

Alternative formats of this document

This publication can be provided in alternative formats such as large print, Braille, tape and on disk to suit specific needs. Please forward your request to the Documentation and Learning Materials Manager at the Institute for Work Based Learning or the Research and Business Office of Middlesex University.

Telephone 020 8411 6772 or 020 8411 2629

Email wbl@mdx.ac.uk or S.Narkiewicz@mdx.ac.uk

To listen to this document

- 1 Download a copy of this handbook from the DPS pages in Oasisplus and on the RBO intranet site
- 2 Open up the PDF file of the handbook in Adobe Reader
- 3 From the top menu bar, select **View**
- 4 From the **View** menu, select **Read out loud**
- 5 Select your preferred option from this menu to control how the document is read to you.

Note To change the speed and tone of your computer's voice, go to the **Ease of access centre** in your control panel and select your preferred settings.

Contents

Section 1	3
Standards of the MProf and DProf	3
1.1 Master of Professional Studies (MProf).....	3
1.2 Doctor of Professional Studies (DProf)	3
Section 2	5
2.1 Assessment of part 1 of the programme	5
2.1.1 MProf/DProf assessment board	6
2.1.2 Middlesex University SVP assessment board	6
2.1.3 Collaborative SVP assessment board	7
3.1 Principles	8
3.2 Application for registration for part 2 (project module/s)	9
3.4 Registration	11
3.5 Supervision and academic support.....	13
3.6 Submission of project outcome(s) for examination	14
3.7 Examinations of final project/s: general	16
3.8 Examination procedures	17
3.9 Candidate’s responsibilities in the examination process.....	18
3.10 Examiners and chair	18
3.11 First examination.....	20
3.12 Re-examination	22
3.12.1 Re-examination.....	22
3.12.2 Project re-examination	22
3.12.3 Programme Assessment Board decision	23
3.12.4 Appointment of an additional external examiner.....	24
3.12.5 Panel of enquiry.....	24
3.13 The project	25
3.13.1 Project submission.....	25
3.13.3 Format requirements	26
3.13.4 Lodging a research project(s)	26
3.13.5 Review of an examination decision.....	26

Appendix 1	28
Definition of project size	28
Appendix 2	30
Presentation of projects	30
Appendix 3	32
Appendix 4	34
Electronic repository form	34
Appendix 5	40
University appeal regulations and procedures	40
2010/11	40
Appendix 6	44
Complaints and grievance procedures	44
6.1 Introduction.....	44
6.2 Basic principles the general student complaints procedures	44
6.3 Procedures	45
6.3.1 Informal stage 1.....	45
6.3.2 Informal stage 2.....	46
6.3.3 Formal stage	46
6.3.4 Appeal	47
6.3.5 Complaints panel	48
6.4 Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education.....	50
6.5 Notes.....	51
6.5.1 Interpretation.....	51

Section 1

Standards of the MProf and DProf

1.1 Master of Professional Studies (MProf)

The standard of the MProf is that expected of a candidate who has engaged in Work Based Learning, from taught and project sources, relating to organisational change and/or professional development. The candidate is required to produce a substantive project report and to orally present and defend the report.

The candidate must have demonstrated:

- a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current issues, much of which is at or informed by the forefront of their area of professional practice
- research and development capability and project management skills applicable to the professional area of their study
- conceptual understanding that enables the candidate to:
- evaluate critically, current professional knowledge in their area of study
- evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new approaches.

1.2 Doctor of Professional Studies (DProf)

The standard of the DProf is that expected of a candidate who has engaged in advanced Work Based Learning, from taught and major project sources, which has the potential to achieve major organisational change and/or excellence in professional practice resulting in original work worthy of publication in complete or abridged form. The candidate must have shown evidence of ability to undertake self-managed and/or collaborative research and project development and must have orally defended the product of the study to the satisfaction of the assessors.

The candidate must have demonstrated the:

- general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project of use for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding which is at the forefront of the professional area, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems or opportunities
- potential usefulness of the project to specific audience(s)
- creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, to extend the forefront of the professional area, and merit publication
- advanced research and development capability and advanced project management skills which have been applied to their professional area of their study
- advanced conceptual understanding, often of an interdisciplinary nature, that enables the candidate to evaluate:
 - critically, current advanced professional knowledge in their area of study
 - methodologies, epistemologies, and develop advanced critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new approaches.

The assessment criteria for levels 7 and 8 are included in the relevant programme handbook, and are agreed at validation

Section 2

Introduction

The MProf/DProf framework (including specialist validated pathway (SVP) variants) comprises two parts.

Assessment of part 1 is at level 7 against the specific learning outcomes of part 1 modules. Part 2 of the programme is project activity which, for the degree of MProf, is assessed at level 7 (masters level) and which, for the degree of DProf, is assessed at level 8 (doctoral level). Both parts of the programme are constructed within a modular framework which is credit-rated.¹

All modules are validated in accordance with the University's validation procedures and grades for all modules are determined by the programme assessment board. Details of the part 1 modules are given in each of the programmes handbooks.

The award of MProf, DProf or SVP degree is made by the University's Research and Research Degrees Committee following examiners' recommendations from the programme assessment board or SVP school research degree committee/assessment board as appropriate.

2.1 Assessment of part 1 of the programme

Assessment is conducted in accordance with the learning outcomes and method of assessment approved for the module concerned, and detailed in the module handbook for the MProf/DProf programme or the handbook for the SVP. The University regulations for taught programmes apply. Submission of coursework is to the School/IWBL office for MProf/DProf, or as specified in the relevant SVP programme handbook. All part 1 assessments are subject to internal moderation and external examiner scrutiny. Assessment decisions at the module level are made by the programme assessment board or SVP assessment board.

¹ In the Business School part 1 is known as phases 1 and 2 at Level 7, part 2 is known as phase 3 at Level 8.

2.1.1 MProf/DProf assessment board

Membership of the board comprises:

- chair: academic director of the MProf/DProf programme or nominee
- external examiner for the scheme
- director of programmes
- internal examiners: all module leader
- secretary: MProf/DProf programme administration manager.

The board's terms of reference are to:

- determine the grade awarded to each candidate in respect of all modules in the scheme
- make recommendations to the University's Research and Research Degrees Committee in respect of final awards
- receive the decisions of the Accreditation Panel (RAL decisions)
- determine entitlement to defer/reassessment.

2.1.2 Middlesex University SVP assessment board

Membership of the board comprises:

- Chair: appropriate School Associate Dean (or nominee)
- external examiner for the programme
- internal examiners: all module leaders
- Secretary: to be determined by the School Associate Dean Research , normally the DProf administrator
- The board's terms of reference are to:
- determine the grade awarded to each candidate in respect of all modules in the programme²
- make recommendations to the University's Research and Research Degrees

2 In HSSC the School Research Committee determines module grades for part 2

Committee in respect of final awards³

- receive the decisions of the Accreditation Panel (RAL decisions)
- determine entitlement to defer/reassessment.

2.1.3 Collaborative SVP assessment board

Membership of the board comprises:

- Chair: School/IWBL Associate Dean Research (or nominee)
- external examiner for the programme
- internal examiners: all module leaders
- link tutors
- Secretary: to be determined by collaborative partner.

For collaborative provision the internal examiners may be from the partner institution.

The board's terms of reference are to:

- determine the grade awarded to each candidate in respect of each module in the programme
- make recommendations to the University Research and Research Degrees Committee in respect of final awards
- receive the decisions of the Accreditation Panel (RAL decisions)
- determine entitlement to defer/reassessment.

Candidates have the right to self-defer assessment once. If a module is failed, candidates have one re-sit as of right. The programme assessment board may agree a second resit in exceptional circumstances.

University regulations governing appeals against programme assessment board decisions and consideration of attempts to gain unfair advantage apply to part 1 of the programme. Specific module assessment requirements shall be as detailed in the approved handbook for the programme.

3

In HSSC the School Research Committee makes the recommendation to RRDC.

Section 3

Programme regulations

3.1 Principles

- 3.1.1 Middlesex University shall award the degree of Master of Professional Studies (MProf), Doctor of Professional Studies (DProf), or SVP variant to a candidate who successfully completes both parts 1 and 2 of their programme.
- 3.1.2 For the MProf and DProf, projects may be proposed in any field of professional activity subject to the requirement that the project(s) satisfy the overall standard of the award and constitute a valid and coherent programme which is approved by the MProf/ DProf programme approval panel.
- 3.1.3 For the SVP variant, the project proposed must be in a field of professional activity appropriate to the SVP concerned subject to the requirement that the project(s) satisfy the overall standard of the award and constitute a valid and coherent programme which is approved by the SVP programme approval panel.
- 3.1.4 Part 2 of the programme shall consist of either one or two project modules. In cases where a candidate undertakes two projects, the link between them shall be made clear at programme approval. Candidates shall be permitted sequential examination of the two projects.
- 3.1.5 The scope of the project(s) shall be determined as part of the programme approval process. The focus of the project(s) shall be taken into account by the programme approval panel.
- 3.1.6 The project(s) may involve collaborative activity reflecting the organisational significance of the programme. There shall be either a team of masters and/or doctoral candidates engaged in a single project or the team leader of the project alone may be the candidate. In either case, each candidate shall identify, distinguish and justify their contribution to the project.

3.1.7 A project shall result in an outcome or product which relates to organisational change and/or professional development or professional excellence. Such outcomes or products shall include reports, books,

manuals, audio-visual material as agreed by the programme approval panel. Projects for the degree of DProf (or SVP equivalent) shall comply fully with the level-8 descriptors. Those for the degree of MProf (or SVP equivalent) shall comply fully with the level-7 descriptors.

3.2 Application for registration for part 2 (project module/s)

No candidate for the award of either MProf or DProf (or SVP variants) shall progress to part 2 of the programme until they have passed all part 1 taught modules.

Part 1 of the programme includes the module **Planning a Practitioner Research Programme** (or SVP equivalent), the gateway to part 2. There shall be no exemption from this module.

3.3 Planning a Practitioner Research Programme (or SVP equivalent)

The candidate shall:

- submit three copies of their learning agreement (module coursework) to the programme administration manager, who shall copy it to the module leader and programme adviser for assessment as soon as possible after submission and at least 10 days prior to the programme approval panel
- be assessed by means of a presentation and oral questioning by the programme approval panel. The presentation shall normally be 20 minutes in length, and this shall be followed by questioning and discussion with the candidate normally also of 20 minutes' duration.

The programme approval panel shall:

- always be chaired by the Academic Director of the MProf/ DProf programme (or nominee). There shall also be a Secretary to the panel

- normally meet at the end of the assessment period of both semesters. Additional meetings shall be at the discretion of the chair
- consider whether or not the candidate's programme constitutes an approved pathway to the indicated award (MProf, DProf or SVP).

When considering a programme proposal, the panel shall be satisfied that:

- potential of the programme satisfies the level 7 assessment criteria (level-7 descriptors) for the MProf programme (or SVP variant) and level-8 assessment criteria (level-8 descriptors) for the DProf programme (or SVP variant)
- proposed programme is coherent and that there is a rationale for the inclusion of any accredited learning
- proposed programme is feasible
- candidate's employer/sponsor has given its agreement, as appropriate
- level of the award sought and the proposed title (the field of study) are appropriate
- there is a rationale for any collaboration in the proposed programme
- relevant issues such as ethics, health, and safety have been taken into account
- assessors, in addition to written report, will complete an Ethics Comments form on the ethical aspects of the programme plan.

Following completion of the assessment, the panel may decide/recommend that the programme:

- constitutes an approved pathway (i.e. that registration for part 2 be permitted)
- constitutes an approved pathway subject to minor amendments (i.e. that registration for part 2 be allowed subject to appropriate amendments gaining approval by the chair within a specified period of time)
- does not constitute an approved pathway, and should be reworked and resubmitted to a subsequent meeting of the panel. In this case, there shall be only one resubmission as of right.

Panel members shall each complete an assessment sheet while the panel is in session. Assessment sheets of all panel members shall be retained by the secretary together with the master record of decisions taken by the panel.

Candidates shall be informed in writing of the outcome of their panel assessment. The notification letter shall be written by the chair in consultation with the candidate's academic adviser and shall include a statement of the outcome in respect of a recommendation.

3.4 Registration

3.4.1 Approval by the programme approval panel shall permit a candidate to progress to part 2 of the programme. The project modules available are described in the appropriate programme handbook and all are assessed at level 7 (for the degree of MProf) and at level 8 (for the degree of DProf).

Candidates shall choose one or two of these modules. The number of credit points that a candidate requires for part 2 shall depend on the qualification sought (MProf, DProf or SVP) and, for DProf and SVP doctorate only, whether the candidate has level 8 recognition and accreditation of learning (RAL). The number of credits required from project modules shall be as stated in the relevant handbook.

Where a team of candidates collaborates in one project, the length of the project outcome shall normally be increased by 50 per cent and shall be subject to specific approval by the programme approval panel.

3.4.2 The registration of projects of candidates on the programme shall satisfy the level 7 descriptors for MProf (and SVP variant) candidates and the level-8 descriptors for DProf (and SVP variant) candidates.

3.4.3 The minimum and maximum project sizes shall be as specified in the appropriate **appendix 1** of these regulations.

3.4.4 A candidate may be permitted to undertake two projects provided they are approved by the programme approval panel as part of a coherent programme.

3.4.5 A candidate for both the MProf and DProf may undertake the part 2 modules on a full- or part-time basis. The available modes of study for an SVP will be as specified in the appropriate programme handbook.

3.4.6 The outcome or product of the project shall be written in English unless the programme approval panel has approved its presentation in another language.

- 3.4.7 Where a candidate or the organisation wishes the outcome or product to remain confidential for a period of time after completion of the work, application for this shall be made to the programme approval panel at least three months before the formal submission date approved by the programme approval panel. The panel shall normally approve an application for confidentiality in order to enable a patent application to be lodged or to protect commercially or politically sensitive material. While the normal maximum period of confidentiality is two years, in exceptional circumstances, the programme approval panel may approve a longer period. Where a shorter period would be adequate, the programme approval panel will not automatically grant confidentiality for two years.
- 3.4.8 Where a candidate is prevented by ill health or other good cause from making progress with the project, the registration may be suspended by the programme approval panel in its discretion, normally for not more than one year at a time. It shall be the candidate's responsibility to inform the programme administration manager of any circumstances, medical or otherwise, which may affect their progress with the project. The candidate shall be notified in writing by the programme administration manager of the decision of the programme approval panel in respect of the re-negotiated timescale for the project.
- 3.4.9 A candidate shall submit the outcome or product of their project as directed in the appropriate programme handbook by the deadline specified on the information sheet given to candidates. The programme approval panel may exceptionally extend a candidate's period of registration normally for not more than one year. It shall be the candidate's responsibility to send a written request for extension of time to the chair of the programme approval panel. Any extension granted shall be notified to the candidate in writing by programme administration manager.
- 3.4.10 The programme Assessment Board/School Research Degree Committee working through the programme administration manager shall monitor annually the progress of every candidate registered for part 2 of the programme to establish insofar as is reasonably possible on the information available that good progress is being made and that supervision, support and facilities are adequate. Upon receipt of monitoring reports from academic advisers and candidates, the programme assessment board shall take appropriate action. This may include changes to the candidate's team (such as an additional academic consultant), a change from MProf to DProf or from DProf to MProf (or SVP equivalents), or the undertaking of an additional module or, in exceptional cases, that the candidate be required to withdraw.

- 3.4.11 In cases where the programme assessment board decides that a candidate's progress is unsatisfactory and that withdrawal is required, the candidate shall be informed of this fact, in writing, by the chair of the programme assessment board. The candidate shall be given a reasonable timescale (not normally less than four months) for improvements to be made. Where these improvements are not made by the stated date, the candidate shall be informed in writing by the programme assessment board/school research degree committee that a decision has been made to end the registration.
- 3.4.12 A candidate may use the complaints and grievance procedures for research students in cases where they believe that the decision to terminate the registration is unjustified. These procedures are included in this regulations handbook.
- 3.4.13 Where a candidate has discontinued the project, they shall communicate in writing this withdrawal of registration to the Programme Administration Manager.
- 3.4.14 A candidate shall pay such fees as may be determined from time to time by the University or partner organisation in the case of a collaborative SVP and which are notified to the candidate at the beginning of each academic year.

3.5 Supervision and academic support

- 3.5.1 In part 2 of the programme, a candidate shall be supported by a team consisting of an Academic Adviser and one or more Consultants, depending on the particular needs of the candidate in relation to the project(s) being undertaken.
- 3.5.2 In cases where there are two Consultants, the second one shall normally be appointed after the candidate has formulated the project(s)/proposal and shall have a specialist supervisory and assessment role, ensuring the project's academic rigour.
- 3.5.3 For the MProf/DProf, the academic adviser shall be from a core team approved by the Programme Directors or the Chair of the School Research Degree Committee. For collaborative SVPs the Academic Adviser is from the partner institution. Academic Advisers from partner institutions will be trained by the partner institution in a comparable way to the university's training. The university's training will be made available to partner staff acting as academic advisers. The adviser shall help the candidate plan and formulate their programme and shall focus on the relationship of

the project(s) to the generic level-7 descriptors for MProf candidates and the generic level-8 descriptors for DProf candidates.

- 3.5.4 The Module Leader shall be responsible for the academic content and successful delivery of the module and is also responsible for the assessment of the module.
- 3.5.5 The Academic Adviser and module leader shall be responsible for arranging with the consultant the amount of time and normal pattern of the consultancy for each candidate. The academic consultant could be external to the university or partner institution.
- 3.5.6 The candidate shall be responsible for establishing initial and ongoing contact with the Academic Consultant.
- 3.5.7 The programme administration manager shall forward to the Academic Consultant a copy of the candidate's learning agreement.
- 3.5.8 Any proposal for a change on academic grounds to the supervisory team shall be made in writing by the Academic Adviser to the programme approval panel.
- 3.5.9 A candidate registered for either part 1 or part 2 of the MProf or DProf (or SVP) shall be ineligible to act as an Academic Consultant for another MProf or DProf (or SVP) candidate, and shall also be ineligible to act as Director of Studies for a research degree candidate (MProf or DProf).

3.6 Submission of project outcome(s) for examination

- 3.6.1 Outcomes or products in various formats shall be accepted. The format shall be that which best achieves the aim of the project and can include reports, manuals, books, a major composition, new courses, a film, a major exhibition and other audio-visual material.
- 3.6.2 In cases where the outcomes are non-textual, they must be accompanied by a written critique giving methodological and contextual information. The length of the critique shall be subject to agreement by the programme approval panel.
- 3.6.3 Except with the specific permission of the programme approval panel, written work for a project shall be presented in English.

- 3.6.4 Where a candidate's project outcome is part of a collaborative group project, there shall be clear indication of each candidate's individual role and contribution.
- 3.6.5 The project shall include a statement of the candidate's aims, and the way in which these aims advance the interests of the candidate in their personal and professional development and in their community of practice.
- 3.6.6 All written project outcomes shall be presented according to the standard format for written work for the MProf/ DProf or SVP in respect of headings, subheadings, tables, diagrams, footnotes, and appendices. The standard format is included as **appendix 2** of these regulations.
- 3.6.7 The project outcomes shall acknowledge published or other sources consulted (including an appropriate bibliography) and any assistance received.
- 3.6.8 There shall be an abstract of approximately 300 words bound into the project outcome which shall provide a synopsis stating the nature and scope of the work undertaken and of the original contribution to the work of, and impact upon, the candidate's profession.
- 3.6.9 The length of the written work shall be as indicated by the appropriate project module description and shall be subject to approval by the programme approval panel. A word count shall be included at the end of the text.
- 3.6.10 The text of the project shall be presented in accordance with the standard format for written work published in the programme handbook. The standard format is included as **appendix 3** of these regulations.
- 3.6.11 Project outcomes shall be presented in accordance with the requirements for research degrees included as **appendix 4** of these regulations.
- 3.6.12 A candidate shall submit three copies of their project outcome for examination, all of which shall be retained by the University.
- 3.6.13 A candidate shall submit their work, by the assessment deadline. Work shall be delivered by hand or shall be sent by recorded delivery as specified in the appropriate programme handbook. In all cases, a receipt must be obtained and retained by the candidate as proof of submission.

3.7 Examinations of final project/s: general

- 3.7.1 The examination for MProf, DProf and SVP shall have two stages: first, the submission and preliminary assessment of the coursework (project outcome) and, second, its defence by the candidate through oral presentation and viva voce.
- 3.7.2 There shall normally be a presentation by, and viva voce for, a candidate unless, for reasons of sickness, disability, or comparable valid cause the programme assessment board is satisfied that a candidate would be under serious disadvantage if required to be assessed by these means. In such cases, an alternative form of assessment or modification to these oral procedures may be approved. Such approval shall not be given on the grounds that the candidate's knowledge of the language in which the thesis is presented is inadequate.
- 3.7.3 The presentation and viva voce shall normally be held in the United Kingdom, or at a Middlesex University international office.
- 3.7.4 A candidate's Academic Adviser or Consultant will normally act as internal project examiner for the MProf, but not for the DProf. For the DProf, the role of internal project examiner is undertaken by an independent academic. For both the MProf and the DProf, there will be an external examiner. Observers may be present only with the agreement of the candidate and the examiners. Observers are not expected to participate in the assessment, but may ask questions if requested by the Chair. Observers shall withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination.
- 3.7.5 The presentation and viva voce examination panel is a delegated panel of the programme Assessment Board which shall make a decision on the assessment reports submitted by the examiners in respect of a candidate. The programme assessment board shall determine the grades and make recommendations to the University's Research and Research Degrees Committee (RRDC). The RRDC may appoint a subgroup to ratify MProf, DProf and SVP recommendations. The power to confer a degree shall rest with the academic board of the University.
- 3.7.6 Where evidence of academic misconduct in the preparation of the project work or other irregularities in the conduct of the examination come to light subsequent to the recommendation of the examiners, the Research and Research Degrees Committee shall consider the matter, if necessary in consultation with the examiners, and take appropriate action. The university's plagiarism procedures for research degrees apply.

- 3.7.7 The Programme Assessment Board or School Research Degree Committee shall ensure that examinations are conducted and the recommendations of the examiners are presented wholly in accordance with University regulations. In any instance where the Research and Research Degrees Committee is made aware of a failure to comply with all the procedures of the examination process, it may declare the examination null and void and appoint new examiners.

3.8 Examination procedures

- 3.8.1 The candidate's Academic Adviser shall propose on the appropriate form the arrangements for the candidate's examination to the Research and Research Degrees Committee for approval. For collaborative provision the proposal will be routed via the appropriate School or IWBL. This should be done no later than three months before the date of the examination. The examination may not take place until the examination arrangements have been approved. In special circumstances, the Research and Research Degrees Committee may act directly to appoint examiners and arrange the assessment of the candidate.
- 3.8.2 The Programme Administration Manager shall make known to the candidate the procedure to be followed for the submission of the project outcome, and any conditions to be satisfied before the candidate may be considered eligible for examination.
- 3.8.3 The Programme Administration Manager shall notify the candidate, the examiners, and any observers of the date, time, and venue of the presentation and viva voce.
- 3.8.4 Examiners should not normally have less than four weeks to read and evaluate the candidate's project work/outcome. In cases where it has been agreed that the submission should be longer than normal (for example, a group project), extra time should be permitted as determined by the examiners.
- 3.8.5 The Programme Administration Manager shall send a copy of the project work/outcome to each examiner together with the examiner's preliminary assessment report form and the University's regulations, and shall ensure that the examiners are properly briefed as to their duties.
- 3.8.6 The Programme Administration Manager shall ensure that all examiners have completed and returned their preliminary assessment forms to the University before the presentation and viva voce takes place.

3.9 Candidate's responsibilities in the examination process

- 3.9.1 The candidate shall ensure that the project work/outcome is submitted and received before the expiry of the registration period.
- 3.9.2 The submission of the project work/outcome shall be at the sole discretion of the candidate. While a candidate would be unwise to submit the project work/outcome for examination against the advice of the supervisory team, it is their right to do so. Equally, candidates should not assume that an academic adviser's or consultant's agreement to the submission guarantees the award of the degree.
- 3.9.3 Where a candidate submits their project work/outcome against the advice of the supervisors, the latter shall make known this fact in writing to the Middlesex University Research and Business Office (RBO), immediately the submission is made. RBO shall not inform the examiners of this fact, but shall inform the Chair of the Programme Assessment Board.
- 3.9.4 The candidate shall take no part in the arrangements of the examination and shall have no formal contact with the external examiner(s) between their appointment as examiners and the presentation and viva voce.
- 3.9.5 The candidate shall ensure that the project outcome format is in accordance with the requirements for submission for part 2 of the M/DProf (see **section 3.6** above).

3.10 Examiners and chair

All MProf, DProf and SVP presentations and viva voce shall be chaired. A Chair shall be independent of the candidate's consultancy team and shall normally be a senior academic with experience of examining professional doctorates at Middlesex University. A Chair is not an examiner. Their role is to ensure that the examiners are fully apprised of, and follow, the regulations and procedures of the University relating to MProf/DProf /SVP examining. For the examination of candidates from partner institutions, the Chair will always be from the University.

3.10.1 Candidates who are not permanent members of the University staff

A candidate for the degree of:

- DProf (or SVP variant) shall be examined by one or two external examiner(s), and by one independent internal examiner. For collaborative provision the internal examiner will normally be from the partner institution in which the candidate is studying. The candidate's adviser shall attend the oral examination as adviser to the exam board. The adviser shall not be an examiner.
- MProf (or SVP variant) shall be examined by one or two external examiner(s) and by one internal examiner. The candidate's adviser shall normally be the internal examiner.

3.10.2 Candidates who are permanent members of the University staff

Both for the degree of DProf (SVP equivalent) and for the degree of MProf (SVP equivalent) there shall be two external examiners. Additionally, there may be one internal examiner. For DProf they shall not be a member of the candidate's advisory team. The candidate's Adviser normally attends the oral examination as adviser to the exam board.

An external examiner shall be independent of both the University and of the candidate's organisation and shall not have acted previously as the candidate's Consultant or Adviser. Former members of staff or DProf/SVP graduates shall not normally be approved until three years after the termination of their employment or studies respectively with the University or the partner institution. For collaborative SVPs external examiners shall be nominated by the partner institution and approved by the University's Research and Research Degrees Committee.

The Research and Research Degrees Committee shall ensure that the same External examiner is not approved so frequently in its opinion that their familiarity with the programme might prejudice objective judgment. In the case of several MProf/DProf/SVP candidates undertaking projects on a similar topic, any particular examiner shall not normally examine more than three candidates in the same assessment round.

Examiners shall be actively engaged in research and/or professional development in the general area of the candidate's final project and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined.

In an examination for part 2 of the MProf (or SVP equivalent) the external examiner (or one external examiner where there are two) shall have examined at least one professional Masters or MPhil or Masters (by research). In an examination for part 2 of the DProf (or SVP equivalent) the external examiner (or one external examiner where there are two) shall have

examined at least one professional doctorate or PhD. The exam team as a whole (external(s) and internal) shall have a combined experience of at least two exams at the appropriate level (either Masters or doctorate level). Internal examiners are not required to have previous examining experience at the level for which the candidate is being examined. At least one examiner or the Chair must have experience of the professional doctoral degrees. No candidate registered for either an MProf, DProf or SVP shall act as an examiner for part 2 of the programme.

In the case of the examination of candidates at a partner institution, the examiners shall be nominated by the partner institution and approved by the University's Research and Research Degrees Committee.

The University shall determine and pay the fees and expenses of the external examiners.

3.11 First examination

Each examiner shall read and examine the project work/outcome and submit, on the appropriate form, an independent preliminary assessment report on it to the programme administration manager before the presentation and viva voce is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the project work/outcome provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree, the size of the project, and the level 7 or 8 descriptors as appropriate to the award (and where possible make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of the presentation and viva voce).

Following the candidate's presentation and viva voce, the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit on the appropriate form, a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree. This shall be given to the chair of the examination for forwarding to the Programme Administration Manager. The preliminary reports and joint recommendation shall together provide sufficiently detailed comments on the quality of the work to enable the programme assessment board to satisfy itself that the recommendation chosen in 3.11.1 below is correct.

Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted. The recommendations shall be made on the appropriate form. All examiner report forms shall be forwarded to the IWBL or RBO as appropriate.

Where the preliminary report forms show that the examiners are of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by conducting an oral examination at that stage, the Chair of the oral examination may recommend that the Research and Research Degrees Committee dispense with the oral examination and refer the research project for further work. In such cases the examiners should provide the RBO/IWBL with written guidance for the candidate concerning the deficiencies of the research project. The examiners should not recommend that a candidate fail outright without holding an oral examination or alternative examination at a later date and following further work on the research project.

If a candidate plagiarises or carries out research activity without the appropriate ethical requirements and approval the viva voce will not take place and the candidate's project will be failed.

3.11.1 Recommendations

Following the completion of the presentation and viva voce, the programme Assessment Board must recommend to the Research and Research Degrees Committee that the project be:

- passed and the degree awarded
- passed and the degree awarded subject to minor/major amendments being made to the project within a specified timescale
- failed and the candidate be permitted to resubmit it within a specified timescale and with or without a further presentation/viva voce as recommended by the examiners, or, in the case of a DProf examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MProf subject to the level-7 descriptors being fulfilled and to the presentation of the project being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.

In the case that one of these recommendations applies, the examiners shall prepare a written list of amendments (for minor amendments) or revisions (for a major reworking of the project) which shall be passed to the candidate's Academic Adviser for forwarding to the candidate. Copies shall be forwarded to the IWBL or RBO as appropriate.

Examiners may indicate informally to the candidate their recommendation on the result of the assessment but they shall make it clear that the decision rests with the programme Assessment Board. Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the programme assessment board may:

- accept a majority recommendation (provided that the majority recommendation includes the external examiner)
- accept the recommendation of the external examiner
- require the appointment of an additional external examiner.

3.12 Re-examination

One re-examination will normally be permitted by the programme Assessment Board. The forms of re-examination are set out below.

Where the candidate's performance at the first presentation and viva voce was:

- satisfactory but the project was unsatisfactory and the examiners, on re-examination, certify that the project as revised is satisfactory, the assessment board may exempt the candidate from further assessment (both presentation and viva voce)
- unsatisfactory and the project was also unsatisfactory, the re-assessment shall be both of the project and the candidate at a further presentation and viva voce.

Where the candidate's project at the first examination was satisfactory but the performance (the presentation and viva voce) was unsatisfactory, the candidate shall be re-assessed orally without being requested to revise and resubmit the project.

3.12.1 Re-examination

In the case of re-examination, each examiner shall read and examine the project work/outcome and submit, on the appropriate form, an independent preliminary assessment report on it, to the Programme Administration Manager, before the presentation and viva voce is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall state whether the project work/outcome satisfies the requirements of the degree, the size of the project, and the levels 7 or 8 descriptors (as appropriate to the award). The examiners shall make their assessment only on those issues which were raised in the first examination and which were made known to the student in the written report on the deficiencies of the project (see 3.11.1 above).

3.12.2 Project re-examination

Following the re-examination of the project or following the presentation and viva

voce, the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit on the appropriate form, a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree to the Chair of the examination for forwarding to the Programme Administration Manager. The preliminary report and joint recommendation of the examiners shall together provide sufficiently detailed comment on the scope and quality of the work to enable the programme assessment board to satisfy itself that the recommendation chosen after re-examination is correct.

Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted. The recommendations shall be made on the appropriate form.

3.12.3 Programme Assessment Board decision

Following the completion of the re-examination, the programme Assessment Board must recommend to the Research and Research Degrees Committee that the project be:

- passed and the degree awarded
- passed and the degree awarded subject to minor amendments being made to the project within a specified timescale
- failed but, exceptionally, a further opportunity for re-examination be granted within a specified timescale either in respect of the project or of the presentation and viva voce or in respect of both
- or, in the case of a DProf examination, the candidate be awarded the degree of MProf subject to the level-7 descriptors being fulfilled and to the presentation of the project being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners
- failed and no further re-assessment be permitted.

Examiners may indicate informally their recommendation on the result of the examination to the candidate but they shall make it clear that the decision rests with the university's Research and Research Degrees Committee.

Where the programme assessment board decides that the degree be not awarded, the examiners shall prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the project and the reason for their recommendation which shall be forwarded to the candidate by the Programme Administration Manager.

In the case of a re-examination, where the examiners are of the opinion that the project is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting the presentation and viva voce, they may recommend that the programme assessment board dispense with the presentation and viva voce, and not award the degree.

Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the programme assessment board may:

- accept a majority recommendation (provided that the majority recommendation includes the external examiner)
- accept the recommendation of the external examiner
- require the appointment of an additional external examiner.

3.12.4 Appointment of an additional external examiner

Where an additional external examiner is appointed, they shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the project submitted and, if considered necessary, may request a further presentation and viva voce. That examiner shall not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. On receipt of the report from the additional examiner, the programme Assessment Board shall complete the examination as set out in 3.11.1. The additional external examiner shall be approved by the University's Research and Research Degrees Committee.

3.12.5 Panel of enquiry

In all cases where a resubmission is failed, or an MProf (or SVP equivalent) award is made to a candidate who submitted for a DProf (or SVP equivalent), a panel of enquiry shall be set up to investigate the reasons. It will be initiated by the Chair of the final examination panel and set up by the M/DProf part 2 Programme Leader of the appropriate school or IWBL. A staff member of the Research & Business Office shall be available to the panel to advise on regulatory and related matters. The panel shall report its conclusions to the relevant Associate Dean Research, and the University's Research and Research Degrees Committee and appropriate action shall be agreed and implemented. In the case of partner institutions, the relevant University School or IWBL shall manage the panel on behalf of the partner institution.

3.13 The project

3.13.1 Project submission

Following the award of the degree of MProf, DProf or SVP, the candidate shall submit to the Programme Administration Manager:

- two copies of the research project(s) in a suitable electronic storage medium (as decided by the University)
- one copy of the research project(s) in hard bound form (the details of the format are in appendix 3).

Note The copies in both formats shall become the property of the University, but the copyright in the project(s) shall be vested in the candidate.

Following receipt of the copies of the project, the programme administration manager shall lodge:

- one electronic copy with the University library for inclusion in the University e-repository
- a second electronic copy and hard-bound copy in the IWBL.

3.13.2 Project confidentiality

Where the Research and Research Degrees Committee has agreed that the confidential nature of the candidate's work is such as to preclude the research project(s) being made freely available in the library of the University (3.8) and, in the case of DProf the British Library, the research project(s) shall, immediately on completion of the programme of work, be retained by the University on restricted access and, for a time not exceed the approved period shall be made available only to those who were directly involved in the project.

The Research and Research Degrees Committee shall normally only prove an application for confidentiality in order to enable a patent application to be lodged or to protect commercially or politically sensitive material. A research project shall not be restricted in this way in order to protect research leads. While the normal maximum period of confidentiality is two years, in exceptional circumstances the Research and Research Degrees Committee

may approve a longer period. Where a shorter period would be adequate the Research and Research Degrees Committee shall not automatically grant confidentiality for two years.

3.13.3 Format requirements

The following requirements shall be adhered to in the format of the submitted research project:

- Title page shall give the following information:
 - full title of the project
 - full name of the author
 - that the degree is awarded by the University
 - award for which the project is submitted in partial fulfilment of its requirements
 - identity of any collaborating establishment/s
 - month and year of submission
- Summary, contents page(s), and full bibliography shall be included
- A 300-word abstract must be included
- All appendices submitted for examination shall be included
- Pages shall be numbered consecutively through the main text including photographs and/or diagrams included as whole pages
- Double, one-and-a-half, or single spacing may be used throughout the text; single spacing should be used for indented quotations or footnotes
- Candidate shall not normally be awarded a degree certified until the copies of the project have been received by the University

3.13.4 Lodging a research project(s)

A candidate shall not be awarded a degree certificate until the two electronic copies and one hard-bound copy of the research project(s) have been submitted to the RBO/IWBL.

Candidates are required to sign the Middlesex University research repository agreement form.

3.13.5 Review of an examination decision

Candidates who wish to appeal against the decision of the university Research and Research Degree Committee should consult the appeals regulations contained in the regulations for part 2 of the programme (see **appendix 5**)

Appendix 1

Definition of project size

Small projects

In the case of small-scale projects, candidates will usually be the principal researchers/developers. Work undertaken with others will be primarily in a consultative capacity. Where the small project is a component of a larger project, issues of collaboration will need special attention. The use of relevant literature will be highly focused. The projects will impact primarily within the candidate's immediate operational context, but will have relevance to the wider professional community. Possible publications arising from the project that can be used as evidence of achievement could be one or two articles in professional journals.

Medium projects

In the case of medium-scale projects, candidates will normally engage with others in the project activity. Candidates must clarify all the roles and contributions of the various participants whether or not they are formally registered for an award. In particular, candidates will treat their own roles problematically. The style of working with others will be co-operative with candidates assuming leadership responsibilities, unless their contribution is a component of a large project where the emphasis may be on joint management or leadership. The projects will impact on organisational/ professional development and understanding beyond the confines of the immediate context. Possible publications that can be used as evidence of achievement may include articles in academic or professional journals, and will usually be publications of interest and relevance to professionals in other organisations or communities of practice.

Large projects

In the case of large-scale projects, candidates will have major leadership and managerial responsibilities within the project. Where there is collaboration with others, the role of candidates must be fully analysed and critically evaluated. Typically, multiple research methodologies will be used and one outcome will be an appraisal of the value and contribution of this approach to research and development understanding and practice. The use of literature will be extensive, and subject to critical review of its applicability to the type and focus of the project being undertaken. While of high value to candidates' immediate operational context, the impact of the project will be far-reaching for relate professional and

managerial colleagues. Possible publications that can be used as evidence of achievement will include academic articles, and may take the form of a book or comparable product.

Appendix 2

Presentation of projects

Titles, headings and numbering

- If chapters are used, give each one a title and number.
- Headings within chapters may help the reader to perceive the structure and flow of the analysis and argument. Principal sections within a chapter may be numbered e.g. 1.1, 1.2 but smaller subdivisions such as 1.1.1 are to be avoided.

Tables, diagrams, graphs

- Place any tables, diagrams and graphs as close as possible to the relevant point in the text. Where more than four or five are used in the document, it is best to collate them in the appendices.
- Use sequential numbering, and label tables as 'Table 1, 2, 3...' and diagrams and graphs as 'Figure 1, 2, 3...'. Remember to provide a descriptive heading to help the reader.

References, footnotes, and bibliography

- References within the text should be shown as follows:
 - Surname of author(s)
 - Year of publication

Example

(Charles, 1993)

(Charles and Hayes, 1994) (Charles et al, 1995) Charles (1992) states that

- Collate all references made within the text in a bibliography at the end of the text.
- Bibliographies should follow the version of the Harvard system recommended by the DPS programme.
- Use footnotes to add supporting information to what is in the main body of the text, without distracting the reader from the flow and direction of the main text. Use sequential numbering (1, 2, 3).

Appendices

- Use these for illustrative and supportive material referred to in the text.
- A brief annotation may be appropriate to indicate its significance and relevance to points being made in the text.

Typing and paper size

- The text must be typewritten on one side only of A4 paper.
- Use single spacing within paragraphs and double spacing between paragraphs and sections, except for the final project which should use double or 1.5-line spacing throughout.
- Start each chapter on a new page.
- Allow a minimum of 15mm for margins, except for the final project, where you should leave not less than 40mm on the left-hand margin to allow for binding.

Word count

Remember to include a word count at the end of the text; it should exclude footnotes, bibliography and appendices. The word counts for projects are given in the module narratives.

Identification and presentation

All submissions must be bound by an appropriate means for examination, for example, a ring binder or soft bound. On the front cover must be stated:

- candidate's name
- student number
- module code
- date of submission
- for projects, the project title

Appendix 3

Presentation and binding requirements for the final format (post-examination) - IWBL candidates only

- One bound copy of the project, along with two electronic copies, shall remain the property of the University but the copyright in the project shall be vested in the candidate.
- The following requirements shall be adhered to in the format of the bound project. Where a candidate desires fuller guidance, reference may be made to the British Standards Institution specification BS 4821 (1990). Where the University's regulations differ from BS 4821 in points of detail, a candidate may follow either.
 - Projects should normally be in A4 format; permission may be given for a project to be submitted in another format where it is satisfied that the contents of the project can be better expressed in that format; a candidate using a format larger than A4 should note that the production of microfiche copies and full-size enlargement may not be feasible.
 - Copies of the project shall be presented in a permanent and legible form either in typescript or print; where copies are produced by photocopying processes, these shall be of a permanent nature; where word processor and printing devices are used, the printer shall be capable of producing text of a satisfactory quality; the size of character used in the main text, including displayed matter and notes, shall not be less than 2.0mm for capitals and 1.5mm for x-height (that is, height of lower case).
 - The thesis shall be printed on the recto side of the page only; the paper shall be white and within the range 70 gsm to 100 gsm.
 - The margin at the left-hand binding edge of the page shall not be less than 40mm; other margins shall not be less than 15mm.
 - Double or 1.5-line spacing shall be used in the typescript except for indented quotations or footnotes where single spacing may be used.
 - 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:
 - i. full title of the project full name of the author
 - ii. that the degree is awarded by the University
 - iii. the award for which the thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of its requirements

- iv. identity of any collaborating establishment/s month and year of submission.

Binding

Copies should be bound in black with gold lettering as follows:

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

The usual title page layout is shown in the example below.

Project Title

**A project submitted to Middlesex
University in partial fulfilment**

Appendix 4

Electronic repository form

Middlesex University Research Repository Agreement

Surname:

First name(s):

Thesis/Dissertation/Research Project Title:

Degree:

Date of Award:

School:

Copyright Declaration

In accordance with the Research Degree Regulations, I am depositing an electronic version of my thesis/dissertation/research project (hereafter referred to as the "Work") in the Middlesex University Research Repository. I retain all rights in the Work in its present version and in any future versions. I am free to publish the Work in its present version, or future versions, elsewhere and in any format.

The right granted to Middlesex University Research Repository is non-exclusive, and royalty-free.

I agree that the administrators of Middlesex University Research Repository, or any third party with whom Middlesex University Research Repository has an agreement may, without changing content, migrate the Work to any medium or format for the purpose of future preservation and accessibility.

Where third party content is included in the Work, I have obtained documented permission from the rights owners to include the material with acknowledgement and grant these rights.

Deposit in Middlesex University Research Repository

I understand that Works deposited in Middlesex University Research Repository will be accessible to a wide variety of people and institutions - including automated agents - via the World Wide Web. An electronic copy of my Work may also be included in the British Library Electronic Theses On-line System (EThOS) under the same copyright terms and conditions as

given in the section on copyright above. Deposit will enable accessibility of my Work essentially for the purposes of non-commercial research, private study, criticism, review, news reporting, illustration for teaching and/or other educational purposes. It may also be searched and copied by text mining and plagiarism detection software.

I agree as follows:

1. That I am the author of the Work and have the authority to make this agreement and to hereby give administrators of Middlesex University Research Repository the right to make available the Work in the way described above.
2. That the digital version of the Work I am supplying is as approved by the examiners and University at the time of the award of my degree.
3. That I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the Work is original and does not, to the best of my knowledge, infringe any third party copyright or other Intellectual Property right, or contain any confidential material (If in doubt, contact the Research and Business Office (ext 5951)).
4. The administrators of Middlesex University Research Repository do not hold any obligation to take legal action on my behalf, or on behalf of any other rights holders, in the event of breach of copyright or any other Intellectual Property rights, or any other right, in the material deposited.

Signature:

Date

Once the signed and dated, please return the completed form to the Research and Business Office (Conferments Section). Keep a copy for your own records.

N.B. If you wish to restrict access to your work please complete and attach the sections below:

A. Withholding Work from the Repository

In certain cases, your Work may include substantial subsidiary material owned by third-party copyright holders. This may occur, for example, where you have already published a journal article or the like (the copyright of which is now owned by its publisher) and some of this is, with the agreement of your supervisors, included within the main text or as an appendix within your Work. Or, it may occur where you have used photographs or other types of image to illustrate your work which is third-party owned, and consent for use has not yet been obtained from the copyright owner. In cases like these, you will not be able to sign this form and have your Work added to the Repository until you have obtained the agreement of

the copyright owner. It may, however, be possible to have certain pages (those that contain the third-party copyright material) withheld from the Repository and the rest of your Work included in the Repository.

It may also be necessary to withhold your Work from the Repository where you and your supervisors are planning to apply for a patent, registered design or other form of Intellectual Property for which confidentiality is required. In such cases, your supervisory team will have applied for non-disclosure of your Work to the University's Research and Research Degrees Committee for a maximum period of two years.

I wish to withhold access to my Work for reasons specified on the attached form:

Signature:

Date:

N.B Please complete the 'Access Restriction Request Form' below and attach before returning.

B. Withdrawing Work from the Repository

You should also note that it is easy to contact Middlesex University Learning Resources which operates the Middlesex University Research Repository to get your Work (or a part of your Work) removed from the Repository. You may need to do this where you decide later to publish all or a part of your Work, and a condition of publication is that you transfer your copyright in the Work to the publisher. In case of part publication of the Work, you may decide to withdraw from the Repository only those parts that are to be published. In cases of full withdrawal of the Work, the University will retain the bibliographic record and the abstract/summary of the Work. To ensure withdrawal from the British Library's EthOS system, you will need to contact them separately. They use the same system of retaining the bibliographic record and abstract/summary.

Access Restriction requested for reasons given below:

- The Work contains copyright material which belongs to a third party and the gaining of approval to
 - publish the material electronically:
 - has been declined by the Copyright Owner/s
 - would be unduly onerous or expensive
 - and removal of the material would compromise the thesis
- The Work contains content which it is proposed will be the subject of a patent application, registered design application, or other commercial exploitation, and confidentiality is required.
- I am seeking to publish the Work in the near future.
- Other (please specify)

--

In normal circumstances any E-print to which access has been restricted will be made available after two years (this does not apply to Works restricted for reasons of Copyright or protection under other Statutory exemptions). Candidates who believe access to their Work should be restricted for more than two years should state their reason here:

--

To be completed by candidate

I confirm that the information I have given on this form is complete and accurate
Signed (Author):
Print Name:
E-mail address:
Date:

To be completed by your primary Director of Studies or Academic Supervisor

I confirm that I agree with the decision indicated on the form by the author of the Work with respect to access to the Work
Signature (Supervisor):
Print Name:
Date:

Please return the completed document to the Research and Business Office (Conferments Section) keeping a copy for your own records.

Appendix 5

University appeal regulations and procedures 2010/11

Appeals procedure for research degree candidates

5.1 Research degree candidates have the right to appeal to the academic board against decisions taken by the research and research degrees committee upon the recommendations made by the examiners. This right extends to candidates of the University and of partner institutions registered for the degrees of PhD, MPhil, or MA (by research), MSc (by research), LLM (by research), or MTh; PhD by Public Works or MPhil by Public Works; also to candidates who have progressed to Part 2 (the research project) of an MProf or DProf degree, or its special validated pathways; or for those registered for the MProf by Public Works, the DProf by Public Works, or its special validated pathways.

An appeal against a particular decision may only be based on the grounds that there:

- were circumstances affecting the candidate's performance of which the examiners were not aware at the viva voce examination and which the candidate, for good reasons, could not divulge at the time (including the existence of exceptional circumstances which could not have been known to the candidate prior to the submission of the thesis)
- is evidence of a procedural irregularity in the conduct of the examination (including administrative error) of such a nature as to cause doubt as to whether the result might have been different had there not been such irregularity
- is evidence of unfair or improper assessment on the part of one or more of the examiners.

5.2 Candidates may not challenge the academic judgement of the examiners and appeals made on this basis will be rejected.

5.3 Inadequacy of supervision or any other administrative procedure at any stage before the submission of the thesis should, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, have been dealt with under the complaints and grievance procedure and under the University student charter.

5.4 A candidate wishing to appeal should give notice of their request for a review (intention to appeal) within one month of receiving the written decision of the research and research degrees committee of the outcome of the examination or re-examination.

- 5.5 Candidates must submit a written case for the review within a further month from the date of giving notice of the intention to appeal.
- 5.6 Written notice of the intention to appeal and the written case for review should be submitted to the academic registrar. The academic registrar will be responsible for interpreting and applying University regulations as they apply to an appeal by a research degree candidate.
- 5.7 The procedure for considering an appeal shall be as described below.
- 5.7.1 An appeal panel shall be established consisting of:
- the deputy vice-chancellor academic or nominee who shall chair the panel
 - at least two senior staff experienced in research degree supervising and examining who are not members of research and research degrees committee, who shall be appointed by the vice-chancellor in his role as chair of the academic board
 - a staff member of the Research & Business Office (secretary).
- 5.7.2 Members of the panel shall have had no previous involvement in the case. Previous involvement is defined as having supervised, advised, or counselled the candidate about the project or advised or counselled the supervisors about matters pertaining to the project. Consideration of the initial registration and/or MProf/DProf approval panels etc of a candidate by a member of a research and research degrees committee or a school/IWBL research committee does *not* constitute involvement.
- 5.7.3 The review panel shall consider the evidence which shall include:
- candidate's written case
 - a report prepared by the academic registrar
 - examiners' preliminary and final reports
 - candidate's thesis.
- 5.8 The candidate shall have the right to be heard in person and to speak to their written case. They may be accompanied by a person of their choice, but may not seek legal representation at a hearing of the panel.
- 5.9 The appeal panel shall have the power to invite the examiners to present an oral or written report to the panel and shall normally do so.

- 5.10 The appeal panel shall have the power to question any member of the University staff, the candidate's external supervisor/s (if any) and the internal and external examiners.
- 5.11 Candidates shall receive a written statement of the reasons for failure prepared by examiners after the examination.
- 5.12 The review panel shall examine the case presented by the candidate, ensure that it falls within the remit of the University regulations and establish whether there is a *prima facie* case as detailed in paragraph 5.1 above. It shall establish this principally by enquiring whether the final decision by the examiners was fair and sound.
- 5.13 The examiners shall be informed that an appeal has been made and told that the panel may find it necessary to approach them on issues raised by the candidate.
- 5.14 The examiners shall be assured that issues to be considered by the panel will be confined to those which fall within the scope of the University's research degree appeals regulations.
- 5.15 The panel may need to meet on several occasions before determining its recommendations to research and research degrees committee.
- 5.16 The examiners shall be informed of the outcome of the panel's deliberations and of the decision of research and research degrees committee.
- 5.17 The appeal review panel shall make one of the following recommendations:
- that the appeal be rejected by the research and research degrees committee
 - that a research and research degrees committee, under powers delegated by the academic board, shall invite the original examiners to reconsider their decision in accordance with approved regulations and procedures
 - that the research and research degree committees appoint new examiners to conduct the examination as if for the first time.
- The panel has no powers to recommend that the original recommendation of the examiners be set aside other than in respect of 5.1 above.
- 5.18 The research and research degrees committee or the chair of the Research and Research Degrees Committee shall receive the recommendations of the review panel and take appropriate action.

- 5.19 The Research & Business Office shall communicate the decision of the research and research degrees committee to the candidate setting out the reasons for the decision and informing the candidate that the appeals procedure of the University has been completed.
- 5.20 Should the candidate wish to take the matter externally, to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA), they must:
- Step 1** View their appeal file (by contacting the secretary to the Research and Research Degrees Committee, Middlesex University Research & Business Office)
- Step 2** Put any concerns about the appeal outcome, or its conduct, or the appeals procedures in writing to the secretary of the research and research degrees committee. The candidate shall receive a full written response which includes confirmation that the internal procedures of the University have been completed.
- 5.21 Within three months of receiving notification that the internal procedures of the University have been completed, the candidate may approach the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA), enclosing a copy of the final decision of the University and stating reasons for redress.

The OIA's address is:

3rd Floor,
King's Reach,
38-50 King's Road,
Reading,
RG1 3AA

Enquiries may be sent to enquiries@oiahe.org.uk or **via the website at** www.oiahe.org.uk

For any further information on research degrees and regulations at Middlesex University, please visit www.24-7.mdx.ac.uk/admin/researchinfo.htm

Appendix 6

Complaints and grievance procedures

6.1 Introduction

These procedures seek to ensure that complaints against the University made by students are treated seriously and, if found to be valid, are acted upon to ensure that the students' interests are protected as far as it is possible for the University to do so.

Specific procedures exist already for dealing with the following student complaints. These are:

- appeals against examination decisions of the University research and research degrees committee
- alleged harassment
- alleged inequality of opportunity
- complaints which fall within the remit of the University's student disciplinary procedures.

Note Complaints against Middlesex University Students' Union are dealt with by the union.

The procedures detailed below are designed for all other forms of student complaints which do not fall within one of the above procedures. They include, but are not limited to, inadequate facilities for academic study, or inadequate supervision (such as the late return of work, or insufficient supervisory meetings or insufficient guidance to permit expected progress) where these are persistent and cannot be resolved through simpler procedures. These procedures also cover termination by a school/institute for work based learning of a student's registration for a research degree.

6.2 Basic principles the general student complaints procedures

The guiding principles of these procedures are that complaints shall be:

- treated seriously and with fairness
- dealt with quickly, simply and at a level of the school/IWBL, campus or service as far as is possible

- treated consistently across the University
- subject to the principles of natural justice
- progressed through two stages – an informal and, if necessary, a formal stage
- dealt with and resolved wherever possible, at the informal stage, and shall be
- without prejudice to a student's or group of students' right to pursue legal remedies outside the University.

6.3 Procedures

Reference to the following complaints procedures should be necessary only in exceptional circumstances since most complaints, other than those related to persistent problems, should be resolved informally between student and director of studies/academic adviser and/or other members of the advisory team.

6.3.1 Informal stage 1

In the first instance, students who wish to make a complaint shall discuss it with their school/IWBL associate dean (research) who will advise whether or not the complaint is best progressed through:

- one of the alternative procedures set out in paragraph 1.2 or
- these general complaints procedures.

Assuming it is agreed that the complaint shall be progressed through these general procedures, the school/IWBL senior staff member responsible for complaints consulted shall discuss the complaint fully with the student, and anyone else involved, to see if it can be resolved informally. This may involve referral of the complaint to a third party who shall be a nominee of the school/IWBL associate dean (research). The outcome of complaints dealt with informally should be briefly documented. Normally, complaints handled through informal stage 1 shall be dealt with within, at most, 10 working days. If the complaint directly involves the school/IWBL associate dean (research), it shall proceed directly to informal stage 2.

6.3.2 Informal stage 2

If the student is dissatisfied with the result of informal stage 1, or if the complaint directly involves the school/IWBL, the complaint shall be sent in writing to the academic director responsible for the programme to which the student is formally aligned. The written complaint shall summarize the relevant background to, and fact of,

the case and shall state the outcome of informal stage 1. An annexe shall be provided with copies of papers related to informal stage 1. If the complaint directly involves the academic director of the programme, it shall proceed directly to the formal stage. The director to whom the complaint is referred shall investigate the complaint fully and shall seek to achieve an informal resolution of the problem(s), either by correspondence or discussion.

In the case of student complaints at partner institutions, the informal stages above should be handled within the institution by the staff members carrying out equivalent roles but following these procedures and timescales. Where the complaint cannot be resolved informally, the matter should be referred on to the University so that the formal stages below can be used.

6.3.3 Formal stage

If a student is dissatisfied with the result of the two informal stages, they shall proceed to the formal stage. The complaint shall be put in writing to the deputy vice-chancellor research and enterprise. The written complaint shall summarise the relevant background to, and facts of, the case and shall state the outcomes of informal stages 1 and 2 and give the reasons why they are dissatisfied with these outcomes. An annexe shall be provided with copies of papers related to informal stages 1 and 2. The deputy vice-chancellor research and enterprise shall normally:

- acknowledge receipt of the written complaint within three working days
- advise in writing and within three working days, any member(s) of staff or students involved that a formal complaint has been received
- consider the evidence, written or otherwise, and, if necessary, hold such discussions with the complainant and any other persons deemed appropriate in order to fully investigate the complaint.

The deputy vice-chancellor research and enterprise, having fully investigated the complaint over a period not normally exceeding 10 working days from its receipt, shall decide whether:

- the complaint should be progressed through other procedures (e.g. disciplinary procedures or other procedures indicated in paragraph 1.2) in which case the complaint shall be terminated at this stage
- there is justification for the complaint
- there is no justification for the complaint.

The deputy vice-chancellor research and enterprise shall:

- make their decision known in writing to the student and to members of staff involved
- seek to resolve any justifiable complaint through recommendations which all parties involved in the complaint shall be invited to accept
- if the recommendations are agreed, ensure that they are implemented in full within the agreed time period.

6.3.4 Appeal

If the student is not satisfied with the decision at the conclusion of the formal stage or if the recommendations made at this stage are not implemented, they may appeal to the deputy vice-chancellor academic. The student shall submit the appeal in writing within 10 working days of receiving the outcome of the formal stage. The written appeal shall summarize the relevant background to, and facts of, the case and state the outcomes of both informal stages and of the formal stage. An annexe shall be provided with copies of papers related to all these stages.

The deputy vice-chancellor academic receiving the appeal shall normally:

- acknowledge its receipt within three working days
- decide to enforce the implementation of the recommendations made at the end of the formal stage
- dismiss the case, giving reasons in writing
- seek agreement to an alternative set of recommendations

- determine whether there are sufficient grounds to convene a research student complaint panel and, if so, shall
- establish a research student complaint panel to hear the appeal.

In such cases the decision of the complaint panel shall be final.

6.3.5 Complaints panel

The research student complaints panel shall involve four persons:

- deputy vice-chancellor academic who shall chair the panel
- member of the University's research and research degrees committee who is not from the school/IWBL about which the complaint is being made and who has had no connection with the student at any time
- student representative appointed by the students' union.
- academic registrar (secretary).

Rights of the parties

- i) The candidate shall have the right to be heard in person and to speak their written case to the panel.
- ii) Staff about whom the complaint is being made shall have the right to be heard in person and to speak their written case to the panel.
- iii) The student making the complaint and the staff member(s) about whom the complaint is being made may be accompanied by a person of their choosing, but may not seek legal representation at the hearing.
- iv) The complaints panel shall have the right to question any member of the University staff including the student's advisers and the school/IWBL associate dean (research).
- v) The student and staff members involved directly in the complaint and persons accompanying them shall be permitted to question any persons giving evidence to the meeting.
- vi) The student and staff members shall have the right to introduce documents to the panel (see procedures in preparation, ii below).

Procedures in preparation for the hearing

- i) The academic registrar shall inform the student and academic staff concerned (including any such staff to be called as witnesses) in writing of the date, time and venue of the hearing. This shall normally be done no less than 15 working days prior to the hearing.
- ii) Written statements and other documentation to be copied for the hearing, submitted by the student or academic staff (see rights of the parties, vi) shall be sent to the academic registrar normally within five working days of the date of the letter giving details the hearing (see i above).
- iii) The academic registrar shall ensure that all such statements and documentation are circulated no less than five working days to the other party and to all members of the panel.
- iv) If the student or staff member(s) involved intend to be accompanied (see rights of the parties, iii), the name and address of the accompanying person(s) shall be notified to the academic registrar no less than 24 hours prior to the hearing.

Conduct of the panel

The panel shall:

- meet in private
- initially decide and then inform all parties concerned how it will conduct the hearing subject to the procedures being consistent with the principles of these general complaints procedures and of these procedural rules
- establish the exact nature of the complaint, establish the facts as far as it is possible to do so, consider the facts and determine its decision.

A written report of the hearing shall be made by the academic registrar.

Outcome

The academic registrar shall:

- send the report of the hearing to the dean of school/institute for work based learning, and school/IWBL associate dean research

- communicate the decision of the complaints panel to the candidate setting out the reasons for the decision.

The dean of school/institute for work based learning shall write a report identifying the action taken by the school/IWBL, normally within six weeks from the date of the complaints panel hearing, for consideration by the deputy vice-chancellor academic. If the deputy vice-chancellor academic is convinced by the complainant that the outcome has not been satisfactorily responded to, the former shall take whatever actions are necessary to ensure the outcomes are complied with within a minimal period. The academic registrar shall then write to the student stating that the internal procedures of the University have been completed.

6.4 Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education

Should the student wish to take the matter externally, to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA), they must:

Step 1 view their complaints file (by contacting the secretary of the research and research degrees committee).

Step 2 put any concern about the outcome, the conduct of the procedures, or the procedures themselves in writing to the secretary of the research and research degrees committee. The student shall receive a full written response which includes confirmation that the internal procedures of the University have been completed.

Within three months of receiving notification that the internal procedures of the University have been completed, the student may approach the OIA enclosing a copy of the final decision of the University and stating reasons for seeking redress.

The OIA's address is:

3rd Floor,
King's Reach,
38-50 King's Road,
Reading,
RG1 3AA

Enquiries may be sent to enquiries@oiahe.org.uk or **via the website at** www.oiahe.org.uk

6.5 Notes

In these procedures:

- A reference to a research student is taken to mean any student registered for the degree of PhD, MPhil, or MA (by research), MSc (by research), LLM (by research), or MTh; PhD by Public Works or MPhil by Public Works; also to candidates who have progressed to Part 2 (the research project) of an MProf or DProf degree, or its special validated pathways; or for those registered for the MProf by Public Works, the DProf by Public Works, or its special validated pathways whether on a full- or part-time basis, self-funded, funded by Middlesex University or by an external body, and includes members of University staff registered for a research degree in their capacity as students.
- In the absence (e.g. vacation or illness) of the person holding a named post in the procedures, the person deputising for them during the time of their absence shall substitute. In cases when the complaint involves the nominated deputy, a member of the executive shall be consulted and shall determine who shall be responsible for handling the complaint.

6.5.1 Interpretation

- The academic registrar is responsible for interpreting these procedures and their decision shall be final except in cases where the interpretation involves a complaint against the academic registrar or University research and business office in which case interpretation of the procedures shall be the responsibility of the deputy vice-chancellor research and enterprise.
- 'Working day' refers to a day on which the University is normally open; it does not include Saturday, Sunday, bank holidays, or other designated periods of closure outside the academic terms.