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Glossary of Terms
Throughout, the following abbreviations have been used:

HESA = Higher Education Statistical Agency
QAA = Quality Assurance Agency
RI= Research Institute
RC = Research Centre
FRC = Faculty Research Committee
DOS = Director of Studies
URC = University Research Committee
APR = Annual Progress Review
PGRT = Post-graduate Research Tutor
RASC = Research Awards Sub-committee (a sub-committee of URC)

Research Forms
Please find below details of the research forms required for key administration processes within research programmes. Instruction is given at the top of each form on who is responsible for completing the different sections of the form.

- Progression Stage Form
- Guidelines for completing the Progression Stage
- Research Proposal
- Examination Arrangement Form (NOMEX)
- Application for change to supervisory team
- Application for change in approved mode of study
- Write up Year Application
- Application for change to Supervisory Team
- Thesis cataloguing form
- Candidates Final Declaration form
- Higher Doctorate Application form
- Application for Restricted Access of a Research Degree Thesis
- Extension Request Form
- Request to conduct a remote viva voce examination
- Submission and receipt of Research Degree thesis

IMPORTANT: For document control purposes and to ensure that the form that you complete is the most up-to-date, please only download forms as and when required from the STaR Office website http://www.wlv.ac.uk/study-here/student-support/star-office/research-forms/
Introduction
The University’s regulations for postgraduate research degree programmes are available to students and staff as hard copy and on the University of Wolverhampton web-pages. This handbook serves to amplify the regulations and where appropriate, the handbook is supplemented by subject-specific guidance provided by approved research degree units.
It covers MPhil, PhD and the research phase of professional doctorate programmes. All research students are expected to be conversant with the handbook and to apply its principles in full.

This handbook is printed for your convenience but may be updated periodically. To view the most up to date version please see the University’s Academic Regulations webpage.

Academic Standards and Enhancement of the Quality of Research Programmes
The University Research Committee (URC) is empowered by Academic Board to oversee the management of the University’s research students. As part of this remit URC aims to ensure that all University of Wolverhampton research students are located in high quality environments with a community of active researchers providing robust research training. To achieve this all research students are managed by a Faculty Research Committee (FRC). This ensures provision of appropriate support and guidance to enable research students to complete their programmes on time, and provides an environment in which students, supervisors, examiners and other staff involved in research degree programmes are aware of and are committed to fulfil their responsibilities.

Each approved unit demonstrates:
• the pursuit of high quality research in cognate areas by a community of academic staff and postgraduates;
• supervisors with the necessary skills and knowledge to ensure the successful completion of students' research programmes;
• access to the facilities and equipment necessary to enable students to complete their research successfully.

Monitoring the Success of Postgraduate Research Programmes
The University Research Committee evaluates performance in each of its Faculty Research Committees and reviews ongoing student performance as part of the annual monitoring process, including:
• submission and completion times and rates;
• pass, referral and fail rates;
• withdrawal rates;
• appeals and complaints, the reasons for them, and how many are upheld;
• comments from examiners;
• recruitment profiles;
• feedback from research students, and where possible from employers, sponsors and external funders;
• where it is available, data on employment and career destinations of former students.

FRCs and the URC each compile annual reports in which statistical and other information relating to postgraduate research programmes is considered and acted upon. The URC annual report is considered by Academic Board. There is student representation on URC and all FRCs.
The Research Environment
Each research unit provides students with a stimulating environment that includes:

- opportunities and encouragement to exchange and develop ideas with people at appropriate levels who are also engaged in research and/or pursuing established research programmes;
- ready access to academic colleagues and others able to give advice and support;
- adequate learning and research tools, including access to IT equipment, library and electronic publications;
- opportunities for students to develop peer support networks where issues or problems can be discussed informally;
- supervision that encourages the development and successful pursuance of a programme of research;
- guidance on ethical pursuit of research and the avoidance of research misconduct, including IPR breaches;
- support to develop research-related skills that contribute to the student’s ability to complete the programme successfully, including an understanding of research funding and the commercial exploitation of research;
- opportunities to develop personal and employment-related skills to complement the advice on career development available through the University’s Careers and Guidance Service;
- access to welfare and support facilities that recognise the particular nature of research degree study;
- the opportunity for effective student representation, and for addressing students’ feedback including complaints;
- sufficient monitoring to ensure that where a project is undertaken in collaboration with another organisation, the standards of both organisations are maintained;
- the opportunity for students to develop intellectual maturity and encouragement to reflect on their own learning about research and on research outcomes.

The PGR Offer
For Postgraduate Research Students - the University has developed expectations in the form of a PGR Offer specific to each faculty. Download the PGR Faculty Offers (PDF 69K, Downloads file)
Section 1: Supervision and supervisors’ responsibilities

Supervisory Teams
Each research student has a Director of Studies and at least one other supervisor, working together as part of a supervisory team. Students must have sufficient opportunities for contacting and receiving advice and guidance from their supervisors throughout their programme. The nature and frequency of this contact is agreed at the outset of the research degree programme. Between them, the Director of Studies and other members of the supervisory team will ensure that research students receive sufficient support and guidance to facilitate their success. The breadth of experience and knowledge across the supervisory team should mean that the student always has access to someone with experience of supporting research student(s) through to successful completion of their programme. At least one member of the supervisory team will be currently engaged in research in the relevant discipline(s), to ensure that the direction and monitoring of the student's progress is informed by up to date subject knowledge and research.

‘Supervision’ of candidates for the award of PhD by Published Works is carried out by an ‘Academic Advisor’ rather than a Supervisor. The Academic Advisor should not only have appropriate academic standing in the discipline and substantial supervision, but also, ideally, examining experience at the level of PhD. Please refer to See Appendix E for further guidelines on the award of PhD by Publication.

Selection of Supervisors
Supervisors are identified for each research degree student at the point of application. The Post Graduate Research Tutor will be responsible for assessing the applicant’s Expression of Interest in conjunction with at least one other suitably qualified Supervisor. Supervisors are drawn from the Register of Supervisors (see below). Following the assessment the Post Graduate Research Tutor will make an offer or reject the application. (For further information regarding the research degree admissions process see the research operations manual).

A Register of Research Supervisors should be maintained by each Faculty and updated periodically to reflect the qualifications and experience of each Supervisor. This register holds essential information about the Supervisor’s research areas and research activity, qualifications, research supervision and examining experience, etc.

All members of the supervisory team should normally possess qualifications equivalent to at least the level of registration of the student, together with an established and current research record in a relevant field. The Faculty Research Committee will consider exceptions in the case of proposed members of the supervisory team who have professional expertise germane to the project. A candidate for research degree (whether registered at the University of Wolverhampton or elsewhere) is not normally eligible to act as a member of the supervisory team for another research degree candidate.

A supervision team shall normally also have the combined minimum levels of training and/or experience in the supervision of research students as follows:
- Successful completion of the 'Introduction to Research Supervision at UoW' for supervisors of research students plus one successful completion to the level of registration of the student (MPhil or PhD level); or
- Supervision of not fewer than two candidates to successful completion of MPhil or PhD, as compatible with the level of registration with the student (see above).

Where a member of staff is new to the University or has not recently (i.e. within three years) supervised research students s/he must participate in the 'Research Supervisor Development Programme (RSDP). All experienced supervisors must attend supervisor briefings annually to ensure that they remain conversant with the regulations.

The Director of Studies normally has the prime responsibility to supervise the candidate on a regular and frequent basis, and to ensure that all monitoring procedures, examination arrangements, and changes to the programme of study are completed in accordance with the University regulations and the relevant Research Handbook. The Director of Studies is normally a member of the academic staff of the University, although exceptionally it may be necessary for a supervisor who is not a member of staff to assume the role of Director of Studies, subject to the approval of the Faculty Research Committee (FRC). If approval is granted for this, a second supervisor from the University academic staff must also be a member of the supervision team, and will assume the monitoring roles normally associated with the Director of Studies.
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Unless otherwise stated, the Director of Studies is the main point of contact for the student. It should be clear to the student who the relevant contact is if the Director of Studies is not available – normally this is the second supervisor. In addition, all Faculties have designated members of academic staff who are independent of the supervisory team and are able to provide general advice and support.

In the case of illness or other temporary inability to supervise, other members of the supervisory team normally provide ongoing supervision and support until the return of the absent Director of Studies or other supervisor. However, if a supervisor is not able to continue supervising on a permanent basis, where possible the Chair of the FRC or the Director of the Research Institute will appoint an appropriate substitute supervisor to assume the role.

The University recognises that on rare occasions a student/supervisor relationship may run into difficulties. Where possible all endeavours should seek to resolve any differences. If this proves impossible, by mutual agreement between the student and the Chair of the FRC, supervisory responsibilities can be changed, subject to the availability of equivalent supervisory expertise. Any such change may be at the request of either the student or a supervisor and is subject to the agreement of any external sponsor. Any proposal for a change in supervision arrangements shall be made to the Chair of the FRC or the Director of the Research Institute on the ‘Application for Change to Supervisory Team’ form.

Where students are experiencing difficulties in relation to supervision and feel that they cannot discuss this with one of the supervisory team they should raise the issue with their Postgraduate Research Tutor in the first instance.

**Development and Support for Supervisors.**

All supervisors have opportunities to develop appropriate skills and subject knowledge to enable them to support, encourage and monitor research students effectively. The University recognises that supervisors need appropriate expertise for their role and that they should engage in development of various kinds to equip them to supervise students. All new supervisors will participate in specified staff development activities to assure their competence in the role.

Existing supervisors will demonstrate their continuing professional development through participation in a range of activities organised by research units and designed to support their work as supervisors. To assure consistency, the University, through its research units, encourages supervisors working in industry or professional practice to participate in developmental activities offered by the institution. The on-going professional development of research supervisors will be maintained and reviewed periodically by the Dean of Research to assure the currency and competency of supervision at the University.

**The Responsibilities of Supervisors**

Supervisors and students need to be fully aware of the extent of one another's responsibilities, to enable both to understand (i) the supervisor's contribution to supporting the student and (ii) where the supervisors’ responsibilities end.

Supervisors’ responsibilities include:

- provision of satisfactory guidance and advice on the conduct of the student’s research programme;
- regular monitoring of the progress of the student's research programme;
- maintaining regular contact with the student and ensuring his/her accessibility to the student when s/he needs advice. This will normally involve face to face contact at least monthly, but may also involve telephone or email contact depending on the student's location and mode of study;
- maintaining appropriate records of supervisory meetings and interim correspondence;
- input into the assessment of a student's development needs;
- provision of timely, constructive and effective feedback on the student's work, including his/her overall progress within the programme;
- provision of advice and guidance to enable the student to conduct his/her research with probity and according to ethical principles, and advice on the implications of research misconduct;
- ensuring that the student is aware of institutional-level sources of advice, including careers guidance, health and safety legislation and equal opportunities policy;
• provision of effective pastoral support, referring the student where appropriate to other sources of such support, including advisers in 'The Gateway @ the George' (for example, counselling, careers or the Student Enabling Centre), Registry staff and others within the student's academic community;
• help for the student to interact with others working in the field of research, for example, encouraging the student to attend relevant conferences and supporting him/her in seeking funding for such events;
• where appropriate, to provide encouragement and advice to submit conference papers and articles to refereed journals;
• identification of suitable examiners and their nomination to the Research Awards Sub-committee (RASC) at least three months prior to the expected date of submission of the thesis. In practice, this should be midway through year 3 of a full-time PhD programme (pro rata for part-time);
• maintenance of supervisory expertise, including the appropriate skills to perform the role satisfactorily, supported by relevant continuing professional development opportunities.

Supervisors should be sensitive to the diverse needs of individual students, including international students, and the associated support that may be required in different circumstances. An awareness of the range of advice and support available to students, and knowledge of how students can access it, is an important part of the supervision process.

**Limits to the Number of Research Supervisions Undertaken by Individual Members of Staff.**

The University recognises that research students are best served by supervisory teams with sufficient expertise, experience and commitment to fully support each student and his/her research. In this context it is important to ensure that individual members of staff do not carry excessive supervisory loads. To help monitor this, the University Research Committee operates a ‘points’ system that applies to all research degrees including Professional / Practitioner Doctorates.

The system is based on a simple points allocation:

- For full-time students - One point is allocated for each second supervisor role and two points for Director of Studies.
- For part-time students – half a point is allocated for each second supervisor role and one point for Director of Studies.

The maximum number of points allocated to any member of staff is 10. However, on reaching the threshold of 6 points, the question of whether extra supervisory commitment is in the best interests of both the research student and supervisor is considered, as is the potential to reduce the demand on existing staff by extending the available pool of supervisors. The Chair of the FRC or Director of the Research Institute has the authority to limit the maximum number of supervision points to optimise supervisor and student performance, within the 6-10 point band.

Proposals to increase supervision points outside the 6-10 range must be considered and approved by the Chair of the FRC. Such proposals may only be approved where the workload commitments of individual staff members allow additional supervisions and only when either or both of the following conditions have been met:

- The supervisor has a track record of successful and timely completions of the type and level of research degree being considered.
- An alternative supervision allocation statement has been outlined in the course documentation (e.g. in the case of Professional/ Practitioner Doctorates) and approved by Faculty Research Committee.

The system aims to maximise performance in the best interests of supervisors, researchers and the University research community. It recognises that the demand placed on supervisors varies with their roles. The Director of Studies has more responsibility and time-commitment to the individual research student, particularly with the requirement to take a lead role in the completion of monitoring and progress forms. Time-commitment also varies through the life cycle of the research degree project. The initial project design and implementation phase and the writing-up stage towards the end of the programme can be particularly time-consuming. To ensure effective supervision, when a research student makes contact for advice or guidance, supervisors should normally respond within a maximum of seven days.
Section 2: Monitoring and Supporting Student to Timely Completion

Timescales for the registration of research degrees
Supervisors have a key role in ensuring timely submission and completion of research degree programmes. The University’s regulations set expectations in relation to successful completion periods. In the case of the PhD and Professional/Practitioner Doctorates the maximum periods of registration are four years full-time (eight years part-time). In the case of the MPhil the maximum registration period is two years full-time (four years part-time). (See tables below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Time Students</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Practitioner Doctorate *</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Master’s Degree *</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Research programme</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part Time Students</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Practitioner Doctorate *</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Master’s Degree *</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Research programme</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* as outlined Section V.3 of the Academic regulations for Professional Doctorate Awards

Leave of Absence and Parental Leave
The University’s regulations set expectations in relation to successful completion periods. In the case of the PhD and Professional/Practitioner Doctorates the maximum periods of registration are four years full-time (eight years part-time). In the case of the MPhil the maximum registration period is two years full-time (four years part-time). If students do not submit their thesis within the maximum period of registration, they will not be allowed to submit late and will be asked to withdraw from the research degree. If students are in receipt of a bursary they may also be required to pay back the fees for non-completion.

However the University realises that there are circumstances when students are temporarily not able to continue with their studies for a period of time, because of a change in their personal circumstances. In these circumstances they may take a break from their research degree and resume their studies when their circumstances allow.

If this scenario applies then students should discuss with their supervisor whether taking a temporary ‘leave of absence’ from their studies is appropriate.

The maximum length of period of absence taken at any one time is 12 months. The maximum total period over the research degree is 24 months. If students take the maximum 12 months then they must return to their research studies for a minimum of 3 months before taking any further periods of leave of absence.

Periods of leave undertaken due to statutory childcare (including maternity leave, paternity leave, shared parental leave and adoptive leave) will not be counted towards the maximum total period of 24 months, although the maximum registration period will be amended accordingly.

After agreeing this option with their supervisor, students must apply for a leave of absence via their e: Vision account. The student will have to confirm that they will not be undertaking any research activities whilst on leave of absence. The student will need to give the reason why they are requesting leave of absence and the date that they believe that they will return to their studies. Leave of absence will not be granted retrospectively.

Please note that students will need to provide a detailed explanation for taking leave of absence. They may be asked to provide evidence to support this.
If a leave of absence is approved, liability to pay tuition fees will cease from the point of leave of absence and will be reactivated on the date of return. Students in receipt of a university bursary will not receive any payments whilst on leave of absence. International students on a Tier 4 visa will be required to return home whilst on leave of absence.

The request to take a leave of absence and the decision to grant this or not, will be reported to the Director of Studies along with the Faculty Postgraduate Research Tutor. It will also be reported to the Faculty Research Committee and at the relevant University Committee.

Any leave of absence will be granted in month-long blocks and then added to the registration period. Whilst on a leave of absence, students will not be entitled to use University facilities, nor have access to their Supervisor in respect of their research work, but they are encouraged to keep in touch with their Supervisor for pastoral support. Leave of absence should not be used to cover holiday leave, research visits, fieldwork visits, etc.

Please note that if a leave of absence is approved, students are still required to complete the Annual Progress Review Form.

**Exceptional requests to extend maximum registration period**

There may be very exceptional circumstances when a student cannot submit their thesis within the maximum period of registration, but the leave of absence process outlined above is not appropriate. This may be either a) because they have already exceeded the maximum length of absence or b) they need a longer period to complete their research because of a setback for which the University takes full responsibility (e.g. equipment failure).

It must be stressed, however, that extensions to maximum registration are only granted in very exceptional circumstances. Extensions will not be granted for what might be considered ‘unexceptional’ circumstances such as everyday life events, work pressure, financial difficulties, academic failure, and poor project/time management. It should also be noted that extensions will not be granted retrospectively.

Any request for an extension should be discussed with the Director of Studies in the first instance. If the Director of Studies supports the request s/he will need to make a formal request with supporting evidence to the Dean of Research and Academic Registrar (or their nominees). The request and the decision made will be communicated to the student by the Director of Studies and formally recorded by the STaR Office. It will be reported to the Research Awards Sub Committee and, where relevant, the Professional Doctorate Award and Progression Board.

If successful, a new maximum registration date will be calculated that takes account of the period granted by the Dean of Research. Students are still liable for fees for any extended period of registration. If the request is unsuccessful, the student should submit their thesis on or before the date of the original maximum registration. If this date has already passed, the student and the Director of Studies will receive a letter to inform them that the student will be withdrawn from the programme.

**Change to Mode of Study**

Students may apply for a change to their mode of study via eVision. They must seek advice from their supervisory team before proceeding with an application to change the mode of study.

The change to mode of study request must be submitted to the Student, Transnational and Research (STaR) Office.

**Withdrawal of Registration**

There may be circumstances where students feel that they are no longer in a position to continue their research and will be unlikely to resume in the foreseeable future. In these cases they can withdraw from registration by completing the withdrawal task via their eVision account and submitting it to the Student, Transnational and Research (STaR) Office.

The FRC also has the authority to recommend that the registration be withdrawn if satisfactory progress has not been made. This would normally occur after a failure to abide by the ‘at risk’ procedures. Such procedures may be invoked in cases such as an unsatisfactory progression, or an unsatisfactory Annual Progress Review form or its non-completion.
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Purpose and forms of monitoring
The main purpose of the monitoring process is to provide encouragement and support to students to enable them to complete research programmes successfully within an appropriate timescale. The purpose and frequency of monitoring arrangements need to be clear from the outset, so that both the student and the supervisor can plan adequately for them, prepare relevant documents and consult other individuals as appropriate. Should a student’s progress not be satisfactory, the monitoring process includes provision to ensure that support is available for the student to make improvements.

Students and supervisors should be aware of:
- the implications of the possible outcomes of review meetings;
- the criteria to be used for making decisions about a leave of absence or withdrawal of a student's registration;
- the circumstances in which student appeal processes may be used.

There are three distinct types of review:
- Regular review meetings where the student and members of the supervisory team meet to discuss matters relating to the research and to review progress
- Progression stage confirming the programme of study by the end of 18 months full-time study (36 months part-time) and
- Annual progress review (APR) of the student’s progress and forward planning.

Regular review meetings
Students and supervisors are expected to meet informally, and frequently enough to address the student’s need for general guidance. The University expects monthly supervision meetings for full time students and at least 6 for part time students. However these arrangements made between the student and supervisor allow some flexibility provided that both are satisfied that adequate support is being provided for the student and there are sufficient opportunities for formally monitoring progress. Notes should be taken at these meetings (See Records of Meetings below) and the record of meetings should form part of each student’s personal development portfolio (see Skills Development below)

Students and supervisors are jointly responsible for ensuring that regular and frequent contact is maintained and there will be times when the student, as well as the supervisor, needs to take the initiative. The nature and frequency of contact between student and supervisor(s) will vary, depending on the duration of the programme, the way the research is being conducted and the amount of support needed by the student. Taking account of these variables, the following should be agreed by and clear to both student and supervisor(s) from the start of the programme:
- the minimum frequency of scheduled meetings between student and supervisor and supervisory team, and the purpose of such meetings;
- guidance on the nature and style of the student/supervisor interaction, including discussions about academic and personal progress.
- the action to be taken if progress is unsatisfactory (see Appendix A, the “At Risk” procedure)

Records of Meetings between Supervisors and Students
Students and supervisors are expected to keep appropriate records of the outcomes of meetings and related activities. Records of all formal meetings between students and supervisors must be kept securely. As a minimum requirement the record of each meeting should state: the date, time, venue, those present, a brief summary of progress made, reflection on any problems that have arisen and an action plan/targets for the next meeting. The record should include discussion of skills development as well as progress on the research project. The records should be entered into the eVision Supervision Log.

Recording student engagement on e:Vision
Where there is no electronic record of a supervision meeting taking place at the expected interval, an automatically generated reminder letter may be sent to supervisors to ensure that regular contact is made with the student. This may be followed up with a letter to the student at a later stage if there has been no further record of a meeting. The
logging of supervision meetings is particularly important for International Tier 4 Students who may be required to provide proof of attendance to UK Visas and Immigration.

The following timeline is the process in place for ensuring that the student remains compliant. (Please note that if a student has returned to their home country then they should update their address via e:Vision. Students currently undertaking research overseas are still expected to maintain regular contact with their supervisor, but these must be logged as skype/email/telephone.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Following enrolment</th>
<th>students are e-mailed with an overview of process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No recorded engagement after 40 days</td>
<td>e-mail sent to Director of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No recorded engagement after 50 days</td>
<td>e-mail sent to Director of Studies and student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No recorded engagement after 60 days</td>
<td>‘Final warning’ e-mail to Director of Studies and student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No recorded engagement after 70 days</td>
<td>e-mail to student, supervisor and STaR Office with a series of tasks culminating in a curtailment decision being made by the UKVI Compliance and Oversight Panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For information on how to access and use the eVision Research Supervision log please see Appendix H.

Paper-based or electronic documents may supplement electronic records. Where they are paper-based, signatures should confirm agreement of the record and a copy should be held by the student and (at least one of) the supervisory team, usually the Director of Studies. In general, it should be the student’s responsibility to compile the records and to store these in her/his personal development file, whether paper-based or electronic.

Supervisors must maintain full records of all meetings and brief notes of other interactions (including email exchanges) in case needed as part of future monitoring/review that may be required by the Faculty Research Committee or University Research Committee.

Progression stage
The progression stage will normally take place by the end of 18 months (36 months for part time students) from date of registration. At this point there should be sufficient evidence to assess the student's performance and potential to complete at the appropriate level. Failure to submit the required evidence within these periods will result in the student being placed ‘at risk’ (see Appendix A). Note that students taking a Professional Doctorate are deemed to have made satisfactory progress on successful completion of the taught programme and are therefore exempt from the Progression Stage.

An overview of the process:
1) The student completes the ‘Progression Stage’ form and gives an oral presentation on the achievements on his/her research programme and future research plans. The supervisory team and an independent internal assessor appointed by the Chair of the FRC should be present during the presentation, which may be arranged as part of an ongoing seminar series.
2) The supervisors undertake an initial assessment, based on the written evidence provided and on the oral presentation.
3) The independent assessor reviews all aspects of the application and makes a recommendation to the FRC.
4) The FRC considers the outcome

Note: FRCs will need to be proactive in appointing the independent assessor for each student at an appropriate point in time (i.e. well before the 18 month/36 month deadline) so that s/he can be present at the student presentation.

The application is made on the ‘Progression Stage’ form and students will provide appropriate evidence (see below) to support their application. The ‘Progression Stage’ requires the following information:
- a statement of the hypothesis and/or research question(s), including their potential to make an original contribution to knowledge and understanding in the field
• an outline of the academic and intellectual context in which the hypothesis is located
• a description of the methodology employed
• a statement of ethical concerns presented by the proposed research and how these have been or will be addressed
• a comprehensive bibliography
• a statement of the award sought (MPhil or PhD)
• a statement outlining how the confirmed programme will meet the learning outcomes for the award sought
• a detailed timetable of work and objectives for the next 12 months, and an indicative timetable and objectives for any periods beyond that.
• The evidence provided (or cited) by students in support of their application will include:
  • examples of written work such as draft chapters, essays, literature reviews or conference papers to demonstrate their ability to work at the appropriate level
  • evidence of successful delivery of presentations, externally or internally, for example to specialist and non-specialist audiences
  • engagement with the University’s skills development programme and the opportunities provided through personal development planning.

**Role of the supervisors at the Progression stage**
A preliminary assessment of the application is made by the supervisory team, who are required to comment specifically on the student’s:
• ability to express themselves in writing at an appropriate level
• knowledge of the field in which the research is located
• ability to evaluate the theoretical framework and/or methodologies relevant to their field of investigation
• mastery of related skills and their skills development since beginning their programme of study
• ability to meet deadlines with work that is of an acceptable quality

Supervisors are also asked to provide their assessment of the evidence of the student’s commitment to the project.

**Role of the independent assessor and the Faculty Research Committee at the Progression stage**
An independent assessor, nominated by the Faculty Research Committee, reviews the application, together with the evidence provided, the student’s presentation and the supervisors’ assessment. The independent assessor provides evaluative comments and a recommendation as to the outcome of the application, which is then considered by the appropriate FRC. Where the independent assessor highlights concerns or criticisms, these must be addressed with the supervisors and student prior to recommendations being forwarded to the FRC. The FRC will consider the ‘Progression Stage’ evidence and recommend that the student (i) proceed as proposed (ii) proceed subject to changes or amendments being made (this may require a change in the research degree sought) or (iii) be placed ‘at risk’.
Formal Annual Review of Student Progress

The University has an established annual process for reviewing student progress that involves members of academic staff who are independent of the supervisor(s) and the student.

Faculty Research Committees (FRCs) are responsible for monitoring students’ progress and are required to respond to any identified problems. They must be satisfied that individual students are making progress with their research and are on target to complete on time before approving progression to the next year of the programme. Students are required to provide details of progress with their research, of any issues they wish to bring to the attention of their supervisory team and a plan of work for the following year. Only students in certain categories do not need to give full details; a simple statement will suffice. These are students who:

- have submitted their thesis and are awaiting examination;
- have been examined but are completing minor amendments or are awaiting conferment;
- are currently on suspension; or
- have been on leave of absence for the majority of the year and have therefore made very little progress.

The APR Process

Each year, every research student is issued with an Annual Progress Review Form. ALL research students, however new, MUST complete this form each year until their award is conferred. The Students should give a summary of progress made on this form with an indicative programme of the following year’s work. They may also highlight any problems they wish to bring to the attention of the Director of Studies. The Director of Studies then adds her/his comments which will include a review of the student’s progress and, if satisfactory, confirmation that they should proceed to the next year. Any problems that the Director of Studies may wish to raise with the Chair of the relevant FRC may also be noted here. Please note that the University considers it good practice for students and their DoS to complete the relevant parts of the Annual Progress Review Form together during one of their regular supervisory meetings in April / May. Failure to return the Annual Progress Review Form will automatically invoke the ‘at risk’ procedure.

In accordance with QAA guidelines, FRCs designate an independent member of staff to interview each student on a one-to-one basis, as part of the annual review. Supervisors should check with the FRC as to the exact procedure followed in your Faculty, as this can vary according to the discipline; normally, however, this is the last stage in the Annual Progress Review process.

After the Annual Progress Review Form is considered by the FRC; either the student’s progress is confirmed or s/he will be advised of any steps that may need to be taken to improve their position. The recommendation goes forward to Registry, which monitors the progress of all students. Successful progression means the student will be able to enrol via e-vision for the next academic year; if there is no recommendation to proceed, corrective action will be taken (e.g. leave of absence or withdrawal (preceded by the ‘at risk’ procedure).

Where a student has not made satisfactory progress, the student is designated ‘at risk’ (see Appendix A). The Director of Studies will discuss progress with the student and if an action plan to resolve any difficulties cannot be achieved s/he may recommend withdrawal of registration. Students cannot be enrolled for a subsequent year until annual monitoring has established, to the satisfaction of the Chair of the FRC, that acceptable progress has been made. Likewise any student who is a debtor cannot enrol and must be placed ‘at risk’ until the situation is resolved.

The procedures outlined above represent a minimum level of progress review. FRCs are encouraged to develop a range of measures that exceed this minimum threshold, including where appropriate poster competitions and other forms of peer and staff review. Following the completion of annual progress review Faculty Research Committees are required, by the due date, inform the STaR Office of the status of each research student and whether they are eligible to proceed.
Section 3: Skills Development

The Personal and Professional Development of Research Students

The Researcher Development Statement (RDS) sets out the knowledge, behaviours and attributes of effective and highly skilled researchers appropriate for a wide range of careers. The Researcher Development Statement is derived from the Researcher Development Framework (RDF), a major new approach to researcher development, which aims to enhance our capacity to build the UK workforce, develop world-class researchers and build our research base (see Appendix B).

The University subscribes to the RDF and acknowledges the importance of acquiring research and other skills during research degree programmes in order to enhance students’ ability to complete the research programme successfully and on time. Such skills are significant in the research graduate’s capability for sustaining learning throughout his or her career, whether in an academic role or in other employment.

During the application process students have the opportunity to identify their development needs through a research skills analysis. Applicants who are registered on the Pre Research Degree Programme follow a programme of skills development based on their research skills needs analysis. During this period (up to 6 months) these students will be supported by range of academics including potential supervisors and, where appropriate, English language tutors. Once registered on a Research Degree programme subsequent development is undertaken in consultation with supervisors. However, all research students are encouraged to take ownership and responsibility for their own learning, during and after their programme of study. The University’s skills development programme is outlined below.

Students’ Skills Development Programme

The University recognises that some research and other transferable skills may be present on commencement (for example in the case of some mature students), explicitly taught, or developed during the research programme. Supervisors are expected to conduct a skills assessment at the start of each research degree programme to identify students’ skills development needs, taking account of their different circumstances and the diversity of the research student population.

Personal and professional development opportunities for research students are spread throughout the duration of the research degree. The extent to which research students are required to take advantage of these opportunities will normally be negotiated through the supervision process, taking account of subject and individual needs.

Key features of skills development at the University are as follows:

- Research skills development workshops are mapped to the Vitae Research Development Framework (RDF) in line with the recommendations of QAA and the Research Councils.
- A comprehensive induction for all students to provide students with a good understanding of the research degree programme and its significant landmarks
- Generic workshops co-ordinated by The Doctoral College with discipline-specific support from Faculties, Research Institutes and Faculty Research Committees
- An identified generic skills co-ordinator in each Faculty Research Committee
- Student ownership of the process, with supervisor involvement as a key to success
- The student-supervisor relationship at the centre of the process with regular meetings to assess individual research skills development needs
- Access to generic and subject-specific skills development opportunities, with the opportunity to review and reflect on progress at regular intervals
- Personal development and action planning an integral part of the overall programme
- Tangible sources of evidence (progress files: on line RDF planner reports, paper based records and or FRC student records) used as a basis for robust annual monitoring and progression.

Records of activity and achievement will contribute to each student’s personal development portfolio considered at Annual Progress Review.
Where postgraduate students are provided with opportunities for teaching (for example, acting as demonstrators in laboratories, or teaching small groups), appropriate guidance and support will be provided. If the student’s teaching activity also extends to assessing students, the training they receive must reflect this. Where possible, students who undertake teaching will do so as part of a teaching team and will benefit from the peer support provided.

To ensure that students’ needs are being met, the University reviews its research and generic skills training as part of the quality assurance mechanisms for research programmes.

**Records of Personal Development**

It is good practice for students to reflect on their learning, supported by frameworks developed by the institution for recording personal development. Research students at the University of Wolverhampton have the opportunity to use the Vitae Research Development Framework Planner (see Appendix B) for recording and reflecting on personal development and other achievements, including research and other skills. In addition, students are expected to discuss with their supervisors the ethical implications of their work (see section ‘Good Research Conduct’ below).

Students, who, on entry to the research programme, are unfamiliar with keeping records of their progress and development can access guidance and support from their Director of Studies. Workshops on the use of RDF planner are provided as part of the skills development programme for research students and supervisors.

Demonstrable progress with personal development planning is required as a part of the annual monitoring and research programme action planning cycle, and at the ‘Progression Stage’.

**Good Research Conduct**

It is the supervisor’s responsibility to ensure that the student conducts his/her research in accordance with the following:

**Research Ethics**

Research that involves systematic collection and / or storage of sensitive data taken from human participants will require ethical approval and / or be subject to restrictions under the Data Protection Act (1998). In these cases, students should seek ethical approval from the Faculty and, where appropriate external Ethics Committee(s). Ideally, this should be done at the time of submission of the Research Proposal, but occasionally the ethical dimensions of a project may only become clear as it develops. In any case, ethical approval MUST be granted BEFORE the research is begun, so it is necessary for supervisors to advise students to complete the appropriate forms and submit them as soon as possible to avoid delays in the research programme.

The ethical implications of the research should be kept under review as the project progresses, and additional ethical approval must be sought should this become necessary during the progress of the project. Supervisors should ensure their students know and understand the ethical implications of the research and to obtain appropriate ethical approval as necessary.

**Ethical Principles:**

The University and researchers should adhere to the following principles:

- Excellence
- Honesty
- Integrity
- Cooperation
- Accountability
- Training and Skills
- Care, Safety and Respect

More detail can be found on the Research Policy Unit’s Ethics Guidance webpages where you will also find the handbook for Ethical Approval & Practice Procedures.
University of Wolverhampton Staff engaged in MPhil/PhD research

If a member of staff leaves the University of Wolverhampton while engaged in MPhil/PhD research, they must follow the below processes:

1. If continued access to and use of resources is understood to be necessary, permission must be sought and approved by the Dean of Faculty in discussion with the Associate Dean of Research.
2. All staff engaged in MPhil/PhD research must reapply to their Ethics Committee for the continuation of their research.
3. Where student data is being used as part of the research the continued access and utilisation of the data must be expressly approved by the Academic Registrar after discussion with the Dean of Faculty and then approved by the Ethics Committee. This is true even if the member of staff transfers their studies, based on this data, to another HEI.
4. The same process of renewal of permissions will also apply to data relating to the wider university experience, in respect to surveys conducted on staff (academic or otherwise), and engagements with resources / learning spaces provisions.

Health and Safety

It is essential that you familiarise yourselves with safety codes, regulations and advice which apply to their studies and all other activities in the University. Supervisors should advise students to comply with these at all times. If your student’s research is carried out in a laboratory or similar environment, they have a personal responsibility to follow safe working practices at all times. As a Director of Studies you should set out the health and safety procedures and check the written record of the work students have carried out to ensure that they are following safe procedures. Guidelines that are specific to your research activity will be provided by your Faculty.

Collection and Retention of Data

There should be clarity at the outset of the research programme as to the ownership of, where relevant:

- data and samples used or created in the course of the research;
- the results of the research; and
- any ideas, designs or inventions generated through the research programme.

Researchers should keep clear and accurate records of the procedures followed and the approvals granted during the research process, including records of the interim results obtained as well as of the final research outcomes.

Data generated in the course of research should be kept securely and in accordance with all legal requirements and ethical principles, such as those prescribed under the Data Protection Act, the requirements of learned or professional bodies, the requirements of University of Wolverhampton’s IPR statements. Research data should be kept intact for any legally specified period and otherwise for at least three years from the end of the project. Data should be stored in a secure and auditable format, in a form that would enable retrieval by a third party.

Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights

Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) may be important to students and in the final project. You should be familiar with the University’s copyright and IPR statements on the website and advise your students accordingly.

Improper Conduct and Plagiarism

Research students are required to conduct their research to the same standards of honesty and probity as all researchers. As a supervisor, you should remind students of the significance of declaring that material being submitted for publication or presented for assessment at any stage in your research degree programme is their own work.

These are serious offences and the University takes a very critical view of anyone who brings the Institution into disrepute. In most cases, students who are found guilty of such offences will be immediately withdrawn from their course of study. Further details on various levels of offence, penalties imposed and the procedure followed can be found in Appendix F – Procedure for the Investigation of Academic Misconduct by Research Students.
Section 4: Feedback

The Collection, Review and Response to Feedback
Constructive feedback from all concerned with research degree programmes is regarded as a valuable contribution to quality enhancement. The University encourages feedback in the following ways:

- **Examiners:** examiners’ reports and the comments therein form part of the University’s evaluation of the quality of its research degree programmes.
- **Examination Chairs:** feedback is sought on the conduct of all *viva voce* examinations and on examiners’ comments.
- **Supervisors:** supervisors have the opportunity to feed comments on the progress of individual students and on the University’s processes and procedures through representation at Faculty Research Committee. Feedback obtained from participants in the research supervisor development programme is used to ensure its relevance and fitness for purpose. In addition, research supervisors are invited to take part in the national surveys such as the Principal Investigators and Research Leaders Survey (PIRLS) and Careers in Research Online Survey (CROS).
- **Students:** there are arrangements for student representation on all Faculty Research Committees or other local committees and on the full University Research Committee (see Appendix C). As part of ongoing quality assurance and monitoring procedures there are annual meetings with students from all Faculty Research Committees in which their views are actively sought. Reports from this monitoring are to be presented annually to University Research Committee (see Appendix C). Finally, all students have the opportunity to make observations on their experiences through the Post graduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) and questionnaires issued on completion of their research degree programme.
- **Research Administrators:** Registry convenes an informal research administrators’ forum to act as a mutual support network and to share problems and successes. The feedback obtained from the forum helps to ensure the dissemination of good practice.
- **Sponsors:** Faculty Research Committees are expected to seek the views of external sponsors as part of their normal ongoing review processes.

A summary report, drawing together all aspects of the feedback obtained through the mechanisms outlined above is to be presented annually to the Research Degrees Sub-committee and thereafter disseminated to Faculty Research Committees (and Research Institutes), and through student representation on these Boards to the student community.
Section 5: Assessment of the thesis

The University has articulated clear learning outcomes for the awards of MPhil, PhD, Professional and Practitioner Doctorates, PhD by Published Work (See below). In each case the criteria for success (i.e. the ‘assessment criteria’) are the achievement of the learning outcomes for the relevant award. In setting the criteria for research programmes, the University drew upon the qualification descriptors for doctoral and master’s degrees in the QAA Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications and the definitions arising from the Bologna Process. The PhD by Published Work is assessed using the same criteria. (The eligibility, procedure and assessment of Higher Doctorates can be found in Appendix G). The criteria used to assess research degrees are available to students, staff and external examiners in the Research Degree Handbooks for Students, Examiners and Supervisors. They are also on the University’s web pages.

Criteria and learning outcomes

The nature of the candidate’s research studies will depend to some extent on the academic discipline concerned. However, regardless of subject, all research degree theses should be examined on the basis of the following learning outcomes:

Learning Outcomes for the Award of MPhil

- Critical investigation and evaluation of a topic through individual research and analysis, which is at, or informed by findings at, the forefront of knowledge in the discipline and which is expressed in a work of publishable quality;
- Evidence of thorough and current knowledge of the specific field to which the topic of the thesis belongs, as well as an understanding of the intellectual context in which that topic is located;
- Demonstration of a comprehensive understanding of appropriate research methodologies;
- Demonstration of originality in the application of knowledge;
- Demonstration of ability to analyse critically one’s own findings and those of others;
- Demonstration of ability to design, plan and implement a research programme to test, explore and evaluate the hypothesis or question(s).

Learning Outcomes for the Award of PhD, PhD by Publication, and Professional Doctorate

- For PhD and PhD by Publication - Substantial critical investigation and evaluation of a topic or set of related topics resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge and understanding in the field to which the topic belongs, and which is expressed in a work of publishable quality;
- For Professional / Practitioner Doctorates - Substantial critical investigation and evaluation of a topic or set of related topics resulting in an independent and original contribution to practice and understanding in the field to which the topic belongs, and which is expressed in a work of publishable quality;
- Originality is demonstrated through the discovery of new facts or methodologies, through subjecting known facts or methodologies to new insights derived from investigation, and/or through the revision, confirmation or adaptation of existing theories or methodologies to the new circumstances described in the thesis;
- Evidence of systematic, thorough, current and detailed knowledge of the specific subject area of the research as well as the general context in which that subject area is located;
- Evidence of knowledge of an appropriate range of research methodologies and a critical evaluation of their merits;
- Evidence of an ability to develop new hypotheses or research questions that have the capacity to extend the frontier of knowledge of the discipline;
- Evidence of an ability to design, plan and implement a research programme to test, explore and evaluate these hypotheses or questions;
- Evidence of an ability to analyse critically one’s own findings and those of others.
Length and contents of thesis
The text of the thesis should normally not exceed the maximum length for the type and subject of the research degree as outlined in Appendix D. This word limit includes endnotes, footnotes and bibliography, but excludes essential ancillary data.

The thesis may contain work previously published by the candidate, and reference to such publication should be made in the thesis. Where publications are jointly authored by the candidate and others, the candidate’s contribution to the publication must be specified.

Published work, supporting narrative, and evidence submitted for the award of PhD by Publication may vary in number and length according to the subject. See Appendix E for further information regarding the PhD by published work. See Appendix G for work submitted for the award of Higher Doctorate.

Submission of thesis
Procedure for the formatting and submission of the thesis is outlined in Appendix D.

The supervisors’ responsibilities around the examination stage

Supporting the writing of the thesis and the ‘writing up stage’
The Director of Studies should read and comment on draft chapters and the overall draft thesis. S/he should advise the student as to the readiness of the thesis for submission.

Students may apply for a reduced fee at the ‘writing up stage’ on the Application for Writing Up form (See Appendix H and refer to the Research Operations Handbook for more details). The writing up stage may only be approved when the Director of Studies is satisfied that the student has completed all field work, data collection and analysis and that no further use will be made of equipment or laboratories. Directors of Study are required to complete a section of the students’ Writing Up application form to confirm this. This application is considered for approval by the Post Graduate Research Tutor. The maximum period for reduced fee at writing up stage is 12 months. Any student who does not submit the written thesis within this period will revert to full fees regardless of mode and location of study, provided they are within the maximum registration period.

If it is found that a student is still undertaking substantive research activities or making insufficient progress in writing up their thesis then they could be reverted to ‘full fee’ status. In such cases, a pro-rata fee would apply.

Nomination of examiners
At least 3 months before the submission of the thesis is expected, the Director of Studies should propose on the ‘Nomination of Research Degree Examiners’ (NOMEX) form the arrangements for the candidate’s examination. It is good practice for Supervisors to discuss potential examiners with their students prior to submitting the NOMEX form.

The NOMEX form is submitted with the examiners’ CVs to the Faculty Post Graduate Research Tutor in the first instance. S/he will carry out a series of checks to assure the examination team are knowledgeable and research active in the field of the thesis, are experienced in terms of examining at research degree level, and are independent of the candidate and the supervisory team (see Research Examiners’ Handbook for selection criteria). Full details of the proposed examination team together with a justification for their appointment must be made on the NOMEX form. A CV is also required indicating recent publications and relevant research activity. Once approved by the Faculty Post Graduate Research Tutor, the NOMEX is then sent via the STaR office to the Chair of the RASC for final approval. Decisions are communicated to the DoS by the Postgraduate Research Examinations Administrator in the STaR Office and reported to RASC and the relevant FRC.
**Viva voce preparation**

It is good practice for research students to be offered support to prepare them for the *viva voce* examination. This may involve a 'mock' viva with suitably qualified staff. The internal examiner must have no part in any such mock examination.

**Viva and post viva responsibilities**

A candidate’s supervisor may not be proposed as an internal examiner. However, at the request of the candidate and with the agreement of the examiners, a candidate’s supervisor may be allowed to attend the examination in the capacity of observer. Any such request must be made in writing to the Postgraduate Research Examinations Administrator in the STaR Office at the point of submission of the thesis. The supervisor must take no part in the assessment of the thesis or the conduct of the oral examination, and must leave the room when the examiners discuss their views and recommendations.

It is good practice for one of the supervisors to be available to the candidate on the day of the viva for support and reassurance. Following the viva, it may help the candidate to have a debriefing session, in which questions and issues that arose in the viva can be discussed and Examiners’ recommendations and suggestions considered.

On receipt of the list of minor corrections or recommendations for resubmission, it is a good idea for supervisors to work through each point with the student and to advise on what is required and how to address each point. It is essential that the student submits the revised or reworked thesis within the timescales. Supervisors should ensure students do so. If a further viva is required, the supervisor may also arrange for a mock viva to take place.
Appendices

Appendix A: The ‘At Risk’ Procedure

The ‘At Risk’ procedure is intended to give early warning that a research degree programme is at risk of either not achieving the learning outcomes or such delays as to make timely completion unlikely. It may be instigated at any point if it can be demonstrated that a student has not achieved agreed targets or is not in regular contact with his or her supervisor(s).

A student is identified as ‘at risk’ if there is evidence that:

- they are making insufficient academic progress for their mode of study; or
- they lack a commitment to the research project, as demonstrated by repeated failure to produce agreed interim outcomes, to attend supervisory sessions and/or to attend a prescribed programme of related studies.

As soon as the Director of Studies identifies a student as ‘at risk’ for any of the reasons given above, s/he should immediately (i) notify the Chair of the Faculty Research Committee and (ii) write to the student detailing the reasons for concern and inviting the student to attend an emergency session to discuss the situation and to devise an action plan where appropriate. The emergency session should normally be scheduled within two working weeks of the date that the Director of Studies wrote to the student, and should be attended by a representative of the FRC who has not been associated previously with the project. The student may be accompanied by a friend or student representative.

A summary of the emergency session, including any action plan or revisions to the research programme, should be agreed by the Director of Studies and the student, and kept by the Director of Studies as part of the record of supervision. The FRC should be notified of the outcome of the emergency session and may instigate any further monitoring procedures it deems necessary.

If a student fails to respond to the letter, fails to attend the emergency session, or is unable to address satisfactorily the concerns of the Director of Studies so that an action plan can be agreed, the Director of Studies may, with the agreement of the other members of the supervisory team, recommend to the FRC that the student be withdrawn. Students have a right of Appeal against any such decision (see Research Student Handbook Appendix 7).

A recommendation to withdraw must be preceded by the implementation of the ‘at risk’ procedure outlined above.
Appendix B: Researcher Development Statement and Framework

Researcher Development Statement

The UK is committed to enhancing the higher-level capabilities of the UK workforce including the development of world-class researchers. Researchers are critical to economic success, addressing major global challenges, and building a leading knowledge economy.

The Researcher Development Statement (RDS) sets out the knowledge, behaviours and attributes of effective and highly skilled researchers appropriate for a wide range of careers. The RDS is for policy makers and research organisations which provide personal, professional and career development for researchers in higher education. The Researcher Development Statement is derived from the Researcher Development Framework (RDF), a major new approach to researcher development, which aims to enhance our capacity to build the UK workforce, develop world-class researchers and build our research base.

The RDF is structured in four domains encompassing the knowledge, intellectual abilities, techniques and professional standards to do research, as well as the personal qualities, knowledge and skills to work with others and ensure the wider impact of research. Within each of the domains are three sub-domains and associated descriptors, which describe different aspects of being a researcher.

For more information on the Researcher Development Framework and associated Statement go to www.vitae.ac.uk/rdf
Appendix C: Format of thesis

Preliminary matters

- The thesis shall be presented in English.
- There shall be a table of contents and associated page numbers at the front of the thesis.
- There shall be a one page abstract of approximately 300 words included at the start of the thesis which shall provide a synopsis of the thesis stating the nature and scope of the work undertaken and of the contribution made to the knowledge of the subject treated.
- The thesis shall include a statement of the candidate’s objective and shall acknowledge published or other sources of material consulted (including an appropriate bibliography) and any assistance received.
- Where a candidate’s research programme is part of a collaborative group project, the thesis shall indicate clearly the candidate’s individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration.
- The candidate shall be free to publish or exhibit material in advance of the thesis but reference shall be made in the thesis to any such work. If any part of a candidate’s work is published, the necessary elements of the copyright must be retained, so as to enable the final thesis be published on WIRE (University on-line repository) and submitted to the British Library.
- Where the thesis contains copyright protected material, the thesis will contain a copy of the written permission to publish the copyrighted material.
- The thesis will include evidence that the appropriate ethical approval has been granted.

Restrictions on access to a Thesis

If the thesis includes materials which are: politically, commercially, personally or industrially sensitive, or protected materials relating to questions of national security the student may request that access to it be restricted for a period of time. A thesis shall not be restricted in this way in order to protect research leads. In some cases, where an industrial sponsor funds a student’s studies or the research project on which the student is working, the contract which the University has drawn up with an industrial sponsor will stipulate any such a restriction.

An application for restricted access must be made at the earliest opportunity and at the latest when the examiners are appointed via an approved NOMEX form. An application should be submitted to the STaR Office using the form ‘Application for Restricted Access of a Research Degree Thesis’. Each application is considered by the Dean of Research in accordance with the grounds outlined in regulation 4.9. The period approved shall not normally exceed two years from the date of conferment of the Award. Where a shorter period would be adequate the Dean of Research shall not automatically grant the maximum two year period.

Where the Dean of Research has agreed that the confidential nature of the candidate’s work is such as to preclude the thesis being made freely available in on-line repository WIRE (and Collaborating Establishment, if any) and, in the case of a PhD, via the British Library, the thesis shall, immediately on completion of the programme of work, be retained by the University on restricted access and, for a time not exceeding the approved period, shall only be made available to those who were directly involved in the project. The copies of the thesis submitted for examination shall remain the property of the University but the copyright of the thesis shall be vested in the candidate.
Format requirements for the thesis submitted for examination

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

Word count
The text of the thesis should normally not exceed the following maximum length for the subject or type of research degree see table below. This word limit includes endnotes, footnotes and bibliography (except where specified otherwise below) but excludes essential ancillary data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>MPhil</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>25,000 words</td>
<td>45,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Social Sciences, Education and Business</td>
<td>45,000 words</td>
<td>90,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative and Performing Arts (where the thesis is accompanied by a portfolio of original, creative work, the following range applies)</td>
<td>20,000 -25,000 words</td>
<td>35,000 - 45,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Doctorate in Biomedical Science (DBMS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (PsychD)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Doctorate in Education (EdD)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Doctorate in Health and Wellbeing (DHW)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The word limit applies to the body of the thesis but excludes the reference list / bibliography, notes and appendices.

(Essential ancillary data should not normally exceed 20% of the length of the thesis. Where such data exceeds 20% of the length of the thesis, the consent of the examiners will be sought.)

- Theses shall normally be in A4 format. In exceptional cases the University Research Committee may give permission for a thesis to be submitted in another format where it is satisfied that the contents of the thesis can be better expressed in that format;
- Copies of the thesis shall be presented in a permanent and legible printed form. Any copies produced by photocopying must also be permanent and legible. The size of character used in the main text, including displayed matter and notes, shall be font size 12. You may use font style Arial, Tahoma or Verdana.
- The thesis may be printed on one or both sides of the paper which shall normally be white, of good quality and sufficiently opaque to avoid show-through;
- The margin at the binding edge of the page shall not be less than 40mm; other margins shall not be less than 15mm;
- Spacing of text should be consistent with clarity; in the main body of the text, this should normally be double-spaced.
- Pages shall be numbered consecutively through the main text including photographs and/or diagrams included as whole pages;

The title page shall give the following information (see specimen later):
- the full title of the thesis;
- the full name and qualifications of the author;
- that the degree is awarded by the University;
- the award for which the degree is submitted in partial fulfilment of its requirements;
- the Collaborating Establishment(s), if any;
- the month and year of submission; and
- statement of copyright.

Theses must be submitted for examination in a secure temporarily bound form.
Submission of the final thesis
Following successful examination, the final thesis must be submitted in electronic format (as detailed below) along with an electronic cataloguing information sheet and hard copy of the signed title page and declaration document. This is used to confirm that the electronic copy is identical to the copy submitted for examination, save for any amendments approved by the examiners. Following the award of the degree the Secretary to the University Research Committee shall send the electronic copy of the thesis to the Learning Centre for placement in the University's on-line repository (WIRE). It is the responsibility of the candidate to send a copy of the thesis to any Collaborating Establishment, in the agreed format.

The format of the e-thesis should be as follows:

- A single merged file as either a Word document or PDF file, in the following order:
  - Title Page
  - Abstract
  - Table of Contents
  - Acknowledgements (optional - unless there is formal collaboration in which case this is required)
  - Chapters in sequential order
  - Bibliography
  - All paginated sequentially

- Submitted to Registry either
  - e-mailed as an attachment to a specified address (details issued following successful examination)
  - sent or handed in on a CD
  - sent or handed in on a memory stick
  - Any non-text elements should be submitted as a separate file

In addition, the candidate is required to submit

(i) an electronic copy of the Cataloguing Information Form
(ii) a hard copy of the signed and dated Title Page
(iii) a hard copy of the signed and dated Declaration Document

Please note that the electronic copy of the thesis will be made available via WIRE, the University’s institutional repository. As such, students should be aware that substantial third party copyright material used in the thesis (e.g. substantial quotations from books or journals, pictures, photographs, maps, etc) must be either cleared for deposit with the copyright holder or removed from the thesis before deposit. ‘Substantial’ in copyright law does not only cover the amount used but also relates to the quality of the quotation.

This does not affect the inclusion of fully referenced and acknowledged third party material in the thesis submitted for examination purposes: it only applies to the deposit of the thesis into the University repository. Please contact WIRE at wire@wlv.ac.uk further advice and assistance with clearing third party material.
Appendix D: PhD by Published Work

This section of the Supervisors’ Handbook clarifies clauses relating to PhD by Published Work in the Regulations.

Application

Initial registration for the PhD by Published Work is through the Research Proposal.

Period of Study

The normal period of study for a PhD by Published Work shall be 12 months from the date of approval of the Research Proposal.

a) Eligible members of staff

Eligible members of staff are defined for this purpose as academic staff of the University of Wolverhampton appointed to a full-time contract or occupying a substantive part-time post equivalent to at least 0.5 of a full-time contract. Staff undertaking a PhD by Published Work must be in such employment at the time of approval of the Research proposal and at the time of submission of the PhD. They will have been in post for at least one year prior to submission of the Research Proposal.

b) Learning outcomes and peer review

The learning outcomes expressly refer to peer-review and sole or lead authorship (see also (c) and (d), below). The learning outcomes must all be demonstrated in the written commentary and/or peer reviewed original research-based publications. Note that publications that have not been peer reviewed cannot be submitted for a PhD by Published Work. The publications submitted for examination will constitute a corpus of work that contributes a coherent body of knowledge rather than a series of disconnected research outputs.

c) Commentary and body of work

The written submission for a PhD by Published Work is comprised of the published works and a commentary. A guide to the word count can be found in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Published works</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Total word count for written submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>Up to 35,000 words</td>
<td>At least 10,000 words</td>
<td>45,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (Arts, Social Sciences, Education and Business)</td>
<td>Up to 70,000 words</td>
<td>At least 20,000 words</td>
<td>90,000 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regulations state that 80% of the published works must have appeared within six years of the date of submission for examination. The 80% is calculated as the proportion of separately published outputs rather than as a proportion of total word count. Given the expected duration of the period of study prior to examination, it is expected that at least 80% of the published works will have appeared within 5 years prior to the approval of the Research Proposal. Where appropriate, a maximum of 20% of outputs may have appeared within 10 years prior to its approval.

The definition of a published work can include individual chapters in a multi-authored book, provided that such works have been peer reviewed. Where more than one chapter in a single book is included in the body of published work, there is a strong expectation that, taken together, these will comprise less than half of the research outputs under consideration. The commentary will be presented in English. The published works will also be in English unless a specific exemption is sought from the University Research Committee at the time of submission of the Research Proposal. Permission to include publications in a language other than English will normally only be granted provided...
that the thesis advisor has reading knowledge of the language of the publications and that the inclusion of such publications would not prejudice or limit the selection of appropriate examiners or Independent Chair.

What should be included in the Commentary
The written commentary provides a context for the published work, a statement (or re-statement) of the argument/research questions (including theoretical and methodological underpinnings) that the publications together put forward. This should explain how the findings from the collection of publications address the research question. The commentary should also a state (or restate) the original contribution(s) to knowledge that the publications together advance.

d) Co-authored works
Where jointly authored works are to be included, a statement from the co-authors clearly identifying the candidate’s intellectual ownership and contribution to each publication should be sought. In addition the written commentary must clarify the candidate’s contribution and identify the basis for his/her claim to the intellectual content of any jointly authored works. Candidates should expect their individual contribution to multi-authored works to be a focus of the oral examination.

e) ‘Supervision’ of candidate for the award of PhD by Published Works
Guidance on the submission of work for this award is carried out by an ‘Academic Advisor’ rather than a Supervisor. The Academic Advisor should not only have appropriate academic standing in the discipline and substantial supervision, but also, ideally, examining experience at the level of PhD.

f) Examiners’ recommendations
Following the oral examination, the examiners will be asked to make one of the following recommendations:

(i) Pass.
(ii) Pass, subject to the correction of minor editorial or other stated deficiencies in the commentary, to be made within twelve weeks. The degree will not be awarded until confirmation that the corrections have been completed is received. Where the candidate does not submit the corrected commentary within twelve weeks, and in the absence of recorded extenuating circumstances, the University reserves the right not to confer the award.
(iii) Fail.

g) Failure of PhD by Published Work
Where the examiners’ recommendation is fail, the candidate may re-enrol for a PhD by Published Work. The new enrolment period shall not begin earlier than three years from the date of the oral examination leading to the ‘fail’ recommendation, and the normal period of study shall be 12 months from the date of approval of the Research Proposal. The candidate shall submit a new body of publications and commentary. A new team of examiners will be appointed.
Appendix E: Procedure for the Investigation of Academic Misconduct by Research Students.

The University’s procedure for research students is closely modelled on that used for undergraduates and students on taught postgraduate programmes.

1. Definitions

A research student is defined as a student of the University who is enrolled on a research degree programme leading to the degrees of Master of Philosophy (MPhil), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) or a Master’s degree by research. Students studying for a professional doctorate who are in the thesis phase of their study programme are also defined as research students for the purposes of this procedure.

Cheating

Cheating is defined as any attempt by a candidate to gain unfair advantage in an assessment by dishonest means, and includes e.g. all breaches of examination rules, falsifying data, commissioning of an assessment form a third party.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of taking someone else’s work and passing it off as your own. This includes incorporating either unattributed direct quotation(s) or substantial paraphrasing from the work of another/others/or yourself.

Collusion

Collusion occurs when two or more students (and/or researchers) collaborate to produce a piece of work to be submitted (in whole or part) for assessment and the work is presented as the work of one student alone, without due acknowledgement of the contribution of others.

In the context of all three definitions: where research students are working in closely related fields to one another, or are supported by technical staff, it is important that each student takes care not to claim deliberately or inadvertently that a given piece of work carried out by someone else is their own work. Due acknowledgement must always be made to the contributions of others, whether in work submitted for assessment, presented at a conference or placed in the public domain through publication or any other medium.

2. Where a case of academic misconduct as defined above is suspected in a piece of work contributing to a research award of the University, the matter must be referred to the relevant Director/Head of the Research Institute/Centre or Dean of Faculty (or nominee), who will determine whether a prima facie case exists to investigate the matter further. The Director/Head/Dean or nominee may seek advice from the Conduct and Appeals Unit in considering the matter. If the Director/Head/Dean or nominee then decides that the matter should be investigated further he or she must inform the Head of the Conduct and Appeals Unit.

* For the purpose of this procedure a “piece of work contributing to a research award of the University” is any written work or oral presentation submitted to the supervisors for assessment or submitted to a Faculty Research Committee in support of the progression stage of a Research Degree Programme or as part of annual monitoring.

3. If a prima facie case for further investigation is established. A letter inviting the student to a meeting will be sent by the Research Institute/Centre (RI/RC).

Academic or administrative staff should not discuss the matter with students. Students who enquire about their assessment should be told that they will be receiving a letter from the Research Institute/Centre (RI/RC) inviting them to a meeting to discuss the work.

The meeting will have in attendance:-

- The Director/Head of the RI or RC, or Dean of Faculty, or nominee
- The Head of the Conduct and Appeals Unit
- Student (and friend)
- Note taker (provided by the Conduct and Appeals Unit)
4. The student will be given the opportunity to discuss with the panel the circumstances which have led to the assessment which is at the centre of the allegation. The standard and burden of proof for the University to prove the allegation(s) of misconduct is, if on the available evidence it is more likely than not that misconduct has occurred then the burden and standard of proof is fulfilled and a penalty will be imposed as appropriate.

If, as a result of this meeting, academic misconduct is admitted by the student or the evidence clearly shows that academic misconduct has occurred, the relevant Faculty Research Committee will be informed and will be requested to apply the appropriate penalty (see paragraph 7 below). The student will be informed in writing within seven working days of the meeting.

5. **Penalties**

Academic Board has agreed that the penalty for serious academic misconduct by any postgraduate research student is exclusion from the University.

Note: Serious academic misconduct is defined as any case, which has either been admitted by a student, or which a panel has judged to include:

- deliberate, premeditated cheating,
- premeditated attempt to deceive and gain unfair advantage,
- significant plagiarism in a critical piece of work i.e. thesis

6. **Right of Appeal**

A student will have the right to appeal against the decision reached by a Stage One hearing. The grounds for appeal are:

- That an administrative error or material irregularity has occurred in the conduct of the investigation.
- That there were personal circumstances which they believe would have affected the decision taken by the panel had they been made aware of them. The student must have a good reason not to have revealed the circumstances to the Stage One hearing.

Appeals must be made within **20 working days** of the receipt of the letter which informs the student of the penalty imposed.

Students are advised to contact the Students’ Union for advice and support prior to submitting an appeal. The Students’ Union Advice & Support Centre can be contacted via email to advice.wolvesunion@wlv.ac.uk or by calling 01902 322038. Details of the Students Union Representation Service are available on their website: www.wolvesunion.org and will be included in the invite letter.

Appeals should be made in writing to:

The Office of the Dean of Students
Gateway @ The George
University of Wolverhampton
Wulfruna Street, Wolverhampton
WV1 1LY

The Head of the Conduct and Appeals Unit (where they have had no previous involvement with the case) or the Dean of Students will review the request for an appeal to determine whether or not the appellant has demonstrated valid grounds for an appeal to proceed. To determine whether it is appropriate for the appeal to be considered by a Stage Two Appeals Panel additional documentation may be requested.

If it is determined that the student has demonstrated a valid case for an appeal to proceed then the case will be referred to a Stage Two Appeal Hearing. If this is not found to be the case a Completion of Procedures letter will be issued, in accordance with the format prescribed by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education.

An appeal review should normally be completed in no more than **30 working days**.

7. **Stage Two Hearing**
The membership of a Stage Two Appeal Panel will be:
- Chair - a Dean of a Faculty other than that to which the student belongs, or their nominee.
- A senior member of academic staff from a Faculty other than that to which the student belongs.
- A Students’ Union representative nominated by the President of the Students’ Union.

Members of the appeal panel shall not have been involved in the original Academic Misconduct Hearing.

Also present will be:
- The student (and friend/representative) – to present the appeal
- A representative from the Stage One Academic Misconduct Panel to present a response to the appeal
- A senior member of staff from the Conduct and Appeals Unit (with no prior involvement in the case at stage one) to provide procedural and regulatory advice to the panel.
- An officer of the Conduct and Appeals Unit to take notes

An audio recording will also be taken. Students who would prefer not to have an audio recording made will be required to request this in advance.

Both parties may call witnesses to appear before the panel

The appellant must be given written notice, at least 7 working days prior to the hearing, of the date and place of the hearing, and a copy of the University’s Academic Misconduct procedure, drawing attention to the appellant’s rights under the procedure. The standard and burden of proof applied will be the same as at stage one of this procedure.

Students will be advised to contact the Students’ Union for advice and support. The Students’ Union Advice & Support Centre can be contacted via email to advice.wolvesunion@wlv.ac.uk or by calling 01902 322038. Details of the Students Union Representation Service are available on their website: www.wolvesunion.org and will be included in the invite letter.

At least 5 working days before the hearing, members of the Stage Two Panel and the appellant and the representative from the Faculty will be provided with the appropriate documentation. The appellant may also provide an additional written statement to the panel.

The student has the right to appear before and be heard by the Stage Two panel. They may be accompanied by a friend (the student shall be responsible for notifying the Conduct and Appeals Unit of the identity of the friend or witness not less than 2 working days prior to the hearing). The role of the friend can be either to provide support (in which case they would not be expected to speak) or to act as a representative (in which case the student would attend but the representative would speak on their behalf).

The Student would normally be expected to attend the stage two hearing. If the student fails to attend the meeting without a valid reason then a decision will be taken in their absence. Students who do not wish to attend the meeting may submit written representations which should be received no later than 2 working days prior to the hearing.

The Chair of the panel shall have discretion to manage the conduct of the hearing including to adjourn, continue or postpone a hearing and to limit the length of the hearing, the questioning of witnesses, and the number of witnesses called.

The student and the representative from the stage one Academic Misconduct Panel may present evidence and call witnesses, who may be questioned by the other party and by the Panel. The student will always be afforded the opportunity to make a final closing statement.

The panel will consider its decision in private. The panel, at the end of its deliberation will either uphold the appeal in whole or part or dismiss the appeal. Where the appeal is upheld the panel can decide to impose an alternative penalty or to rule that no penalty should be imposed.

The decision taken by this panel will be final.
The student will be informed of the outcome and reasons in writing within 5 working days of the hearing. A Completion of Procedures letter will also be issued to the student, in accordance with the format prescribed by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. Further details of the review scheme operated by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) are available at their website: www.oiahe.org.uk

The Panel decision will be communicated to the Chair of the Research Awards Sub-Committee (RASC).

It is anticipated that the full appeal process will take no longer than 90 calendar days to conclude.

**Office of the Independent Adjudicator**

If having exhausted all Stages of the University’s internal procedure, the student considers that the University has failed to consider and respond to their appeal appropriately, they can refer the case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). This office provides an independent scheme for the review of student complaints and appeals.

In order to refer their case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator they will require a Completion of Procedures Letter. A Completion of Procedures letter will be issued when all applicable stages of the procedure have been exhausted. The letter will be issued in accordance with the format prescribed by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

Details of the rules of the scheme and information about how to make an application for review by the OIA are available at their website: www.oiahe.org.uk

Students are advised to contact the Students’ Union for advice and support prior to submitting a complaint to the OIA. The Students’ Union Advice & Support Centre can be contacted via email to advice.wolvesunion@wlv.ac.uk or by calling 01902 322038.
Appendix F: Higher Doctorates
The University of Wolverhampton awards higher doctorates for a substantial portfolio of work of distinction which makes original contributions to the advancement of knowledge and its application.

a) Applications for the following Higher Doctorates include:
- Doctor of Science (DSc)
- Doctor of Letters (DLitt)
- Doctor of Laws (LL.D.)
- Doctor of Social Science (DSocSc)

b) Eligibility
Candidates should normally either:

(i) be holders, of at least seven years standing, of a first degree awarded by a UK University (or equivalent body), or of a qualification of equivalent standard; or

(ii) be holders, of at least four years standing, of a higher degree awarded by a UK University (or equivalent body), or of a qualification of equivalent standard.

c. The Nature of Submissions
Work submitted must be of high distinction; it should constitute an original and significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge and/or its application and should support the case that the applicant is an authority in his/her field of study. That the latter is the case will be demonstrated by evidence of a sustained and coherent contribution to scholarship over a number of years. Such evidence will largely be provided by published work submitted but may be complemented by supporting evidence of sustained contributions to higher education, especially at the postgraduate level in such activities as successful research degree supervision and examination of research degree candidates.

d. Permissible Publications
Books: Those focused on the specialism(s) and research area(s) of the applicant; those which have become standard undergraduate and postgraduate texts; those bodies of work edited by and/or contributed to by applicants.

Papers: While contributions to the full range of published material in a candidate's field may be submitted, the greatest weight is likely to be given to publications of substance appearing in learned journals (including electronic journals) and which are subjected to academic peer refereeing; conference papers which ultimately appear in appropriate scholarly media are acceptable.

Other Contributions: Patent specifications, reports, design studies and other relevant evidence of original work may be submitted as part of an applicant’s portfolio. Work yet to be published, provided that there is firm evidence of its having been accepted for publication (such as the copy of a proof or some other pre-printed stage) may be considered as part of a candidate's case, although a preponderance of work in press may convey the impression of insufficient research maturity.

e. Procedure
An applicant should submit three copies of the work upon which the application is based: all material other than books must be secured in chronological order in one or more hard-backed folders, each containing a title and contents page. The contents of a submission must be in English unless specific permission to the contrary has been given by the University.

In addition to the copies of the work on which the application is based, applicants must submit one copy of the completed application form. The must be considered by the appropriate Faculty Research Committee (FRC) before forwarding to the University Research Committee (URC). A list of potential advisors/examiners may be included as
part of the application although it is at the discretion of any Higher Doctorate panel whether any persons on that list are approached at any stage.

Submission of an application must also be accompanied by the appropriate fee. Upon receipt of an application for a Higher Doctorate and accompanying documentation, the Chair of URC will convene a panel to examine the evidence and assess whether a prima facie case for proceedings to a formal examination has been established. The panel will consist of the Chair of URC (or delegate, in case of a conflict of interest), a member of the University's Offices of the Vice Chancellor, at least two other members of the University whose expertise is relevant and at least one specialist in the field from outside the University. The panel may take whatever advice it considers to be appropriate, including the use of external advisors. If satisfied that a case has been established, the panel will select two external examiners at least one of whom must hold a Higher Doctorate or equivalent qualification. URC must approve any examination arrangements before any further action can be taken. When approval has been given, the full application along with copies of all papers will be sent to the examiners for scrutiny. Each examiner must then make an independent report to the University. In the case of disagreement between the examiners, the University may appoint a third examiner. Examiners' reports will be put before the URC who will decide whether a recommendation to confer the award will be made to Academic Board. The applicant will be advised of the decision of the URC at this stage.

The University shall retain on controlled access one set of the publications (suitably bound) submitted in support of an application which is successful. The other two sets shall be returned to the applicant. In the case of applications which are unsuccessful, the Dean of Research shall inform candidates of the weaknesses which are deemed to exist in the case made for the higher doctorate and advise them whether it is in their best interests to resubmit at some future date. By the nature of higher doctoral submissions, a candidate would normally be advised not to re-submit before two years had elapsed from the previous application.

f. Fees
Fees payable shall be those approved from time to time by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of Academic Board. Registry will provide for intending candidates information regarding the payment of fees.
Appendix G: Specimen Forms

Application for Write-up Stage
Students commencing the writing up stage of their Research may apply for a reduced fee using the writing up application form published in the Research Students Handbook and available on-line at TBC. Staff please refer to Research Operations Handbook for full details).

The writing up stage may only be approved when the Director of Studies is satisfied that the student has completed all field work, data collection, analysis, submitted a significant majority of chapters and that no further use will be made of equipment or laboratories.

Directors of Study are required to complete a section of the students writing up application to confirm this. This application is then considered for approval by the Post Graduate Research Tutor and submitted to the STaR Office. The writing up period is for a maximum of 12 months. Any student who does not complete the written thesis within this period will revert to full fees regardless of mode and location of study, provided they are within the maximum registration period.

If you meet the above criteria please fill in the relevant sections below.

Student Number:

Student Surname: Student Forename:

Director of Studies:

Please attach written evidence to support your application for write up (maximum 500 words)

Signature……………………………………………………………………… Date:

Director of Studies (only)

Has the student completed all data collection and analysis? YES/NO

Does the student require any further use of equipment and or laboratories to complete their project? YES/NO

Which chapters of the thesis have been submitted to you in draft?

Based on your evaluation of the students’ draft chapters, is s/he likely to complete the written thesis to publishable standard within 12 months? YES/NO

Signature………………………………………………………………………Date:

Faculty Postgraduate Research Tutor (only)

Can you confirm the above is true and approve the application….Yes/No

Signature………………………………………………………………………Date:

STaR Office (only)

Date application form received:

Original registration date:

Write up year will commence:

Write up year expiry:

Confirmation of Writing-up Period sent to student/DoS: Date:
Appendix H: How to access the eVision Research Supervision Log

Research Supervisor Logs – Add a New Log

To add a new log click the ‘Update’ button.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Code</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>View All Meetings</th>
<th>Update Research Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>030000002</td>
<td>RICHARDS-TESCJ</td>
<td>BU002001UV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete all sections of the form.

- Select the Type of Meeting from the drop down list.
- Please only select meeting if you have met the student face to face in the UK
- Enter the date of the meeting using the format DD/MM/YY
- Add in the names of those attending the meeting
- Add the notes of the meeting into the ‘Meeting Notes’ field
- Click ‘Next’

If ‘Date of Meeting’ or ‘Meeting Notes’ are left blank, the log will not be stored and the following error messages will be displayed. If the ‘Meeting Attendees’ fields do not have at least one attendee entered an error message will also be displayed and the log will not be stored.
If any of the details displayed are incorrect, the ‘Edit’ button should be clicked. When the ‘Edit’ button is clicked, the user will be returned to the ‘Create New Meeting’ screen.

If all information is correct, click ‘Save and the meeting will be saved.