normally no later than one month after the Senate decision. Where possible the Director of Postgraduate Research will arrange to meet the student at Keele unless the student indicates that this is not required. If the student then decides that they intend to resubmit, the student and the intended Lead Supervisor for the student’s period of resubmission are normally required to provide a workplan and timetable for resubmission as part of the resubmission statement (Annex C11) which also includes:

- Student details and thesis title
- The name of the Lead Supervisor who will support the student during the period of resubmission (who may or may not be the same as the original Lead Supervisor)
- A signed declaration from the student indicating:
  i. that the requirements for resubmission have been explained
  ii. whether or not they intend to submit
  iii. that they are satisfied that appropriate arrangements have been put in place to support them during the period of resubmission
- whether a meeting at Keele with the Director of Postgraduate Research is requested

A copy of this statement accompanied by the workplan and timetable for submission agreed with the Lead Supervisor must be sent to the Director of Postgraduate Research who will forward it to the Research Degrees Committee (RDC) for approval.

4.5.4 Where the student confirms in this statement that he or she will not be making a resubmission, the case will be referred back to Research Degrees Committee for a recommendation about whether the thesis should fail or be awarded a lesser degree.

4.5.5 Students will be required to pay resubmission fees for the period of resubmission.

4.5.6 In exceptional circumstances the maximum period for resubmission may be extended by Research Degrees Committee on behalf of Senate, by not more than 12 months. The procedure for requesting an extension is as set out in paragraph 3.2.7.

4.5.7 If the candidate fails to resubmit within the two years allowed (or any approved extended period), the candidate will be failed. There is a right of appeal.
SECTION 5: Quality Assurance

- Criteria for awards
- Research Institutes and Schools
- Research Degrees Committee
- Quality Assurance Committee.

5.1 Criteria for awards

Standards of awards are assured in part by having clearly articulated criteria for awards which conform to national standards (see Annex A1), and a single set of recommendations for examiners with clear guidance about circumstances in which they should be used (see Annex A2).

5.2 Research Institutes and Schools

5.2.1 Research Institutes have the primary responsibility for the delivery of research degree programmes. Schools and Research Institutes, supported by the LPDC, have responsibility for the delivery of research training modules. The University Postgraduate Research Committee has the responsibility for monitoring the quality of research degree programmes delivered by Research Institutes and the overall quality of the research training programme delivered by Research Institutes, Schools and the LPDC.

5.2.2 The University Postgraduate Research Committee, including representation from each Research Institute and from students, is a principal mechanism for ensuring consistency of process across the University, spread of good practice, and identification of issues to be addressed.

5.2.3 The University Postgraduate Research Committee is responsible for developing mechanisms for obtaining feedback from students about the quality of research degree provision and for addressing issues arising as appropriate. (See also COP section 6)

5.3 Research Degrees Committee

5.3.1 The Research Degrees Committee (RDC) is responsible for considering reports and recommendations from examiners and for agreeing a final recommendation to Senate. In carrying out this role they will have particular regard to the following:

- Whether examiners have taken appropriate account of the criteria for awards
- Whether there is consistency between the detail of each report and the recommendation
- Whether there is sufficient agreement between the examiners for a joint recommendation to be appropriate
- Whether reports provide sufficient guidance about required revisions (a) for the Committee to determine whether the recommendation should be minor revisions or resubmission, and (b) for the candidate to make the necessary revisions
- Whether the reports are an adequate basis on which to make any recommendation.

5.3.2 The Research Degrees Committee also has a role in ensuring the quality and consistency of research degree programmes by monitoring and approving matters
with respect to individual staff and students, on the basis of recommendations from Research Institutes:

With respect to individual staff
- Approval of supervisors and mentors (see Annex B6).

With respect to individual students
- Progression for doctoral study
- Extensions to maximum date for submission
- Changes to the mode of attendance
- Applications for leave of absence
- Withdrawal of students for not maintaining good academic standing
- Approval of examiners and chair for specific thesis (see Annex B7)
- Progression to continuation
- Approval of resubmission statements
- Considering any other matter about the progress of individual students referred to it by Research Institutes.

5.3.3 In addition, when considering examiners’ reports, the Research Degrees Committee will identify where there may be any cause for concern in the quality of the support provided to research degree candidates, and will take this up with Research Institutes.

5.3.4 The Research Degrees Committee makes an annual report to the University Postgraduate Research Committee, setting out statistics of recommendations made during the year and of the number of awards made, and highlighting any issues discussed by Research Degrees Committee.
SECTION 6: Student Liaison, Feedback & Complaints

- Student liaison and representation
- Feedback and evaluation
- Complaints.

6.1 Student liaison and representation

6.1.1 All Research Institutes should have mechanisms for ensuring research students can participate in discussions and bring forward concerns about facilities and resources available to them, including the research training programme, and any other matters which affect their progress or welfare, either individually or collectively.

6.1.2 The University has a Research Students’ Executive Liaison Committee, chaired by the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise, which meets several times during the year to discuss issues of interest and relevance to research students. All Research Institutes are invited to send student representatives to the meetings.

6.1.3 Both the Keele Postgraduate Association (KPA) and the Students’ Union offer representation for postgraduate students. KPA and KeeleSU officers sit on major University committees such as Council, Senate, University Learning and Teaching Committee and the University Postgraduate Research Committee. The KPA has a committee of postgraduate students and KeeleSU has a committee of all types of students (including a specific post for Postgraduate representation). For either committee, research students can obtain a place by standing in the elections (which normally occur in March each year).

6.2 Feedback and evaluation

See 5.2.3 above relating to the University Postgraduate Research Committee’s responsibility.

6.3 Complaints

Please refer to Regulation 26

6.3.1 A (student) complaint is the expression of a specific concern about the provision by the University of a service, either academic or non-academic.

6.3.2 The University's Student complaints procedures are described in Regulation 26, available at [http://www.keele.ac.uk/regulations/](http://www.keele.ac.uk/regulations/). The University has a four stage (formal) procedure but every attempt should be made to resolve issues on an informal basis in the first instance, without recourse to a formal procedure.

6.3.3 All Postgraduate Committees should have clearly articulated procedures for handling problems and complaints on an informal basis, including complaints about supervision or adequacy of facilities. Informal mechanisms may involve the Director of Postgraduate Research or other senior member of the Research Institute, or identified staff outside the Research Institute, for example the Dean of the Faculty or members of the Student Conduct Office (Directorate of Planning and Academic Administration).

6.3.4 No formal complaint will be considered unless students have exhausted informal mechanisms for resolving their problems. Once a formal complaint is initialised, it will move through the stages described in Regulation 26.
6.3.5 The senior officer appointed to deal with complaints is the Pro-Vice Chancellor for Education and Student Experience.

6.3.6 At any stage (informal or formal) a student may seek the assistance of the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise in dealing with their problem or in presenting their case. Additionally a student may wish to speak to the Independent Advice Unit in the Students’ Union who can offer free independent impartial advice and representation.
Annex A1: University criteria for making research degree awards at doctoral and masters level

Keele University wishes to ensure that its awards are made at the recognisable national standard, and subscribes to the descriptions of learning outcomes required at doctoral and masters level as set out by the Quality Assurance Agency in August 2008 (The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, now incorporated as part of Chapter 1 of the Quality Code). Examiners should use the following criteria when deciding whether candidates for research degrees have met the requirements for an award.

Doctoral level

D1 For an award to be made at Doctoral level (PhD, EdD, DBA, DM, MD, DPsych, DPharm, DSW), students must achieve the required learning outcomes:
Doctorates are awarded to students who have demonstrated:
   d) 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;
   e) 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;
   f) 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;
   g) a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

D2 The thesis shall be no longer than 100,000 words (to include main text and footnotes, but not references and appendices). Although there is no lower word limit for thesis length, the thesis must be long enough to explore the subject in sufficient depth and breadth to fulfil the requirements for the degree. Clarity and succinctness of expression is valued. The literary style and presentation of the thesis should be satisfactory. The candidate will be required to satisfy the Senate that it affords evidence of originality, shown either by the discovery of new facts or by the exercise of independent critical power.

D3 Musical composition

A candidate in musical composition is required to submit a folio of original compositions, in the form of scores or, in the case of electronic music, recordings (or equivalent) on appropriate media. A written introduction is also required, which covers all the works submitted, giving background information as well as details relating to aesthetic and technical concerns.

Where part of a candidate's research has included the production of original software or other tools which have assisted the realisation of the portfolio then these may also form part of the submission. Alternatively, and particularly where the compositions or other musical examples are mainly illustrative of the capability of such tools, then the candidate should submit under regulation D1. Wherever possible, the appropriate submission pathway should be determined at the outset with the supervisor.

For submissions consisting solely of musical compositions the following guidelines will apply:

- A folio should either consist of several compositions, of which at least three shall be considered substantial by the examiners by virtue of content (e.g. in
terms of scale, duration, original techniques or use of authored software tools) OR a single large-scale work such as an opera.

- In musical composition a candidate will be required to satisfy the Senate that the submission shows clear evidence of creative ability and academic competence, and represents an original and significant contribution to the art of music. Also, that instruments and voices are written for within their capabilities, and that performing instructions and layout are accurate in detail.

D4 Visual arts

A candidate wishing to combine academic and creative research may, instead of a thesis, submit all three of the following:

e) a substantial body of creative work which has been documented and recorded by means appropriate for the purposes of examination and eventual deposit in the University Library

f) an accompanying thesis of no more than 50,000 words showing clear evidence of academic competence, an awareness of the current critical context in which the creative work has been produced and an original contribution to research into the relationship between history and/or theory and practice

g) a selection of work, referred to under (a) suitable for exhibition.

D5 Professional and taught doctorates

Professional and other taught doctorates will be required to have Programme Regulations which set out the formal structure of the course including cohort work and research training, and any forms of interim and summative assessment, as well as any additional entry requirements.

The thesis for a professional or taught doctorate will be no longer than 60,000 words (to include main text and footnotes, but not references and appendices). Although there is no lower word limit for thesis length, the thesis must be long enough to explore the subject in sufficient depth and breadth to fulfil the requirements for the degree. Clarity and succinctness of expression is valued. Additionally candidates may be required to be formally assessed (through in-course assessment or written examination or both) on the taught and group elements of the Programme of Study, as set out in the Programme Regulations.

A candidate shall be required to satisfy the Senate of competence in independent work, professional activity or experimentation, of understanding of the appropriate techniques, and of competence in making critical use of published work and source materials. The thesis shall be a major contribution to the creation and interpretation of new knowledge.

D6 Doctoral degree by published work

A PhD degree by published work falls under University Regulation 3, and is mostly beyond the scope of the Code of Practice in so far as it deals with supervision.

Candidates for the degree of PhD by Publication shall be required to meet the same standards of award as candidates for the PhD by supervision, as set out in this Annex.

The candidate must submit to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) three copies of a portfolio which shall include the following:
• a title page setting out the candidate's name, approved title of the submission, and award for which the submission is made
• details of the candidate's qualifications
• a critical commentary on the submission which comprises a review of the contribution the work makes to the academic field in question (not exceeding 10,000 words)
• a list of the publications submitted in the order submitted
• copies of all the relevant published material, appropriately ordered.

The examiners will examine the work submitted, write independent reports, and conduct an oral examination, in a way similar to research degrees by supervision. They will make a recommendation to Research Degrees Committee who, after consideration, shall make a recommendation to Senate.

The requirement for an oral examination will be at the discretion of the examiners, with a presumption in favour. Any examiners wishing to waive the oral examination will need to justify it and obtain the agreement of the Research Degrees Committee.

Recommendations available to examiners of research degrees are set out in Regulation 2D (11.3), except that for degrees by published research only recommendations 1, 2, 6 and 7 are available (see Annex A2). No resubmissions will be permitted, and any minor revisions may relate only to the critical commentary.

Masters level

M1 For an award to be made at Masters level (MPhil) students must achieve the required learning outcomes:

Masters degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

h) 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
i) a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship
j) 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
k) 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.

M2 The thesis shall be no longer than 60,000 words (to include main text and footnotes, but not references and appendices). Although there is no lower word limit for thesis length, the thesis must be long enough to explore the subject in sufficient depth and breadth to fulfil the requirements for the degree. Clarity and succinctness of expression is valued. The literary style and presentation of the thesis should be satisfactory. The candidate will be required to satisfy the Senate of competence in independent work or experiment,ation, of understanding of the appropriate techniques, and of competence in making critical use of published work and source materials. The thesis shall normally consist of a critical review of the field of research together with some new results but may, if approved by the Senate, take the form of a critical review only.
M3 Musical composition

A candidate in musical composition is required to submit a folio of original compositions, in the form of scores, or, in the case of electronic music, recordings (or equivalent) on appropriate media. A written introduction is also required, which covers all the works submitted, giving background information as well as details relating to aesthetic and technical concerns.

Where part of a candidate’s research has included the production of original software or other tools which have assisted the realisation of the portfolio then these may also form part of the submission. Alternatively, and particularly where the compositions or other musical examples are mainly illustrative of the capability of such tools, then the candidate should submit under regulation M1. Wherever possible, the appropriate submission pathway should be determined at the outset with the supervisor.

For submissions consisting solely of musical compositions the following guidelines will apply:

The submission should either consist of up to three contrasted pieces of music of moderate substance and/or length or a single extended work. In musical composition a candidate will be required to satisfy the Senate that the submission shows clear evidence of creative ability and academic competence, and represents an original and significant contribution to the art of music. Also, that instruments and voices are written for within their capabilities, and that performing instructions and layout are accurate in detail.

M4 Visual arts

Instead of a thesis, candidates may submit all three of the following:

   d) a body of creative work which has been documented and recorded by means appropriate for the purposes of examination and eventual deposit in the University Library
   e) an accompanying thesis of no more than 30,000 words showing clear evidence of academic competence and awareness of the current critical context in which the creative work has been produced
   f) a selection of work referred to under (a) suitable for exhibition.

The proposed submission must be approved at the start of the course by the Director of the relevant Research Institute.
Annex A2: Recommendations available to examiners of research degrees

There are seven possible recommendations available to examiners of a research degree thesis. Some of the recommendations may not be available for all candidates, as indicated below.

Recommendation 1

The student be awarded the degree for which he or she has made a submission.

Guidance

This is appropriate if the thesis is acceptable and the student satisfies the examiners in all other parts of the examination.

Recommendation 2

The student be awarded the degree for which he or she has made a submission once revisions have been made to the thesis to the satisfaction of the examiner(s) named.

Guidance

Minor revisions is the appropriate recommendation where the thesis is sound and virtually complete in terms of its aims, methods, results, interpretation and conclusions, but has minor errors, or is poorly assembled or presented.

The required revisions fall typically within the following categories and should not require re-working or re-interpretation of the intellectual content of the thesis:

- Typographical errors
- Grammatical errors
- Checking and correcting references
- Presentation of bibliographical data
- Improving aspects of figures (e.g. labelling, quality of reproduction)
- Minor corrections of fact
- Minor additional material
- Minor revisions to interpretation of data, results, conclusions
- Minor reorganisation of material
- Minor rewriting of the text.

The normal expectation is that minor revisions will be completed within 3 months. However, examiners may recommend a longer period (up to a maximum of 6 months) if the nature of the revisions or the current circumstances of the candidate justify it. Examiners must justify any recommendation for an extended period.

Recommendation 3

[Only for original submissions, not for re-submissions.]

Although the required standard for the award for which the student has submitted has not been met, the submission is of sufficient merit to justify the student being permitted to re-present the thesis and to submit to a further oral examination within two calendar years from the date of the decision at the relevant meeting of Senate.
Guidance

Resubmission is the appropriate recommendation where the thesis is unsound or incomplete in terms of its aims, methods, results, interpretation or conclusions. Substantial additional work is required which may lead to a significant change in the results, interpretation and conclusions.

The required revisions fall typically within the following categories:

- Reinterpretation of the data (including background literature)
- Collection of new data or additional research to be carried out
- Substantial rewriting of large portions of the text
- Substantial additional material to be incorporated within the text
- Substantial revisions to results and conclusions
- Thorough revision of presentational matters which require a complete editing.

Following resubmission of the thesis, the oral examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

Recommendation 4

[Only for doctoral candidates, not for masters candidates.]

The student should be approved for a Masters level award, not a Doctoral level award.

Guidance

This is appropriate if, after completion of the whole examination process, the examiners determine that the student has not reached the standard required for the award of a doctoral degree nor for re-presentation of the thesis in a revised form, and that the examiners determine that the student has reached the standard required for the award of a masters degree, subject to any minor amendments which may be required.

Recommendation 5

[Only for original submissions by doctoral candidates, not for re-submissions, nor for masters candidates.]

The required standard for a doctoral level award has not been met, and the submission is of insufficient merit to justify the award of a doctoral degree. However, the student should be permitted to re-present the thesis for the award of a masters degree, and to submit to a further oral examination, within two calendar years from the date of the decision at the relevant meeting of Senate.

Guidance

This is appropriate if after completion of the whole examination process, the examiners determine that the student has not reached the standard required for the award of a doctoral degree nor for re-presentation of the thesis in a revised form for a doctoral award. However, the submission, though unsatisfactory, contains sufficient merit and potential for the
examiners to recommend that the student be permitted to re-present the thesis in a revised form for a masters award. Following resubmission of the thesis, the oral examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

**Recommendation 6**

The student should not be awarded any degree, nor be permitted to re-present the thesis, nor submit to any further examination.

**Guidance**

This is appropriate if, after completion of the whole examination process, the examiners determine that the student has not satisfied the conditions for the award of a research degree and should not be allowed to re-present the thesis nor to submit to any further examination.

**Recommendation 7**

The examiners are unable to come to a joint recommendation and an additional examiner or examiners should be appointed whose decision shall resolve the matter.

**Guidance**

This is appropriate if, after completion of the whole examination process, the examiners cannot come to an agreed view about the appropriate recommendation.
Annex A3: Registration mode of attendance

A research student will always have one, and only one, mode of attendance (MOA) at any one time, though students may change from one MOA to another during the course of their programmes. Possible MOA options are as follows:

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Continuation
- Leave of absence.

The level of resources and facilities available to students on each MOA is set out in Annex D2. The general requirements relating to each of these options is as follows:

**Full-time**
- Students make a full-time commitment to their research degrees, which is normally at a level of about 35 hours a week, 12 months a year, with up to 6 weeks for holidays (details agreed with Research Institutes)
- Students may not be employed full-time, though may have some part-time employment
- The requirement is that masters students must complete within two years and doctoral students must complete within four years. The expectation is that these completion times will be considerably less (see 3.2.1)
- Students pay tuition fees at the full-time level.

**Part-time**
- Students make a part-time commitment to their research degrees, which is normally at a level of about half that expected for a full-time student
- Students may simultaneously be employed full-time or part-time
- The requirement is that masters students must complete within four years and doctoral students must complete within eight years. The expectation is that these completion times will be considerably less (see 3.2.1)
- Transfer to part-time study is normally permitted only if a student becomes unable to continue studying on a full-time basis because of employment or other commitments (such as a carer role) for a significant part of the working week, or due to health problems
- Requests to transfer to part-time study are subject to approval by Research Degrees Committee and by the appropriate Research Council for Research Council funded students
- Students pay tuition fees at the part-time level, which is normally half the full-time level.

**Continuation**
- Students are expected to make a level of commitment as agreed with their Research Institutes, in the light of their circumstances, such that the thesis can be completed and submitted in the shortest possible time and within the maximum period of study (see Code of Practice 3.2.1 and regulation 2D (7))
- Students may normally be on continuation MOA for no longer than 12 months (24 months PT) from the date of approval to change to continuation MOA
- Students pay tuition fees at the continuation fees level, normally 15% of the full-time level.
Leave of absence

- Students are not expected to make any commitment to their research degrees
- There are no requirements about the use of time during periods of leave of absence
- Approved periods of leave of absence automatically extend the maximum period within which a student is required to submit by an equivalent period
- Students pay no tuition fees
- All Research Council funded students are entitled to take 6 months of maternity leave on full stipend and a further 6 months of unpaid maternity leave. For part-time students leave payments will be calculated on a pro-rata basis. For non-Research Council funded students, the stipend payable for the first 6 months will be that in place at the start of the leave.
Annex B1: Submission for a research degree

The student is required to submit a two-part declaration along with their dissertation or thesis.

Part 1 is bound into the dissertation or thesis and is essentially a confirmation that the work is the student’s own.

Part 2 is supplied loose (not bound into the dissertation or thesis) on submission and is a series of declarations by (1) the student, (2) the lead supervisor and (3) interested parties such as the non-academic supervisor if the thesis contains confidential information.

Part 2 is not supplied to the examiners of the degree.

Part 2 section 3 is also important if there is to be an embargo on access to the thesis within the library.

The two-part declaration can be downloaded at http://www.keele.ac.uk/
Annex B2: Format for research institute Personal Development and Learning Plan

From September 2011, all new students are required to develop and maintain a Personal Development and Learning Plan (see 1.6.6) instead of the previous two part Learning Plan. [It is hoped that Research Institutes will also adopt such plans for continuing students as appropriate.]

Research Institutes are required to develop their own format for the Personal Development and Learning Plan to be used by their students (see 1.4.3), but as a minimum the Personal Development and Learning Plan must make clear the minimum RT requirements as set out in CoP 2.2, and include the following sections. A pro forma is available on the web for Research Institutes wishing to use or adapt it.

Personal Development and Learning Plan for Postgraduate Research Students

To be discussed with supervisory team and submitted to RI PGR committee within 3 months of registration. Thereafter to be maintained by the student and made electronically accessible at all times to the supervisors and the PGR Director.

- Student details
- Identification of roles of each member of the supervisory team
- Any changes to the supervisory team
- Timetable for milestones in the completion of the research degree
- Programme of regular review of progress
- Record of approved leaves of absence and extensions
- Record of approved changes to the mode of attendance
- Analysis of student’s learning needs and skills development objectives
- Record of changes to analysis of learning needs and skills development objectives
- Details of any compulsory research training to be completed
- Details of previous research training and skills development, including any agreed credit exemption
- Record of research training and skills development completed including reflection on value
- Plan and record of research activities including research objectives with target dates for their achievement
- List of proposed thesis chapters including progress towards their completion
- Record of supervision meetings
Annex B3: Contents of research institute handbooks for research students

Paragraph 1.4.6 of the Code of Practice sets out in general terms the requirements of Research Institute Handbooks for Research Students, and specifies that Handbooks are an integral part of the Code of Practice. This Annex provides a checklist for Research Institutes of all the sections which must be included as a minimum within Handbooks.

The research environment
- The Research Institute, its research environment and its staff (including contact list)
- Objectives for postgraduate research education
- The role and membership of any Research Institute committees dealing with postgraduate issues and allowing for student representation
- Opportunities within the Research Institute for interaction with other research students
- Admission criteria, particularly those specific to the Research Institute
- Health and safety issues
- Sources of help and advice
- Facilities and resources for research students
- Details of any internal bursary schemes.

Expectations within the discipline
- The expectations of research degree study with respect to the individual Research Institute and academic discipline (e.g. frequency and nature of contact with supervisor, academic and professional standards, nature of research, timetable of requirements of the programme of study, ethical issues)
- What the student and supervisor should expect from each other, including frequency and type of contact
- Guidance on avoiding plagiarism or other academic dishonesty (referring also to university guidance)
- Research training programme – guidance for relevant disciplines.

Research Institute procedures
- Procedures for monitoring student progress, including confirmation of doctoral progression and progression to continuation mode of attendance
- Constitution of panel for doctoral progression
- Where RIs have specific dates for submission of progress report forms by supervisors and students (one in Spring and one in Autumn) these should be specified
- Period during which doctoral progression panels will be convened
- Procedures for handling feedback, problems and complaints within the Research Institute (informal).
Annex B4: Doctoral progression procedures

Section 3.6 of the Code of Practice describes the formal doctoral progression procedures. This Annex sets out the typical contents of the written report and the typical criteria for satisfactory progress and continuation to PhD study as well as the constitution of the panel which should consider each student’s case. Research Institutes may modify these to meet the particular needs of their disciplines provided details are clearly set out in Research Institute Handbooks.

Report – Typically the report (up to 5,000 words) will include the following (as appropriate) and should be accompanied by an updated copy of the Personal Development and Learning Plan:

- Literature review summary and/or update
- Background and rationale for proposed research
- Research methods to be used
- Acquisition of skills and techniques
- Report on preliminary studies
- Research plan for the next year.

Ethics - All research involving human participants, their tissues, or personal information must be approved by a recognised research ethics committee before the research can commence. This includes social science research (e.g. fieldwork-based, interview and questionnaire studies). For more information about how to obtain the appropriate ethical approval for your research please access http://www.keele.ac.uk/researchsupport/researchethics/

Criteria – Criteria for satisfactory progress and continuation to PhD study typically include:

- Demonstrated progress in developing the intellectual and cognitive skills necessary for the satisfactory completion of a doctoral thesis
- Thorough literature review and demonstrated understanding of the context of the research
- Clearly identified research question or topic
- Appropriate research plan and methodologies
- Acquisition of necessary skills and competences to carry out the research plan
- Demonstrated an ability to set and keep to realistic deadlines for the production of work
- Approval, where required, by one of the University’s Ethical Review Panels (or by a recognised external committee, such as an NHS-REC). Where approval has not yet been granted, a satisfactory explanation of either why approval is not required or what plans are in place for obtaining it must be provided.

No student may pass doctoral progression unless and until he or she has fulfilled the relevant research training requirements as set out in COP section 2.2.

Panel – The composition of the doctoral progression panel should be given in the RI Handbook. When determining the composition, RIs should consider the following:

- The Chair should be a member of staff experienced in postgraduate research education – there may be some value in consistency and some RIs may wish to have the Director of Postgraduate Research
- The panel may not include members of the supervisory team, but they could be present as observers and only with agreement of the student and other panel members.
Annex B5: Required sections for progress monitoring forms
(Including grading scale relating to student progress)

Paragraph 3.5 of the Code of Practice requires Research Institutes to devise their own 6-monthly progress monitoring forms. With the introduction of Personal Development and Learning Plans, progress monitoring forms are no longer required to include sections outlining the activities undertaken by students. Instead, Postgraduate Committees may request that the student submit their Personal Development and Learning Plan to be considered alongside the Progress Monitoring Forms.

There are two separate Progress Monitoring Forms, one completed by the Lead Supervisor and one completed by the Student, each submitted separately to the Postgraduate Committee (with a copy to the other for information – Lead Supervisor or Student). The two parts should include at least the following sections. Pro formas covering these two reports are available on the web for Research Institutes wishing to use or adapt them.

Lead Supervisor's report on progress
[Not to repeat information in the Personal Development and Learning Plan]

1. Comments on the student’s progress on the research project and their success in meeting research objectives
2. Comments on the student’s overall progress and standard of work
3. Comments on student’s general progress and record in keeping to the agreed timescales
4. Recommended overall grade with reference to the following scale:
   - A excellent,
   - B good,
   - C satisfactory,
   - D poor,
   - E unsatisfactory

   Postgraduate Committees must choose one clear grade.

   The grade should be determined by reference to the Personal Development and Learning Plan and to section 3.3 of the Code of Practice (Requirement to remain in good academic standing), and should take into account both the adequacy and standard of work, and the level of active study, evaluated in accordance with the student’s mode of attendance. See paragraph 3.3.5 (b) of the Code of Practice for details of the implications for a student of receiving a grade E (unsatisfactory).

5. Any action recommended, and by whom.

Student’s report on progress
[Not to repeat information in the Personal Development and Learning Plan]

1. Comments on adequacy of progress on the research project
2. Comments on whether you are keeping to the agreed timescales and, if not, give reasons and suggestions for improvement
3. Comments on progress with thesis writing if appropriate
4 Comments on your progress with the Personal Development and Learning Plan

5 Comment on any problems encountered with access to supervision or facilities or the quality of these.
Annex B6: Approval of supervisors and mentors

This Annex sets out the approval process for anyone who is to be a member of a supervisory team and for approval of mentors to supervisors.

1 The University considers that the quality of the educational experience for research students is to a large extent determined by the quality of the supervision which they receive, and consequently places a very high priority on ensuring that supervisors are able to carry out their role effectively.

2 Academic staff (including honorary clinical staff) must undergo a formal process of approval by the Research Degrees Committee in order to be able to supervise research students.

3 In order to become Approved Supervisors, academic staff will normally need to fulfil the following conditions:
   • Already have a higher degree by research
   • Be active in research as evidenced by recent publications and / or research grants
   • Hold an academic post at the University
   • Have undertaken supervisor training, or be able to demonstrate a track record of successful supervision
   • Have undertaken research governance training or otherwise demonstrate that they understand the implications of research governance
   • Have taken the Lead Supervisor role (as an Associate Supervisor at Keele, or as Associate or Approved Supervisor elsewhere) and supervised to successful completion one or more candidates at PhD level.

4 Staff who can fulfil the first three conditions, but have little or no experience of supervision, may be approved initially as Associate Supervisors. Associate Supervisors will be allowed to supervise higher degrees (including as Lead Supervisor) provided:
   • They undertake supervisor training
   • They undertake research governance training, or otherwise demonstrate that they understand the implications of research governance
   • They are allocated a Mentor, who will provide guidance and mentoring to the Associate Supervisor.

5 Mentors to Associate Supervisors will be Approved Supervisors with several years’ experience of successful supervision.

   In putting forward a case to be a mentor, the individual, supported by a case made by the Director of Postgraduate Research for the Research Institute of which they are a member, will need to demonstrate a history of successful supervision. Additional relevant experience might include participation in supervisor training, engagement with issues of research governance and a management or development role in postgraduate research education.

6 Postgraduate Committees will allocate Mentors to Associate Supervisors at the same time as they put forward Associate Supervisors for approval. Mentors do not need to be in the same subject area as the Associate Supervisor, though if possible a Mentor should be in a cognate discipline.
Research Institutes will raise any concerns about supervisory performance with the Research Degrees Committee. Where the performance of Approved or Associate Supervisors gives cause for concern, the Research Degrees Committee will review whether such approval should be allowed to continue and, if so, on what terms or conditions.
Annex B7: Approval of examiners and chair of oral examination

This Annex sets out the procedures for the approval of internal and external examiners, and of the Independent Chair.

Nomination of examiners

1 The examiners are nominated by the student’s Postgraduate Committee to the Research Degrees Committee, which approves the appointments on behalf of Senate.

2 The thesis is referred to a minimum of two examiners, normally one internal and one external. In no circumstances will a member of the candidate’s Supervisory team be an examiner. A second external examiner will be appointed instead of an internal examiner in the following circumstances:
   • If the candidate is a member of the academic staff of Keele University
   • If no appropriate internal examiner can be found
   • Any other circumstances which the Research Degrees Committee considers would warrant a second external examiner (possibly in addition to an internal examiner).

   Exceptionally there may be a third examiner.

3 When nominating examiners for research degrees, Postgraduate Committees should take account of the following criteria used by the Research Degrees Committee:
   • Examiners are expected to be experts in the field of knowledge covered by the research thesis being examined, and have an established reputation for research and scholarship.
   • Examiners will normally hold a higher degree of at least the level for which they are to be nominated examiner.
   • Examiners will normally hold a post of senior lecturer or above (though other individuals may be nominated provided information and justification is provided).
   • The combined experience of the examiners must include both examining and supervision of research theses of the level to be examined either at Keele or elsewhere, with each examiner being experienced in at least one of these areas.
   • Examiners must not be collaborators in the research, and any links between the candidate and the proposed examiners (particularly in relation to research collaboration) must be declared when making nominations. Examiners will not be approved if the extent of collaboration is such that a joint publication might result from the work. The normal exchange which might, for instance, take place during normal working contact such as in a laboratory or departmental discussion would not constitute collaboration in this context. If there is any doubt about the level of collaboration, the recommendation of examiner will not be approved.
   • Examiners should not be nominated if their work is the focus of the candidate’s research project.

4 The Lead supervisor and student will be invited by the Postgraduate Committee to discuss possible examiners and Postgraduate Committee will then make
recommendations to Research Degrees Committee. The Lead supervisor and candidate will thereafter be informed of the names of the approved examiners.

5 All examiners, when confirming their willingness to so act, will be required to confirm also that they have read and understood the sections of the Code of Practice which relate to the examination of a research thesis, and will comply with its provisions.

**Nomination and Allocation of Chair of oral examination.**

6 Each oral examination will have an Independent Chair, who manages the conduct of the oral examination and who will take no part in the examination itself.

An Independent Chair will be a member of Keele academic staff. It is a condition of full Research Institute Membership that full RI members identified by their RI as potential Independent viva chairs put themselves forward for nomination as an Independent Chair, undertake training as appropriate, and subsequently make themselves generally available to chair vivas.

Independent Chairs are nominated by the student’s Postgraduate Committee to the Research Degrees Committee, which approves the appointments on behalf of Senate. The Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students will maintain a list of approved Independent Chairs who will be allocated, subject to confirmation by Research Degrees Committee, by the student’s Postgraduate Committee. The Independent Chair will normally be from the same Research Institute as the student, but Postgraduate Committees may approach approved Independent Chairs from other Research Institutes.

In exceptional circumstances the Research Degrees Committee reserves the right to allocate the Chair for a particular oral examination. Directors of Postgraduate Research may not act as Independent Chairs.

The normal expectation is that an Independent Chair will have an established reputation for research and scholarship and experience or training in the research degree examination process.
**Annex B8: Oral examination procedures**

All research students, whether doctoral or masters students, will be required to take part in an oral examination (also known as ‘viva’ or ‘viva voce’). This Annex sets out the procedures for the conduct of the oral examination and suggests ways in which participants should prepare for it.

**Aims and objectives of the oral examination**

1. The oral examination is an integral part of the examination process, and so its aim is to **evaluate whether the student has met the standards for the award.** (These standards are set out in Annex A1.)

2. Within the examination process, the oral examination has the following objectives:

   - to confirm or revise the examiner’s initial views about the standard of the student’s research, based on the thesis
   - to identify and discuss any amendments to the thesis which may be required to meet the standard for the award
   - to determine as far as possible whether the Part 1 Declaration made by the student on submission of the thesis is true.

3. These objectives will be achieved through the examiners discussing the research and the thesis with the student, to gain clarification, probe background knowledge, and assure themselves of the student’s full understanding of the relevant issues. In particular the examiners may wish to elicit information on the following issues:

   - explanation of the structure of the thesis
   - justification for the inclusion or exclusion of material
   - explanation for and justification of the use of particular research methods and techniques
   - defence of the originality of the thesis, and how it relates to the work of others
   - clarification of any points of ambiguity within the thesis
   - justification for the conceptual approach taken in the thesis
   - the depth of knowledge of the contextual background to the subject of the thesis.

4. While it is recognised that apparently minor errors may conceal more fundamental problems, in general the purpose of the oral examination is not to identify and question the candidate on minor errors or amendments. Examiners should normally present to the student a list of such amendments required at the end of the examination, and incorporate them into Part II of the examiners’ report.

5. The final recommendation will be made on the basis of the total examination process with the examiners having formed a view about whether the student has achieved the standards required for the award. If amendments to the thesis are required to reflect their judgement about the student’s achievements, this should be reflected in the recommendation made, and guidance about revisions given in Part II of the examiners’ reports.

6. Note: Where research programmes approved by Senate incorporate a taught or professional element students may, in addition, be required to complete and pass an approved course of study and assessment, before the final award can be made.
Preparing for the oral examination – examiners

Organisation of oral examination: The arrangements for the oral examination will be made through the Research Institutes. The organiser of the viva, who is normally the internal examiner or the Independent Chair, must ensure that all parties (both examiners, Independent Chair and student) are included in the process and are involved in the decision relating to the date, time and place of the viva. The organiser must then inform both the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) and the RI PGR Director of the agreed date, time and location of the viva. If any additional facilities are needed for the examination these must be identified by the examiners in advance and organised through the Research Institute.

Planning the examination: The Independent Chair should arrange to meet (or otherwise communicate with) the examiners, prior to the oral examination, to discuss how they will conduct the examination within the guidelines outlined in this annex. In particular they will consider which key issues they wish to address and how they will organise the discussion.

Notice of additional requirements: In the majority of subject disciplines the examination will normally take the form of oral discussion only. In cases where the examiners wish to request a presentation or demonstration by the candidate the examiners must notify the Independent Chair of their requirements and the student must be notified by the Independent Chair of such a request at least two weeks in advance of the oral examination, together with a statement about the intended purpose.

Preparing for the oral examination – students

It is desirable that students remain engaged with their research material during the months prior to the oral examination by, for example, re-reading their written submission, giving talks on their research, or preparing material for publication, as appropriate. Students should also continue reading new relevant material as it is published.

Students should ensure that they know their thesis thoroughly, and have a clear understanding of, and can articulate briefly, the key points which are important and new in the research. They should be able to respond to questions which address the issues listed above under 3.

Students should ensure that they have read and understood this guidance on the examination process.

Students should preferably have undertaken some form of training or practice in the oral examination, such as the session provided in the University’s Research Training programme, and a mock viva.

Students must not communicate directly with the examiners about the thesis or its assessment (see Annex D3).

Conduct of the oral examination

The oral examination of the student will be carried out by both (or all) examiners, with the Independent Chair governing the conduct of the examination. The normal expectation is that no other persons will be present. However, if all parties agree,
Supervisors may be present as observers, and may answer questions directly addressed to them by the examiners in terms of background and contextual information. Where Supervisors are not present it is expected they will be available for consultation if the examiners wish.

16 It is the role of the Independent Chair to ensure that the appropriate tone and environment are created and maintained. The oral examination should be conducted in a non-intimidating way, reassuring the students, putting them at their ease, and minimising the inevitable stress of the occasion. Students should be treated with respect, courtesy, and understanding.

17 The Independent Chair should ensure, at the outset, that the student understands the purpose of the oral examination, introduce the examiners, and outline for the student the way the examination will be conducted. In addition, the Independent Chair should inform the student that no information about outcomes will be provided until the end of the examination, and that no conclusions should be drawn about this. The Independent Chair should refer to this guidance as being the document which governs the conduct of the oral examination.

18 The oral examination will be in the form of discussion, question and answer. Unless notified in advance (see 9 above) the examiners may not request any other activity such as a presentation or demonstration. The Independent Chair should ensure that questioning is not excessively protracted and keeps to the key purpose of the oral examination.

19 An oral examination will normally last for at least one hour, and rarely more than two hours. If it is necessary for the examination to last for more than two hours, the student will be offered a break.

20 At the end of the oral examination, the Independent Chair will ask the student to leave the room while the examiners reach a definitive conclusion about the outcome of the examination process. The decision should be reached as quickly as possible to minimise unnecessary stress.

The Independent Chair of the oral examination has the responsibility for the conduct of the oral examination at Keele. Full guidance is available at http://www.keele.ac.uk/gradschool/codeofpractice. It must be made clear to the student that the Research Degrees Committee may not always confirm the examiners’ recommendations. (Where recommendations do not appear to be fully justified by the reports they may be referred back to the examiners by Research Degrees Committee (see also paragraph 5.3.1.)

On completion of the oral examination, examiners should indicate to the student what amendments and corrections to the thesis are required, if any. They are asked to return a list of corrections and amendments to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) as part of their joint report (Part II), and to provide a copy of this list to the student. Where the list of corrections is partly or wholly annotated within the copy of the thesis, the Independent Chair will ensure that these are returned to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) who will then forward such copies to the student.
Annex B9: Format for examiners’ reports

1. On submission of the thesis by the candidate, each examiner will be sent a copy of the thesis together with a request for a report on the thesis.

2. Examiners’ reports will be in two parts, Part I written independently, Part II written jointly. Part I will be written on consideration of the thesis alone. Part II will be written after consultation with the other examiner(s) and after the oral examination. In addition, immediately after the oral examination the examiners will sign a joint certificate with their recommendation.

3. Part I of the report should be written after consideration of the thesis, and should include the following:
   - a critical synopsis of the thesis
   - comments on the standard and originality of the work submitted
   - areas to be explored in the oral examination
   - any suspicions about academic malpractice, or other doubts about the veracity of the student’s Part 1 Declaration
   - a preliminary recommendation, referring to the standards required for an award at doctoral and masters level as set out in Annex A1 and the available recommendations as set out in Annex A2
   - grounds upon which the preliminary recommendation is made.

   Examiners should feel free to make notes on the thesis as they read it.

4. Part I of the report should be sent to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) at least one week before the oral examination, and no later than one month after receiving the thesis and request for the report. The Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) will ensure that a copy of each report is sent to the other examiner(s) prior to the oral examination. Each report should be accompanied by a Part I cover sheet which bears the initial Recommendation and the signature of the Examiner.

5. Part II of the report should be written jointly by the examiners after the oral examination, and should include the following:
   - any supplementary comments arising from discussion between the examiners and the oral examination, including reasons for any changes of opinion from those expressed in Part I of the examiners’ reports
   - justification for the final recommendation as set out in the joint certificate signed immediately following the oral examination, referring to the standards required for an award at doctoral and masters level as set out in Annex A1
   - clear reasons for the recommendation, and details of any required amendments and revisions, so that Research Degrees Committee can be confident in the appropriateness of the recommendation and the student understands the reason for the outcome and can take appropriate corrective action if necessary
   - a statement that the examiners are satisfied that the student’s Part 1 Declaration is true or, if not so satisfied, the areas and grounds on which the examiners have concerns about its veracity.

6. Part II of the report should normally be sent to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) within a week of the oral examination, together with return of the thesis (unless this has already been returned to the candidate at the oral
examination). The Part II cover sheet should normally be sent to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) on the day of the viva. It bears the final Recommendation as well as the signatures of the Examination Panel.

7 All reports must be typed, dated and signed by the examiner.

8 Examiners’ reports are not confidential, and copies will be sent to students and supervisors on completion of the examination process.
Annex B10: Terms and conditions for appointment of graduate teaching assistantships

Graduate Teaching Assistantships
1. A standard Graduate Teaching Assistantship lasts for three years, and includes the following (for further terms and conditions):

1.1. Payment of fees (up to EU level only; international students are eligible, but will need to cover the difference between EU and international fees).

1.2. A stipend at standard RCUK level (currently £13,590), of which a maximum of £2,052 will be remuneration for teaching.

1.3. An agreed (by School in consultation with lead supervisor) programme of teaching (undergraduate and, if appropriate, postgraduate) for each year (no more than six hours a week of teaching or teaching-related activity, excluding formal training averaged over the course of each year).

1.4. A full programme of development, mentorship and support.

1.5. An expectation of satisfactory performance in both research (evaluated in the normal way) and teaching; unsatisfactory performance in either to lead to termination of the Assistantship.

1.6. An expectation that the programme of research will be completed within normal time limits.

Other teaching opportunities
2.1 Availability of GTAs is entirely compatible with arrangements whereby some PGR students undertake, on a sessional basis, less teaching than would be expected of a student holding a GTA.

2.2 It is not the intention that the reintroduction of GTAs should necessarily lead to alteration of current practice. If established arrangements are working well, there is no reason to change them.

2.3 Where no framework for doing so currently exists, Schools and RIs are expected to work together to ensure equity and transparency in allocation of teaching responsibilities to PGRs who do not hold GTAs. Procedures can and should be light-touch but rigorous.

2.4 PGR students who undertake teaching are currently eligible to take advantage of formal training offered by the LPDU.

Terms & conditions for the appointment of Graduate Teaching Assistantships
This Annex sets out the terms and conditions which apply to all Graduate Teaching Assistantships (GTAs), including the following:

1. Strategic role of GTAs
2. Funding issues
3. Recruitment
4. Roles and responsibilities of students holding GTAs
5. Training and support for students holding GTAs
Strategic role of GTAs
Schools and Research Institutes (RIs) should be encouraged to consider and articulate the strategic role of GTAs within their overall teaching and research strategies, including any or all of the following:

- Recruitment of high quality research students, giving a competitive edge in the market, particularly where there is very little external funding for research students – without being able to fund GTAs there might be no research students in the discipline
- Integral and important part of the research culture within the Research Institute, contributing to specific research outputs
- Valuable resource dedicated to specific research areas within the RI
- Essential to the delivery of certain teaching functions such as laboratory teaching and demonstrating, examples classes, and teaching large cohorts of undergraduate students
- Provide excellent teaching, are well motivated and enthusiastic, contribute ideas and input from the training programme, and become experts in their field, providing significant added value over 3 years
- Provide continuity, are reliable, under School control, and are more fully members of the School than PT tutors would be
- An important factor in the renewal of the academic community

Funding issues
2.1 All funding for GTAs will come from School/RI funds (or external funds which have been obtained for the purpose). GTAs may be funded in one of two ways, either from School/RI budgets or through making a bid in lieu of other staff.

2.2 The funds for a GTA must include both the stipend paid to the GTA-holder and the relevant tuition fees payable to the university.

2.3 GTA awards are normally for three years. Continuation of GTAs is dependent on satisfactory progress in research, as measured by established mechanisms, and on satisfactory performance of teaching duties.

Recruitment
3.1 The selection process for GTAs must be in all respects transparent and equitable.

3.2 GTA opportunities should be advertised alongside other forms of student support (full and part studentships etc.), with full details on the website.

3.3 Selection criteria should include both research and teaching potential, including the necessary social and communication skills. Candidates’ career intentions should be ascertained at interview.

3.4 Eligibility for a GTA award should be restricted to full-time research students intending to complete a PhD. If an award is made to a student who is required to pay overseas fees, the student will normally be required to pay the difference between the home level and overseas level of fees.

3.5 Further particulars of each GTA post advertised should include a copy of these guidelines, as well as more specific details of expected duties and the level of stipend.
3.6 Offers of a GTA award will include a contract supplemented by a statement of duties (Schedule of Work), support arrangements, training requirements, name of mentor, etc).

Roles and responsibilities of GTA-holders

4.1 GTA-holders are research students who, by virtue of their aptitude, training and expertise, have been selected to provide teaching and related administrative support to their academic Schools. In return for this support, the university pays them an annual stipend and their tuition fees for their research degree. Their primary purpose is to undertake and complete a research degree.

4.2 All GTA-holders are required to register for, attend and satisfactorily complete an appropriate training course to support their teaching role.

4.3 When determining the general teaching programme for a GTA-holder, Heads of Schools should discuss proposals with the student, be aware of the overall load (teaching and research), and take into account the following guidelines:

   a) Teaching should be no more than 6 contact hours a week during semester time (a maximum of 144 hours a year). With preparation, marking, office hours, meetings and other teaching-related activity, this should not require more than 180 hours’ commitment a year.

   b) Teaching-related activity is additional to contact hours and unquantified within the maximum of 180 hours’ commitment. Teaching duties should not normally be such as to require other than relatively modest amounts of preparation time.

   c) GTA-holders should, over the course of their three years, have the opportunity to contribute to the delivery of a range of modules appropriate to their development and to the needs of the School.

   d) GTA-holders, through their experience and training, are preparing for an academic career, and should be given the opportunity to practise a range of academic teaching activities and levels over the period of their award.

   e) Activities appropriate to early stages of the GTA award:
      • Tutorial teaching of level 1 and level 2 modules
      • Laboratory classes and demonstrating
      • Examples classes
      • Fieldwork
      • Supervised assessment of level 1 and level 2 modules
      • Office hours/surgery
      • Participation in course team meetings
      • Attendance at School meetings

   f) Additional activities appropriate to later stages of the GTA award, after some training and experience (general teaching training):
      • Tutorial teaching of level 3 modules
      • Second marker for level 3 modules
• Lecturing in area of research expertise
• Some involvement in module design

g) GTA-holders should be treated as a full member of the relevant course team, and consulted about the course and their students in the same way as a junior lecturer. This will include attending relevant examiners’ meetings.

**Training and support for GTA-holders**

5.1 All GTA-holders are required to participate in a relevant training scheme (see 4.2 above), and Schools/RIs must ensure that they are given the time to do so and the opportunities to fulfil the requirements of the training.

5.2 Ultimate responsibility for management of the teaching undertaken by a GTA-holder lies with the Head of School, who may delegate this as appropriate.

5.3 All GTA-holders will be allocated a mentor or teaching supervisor (who will not normally be the research supervisor). The mentor provides the following support for the GTA-holder:

- Provides advice on all aspects of teaching, including presentations, course materials, and organisational matters appropriate to the subject
- Monitors the GTA-holder’s participation in training programmes, ensures attendance, advises on additional training and discusses progress
- Liaises with research supervisor and ensures that overall load is not excessive
- Conducts ongoing reviews
- Recommendations concerning continuation

5.4 All teaching and assessment work must be supervised by a member of the academic staff.

5.5 GTAs are entitled to the same research facilities as all other research students in the RI. In addition, they should have access to sufficient School resources to enable them to carry out their teaching duties.

5.6 GTA-holders who are unable to work due to sickness must inform their School of the reason for absence and its likely duration, as soon as possible, and in any event within 30 minutes of the GTA-holder’s normal start time. Consideration should be given by the School, in consultation with the GTA-holder, as whether the teaching commitment can be rescheduled to an alternative time.
Annex B11: Ownership and management of intellectual property

1. During the course of a research degree at the University research students will contribute to the generation of intellectual property e.g. patentable technologies, design rights, copyright, including copyright in computer code, know-how, etc. As this Intellectual Property is generated with the benefit of the University environment (this includes resources, facilities and intellectual capital of the University) in all cases (subject to 2 below) the University owns the Intellectual Property.

2. The exception to this occurs where students are sponsored by a third party (e.g. company or charity) where contractually it has been agreed, prior to the start of the degree, that the sponsor owns the intellectual property arising from the body of sponsored work.

3. In the event of commercialisation of the intellectual property, the University agrees to offer the student a share in any financial gain in accordance with the University Commercialisation Policy. Where appropriate students are required to notify the University of the existence of any Intellectual Property, through the IP and Innovation Manager (Research and Enterprise Services), and are required to complete an Intellectual Property Disclosure form.

4. Students should not disclose commercially important intellectual property unless such disclosure is covered by a confidentiality agreement, approved by the Research and Enterprise Services. Students are encouraged to publish their work but where such publications relate to commercially important intellectual property students must seek advice from the IP and Innovation Manager (Research and Enterprise Services) prior to publication.
Annex B12: Standard agreement for the provision of supervision services

(See paragraph 1.6.5. Note that the WHEREAS clauses may be changed in different circumstances, such as where clinical staff hold honorary contracts.)

AGREEMENT

between

KEELE UNIVERSITY

and

[NAME] (“Supervisor”)

Concerning the provision of supervision services for

[STUDENT] (“Student”)

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR [NAME]

Effective Date of Agreement

WHEREAS

- The Supervisor has been a member of the Keele staff, but will no longer be so at the Effective Date, following retirement or resignation.
- The Supervisor has been supervising the Student, and the specific circumstances make it desirable that the Supervisor continues to be involved in the supervision of the Student after leaving the University.
- This Agreement sets out the terms and conditions for the Supervisor to provide such supervision services to the University in relation to the Student.

1 Period of the Agreement

1.1 This Agreement shall commence on the Effective Date shown above, and shall continue until the Student submits his or her thesis for examination (or such other time as is mutually agreed). The Agreement may be extended or renewed for a further period if the Student is permitted to resubmit his or her thesis.

1.2 The University may terminate the Agreement at any time with immediate effect if the Supervisor fails to provide supervision services to the satisfaction of the University, such failure constituting a material breach of the Agreement.

1.3 Either party may terminate the Agreement for any reason by giving one month’s written notice to the other.
2 Supervision Services

2.1 The conduct of research degree programmes at Keele University is governed by the Code of Practice on Postgraduate Research Degrees ("Code of Practice"). A copy of the latest version accompanies this Agreement (receipt of which the Supervisor confirms), and the most up-to-date version is always available on the University’s website at www.keele.ac.uk/gradschool.

The Supervisor agrees to ensure that he or she is aware of, and follows the requirements of, the most recent version of the Code of Practice at any time. The Director of Postgraduate Research will bring to the attention of the Supervisor any significant amendments which may affect the provision of the supervision services specified.

2.2 The Supervisor will be directly accountable to the Director of Postgraduate Research in the Student’s Research Institute for the provision of supervision services.

2.3 In general terms, the Supervisor will be required to perform all those services which are required of Supervisors under the Code of Practice, including those additional services set out in the Research Institute’s Postgraduate Research Degree Handbook (which forms an integral part of the Code of Practice).

This shall include at least the activities listed in Annex D3 of the Code of Practice (insofar as they are relevant to the stage of progress of the Student). In specific circumstances, some of these activities may be either unnecessary (because of the stage of progress of the student) or may be undertaken by University staff members.

2.4 The exact nature of the supervision services as set out in 2.3 above may be moderated by details set out in the attached Schedule relating to the circumstances of the specific Student.

2.5 The Supervisor will perform the supervision services personally, and undertakes that appropriate time will be spent (if appropriate, at the University) on the supervision services, including the preparation of any documentation, to ensure the timely completion of work within any set deadlines.

2.6 The Supervisor shall keep detailed records of all things done in relation to the provision of supervision services, and at the University’s request shall make them available for inspection and/or provide copies to the University.

3 Remuneration for supervision services

3.1 The University shall pay to the Supervisor a fee of £250 with respect to each 6 month period of supervision (pro rata) which has been undertaken to the satisfaction of the University. No variation to this price will be permitted unless the University gives its consent in writing in advance to any variation.

3.2 If the Supervisor incurs any necessary travel expenses in relation to providing supervision services, these may be paid in addition to the fee provided this has been agreed in advance with the University through the relevant Director of Postgraduate Research.

3.3 Payment will be made at the end of each 6 month period, and is conditional on receipt of a satisfactory progress report on the Student, or on submission of the thesis. A satisfactory progress report will be one which is sufficiently detailed to give
the Research Institute’s Postgraduate Committee a realistic picture of the progress of
the student during the period covered by the report.

3.4 The Supervisor should submit an invoice, and the payment (fee and any expenses)
will be authorised by the Director of Postgraduate Research in the relevant Research
Institute, to be charged to the Research Institute.

4 Contractual status

4.1 It is the intention of the parties that the Supervisor shall be self-employed and that
nothing in this Agreement shall give rise to a contract of employment between the
parties. During the period of the Agreement the Supervisor may accept and perform
engagements from other organisations which do not impinge upon his or her ability to
provide the supervision services as required by the University.

4.2 The Supervisor bears sole responsibility for the payment of any tax and National
Insurance contributions due with respect to payments made under this Agreement.
Nevertheless, the Supervisor agrees to provide the University Finance Department
with his or her National Insurance number, so that the University can fulfil its
obligations with respect to completing annual returns.

4.3 The construction, performance and validity of this Agreement will be governed by the
laws of England and the parties agree to submit to the jurisdiction of the English
courts.

I agree to the terms and conditions set out in this Agreement and the attached
Schedule.

Signed  ______________________________________ Date _________
(The Supervisor)

Signed  ______________________________________ Date _________
(Director of Postgraduate Research for Research Institute)

Signed  ______________________________________ Date _________
(Head of Human Resources Department)
On behalf of Keele University

Cc: Director of Postgraduate Research, Research Institute for
Director of Research Institute
SCHEDULE TO AGREEMENT FOR SUPERVISION SERVICES

RESEARCH INSTITUTE

SUPERVISOR

STUDENT (reg no)

DIRECTOR OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH

EFFECTIVE DATE

1 Details of student registration

   Degree programme
   Initial registration date
   Mode of attendance

   Final date for submission (university maximum)
   Final date for submission (departmental requirements)

   Sponsorship (if any)

2 Tasks still to be completed by the Student prior to thesis submission, as at the Effective Date:

3 For the purposes of this specific Agreement, the following additions or modifications to the general requirements set out in 2.3 of the Agreement will apply:

4 The University, the Student and the Director of Postgraduate Research may contact the Supervisor through any of the following routes:

   Address:
   Telephone:
   Fax:
   Email:

5 Student contact details held on the University records system as at the Effective Date are as follows:

   Address:
   Telephone:
   Fax:
   Email:
Annex B13: Guidance on research degrees by published works - PhD

The University may award research degrees by published work to individuals who have demonstrated a sustained record of academic publication.

Please note that a student registered on a Keele PhD by Research or Professional Doctorate at Keele shall not be allowed to transfer to the research degree by published works.

The degrees to which a candidate may proceed under this Regulation are those of PhD (Doctor of Philosophy).

1 Standards Of Award

1.1 Candidates for the degree of PhD by publication shall be required to meet the same standards of award as candidates for the PhD by supervision (See Regulation 2D and Code of Practice Annex A1). The latest version of the Regulations is available on the University website and the Code of Practice is always available on the Postgraduate Research webpages.

1.2 The PhD by publication award is based on the submission of a critical overview and portfolio of evidence containing peer reviewed published work and other outputs.

2 Eligibility

2.1 In order to be eligible to submit for a degree by published work, a candidate must fulfil at least one of the following criteria:

- be a graduate of this University of at least six years standing
- hold a Masters Degree of this University of at least five years standing
- be a graduate of any other University approved for this purpose of at least six years standing and have been a full-time member of the academic staff of this University for at least three years
- be any other person associated with the work of the University whose qualifications are deemed by the Research Degrees Committee, on behalf of Senate, to be acceptable.

The University will normally only consider applications in relation to subjects for which it currently offers supervision for a research degree and where appropriate supervision is available.

3 Application Procedure (Primae Facie Case)

3.1 To apply for a PhD by Published Works a candidate must, in the first instance, submit the following to the Director of Planning and Academic Administration:

- a statement of the intended award
- a critical commentary, including a précis of the work to be submitted and a justification for the award, not exceeding 500 words
- their c.v. including a full list of publications
- a proposed title.
3.2 A student registered on a Keele PhD by research or Professional Doctorate programme at Keele shall not be allowed to transfer to the research degree by published works.

3.3 The Director of Planning and Academic Administration will consult with the appropriate Research Institute to confirm that there is a *prima facie* case that the application is appropriate and that appropriate supervision is available prior to arranging for the Research Degrees Committee to consider the application. The Research Degrees Committee may take additional advice from within the University or externally.

3.4 If the Research Degrees Committee determines that a *prima facie* case exists, the candidate will be required to make a submission within six calendar months of the notification of the decision of Research Degrees Committee.

3.5 There will be two external examiners for a PhD by Publication. The title and examiners will be approved following the same procedures as for PhDs by supervision and can be found in the Code of Practice.

4 **Supervision**

4.1 Candidates for a PhD by Published Work will be provided with an appropriate supervisor by the Research Institute Committee. The supervisor will normally be an approved supervisor, preferably of mentor status.

4.2 The supervisor will:

j) Guide the candidate in the selection of publications for inclusion in the submission

k) Guide the candidate as to whether further submissions are needed

l) Support and advise on the critical commentary

m) Provide guidance on the body of work to be submitted.

5 **Submission**

5.1 The candidate must submit to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) three copies of a portfolio which shall include the following:

n) a title page setting out the candidate's name, approved title and award for which the submission is made

o) details of the candidate's qualifications

p) a critical commentary on the submission which comprises a review of the contribution the work makes to the academic field in question (not exceeding 10,000 words)

q) a list of the publications submitted in the order published

r) copies of all the relevant published material, appropriately ordered

s) a full statement on the extent of the contributions to all papers is required where there are multiple authors (where an academic is submitting work undertaken by a student particular attention must be paid to the students' element).

5.2 Guidance on what may be submitted:-

t) Papers in peer reviewed journals

u) Books, or chapters in books

v) Patents

w) Monographs

x) Other published work
y) The publications should normally have been published no more than 10 years prior to the first date of student registration

z) Work “in press” can be considered as published where there is a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) or publishing contract

aa) Outputs to be included must not have been used in the submission for another higher research degree at this or any other University

bb) Electronic publications may be submitted but only with evidence that they will be publicly available for the foreseeable future in the current form and that they are of the appropriate quality for submission. Web links for the journal publishing the paper should be included in the critical commentary to ensure copyright requirements are covered

cc) The number of publications will depend on the academic discipline and type of publication, but the submission should normally comprise at least ten publications.

5.3 The critical commentary, which must be submitted with the publications should demonstrate the coherence of and rationale for the submitted work. It should be no longer than 10,000 words excluding the submitted works. As a minimum it should contain the following:

dd) Autobiographical context for the portfolio of evidence

ee) Chronological description of the submission and the development of the work

ff) An evaluative description of the originality of each output

gg) Demonstration of the original and independent contribution to knowledge and a rationale to prove that the work submitted equates to PhD standard

hh) A critical review of the overall contribution to the research area which has been made by the body of work submitted for examination. This could include any published reviews of the submitted work

ii) A critical reflection on the candidate’s development as a researcher

jj) Conclusions and suggestions for future work.

5.4 The contents of the submission must be in the English language unless specific permission to the contrary has been granted by Research Degrees Committee.

5.5 The submission must be accompanied by the relevant examination fee (available on the Postgraduate Research webpages). The copies should be bound in comb binding where possible.

6 Examination

6.1 The examiners will examine the work submitted; write independent reports following the guidance in the Code of Practice, and a further joint report agreeing their recommendation to Research Degrees Committee. They will make a recommendation to Research Degrees Committee who, after consideration, shall make a recommendation to Senate.

6.2 An oral examination is required for all submissions.

6.3 Arrangements for the oral examination are made in the same way for a PhD by supervision.

6.4 Recommendations available to examiners of research degrees are:

i) the student be awarded the degree for which he/she has made a submission; or

m) the student be awarded the degree for which he/she has made a submission once revisions to the critical commentary have been made to the satisfaction of the examiner(s); or
h) the student should be not awarded any degree nor be permitted to re-present
the thesis, nor submit to any further examination.
n) the examiners are unable to come to a joint recommendation and an additional
examiner or examiners should be appointed whose decision shall resolve the
matter.

6.5 Research Degrees Committee will communicate the outcome of the examination
process to the candidate and any subsequent instructions prior to approval at Senate.

7 Appeals

7.1 Appeals can only be made following the outcome of the award and will follow the
procedures laid out in Regulation 7.

8 Academic Misconduct

8.1 Any allegation of academic misconduct shall be dealt with in accordance with the
following procedures. Academic misconduct is most likely to be, but is not
exclusively, collusion, where a piece of work is prepared by more than one student,
including work deriving from a piece of authorised collaborative group-work, and is
presented in whole or in part for assessment as if it were the student's own work.

8.2 Any such investigation shall be carried out by a panel consisting of a senior member
of the academic staff nominated by the Vice-Chancellor as chair, the Dean or his/her
nominee from the Faculty in which the alleged offence has taken place and one other
Dean or his/her nominee. If the alleged offence has taken place in the Dean's
department, then the Dean shall nominate a senior member of the academic staff
from another department in that Faculty to act on his/her behalf.
Annex B14: Guidance on research degrees by published work - higher doctorates DLitt, LLD or DSc

The University may award research degrees by published work to individuals who have demonstrated a record of academic publication and achieved a reputation for academic excellence in their field.

The degrees to which a candidate may proceed under this Regulation are those of Doctor of Letters (DLitt), Doctor of Laws (LLD) and Doctor of Science (DSc).

1 Standards Of Award

1.1 Candidates for a higher doctorate (DLitt, LLD, DSc) shall be required to meet a standard substantially higher than that expected for a PhD. The work submitted should represent a significant, substantial, original and long-term contribution over a sustained period to the development of knowledge within a discipline, demonstrating international recognised excellence and that the candidate is a recognised authority in the relevant field of study.

2 Eligibility

2.1 In order to be eligible to submit for a degree by published work, a candidate must fulfil at least one of the following criteria:
   a) be a graduate of this University of at least nine years standing
   b) hold a Masters Degree of this University of at least eight years standing
   c) hold a Doctoral Degree of this University of at least six years standing
   d) be a graduate of any other University approved for this purpose of at least nine years standing and have been a full-time member of the academic staff of this University for at least three years
   e) be any other person associated with the work of the University whose qualifications are deemed by the Senate to be acceptable.

3 Application Procedure

3.1 In the first instance the candidate should submit the following to the Director of Planning and Academic Administration:
   • a statement of the award intended
   • a précis of the work to be submitted, not exceeding 1000 words explaining the relevance of the works to the advancement of knowledge in the research area
   • a summary list of publications
   • a proposed title.

3.2 The Director of Planning and Academic Administration will consult with the appropriate Research Institute to confirm that there is a prima facie case that the application is appropriate prior to arranging for Research Degrees Committee to consider the application. The Research Degrees Committee may take additional advice from within the University or externally.

3.3 If the Research Degrees Committee determines that a prima facie case exists, the candidate will be required to make a submission within six calendar months of the decision of Research Degrees Committee.
3.4 The approved title will be confirmed, and the Senate will appoint two external examiners and an Independent Chair on the recommendation of the Committee. The candidate will be required to nominate at least six external examiners to their Research Institute Committee who will propose two of these examiners to Research Degrees Committee along with an internal Independent Chair. The candidate is required to declare all links with the examiners they nominate. Research Degrees Committee reserves the right to consult the candidate.

4 Submission

4.1 The candidate must submit to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) Office three copies of a portfolio which shall include the following:
- a title page setting out the candidate's name, approved title of the submission, and award for which the submission is made
- details of the candidate’s qualifications
- a critical commentary on the submission which comprises a review of the contribution the work makes to the academic field in question (not exceeding 10,000 words)
- a list of the publications submitted in the order submitted
- copies of all the relevant published material, appropriately ordered
- a full statement on the extent of the contributions to all papers is required where there are multiple authors (where an academic is submitting work undertaken by a student particular attention must be paid to the students’ element).

4.2 Guidance on what may be submitted:
- Papers in peer reviewed journals
- Books, or chapters in books
- Patents
- Monographs
- Other published work
- Work “in press” can be considered as published where there is a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) or publishing contract
- Electronic publications may be submitted but only with evidence that they will be publicly available for the foreseeable future in the current form and that they are of the appropriate quality for submission. Web links for the journal publishing the paper should be included in the critical commentary to ensure copyright requirements are covered.
- The number of outputs will depend on the academic discipline and type of publication.

4.3 The critical commentary which must be submitted with the publications should demonstrate the coherence of and rationale for the submitted work. It should be no longer than 10,000 words excluding the submitted works. As a minimum it should contain the following:
- Autobiographical context for the portfolio of evidence.
- Chronological description of the submission and the development of the work
- An evaluative description of the originality of each output.
- Demonstration of the original and independent contribution to knowledge and a rationale to prove that the work submitted equates to the standard of a higher doctorate
- A critical review of the overall contribution to the research area.
4.4 The submission must be accompanied by the relevant examination fee.

5 Examination

5.1 The examiners will examine the work submitted, write independent reports, and may conduct an oral examination, in a way similar to research degrees by supervision. They will make a recommendation to Research Degrees Committee who, after consideration, shall make a recommendation to Senate.

5.2 The requirement for an oral examination will be at the discretion of the examiners with a presumption against for a higher doctorate submission. Examiners will be required to make their decision on whether or not to viva clear in their initial reports.

5.3 The examiners will be required to write independent reports evaluating the work submitted and to subsequently provide a joint recommendation which will be considered by Research Degrees Committee.

5.4 Recommendations available to examiners of research degrees are

1. the candidate be awarded the degree for which he/she has made a submission; or
2. the candidate be awarded the degree for which he/she has made a submission once revisions to the critical commentary have been made to the satisfaction of the examiner(s); or
6. the candidate should be not awarded any degree nor be permitted to re-present the thesis, nor submit to any further examination.
7. the examiners are unable to come to a joint recommendation and an additional examiner or examiners should be appointed whose decision shall resolve the matter.

5.5 Research Degrees Committee will communicate the outcome of the examination process to the candidate.

6 Appeals

6.1 Appeals can only be made following the outcome of the award and will follow the procedures laid out in Regulation 7.

7 Academic Misconduct

7.1 Any allegation of academic misconduct shall be dealt with in accordance with the following procedures. Academic misconduct is most likely to be, but is not exclusively, collusion, where a piece of work is prepared by more than one student, including work deriving from a piece of authorised collaborative group-work, and is presented in whole or in part for assessment as if it were the student’s own work.

7.2 Any such investigation shall be carried out by a panel consisting of a senior member of the academic staff nominated by the Vice-Chancellor as chair, the Dean or his/her nominee from the Faculty in which the alleged offence has taken place and one other Dean or his/her nominee. If the alleged offence has taken place in the Dean's department, then the Dean shall nominate a senior member of the academic staff from another department in that Faculty to act on his/her behalf.
Annex B15: Joint PhD Programmes with External Partners

1 Background

1.1 This annex covers the generic elements which must be addressed and included in the development and implementation of collaborative PhD programmes with external partners.

1.2 While those engaged in the development of joint PhD programmes will be responsible for the initial proposals, the final proposal must be prepared in conjunction with the Research and Enterprise office and must include all aspects of a legal agreement with a partner such as dispute resolution, indemnity, intellectual property rights and other contractual issues. The agreement must be signed on behalf of Keele by the Secretary and Registrar.

1.3 While a range of different partnerships models are possible, this Annex is focused solely on partnership programmes which lead to a Keele degree.

2 Joint PhD programmes

2.1 Where students in a partnership are expecting to receive a Keele degree then they must be:

- Subject to the Keele Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Degrees (COP) except for the variations set out in this Annex
- Subject to a legally binding agreement with the partner institution.

2.2 The following areas, where there is likely to be variation from the COP, must be covered in any agreement with the partner institution:

- Admissions – admissions standards and eligibility shall be in accordance with Keele’s admission’s policy, including English language requirements, which may vary according to subject area
- Enrolment and induction – it is recognised that where students are based abroad they may not be able to attend induction at Keele. Specific arrangements must be put in place to ensure that the same level and quality of induction takes place at the partner institution
- Supervisory arrangements – as a minimum Keele should provide the lead or second supervisor. Keele would also formally approve supervisors assigned by partner institutions using normal procedures set out in Annex B6
- Contact with student – the collaboration agreement should state the minimum number of contacts between the Keele supervisor and the student. While regular contact may be by e-mail, telephone or video conference, face-to-face meetings will normally be required at least once a year. The responsibility for providing funding associated with these meetings must be specified (see below). The Keele supervisor must keep records of all contact and communications with the student and supervisor at the partner institution. The student must keep records in the Personal Development and Learning plan of all such contact and communication (see COP section 3.3.2 and Annex B2)
- The nature and extent of visits, in either direction, for face-to-face meetings between the student and a supervisor or for research on the project, must be specified along with the source and extent of funding (travel, accommodation, project costs etc) required for these visits
• Research training – research training needs and the organisational units at Keele or the partner institution which would deliver the training must be identified in advance. For students based in the partner academic institution, the training requirements in the COP will need to be addressed, and any variance agreed, in advance. Options available include remote completion or exemption for equivalent training.

• Progress monitoring – all PGRs studying for a Keele degree will follow the progress monitoring arrangements set out in the COP section 3.5. The Keele supervisor must work with the supervisor at the partner institution to ensure that all progress report forms are complete.

• Academic facilities and resources – where the student is based at Keele, even for part of the duration of their study, they should expect to be supported as any other Keele PGR as set out in the COP section 2.1. For students based in the partner institution academic facilities and resources need to be separately identified in the agreement and should be equivalent to the support provided at Keele. Jointly supervised students, regardless of location, would be registered at Keele and should have a Keele email account.

• Examination – Given that Keele is the awarding body, jointly supervised PhD students will be subject to the Keele examinations process as set out in the COP section 4.2 and Annex B7. Where students are based abroad the oral examination may take place in the partner institution or at Keele. In exceptional circumstances the viva could be via video conference (but not telephone).

• Fees – specific fee levels may be set for students on a joint programme and these should be set out in the agreement. The sharing of the fee income and other costs should also be specified in the agreement and should reflect the balance of input of resources from each partner.
Annex C: Forms for PGR students
(all forms are available from the Postgraduate Research webpages)

Annex C1: Submission of thesis for a research degree
Annex C2: Approval of supervisors and mentors
Annex C3: Approval of examiners and chair for a research degree
Annex C4: Doctoral progression
Annex C5: Pre-submission review
Annex C6: Progression to continuation mode of attendance
Annex C7: Application for leave of absence
Annex C8: Appeals from research degree students
Annex C9: Progression report form (supervisors and students) pro-formas
Annex C10: Personal Development and Learning pro-forma
Annex C11: Resubmission report
Annex D1: Guidance on avoidance of plagiarism and academic dishonesty

This Annex gives some guidance on how to avoid academic dishonesty (particularly plagiarism, falsification of results and collusion), and identifies the regulations which are applied in suspected cases of academic dishonesty.

Declaration and academic dishonesty

1 When submitting a thesis (or approved alternative) for examination for a higher degree, students are required to sign a two-part Declaration (see 1.6.4 and Annexes B1 & C1 of the Code of Practice). The Part 1 Declaration includes a commitment to having undertaken research in an ethical and appropriate manner.

2 Examiners are required to confirm, as part of the examination process, that they are satisfied as far as possible that the Part 1 Declaration made by the student is true.

3 It is the students’ responsibility from the outset of their research programmes to ensure that they fully understand the implications of the Declarations for the conduct of their research and for the way in which they write it up in the thesis presented for examination.

4 Academic dishonesty includes plagiarism, falsification of research results, collusion, cheating in examinations, and any other action by the student which gives a false impression (intentionally or unintentionally) to an examiner or assessor that what is put forward for examination or assessment is the student’s own work.

Plagiarism

5 In the course of their research, research students will inevitably draw on a wide range of previously published material, of which some will directly inform and influence their own lines of enquiry. It is important that reference to other people’s work is acknowledged properly while the student’s own research should be related to it carefully and unambiguously. Sources of information should always be acknowledged, both by a footnote and in the bibliography/reference section.

6 This account of plagiarism is adapted from the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, ed by Joseph Gibaldi and Walter S Achtert, 2nd edn (New York: MLA, 1984). The following paragraphs are largely quotations from this source.

Please note that the illustrations given are from literary criticism and anthropology but the issues are the same in all disciplines. In mathematics and science, for example, the unacknowledged usage of data constitutes plagiarism even if it is adapted in presentation. If in doubt, students must check with their supervisors.

7 TO PLAGIARISE IS TO GIVE THE IMPRESSION THAT YOU HAVE WRITTEN OR THOUGHT SOMETHING THAT YOU HAVE IN FACT BORROWED FROM SOMEONE ELSE. Plagiarism is the act of using another person's ideas or expressions in your writing without acknowledging the source. The word comes from the Latin word plagarius ('kidnapper'), and Alexander Lindey defines it as 'the false assumption of authorship: the wrongful act of taking the product of another person's mind, and presenting it as one's own' (Plagiarism and Originality [New York: Harper, 1952] 2).
Plagiarism in student writing is often unintentional, as when a school pupil, assigned to do a report on a certain topic, goes home and copies down, word for word, everything on the subject in an encyclopaedia. Unfortunately, some students continue to use such 'research methods' without realising that these practices constitute plagiarism. Students may certainly use other persons' words and thoughts in their essays or research papers, but they must acknowledge the authors.

The most blatant form of plagiarism is to repeat as your own someone else's sentences, more or less verbatim. Suppose, for example, that you want to use the material in the following passage, which appears on page 906 in volume 1 of the Literary History of the United States:

"The major concerns of Dickinson's poetry early and late, her 'flood subjects', may be defined as the seasons and nature, death and a problematic afterlife, the kinds and phases of love, and poetry as the divine art."

If you write the following without any documentation, you have committed plagiarism:

The chief subjects of Emily Dickinson's poetry include nature and the seasons, death and the afterlife, the various types and stages of love, and poetry itself as a divine art.

You may present the information if you credit the authors:

Gibson and Williams suggest that the chief subjects of Emily Dickinson's poetry include nature, death, love and poetry as a divine art (1974, 1, 906)

The sentence and the parenthetical documentation at the end indicate the source, since the authors' names and the volume and page numbers refer the reader to the corresponding entry in the bibliography:


Other forms of plagiarism include repeating someone else's particularly apt phrase without appropriate acknowledgment, paraphrasing another person's argument as your own, and presenting another's line of thinking in the development of an idea as though it were your own. Two more examples follow:

Original source

This, of course, raises the central question of this paper: What should we be doing? Research and training in the whole field of restructuring the world as an 'ecotopia' (eco, from oikos, household; - topon from topos, place, with implication of 'eutopia' - 'good place') will presumably be the goal. (From E.N. Anderson, Jnr., 'The Life and Culture of Ecotopia' in Reinventing Anthropology, ed. by Dell Hymes, New York: Vintage-Random, 1974, 275.)

Plagiarised in student writing

At this point in time humankind should be attempting to create what we might call an 'ecotopia'.
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Here, the writer borrowed a specific term (‘ecotopia’) without acknowledgment. Plagiarism could be avoided by rewording slightly and inserting appropriate parenthetical documentation.

At this point in time humankind should be attempting to create what E.N. Anderson, Jnr (1974) has called an ‘ecotopia’ (275).

As before, the sentence and the parenthetical documentation in each revision identify the source of the borrowed material and refer the reader to the full description of the work in the bibliography at the end of the paper.


11 If you have any doubt about whether or not you are committing plagiarism, cite your source or sources.

12 In addition to correctly attributing extracts or ideas of previously published work to the author(s) students must also ensure that their own personal share in any investigation is clearly stated, where any collaboration has taken place between the student and their supervisor or another person.

13 Plagiarism may also take place when one student copies work from another student, without the knowledge of that student. In this case both students may be suspected of academic dishonesty and be subject to a disciplinary investigation.

14 Care should be taken to present all data in such a manner that allows no room for doubt as to the authorship of the research.

Falsification of results

15 Researchers may be tempted to falsify the outcomes or results of research if experiments or surveys or other research methods produce data which do not confirm the researcher’s expectations or hopes. Such falsification of results is dishonest.

16 Research needs to be reproducible, by the same or other researchers, to gain validity, and research students may need to repeat their research activity several times in order to be confident in the results they have obtained. It is crucial that the research design is appropriate from the start if results are to be valid.

17 Data collected through research needs to be recorded accurately. Researchers must use appropriate forms of analysis to identify patterns and correlations, and then seek explanations for what has actually been found, not for what they wish had been found. There may be creativity and insight about the implications of the results, but not about the core data nor about the analysis of that data.

Collusion

18 Collusion is also a form of academic dishonesty. This is similar to plagiarism, but involves two or more students working together, without the prior authorisation of the supervisor, to produce the same piece of work, and then attempting to present this work individually as entirely their own work. Any suspected cases of collusion will be subject to the regulation governing academic misconduct.
Regulatory framework

19 Ordinance IV (6) states that A student found to have cheated in degree assessments/examinations (including those for research degrees) may by decision of the Vice-Chancellor be denied a degree and be denied the right to be re-examined/re-assessed. The student will also be liable to other action by the Vice Chancellor.

20 Any allegation or suspicion (by the examiners or the University) of academic dishonesty in relation to examined or assessed work will be investigated under procedures set out in Regulation 8 (12) relating to cheating and other misconduct in examinations. The investigation and subsequent procedures will in general follow the normal disciplinary procedures (see Regulation 20).
Annex D2: Normal expectations of research institute facilities and resources for research students

The level of resources available to research students at any time will depend upon their mode of attendance (see Annex A3). For guidance, the following resources should be available within all Research Institutes, though there may be minor variations depending on the needs of specific disciplines. Research Institute Handbooks will set out full details for each RI.

**Full-time**
- supervision as set out in Research Institute Handbooks and agreed between student and supervisor – an initial rule of thumb should be regular meetings (somewhere between weekly and monthly), with perhaps an uninterrupted hour made available on each occasion, even if the full time does not always need to be used
- office space, cabinet or bookshelf, desk and chair
- access to PC with Internet connection and necessary software
- access to shared printer
- reasonable access to telephone for internal and external calls (not overseas)
- reasonable use of stationery, postage and fax costs towards inter-library loans and photocopying (see RI Handbook for more detail)
- ability to bid for funds for research travel and conferences.

**Part-time**
- same facilities as for full-time, but level of supervision, access and provision to be negotiated with students to meet their needs and to reflect the reduced annual time commitment.

**Continuation**
- minimal supervision, primarily related to reading and commenting on draft thesis chapters
- access to the library and other facilities
- use of computing facilities in the Research Institute.

**Leave of absence**
- Students on leave of absence are not entitled to any access to facilities, resources or supervision.
Annex D3: Roles and responsibilities of students and supervisors

Chapter B11: Research degrees of the QAA Quality Code (referred to below) can be referenced at www.qaa.ac.uk. It was published in 2012 and replaced Section 1: Postgraduate research programmes (2004) from the Code of Practice. The Chapter represents the broadly shared view of those responsible for research degrees about the systems, policies and procedures that are conducive to an excellent experience for research students and that support higher education providers in maintaining academic standards for research degrees.

This Annex gives some additional guidance for students and supervisors. Research Institute Handbooks should set out any disciplinary differences or more precise guidelines.

Students

1. Written work should be well-presented, and given to supervisors for comment in a timely fashion. Work should be of an appropriate standard for the degree, and any concerns expressed by the supervisor or by the Postgraduate Committee should be taken seriously and acted upon.

2. Where the student experiences any problems, it is the student’s responsibility to make these known, to the supervisor in the first place, or following Research Institute procedures. If issues are not raised at the time, they cannot be used later as grounds for formal appeal.

3. More specifically, students are expected to
   - discuss with their supervisor the type of guidance and comment they find most helpful, and agree a schedule of meetings
   - take the initiative in raising problems or difficulties, however elementary they may seem
   - maintain the progress of work in accordance with the stages agreed with the supervisor, including in particular the presentation of material as required in sufficient time to allow for comments and discussion before proceeding to the next stage
   - request written feedback from supervisors, particularly where supervisors express concern with the student’s standard of work
   - provide reports as required for consideration by the Postgraduate Committee
   - decide when they wish to submit in accordance with the Regulations, taking informed advice as appropriate.

4. Students must on no account communicate directly with the appointed examiners of the thesis on any matters related to its content or the assessment process. This includes any matters relating to revisions to the thesis. If it is felt that communication with one or more examiners is needed, the student should contact the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities).

5. Indicator 7 of Chapter B11 of the Quality Code relates to the entitlements and responsibilities of research students, includes the following guidance, which all students should follow.

   - Institutions should assure themselves that students are made aware of their responsibilities at the beginning of their programme. Students’
responsibilities normally include: their own personal and professional development, including, where possible, recognising when they need help and seeking it in a timely manner

- maintaining regular contact with supervisors (joint responsibility with supervisors)
- preparing adequately for meetings with supervisors
- setting and keeping to timetables and deadlines, including planning and submitting work as and when required and generally maintaining satisfactory progress with the programme of research
- maintaining research records in such a way that they can be accessed and understood by anyone with a legitimate need to see them raising awareness of any specific needs or circumstances likely to affect their work
- attending any development opportunities (research-related and other) that have been identified when agreeing their development needs with their supervisors
- being familiar with institutional regulations and policies that affect them, including those relating to their award, health and safety, intellectual property, electronic repositories and ethical research guidelines.

Supervisors and supervisory teams

6 The role of the supervisory team will include:

- giving guidance about the nature of research and the standard expected, about the planning of the research programme, about literature and sources, attendance at taught classes, about requisite techniques (including arranging for instruction where necessary), and about the problem of plagiarism
- ensuring they are aware of any external codes of practice or guidance in relation to research ethics and governance applicable to their fields of research supervision, complying with such codes as appropriate, and ensuring students are aware of and comply with such codes as appropriate
- maintaining contact through regular tutorial and seminar meetings, in accordance with Research Institute policy and in the light of discussion of arrangements with the student and agreements set out in the Personal Development and Learning Plan
- being accessible to the student at other appropriate times when he or she may need advice
- giving detailed advice on the necessary completion dates of successive stages of the work so that the whole may be submitted within the scheduled time
- giving advice to the student on whether areas of their work could be commercially sensitive and so require a confidentiality disclosure agreement (CDA) or embargo on publishing
- requiring written work as appropriate, and returning such work with constructive criticism in writing and in reasonable time
- arranging as appropriate for the student to talk about their work to staff at graduate seminars
- ensuring that the student is made aware of inadequacy of progress or of standards of work below that expected – all such comments and feedback must be made in writing to the student.

7 Monitoring student work and training and academic progress will normally be exercised through such activities as regular meetings with students, recording key points agreed, written feedback on progress in general and on drafts of thesis chapters, and regular progress reports monitored by the Postgraduate Committee,
including drawing to the attention of the Research Institute in a timely fashion any issues affecting satisfactory progress of the student.

8 A clear understanding between supervisor and student needs to be established at an early stage about the supervisor’s responsibility in relation to the student’s written submission, and this may change as the project develops and is subject to continued negotiation. The understanding must cover the nature of guidance or comment the supervisor will offer, and the proportion of the final submission the supervisor will read (perhaps the whole), within the general principle that a thesis must be the student’s own work.

9 Indicator 11 of Chapter B11 of the Quality Code, which relates to the responsibilities of supervisors, includes the following guidance, which all supervisors should follow.

It is important that supervisor(s) and student are fully aware of the extent of one another’s responsibilities, to enable both to understand the supervisor’s contribution to supporting the student and where the supervisor’s responsibilities end.

Depending on institutional, sponsor(s) and research council guidance, supervisory responsibilities may include:

- introducing the research student to the department (or equivalent), its facilities and procedures, and to other research students and relevant staff
- providing satisfactory guidance and advice monitoring the progress of the student’s research programme
- establishing and maintaining regular contact with the student (guided by the institute’s stated regulations and guidance) being accessible to the research student to give advice (by whatever means is most suitable given the student’s location and mode of study) contributing to the assessment of a student’s development needs
- providing timely, constructive and effective feedback on the student’s work, including his/her overall progress within the programme
- ensuring that the student is aware of the need to exercise probity and conduct his/her research according to ethical principles, including intellectual property rights, and of the implications of research misconduct
- ensuring that the research student is aware of sources of advice, including careers guidance
- helping research students understand health and safety responsibilities
- providing effective pastoral support and/or referring the student to other sources of such support, including Student Support and Development Services staff and others within the student’s academic community
- helping the student to interact with others working in the field of research, for example, encouraging the student to attend relevant conferences, supporting him/her in seeking funding for such events; and where appropriate to submit conference papers and articles to refereed journals
- where appropriate, giving encouragement and guidance to the research student on the submission of conference papers and articles to refereed journals
- maintaining the necessary supervisory expertise, including the appropriate skills, to perform all of the role satisfactorily, supported by relevant continuing professional development opportunities.
Annex D4: Preparation and presentation of a research thesis

This Annex sets out guidance for students about the nature of a thesis, its normal structure and content, and the formalities of presenting the thesis in terms both of format and process. There are clearly differences between disciplines in terms of the emphasis placed on different aspects of a thesis, and you should seek additional advice from your Research Institute, but there are some common points which you should take into account. In particular you should note that the following sections are requirements for all students:

- format for presentation of a thesis
- submitting your thesis for examination
- after examination
- lodging the thesis in the library and copyright issues.

WRITING THE THESIS SHOULD START VERY EARLY ON IN YOUR RESEARCH DEGREE PROGRAMME. IT IS NOT SOMETHING TO BE LEFT UNTIL THE END.

Purpose of a thesis

1. First and foremost, the thesis is the document which forms your examination submission. It is on this basis that examiners will determine whether you have fulfilled the criteria for the award (see Annex A1). Therefore from the outset you should ensure that you are familiar with the relevant award criteria, and when writing your thesis aim to demonstrate that you have fulfilled them.

2. The thesis is also a description of your research project, its definition, purpose, methods, results and conclusions. It needs to be a self-contained work which places your project in context and then sets out in a coherent and logical way how and why you pursued the project in the way you did, what new results or data were obtained, or how you developed your arguments and theories, and what conclusions you draw from them. Examiners will look carefully at the methods you have used and whether they are appropriate to the project. If you have published work from your thesis prior to submission of the thesis you can include some of the same text in the thesis provided the thesis as a whole is a self-contained and coherent work. The publication should be referenced.

3. The thesis (particularly for a doctoral award) should provide evidence of originality. Originality may be in terms of a previously unexplored field or topic (or aspect), or may consist in a re-analysis of previous findings or a new interpretation of events. You will need to demonstrate independent critical thought. If you have collaborated with anyone else on aspects of your research your own original contribution needs to be clearly identified. For example, if you have separately published some findings in a multi-authored publication prior to submission you will need to set out very clearly your own contribution.

4. You should also place your findings in the context of current research and debates, and suggest some implications, including identifying further research which may be useful.
Literature search and referencing

5 In most projects, at a very early stage you will need to conduct a literature search in order to discover what has already been written about your topic, so that you can take previous findings into account in your own work and not duplicate work already done.

6 From the outset you will need to determine which system you intend to use to keep a note of your reading. This will need to be in a form which you can access readily when you wish to reference an item in your thesis, or compile your bibliography. There are different views about whether you need both a list of references and a bibliography – some people advocate just a list of references since this should incorporate all relevant items. Ask your Research Institute for guidance.

7 The University has a site licence for bibliographic software - Refworks. Refworks is one of the bibliographic services bought by the University Library, who also provide training and support. Further information is available from the Library website. You are strongly advised to use Refworks to routinely store details of all publications referred to during the course of your research.

8 It is essential that in writing your thesis you have a consistent format for referencing. There are various different systems available, and your Research Institute will advise you about what is most appropriate or usual in your discipline. However, different journals also require different referencing styles. One of the advantages of using bibliographic software is that you can produce bibliographies and references in a number of different styles, at the click of the mouse. This will help you greatly, therefore, to have consistent referencing in any document, in a style of your choice.

Structure of a thesis

9 There will be variations between disciplines. However, as a guide, a typical thesis would have the following structure:

Preliminary pages
- Title page
- Student declaration Part 1 (bound into the thesis)
- Abstract (not exceeding 300 words in accordance with section 8.3.4 of Regulation 2D)
- Contents page (which can often be generated automatically if set up in word processing software)
- List of tables and figures (if appropriate)
- Acknowledgements.

Principal chapters
- Articulate the research question or topic, and why it is important or interesting
- Give background about other research in the field, largely as the result of your literature search
- Set out how you approached the research and justify your choice of research method
- Describe the research process
- Give your results, or line of argument, as clearly as possible – some detailed aspects may be in annexes
- Set out your conclusions – this will be one of the most important chapters, the kernel of what you set out to explore, the evidence of your originality
• Summary of the whole thesis, implications and suggestions for further research.

Annexes

• References (sometimes these come after the final chapter rather than in an Annex) – this will be a consolidated list which doubles as the bibliography
• Bibliography (some Research Institutes may advise having this as well as the list of references, though it will normally be redundant)
• Detailed tables of results
• Questionnaires used
• Where relevant, a letter from the approving body confirming that ethical approval has been given should be bound in the thesis as an Annex
• Any other detail which would interrupt the flow of your argument if included in the main text
• If not too long, you could bind in a copy of any paper published arising from the research, but often this would be repetitive and more normally the paper would just be referenced.

10 All chapters and sections should be clearly numbered and titled.

Examiners’ dislikes

11 You should be aware that examiners tend to dislike, or be irritated by, the following:
• Poor linkage between the research question, the methods used and the final results
• Carelessness
• Minor typing errors
• Inconsistency
• Incomplete references or bibliography
• Diagrams and tables incorrectly (or not) labelled.

Format for presentation of a thesis

[formal requirements which must be complied with]

12 All theses must be typewritten and printed clearly, using the following format:

Paper size A4 (210mm x 297mm), or the intended close equivalent used on some printers.

Font size Font for all text, including footnotes where used, should be no smaller than 10 point.

Spacing Double line spacing for main text including quotations, single line spacing for footnotes.

Margins 40mm left hand side, 15mm right hand side of each page.

Length Doctoral degrees maximum of 100,000 words, masters degrees maximum of 60,000 words. There are some variations. See Annex A1 for details. Thesis length includes footnotes but not references or appendices.
Pages Single sided only.

Numbering It is recommended that preliminary pages should bear roman numerals (i, ii, iii, etc). Principal pages must bear arabic numerals (1, 2, 3 etc)

Footnotes These may either be footnotes or endnotes, but if footnotes (which tend to be easier to read) they must appear on the same page as the textual number. If a numerical referencing system is used, references and footnotes must be distinguishable or combined.

Where possible maps, plans or diagrams forming part of the thesis must be of the same size, being reduced or enlarged to conform to A4.

13 If there are special reasons why a thesis should be submitted in a format other than the above, permission should be sought from the Research Degrees Committee (RDC) at least three months before submission, supported by a precise statement of what variation from the norm is proposed. The request must be supported by your Research Institute's Postgraduate Committee.

14 Thesis title

The title of the thesis must be approved by the Research Institute’s Postgraduate Committee before the Committee makes a recommendation to the Research Degrees Committee (RDC) about examiners for the thesis. It is recommended that this should take place about 3 months prior to expected submission date (see COP section 4.1.3).

Thesis titles should be no more than 20 words, and should be such as to make clear to readers the research field and topic of the thesis. In some information retrieval systems the title may be the only field searched, and you should include key words.

Titles may be divided into two halves, separated by a colon. In this case, the first half will tend to specify the topic, while the second half will tend to explain the approach taken. Except for an initial capital, the full title should be in lower case except where capitals are necessary (for example, generic and specific names of organisms, proper nouns, etc). Use italics for genus and species names, and foreign language words.

15 Title page

The title page is the first page of the thesis and must include the following details:

- Title of thesis (exactly as approved)
- Author’s name (without qualifications listed)
- Degree for which the thesis has been submitted
- Month and year (of thesis submission for soft bound (pre-examination) and month and year of Senate approval of the award for hard bound version lodged with library)
- Keele University.

16 Abstract

The page should be headed Abstract, followed by not more than 300 words describing the key features of the thesis. Many information retrieval systems will search abstracts rather than complete works, and you should include key words.
Note that Regulation 2D (10.3.4) specifies the requirement to include an abstract of no more than 300 words.

17 Declaration

When submitting your thesis you are required to sign a two-part Declaration. You should obtain this in advance from the Postgraduate Research webpages, complete and sign it (except date of submission) and bind Part 1 into your thesis and supply Part 2 loose along with your thesis.

Notes Part 1:
   i) You are required to state the number of words in the thesis on the Part 1 Declaration.
   j) You should be aware of the statements on the Part 1 Declaration form from the beginning of your research degree programme (see COP section 1.6.4 and Annexes B1 & C1) since they specify that you have conducted your research in an appropriate way. You need to ensure that this is indeed the case.

Note for Part 2:
   o) You should not rely on being able to get any signatures required for the document on the day you wish to submit and should therefore plan to have the document completed prior to submission.

The Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) will complete the date of submission on the original and each copy when you are ready to submit.

18 Acknowledgements

If the research degree is set within a broader programme of work involving a group of investigators – particularly if this programme of work predates the candidate’s registration – the candidate should provide an explicit statement (in an ‘Acknowledgments’ section) of the respective roles of the candidate and these other individuals in relevant aspects of the work reported in the thesis.

For example, it should make clear, where relevant, the candidate’s role in designing the study, developing data collection instruments, collecting primary data, analysing such data, and formulating conclusions from the analysis. Others involved in these aspects of the research should be named, and their contributions relative to that of the candidate should be specified (this would not apply to the ordinary supervision process, only if the supervisor or supervisory team has had greater-than-usual involvement).

19 Ethics

All research involving human participants, their tissues, or personal information must be approved by a recognised research ethics committee. This includes social science research (e.g. fieldwork-based, interview and questionnaire studies). Where relevant a letter from the approving body confirming that ethical approval has been given should be bound in the thesis as an Annex.

20 You should check the thesis carefully before presentation. Defects in style of presentation may lead to your thesis being refused for examination until they are rectified.
Submitting your thesis for examination
[formal requirements which must be complied with]

21 Normally three copies of the thesis will be required, one for each examiner and one (the top copy) for yourself. However, exceptionally, if there are more than two examiners an additional copy will be required. A copy of the thesis is not required for the Independent Chair.

22 Each copy should be bound in a secure plastic ring-binding (also known as comb-binding) between card covers. This service can be provided by the Student Union Print Shop. Alternatively, the thesis may be glue (heat) or clamp bound.

23 When you are ready to submit your thesis you should take your two (exceptionally three) copies of the thesis to the Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities), together with an extra copy of your Declaration forms. The thesis will be accepted only if the title is exactly the same as the final title approved by your Research Institute's Postgraduate Committee.

24 The Quality Assurance Officer (with responsibility for PGR activities) will insert the date of submission on your Declaration forms and will give you a receipt for your thesis copies. Copies of the declaration forms will also be sent to your Lead Supervisor and Director of Postgraduate Research, as confirmation that you have submitted your thesis.

After examination
[formal requirements which must be complied with]

25 There are various possible outcomes from the examination process. See Annex A2 for details. The actions you need to take with respect to your thesis will depend on the outcome of the examination.

26 Minor revisions

The most common outcome from the examination process is that students may be awarded the degree subject to the completion of minor revisions (Recommendation 2). These revisions must be completed and submitted to the Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students within the three month period allowed. Exceptionally, students are allowed longer than three months, up to a maximum of six months, to complete minor revisions.

The top copy of the thesis must have the revisions made to it, substituting pages as necessary. The Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students will communicate the revisions to the relevant examiner(s). The changes should not be submitted direct to the examiner(s) by the student. If the examiners agree, it may be possible to submit the revisions to the examiner in an electronic (pdf) format.

Those examiner(s) who are required to certify that the revisions have been made to their satisfaction must complete and sign a statement to that effect (form from the Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students) and return the form to the Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students.

27 Doctoral candidates awarded masters degrees

If you have submitted your thesis for a doctoral degree but been awarded a masters degree, you need to reflect this in the title page and binding of your final thesis. The
binding will need to show the masters award. The title page of the thesis can either just indicate that a masters degree was awarded, or can indicate that the thesis was submitted for a doctoral degree but was awarded a masters degree.

28 Resubmission

If the recommendation approved by Senate is that you be permitted to resubmit your thesis (Recommendation 3), then in effect you go back to the beginning again, taking particular account of the points raised by the examiners in their reports. The required revisions may relate to intellectual content, major presentational matters and/or other matters of substance. You will be required to pay a re-examination fee before the resubmitted work can be re-examined. After you have resubmitted the thesis, examiners will pay particular attention to whether you have addressed satisfactorily the issues they raised at the first examination. You only have one opportunity to resubmit a thesis. Note that for the hard bound version lodged with library the year to be given on the spine and front board, and the month and year given on the title page, is the date of Senate approval of the award (see 29). For the soft bound (pre-examination) version the date on the title page is the Month and year of thesis resubmission.

29 Binding the thesis

Once you are being recommended for an award, you should prepare your thesis for lodging in the library. The thesis should be printed on 100gsm (or 120gsm) paper and then hard bound, with a cloth colour of dark blue (colour code 544). Arbeleve Buckram binding is recommended.

The Part 1 declaration of your final, completed submission must be bound into the thesis submitted to the library.

You may also clamp bind the thesis but you should bear in mind that this method may not be as permanent as the traditional stitched Arbeleve Buckram binding. A clamp binding service can be provided by the Student Union Print Shop. The Library will accept a dark blue linen clamp bound copy, as long as it conforms to the presentation requirements set out below.

Please note: No more than 240 sheets of @100gsm paper can be clamp bound in one volume, so traditional stitched binding (Arbeleve Buckram) is still the preferred option for larger theses.

In general, the more urgently you need your thesis bound (48 or 24 hours) the more expensive it will be.

The title page is the first page of the thesis and must include the following details:

- Title of thesis (exactly as approved)
- Author’s name (without qualifications listed)
- Degree for which the thesis has been submitted
- Month and year (that Senate will approve the award*)
- Keele University.

* Please remember that this date is not the year of submission, which may be different. The year of award may fall in the following year if submitting in November or December. If you are in any doubt, please check with the Records & Exams Officer for Postgraduate Research Students.
The bound thesis must indicate (lettered in gold) on the front board

- thesis title (front board only)
- author’s name (full name in the same form as appears on your student record)
- degree which has been awarded
- year of award (that Senate will approve the award*).

The bound thesis must indicate (lettered in gold) up the spine (reading from bottom to top, in upper case lettering)

- author’s name
- degree which has been awarded
- year of award (that Senate will approve the award*).

Multi-volume theses must display the volume number, in gold-lettered Arabic numerals, across the base of the spine and below the thesis title.

A thesis with multiple parts (such as scores, published works, DVDs) should be boxed together in dark blue cloth and lettered as above.

Although the University requirement is for one bound copy for the Library, most students have two or three copies bound, one for the library, one for their Research Institute and one for themselves. Some Research Institutes require a bound copy for their library, so you should check with your RI.

**Electronic deposit of thesis in the library**

30 Why does the University require edeposit?

It is now a regulatory requirement (University regulation 2D 10.3.8) that all Keele postgraduate research students enrolled from September 2011 onwards deposit an electronic copy of their final approved thesis for uploading to the University’s open access Research Repository. This is in addition to the required bound paper copy. The hard copy thesis is the full, final, examined and awarded version and remains the authoritative copy. Where possible, the electronic version should be the same as the hard copy, but there will be some exceptions, which this guidance explains.

Research degree candidates who commenced study before September 2011 are strongly encouraged to edeposit voluntarily.

31 What are the benefits?

Like most universities, Keele has established a Research Repository to capture, store, index, preserve and redistribute the University’s scholarly research in digital formats.

Your thesis will be uploaded to the repository, becoming exposed to internet search engines and harvesters, as well as being made available to EThOS and linked to Index to Theses, the comprehensive UK thesis listing.

As a result, your research is more readily available, easily searchable and more visible worldwide. This has potential implications for your career progression and research success - as your thesis is picked up and cited more widely, so it makes a greater impact in your subject discipline.
What changes to do I need to know about?

Online access to theses constitutes publication and requires more careful consideration of issues related to sensitivity to copyright, confidentiality, Intellectual Property Rights and co-sponsorship. Before depositing your ethesis, and ideally at an early stage in your research, you should read the following guidance.

Third Party Copyright

Copyright in theses is covered by the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988. Third party copyright is where the rights are owned by others – you may have included published extracts, quotations, images, maps, tables, diagrams, music scores or other third party copyright material in your thesis. Third party copyright also includes extracts from publications that you have authored and use depends upon the agreement you entered into with the publisher. If you have included unpublished material, such as manuscripts and photographs, remember that much unpublished work remains in copyright until 2039.

For the purpose of examination, it has been acceptable to quote from copyrighted works without seeking permission from the rights holder. However, electronic availability is a form of publication, and therefore permission must be obtained from copyright holders before including extensive and significant third party copyright material in your ethesis.

Fair dealing

Under ‘fair dealing’, it is not necessary to seek permission from the copyright holders where extracts are short and insubstantial and are cited accurately. It is important to reference correctly to avoid accusations of plagiarism. However, the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 does not define what constitutes short or insubstantial, so if in doubt, you should seek permission. Inclusion of images and music extracts in copyright will certainly require permission. When making a judgement, consider whether you would be happy for others to copy a similar quantity of your work in such a way.

Contacting copyright holders

When seeking copyright clearance to include ‘substantial’ material from published books or journals in your thesis, contacting the publisher is usually the best starting point. Contact addresses can be found on publishers’ websites and the larger companies usually have Rights and Permissions departments (or search under ‘copyright’ and ‘clearance’). Seeking approval can take time, so don’t leave it until the last minute. Be aware that images from publications usually have different rights holders who need to be contacted separately. Where permission has been granted, remember to include evidence in your full thesis, e.g. ‘Permission to reproduce…has been granted by…’ You might find the following sample text helpful when contacting rights holders:

Sample permission letter 1

I am completing a research degree thesis at Keele University and I am contacting you to request permission to include the following material within the electronic version of my thesis:
An electronic version of my thesis will be deposited in Keele University’s Research Repository. Once available in digital format, access to the thesis will be freely available via the Web and through the ‘Electronic Thesis Online Service’ (EThOS). The User of the thesis will be required to agree that they shall only use the thesis for non-commercial research, private study, criticism, review and news reporting, illustration for teaching, and/or other educational purposes in electronic or print form.

I would be grateful if you, or the company you represent, could grant me permission to include the Material in my thesis and to use the Material, as set out above, royalty free in perpetuity. If you are not the owner of the copyright in this material I would be most grateful if you would confirm this and advise me who to contact.

Sample permission letter 2

I am the author of [insert full citation details for the work] [“the Work”] which was published by [insert publisher’s name] in [insert name of publication/s] and which was assigned to [you or your company] by an agreement dated [insert date].

I would like to include the Work in my research degree thesis, [title of thesis]. My thesis will be made available electronically in Keele University’s Research Repository. Once available in digital format, access to the thesis will be freely available via the Web and through the ‘Electronic Thesis Online Service’ (EThOS). The User of the thesis will be required to agree that they shall only use the thesis for non-commercial research, private study, criticism, review and news reporting, illustration for teaching, and/or other educational purposes in electronic or print form.

I would be grateful if you, or the company you represent, could grant me permission to include the Work in my thesis and to use the Work, as set out above, royalty free in perpetuity.

36 Editing your eThesis

Where approval from a rights holder has not been obtained, or where a publication fee is being requested and you do not wish to pay this, then the ethesis should not be made available online, unless you first remove the relevant third party copyright material from the e-version. Remember, you should not compromise what is included in your hard copy thesis as this is the authoritative copy.

The thesis deposit agreement gives the option to deposit an abridged electronic version. Where third party copyright material has been removed from the ethesis, you should include reference to where this material can be found. On the title page of an edited ethesis, you should include wording similar to:

‘This electronic version of the thesis has been edited solely to ensure compliance with copyright legislation and excluded material is referenced in the text. The full, final, examined and awarded version of the thesis is available for consultation in hard copy via the University Library’
37 Intellectual Property

Where a student or supervisor believes a thesis may contain intellectual property with potential commercial value, this should be brought to the attention of Research and Enterprise Services before any disclosure takes place.

If you are seeking to patent an idea, it must not have been published already. Electronic availability of your thesis constitutes publication, so do seek advice.

You may decide to place a time-limited restriction on access to the hard copy and the electronic thesis, or to place an embargo on the electronic version only. The duration of an embargo is most commonly between 2 and 5 years. Please refer to the options on the thesis deposit agreement.

38 Co-sponsorship

Where a studentship is funded by an external organisation and governed by a formal contract, in order to prevent a possible breach of contractual obligation, advice should be sought from Research and Enterprise Services. It might well be decided to place a time-limited restriction on access to the hard copy and electronic version, or to restrict access to the ethesis only. Embargoes do not usually exceed 5 years. Please see the access options on the thesis deposit agreement.

39 Publishing

Many publishers are not concerned about availability of theses in repositories and do not consider them to be equivalent publications. However, if you are seeking to publish your research and are concerned that electronic availability of your thesis could constitute prior publication, do consult your supervisor and contact your publisher to ask for their policy on etheses. After consultation, it may be decided to restrict access to both print and electronic versions. In such cases, an embargo period of between 2 and 5 years is advisable. Access options can be found on the thesis deposit agreement.

40 Plagiarism

Plagiarism can occur in any medium. By making your thesis available electronically, it becomes easier to discover whether your work has been plagiarised and appropriate action can then be taken. As your research becomes widely available, it can be recognised and acknowledged as your work and appropriately referenced. Keele’s Research Repository and EThOS both operate an immediate thesis take-down policy, should issues arise.

Lodging your thesis in the Library and licensing use

41 Before your degree can be awarded by Senate, both hard copy and electronic copy of your thesis must be deposited in the Library, along with your completed thesis deposit agreement, available on the Code of Practice website http://www.keele.ac.uk/gradschool/codeofpractice/ or from the Library Administrator.

If you commenced study prior to September 2011 and are choosing not to deposit an electronic copy, please be aware that your thesis can still be requested for digitisation and made available online. The thesis deposit agreement allows you to permit or restrict electronic access, so please complete with care.
The ethesis should be the full and final approved thesis, unless an edited version is being deposited for reasons relating to copyright. There may be some delay before your ethesis is uploaded to the Research Repository as we need to check it against the hard copy and create metadata.

42 Access restrictions

If you are placing an access restriction on your thesis (see guidance on Intellectual Property, Co-sponsorship and Publishing) you must still deposit a full electronic copy with the Library for preservation. The ethesis will be accessed by authorised persons only and uploaded to the Research Repository once the embargo has expired.

43 Format

The ethesis should be deposited as a single PDF on CD, as PDF is a recognised international standard and will ensure retention of the original layout. The file should be readable text and not digitised images of the pages of your thesis. Ensure that the CD is clearly labelled.

Further reading and advice

44 Several books have been written about preparing a research thesis, and you may find them of interest and help. Some which have been recommended by research students are listed below.


Managing Information for Research Elizabeth Orna (Open University Press)


Authoring a PhD: How to plan, write and finish a doctoral thesis or dissertation Patrick Dunleavy (2003. Palgrave Macmillan)


45 A number of web sites may be of interest to research students seeking further advice about how to successfully complete a research degree. Some suggestions are given below.

www.vitae.ac.uk
www.srhe.ac.uk
Annex D5: Joint Statement of the Research Councils’ Skills Training Requirements

Introduction

The Research Councils play an important role in setting standards and identifying best practice in research training. This document sets out a joint statement of the skills that doctoral research students funded by the Research Councils would be expected to develop during their research training.

These skills may be present on commencement, explicitly taught, or developed during the course of the research. It is expected that different mechanisms will be used to support learning as appropriate, including self-direction, supervisor support and mentoring, departmental support, workshops, conferences, elective training courses, formally assessed courses and informal opportunities.

The Research Councils would also want to re-emphasise their belief that training in research skills and techniques is the key element in the development of a research student, and that PhD students are expected to make a substantial, original contribution to knowledge in their area, normally leading to published work. The development of wider employment-related skills should not detract from that core objective.

The purpose of this statement is to give a common view of the skills and experience of a typical research student thereby providing universities with a clear and consistent message aimed at helping them to ensure that all research training was of the highest standard, across all disciplines. It is not the intention of this document to provide assessment criteria for research training.

It is expected that each Council will have additional requirements specific to their field of interest and will continue to have their own measures for the evaluation of research training within institutions.

(A) Research Skills and Techniques - to be able to demonstrate:

I. the ability to recognise and validate problems
II. original, independent and critical thinking, and the ability to develop theoretical concepts
III. a knowledge of recent advances within one's field and in related areas
IV. an understanding of relevant research methodologies and techniques and their appropriate application within one's research field
V. the ability to critically analyse and evaluate one's findings and those of others
VI. an ability to summarise, document, report and reflect on progress

B) Research Environment - to be able to:

I. show a broad understanding of the context, at the national and international level, in which research takes place
II. demonstrate awareness of issues relating to the rights of other researchers, of research subjects, and of others who may be affected by the research, e.g. confidentiality, ethical issues, attribution, copyright, malpractice, ownership of data and the requirements of the Data Protection Act
III. demonstrate appreciation of standards of good research practice in their institution and/or discipline
| IV. | understand relevant health and safety issues and demonstrate responsible working practices |
| V. | understand the processes for funding and evaluation of research |
| VI. | justify the principles and experimental techniques used in one’s own research |
| VII. | understand the process of academic or commercial exploitation of research results |

(C) Research Management - to be able to:

- I. apply effective project management through the setting of research goals, intermediate milestones and prioritisation of activities
- II. design and execute systems for the acquisition and collation of information through the effective use of appropriate resources and equipment
- III. identify and access appropriate bibliographical resources, archives, and other sources of relevant information
- IV. use information technology appropriately for database management, recording and presenting information

(D) Personal Effectiveness - to be able to:

- I. demonstrate a willingness and ability to learn and acquire knowledge
- II. be creative, innovative and original in one’s approach to research
- III. demonstrate flexibility and open-mindedness
- IV. demonstrate self-awareness and the ability to identify own training needs
- V. demonstrate self-discipline, motivation, and thoroughness
- VI. recognise boundaries and draw upon/use sources of support as appropriate
- VII. show initiative, work independently and be self-reliant

(E) Communication Skills - to be able to:

- I. write clearly and in a style appropriate to purpose, e.g. progress reports, published documents, thesis
- II. construct coherent arguments and articulate ideas clearly to a range of audiences, formally and informally through a variety of techniques
- III. constructively defend research outcomes at seminars and viva examination
- IV. contribute to promoting the public understanding of one's research field
- V. effectively support the learning of others when involved in teaching, mentoring or demonstrating activities

(F) Networking and Teamworking - to be able to:

- VI. develop and maintain co-operative networks and working relationships with supervisors, colleagues and peers, within the institution and the wider research community
- I. understand one’s behaviours and impact on others when working in and contributing to the success of formal and informal teams
- II. listen, give and receive feedback and respond perpectively to others
G) Career Management - to be able to:
   I. appreciate the need for and show commitment to continued professional development
   II. take ownership for and manage one's career progression, set realistic and achievable career goals, and identify and develop ways to improve employability
   III. demonstrate an insight into the transferable nature of research skills to other work environments and the range of career opportunities within and outside academia
   IV. present one's skills, personal attributes and experiences through effective CVs, applications and interviews.

Source: Joint Skills Statement 2001