

GUIDELINES

for examiners of candidates for degrees by research at the University of Bath

- *Master of Philosophy (MPhil) Regulation 16.3*
 - *Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Regulations 16.5 and 16.13*
 - *Doctor of Education (EdD) Regulation 16.4*
 - *Master of Surgery (MS) Regulation 16.6*
 - *Doctor of Medicine (MD) Regulation 16.6*
 - *Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) Regulation 16.12*
 - *Doctor of Health (DHealth) Regulation 16.14*
 - *Doctor of Engineering (EngD) Regulation 16.15*
-

GENERAL NOTES

Regulations and Codes of Practice

Regulation 16 covers all Higher Degrees at the University of Bath. It is available at <http://www.bath.ac.uk/regulations/pdf/Regulation16.pdf>

The University's *Code of Practice on Research Degrees* (QA7) is available at <http://www.bath.ac.uk/learningandteaching/cop/qastatements/QAX/QA07.pdf>

Roles of the examiners

As stated in QA7:

- 12.2.1 The role of the External Examiner is to:
- examine the candidate's suitability for the award of the higher degree in question;
 - enable the University to ensure that its degrees are comparable in standard with those awarded by other universities in the United Kingdom in similar subjects;
 - verify that the standards expected of successful candidates are appropriate for the level of the award;
 - monitor and report on the proceedings of the Board of Examiners and in particular on whether these ensure that students are treated fairly and consistently.
- 12.2.2 The role of the Internal Examiner is to:
- examine the candidate's suitability for the award of the higher degree in question;
 - ensure that the examination is conducted in accordance with the University's Regulations and Quality Assurance procedures;
 - verify that the standards expected of successful candidates are appropriate for the level of the award.

Examiners for the degrees of DBA, EngD and DHealth should follow any additional roles and responsibilities set out in the specific programme regulations.

Theses/research enquiries/portfolios

All candidates are required to submit three copies of the thesis/research enquiry/portfolio for examination. These may be bound initially in a temporary binding, as specified in the document *Specifications for Higher Degree Theses*, which is available from the Graduate Office and at http://www.bath.ac.uk/grad-office/thesis_spec.htm. This document is given to all candidates when they notify the Graduate Office, at least two months in advance, of their intention to submit a thesis. Every thesis must include a full bibliography conforming to a widely used standard, as recommended by the Department or School with which the candidate is registered, and must display an acceptable level of referencing throughout. Where illustrations, charts, graphs or other figures are used, these must be clearly labelled and captioned. Sources for such material not authored by the candidate must be clearly indicated. Ring, spiral or other loose-leaf bindings are NOT acceptable. It should be noted that the *Thesis Specifications* document permits candidates to submit theses printed on both sides of the paper.

Examination

The main purpose of the compulsory oral (*viva voce*) examination is to establish that the candidate can defend the content of his/her thesis or portfolio and that s/he fully understands the implications and context of its main findings or argument. In common with practice in the UK, the *viva voce* is a closed examination rather than a public event taking place in the presence of friends, colleagues etc. QA7 paragraph 12.5 specifies that:

“Members of the supervisory team will not normally be present at a *viva voce* examination, unless the student notifies the Postgraduate Director of Studies (Research) that they want a member of the supervisory team to attend. A member of the supervisory team who has been permitted to attend a *viva voce* examination may neither be a member of the Board of Examiners nor take any active part in the *viva voce* examination.”

All candidates for the degrees of PhD, EdD, DBA, DHealth and EngD are required to attend a *viva voce* examination conducted by the internal and external examiners appointed by the Faculty or School Board of Studies on behalf of the University of Bath Senate. In every case the examiners are required to complete and submit pre-*viva* reports (Form EX2) and, following the *viva voce* examination, Form EX3. In cases where a candidate is required to submit a revised thesis, a second set of ‘pre-*viva*’ reports (Form EX4) is required, even if the candidate is not required to undergo a second pre-*viva* examination. The Board of Examiners may either specify that a second *viva voce* examination is necessary when the candidate is informed of the requirement to submit a revised thesis, or may delay a decision about whether a second *viva voce* examination is required until after the revised thesis has been submitted.

In the case of candidates for the degree of MPhil, Regulation 16.3 (m) allows the examiners to determine whether a *viva voce* examination is necessary. Examiners are required to complete and submit form EX3, even if no *viva voce* examination takes place.

Examiners should note that, as stated in QA7 14.2, “in accordance with Data Protection legislation, Pre-Viva Report Forms may be made available upon request to the candidate after the *viva voce* examination has taken place.”

Finally, it is important to note that once the candidate has submitted the thesis or portfolio, the examination process must be completed; that is to say that there is no option to return the thesis or portfolio to the candidate for any sort of amendment until the examination process has been completed.

Plagiarism

The procedures for dealing with suspected plagiarism are set out in QA53, which is available at <http://www.bath.ac.uk/learningandteaching/cop/qastatements/QAX/QA53.pdf>

Outcome of the examination

The extracts given below from the regulations for each of the named research degrees list the various possible outcomes of the examination process. In addition, as stated in QA7:

- 16.2 The lead supervisor (or a member of the supervisory team) will be available for consultation with the Board of Examiners at the time of the viva voce examination and should be in attendance when the candidate is informed verbally of the examiners' recommendations.
- 16.3 All examiners must be present when the candidate is informed verbally of the recommendation following the viva voce examination. It should be made clear to the candidate that the oral communication has no authoritative significance until the recommendation of the examiners has been approved by the Board of Studies.
- 16.4 Following the viva voce examination, the Board of Examiners should complete the appropriate Examiners' Report Form (different for research Master's and Doctoral degrees), which summarises its deliberations and recommendations to the Board of Studies. In accordance with Data Protection legislation the Examiners' Report Form may be made available to the candidate after the viva voce examination has taken place.
- 16.5 It is the responsibility of the Postgraduate Director of Studies (Research) to ensure that the examiners provide for the candidate and the lead supervisor clear written notification of:
- i) the examiners' unconfirmed recommendation, and
 - ii) the details of the additional work, if any, required
 - iii) the deadline for the completion of any required additional work
- as soon as possible after the viva voce examination, and in no case more than two weeks later. In this written notification, it should be made clear that the decision of the Board of Examiners has the status of an unconfirmed recommendation to the Board of Studies.
- 16.6 ***Award of degree with no corrections:*** Where the approval of the award is recommended with no corrections required, the Board of Examiners' recommendation can then be submitted to the Board of Studies. Subject to confirmation that the final version of the thesis has been deposited with the Library in accordance with University Regulations, the Board of Studies will approve the award under delegated powers of Senate. The candidate will be formally notified in writing of the decision of the Board of Studies by the Secretary to the Board of Studies.
- 16.7 ***Minor corrections (trivial or typographical):*** Where approval of the award is recommended subject to minor (trivial or typographical) corrections, the initial recommendation of the Board of Examiners does not require confirmation from the Board of Studies. The candidate will not normally be allowed more than 30 days from the date of receiving written notification to complete these corrections. Exceptionally, the Chair of the Board of Studies may allow the candidate a short extension to the 30 day period. The satisfactory completion of the corrections must be signed off by at least one member of the Board of Examiners. The Internal Examiner is expected to submit to the Board of Studies the completed Examiners' Report Form, indicating whether the corrections have been carried out satisfactorily, within 30 days of the candidate having submitted the corrected thesis. Subject to confirmation that the final version of the thesis has been deposited with the Library in accordance with University Regulations, the Board of Studies will approve the award under delegated powers of Senate. The candidate will be formally notified in writing of the decision of the Board of Studies by the Secretary to the Board of Studies.
- 16.8 ***Minor corrections (significant or substantial):*** Where approval of the award is recommended subject to more significant corrections, the initial recommendation of the Board of Examiners should be formally approved by the Board of Studies, or the Chair acting on its behalf. The candidate will not normally be allowed more than 12 weeks from the formal approval of the initial recommendation to complete the corrections. The satisfactory completion of the corrections must be signed off by at least one member of the Board of Examiners. The Internal Examiner is expected to submit to the Board of Studies the completed Examiners' Report Form, indicating whether the corrections have been carried out satisfactorily, within 30 days of the candidate having submitted the corrected thesis. Subject to confirmation that the final version of the thesis has been deposited with the Library in accordance with University Regulations, the Board of Studies will approve the award under delegated powers of Senate. It is essential that the full Board of Studies take a part in approving the award of the degree

either at the stage of formally approving the initial recommendation of the Board of Examiners or at the stage of formally approving the award. The candidate will be formally notified in writing of the decision of the Board of Studies by the Secretary to the Board of Studies.

- 16.9 **Revised Thesis:** Where a candidate is required to submit a revised thesis, the examiners must complete Part II of the Examiners' Report Form, indicating the date by which the revised thesis must be submitted and which of the examiners will be responsible for examination of the revised thesis. The examiners' recommendation and completed form must be submitted to the Board of Studies for approval. **The Board of Examiners may reserve the right to wait until after the revised thesis has been submitted and reviewed to decide whether a second viva voce examination is necessary.** Once the revised thesis has been examined, the completed Examiners' Report Form, together with a report signed by the examiners (as indicated in paragraph 2(b) of Part II of the Examiners' Report Form) confirming whether or not the revisions specified have been carried out satisfactorily, should be submitted to the Board of Studies as soon as possible after the examination process has been completed. Subject to the satisfactory completion of the specified revisions and confirmation that the final version of the thesis has been deposited with the Library in accordance with University Regulations, the Board of Studies will approve the award under delegated powers of Senate. The candidate will be formally notified in writing of the decision of the Board of Studies by the Secretary to the Board of Studies.
- 16.10 **Fail:** The examiners' recommendation and completed form must be submitted to the Board of Studies for approval. The candidate will be formally notified in writing of the decision of the Board of Studies by the Secretary to the Board of Studies.
- 16.11 Boards of Studies will regularly scrutinise External Examiner comments on the examination process and take appropriate action in light of these comments.

Timescales for the examination process

QA7 sets out the following timescales:

14.1 Pre-*viva* report forms (EX2) must be submitted to the candidate's academic department or school at least one week before the *viva voce* examination is due to take place

15.2 The *viva voce* examination should normally take place within three months of the submission of the thesis, and the candidate must be given as much notice as possible and at least one week's notice of the date of the *viva voce* examination.

16.5 The candidate must be informed in writing of the examiners' recommendation within 2 weeks of the examination

16.7 Candidates are normally allowed up to 30 days from the date of formal notification to complete minor (trivial or typographical) corrections.

16.8 Candidates who are required to complete more substantial but nevertheless minor corrections are allowed up to 12 weeks from the formal approval of the initial recommendation.

Disagreement amongst the examiners

In the case of a Board of Examiners which is unable to agree on a decision, the disagreement must be reported to the Faculty Board, who may recommend that another Board of Examiners be appointed, without prejudice to the student.

Feedback on the examination process

In accordance with precept 21 in the *QAA Code of Practice on Research Degree Programmes*, the Examiners' Report Form seeks feedback from examiners on the process of examination.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PARTICULAR DEGREES

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY Regulation 16.3

Thesis

(m) AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

The Degree of Master may be awarded to candidates who shall have pursued a programme as prescribed under Regulation 16.3(b) above and have satisfied the Board of Examiners by presenting a satisfactory thesis and, if the Board of Examiners so requires, by passing a viva voce examination. The thesis must satisfy the examiners as giving evidence of originality of mind and critical judgement in a particular subject. The examiners may, at their discretion, require that a candidate presents for a written examination.

Examiners' decision

(l) BOARD OF EXAMINERS

(i) The Board of Examiners for research degrees shall make recommendations as detailed below. If the Board of Examiners cannot agree, the Board of Examiners shall report this disagreement to the Board of Studies who may recommend to Senate that a new Board of Examiners be appointed, without prejudice to the candidate.

(ii) The Board of Examiners for research degrees may recommend to the Board of Studies:

either: (1) that the candidate be awarded the degree of Master;

or: (2) that the candidate be awarded the degree of Master subject to minor corrections to the thesis being executed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner(s);

or: (3) that the candidate be permitted to submit a revised thesis;

or: (4) that the candidate fail and be neither awarded for the degree of Master nor be allowed to submit a revised thesis.

(iii) A written report on the thesis submitted must be provided by the examiners. Where a candidate satisfies the examiners regarding the contents of the thesis but fails to satisfy the examiners at the viva voce, the candidate shall be given the opportunity of re-examination at a second viva voce; failure to satisfy at the second viva voce shall constitute failure of the degree submission as a whole.

(iv) Under the provisions of paragraph (3), candidates may, with the permission of the Board of Studies, be permitted to submit a revised thesis, within such lapse of time as may be prescribed, and present themselves for re-examination; no further resubmission is permitted if the candidates fail to satisfy the Board of Examiners at this second attempt.

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (including the Integrated/NewRoutePhD) Regulations 16.5 and 16.13

Thesis

(m) AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy shall be awarded to a candidate who shall have:

(i) pursued a programme of study as prescribed under Regulation 16.5(b)

(ii) presented a thesis on the candidate's advanced study and research which satisfies the Board of Examiners as:

(a) making an original and significant contribution to knowledge

(b) giving evidence of originality of mind and critical judgement in a particular subject

(c) containing material worthy of peer-reviewed publication

(d) being satisfactory in its literary and/or technical presentation and structure with a full bibliography and references

(e) demonstrating an understanding of the context of the research: this must include, as appropriate for the subject of the thesis, the scientific, engineering, commercial and social contexts, and

(iii) passed a viva voce examination conducted by the examiners on the broader aspects of the field of research in addition to the subject of the thesis. A viva voce examination is mandatory once a Doctor of Philosophy candidate has submitted a thesis.

Candidates at the discretion of the examiners may be required to pass a written examination to test their knowledge of the chosen field of research.

Examiners' decision

(1) BOARD OF EXAMINERS

(i) The Board of Examiners shall make recommendations as detailed below. A report on the thesis and the viva examination must be provided by the examiners. If the Board of Examiners cannot agree, the Board of Examiners shall report this disagreement to the Board of Studies who may recommend to Senate that a new Board of Examiners be appointed, without prejudice to the candidate.

(ii) The Board of Examiners may recommend to the Board of Studies:

either: (1) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy;

or: (2) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to minor corrections to the thesis being executed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner(s);

or: (3) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to satisfactory performance at a second viva examination and subject also to any minor corrections to the thesis required by the examiner(s). Failure to satisfy the examiners at the second viva shall constitute failure of the submission for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy;

or: (4) that the candidate not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy but be given the opportunity to submit a revised thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The examiners may require the candidate to undergo a second viva voce examination. If, in the opinion of the examiners, the thesis as first submitted is worthy of the award of the Degree of Master of Philosophy, the examiners may offer the candidate the opportunity to accept the Degree of Master of Philosophy, subject to any minor corrections to the thesis which may be prescribed by the examiners and which must be carried out to their satisfaction. A candidate wishing to accept the degree of Master of Philosophy under these circumstances shall inform the examiners in writing of this wish by a date prescribed by the examiners;

or: (5) that the candidate not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy but be awarded the Degree of Master of Philosophy (subject to any minor revisions to the thesis which may be prescribed by the examiners and must be carried out to their satisfaction);.

or: (6) that the candidate fail and be awarded neither the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy nor the Degree of Master of Philosophy.

(iii) Where submission of a revised thesis has been recommended candidates may, with the permission of the Board of Studies, be permitted to submit a revised thesis, within such lapse of time as may be prescribed, and present themselves for re-examination; no further resubmission is permitted if the candidate fails to satisfy the Board of Examiners at this second attempt.

MASTER OF SURGERY and DOCTOR OF MEDICINE Regulation 16.6

Thesis or published work

(e) PRESENTATION AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS OR OTHER WORK

Candidates should note that they are expected and advised to seek consultation at an early date. The work shall be submitted in accordance with paragraph (i) below. In either case the work shall be presented in accordance with Regulation 16.1 (e).

(i) Either: a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Medicine or the degree of Master of Surgery may present a thesis embodying the results of work done mainly while the candidate is employed in appropriate clinical or scientific work in one or more of the hospitals or institutions as approved under 16.6(a)(ii) above. A certificate to this effect shall be signed by the candidate when presenting the thesis. The certificate should indicate, where the thesis or other submission has been produced by a candidate jointly with others, that a substantial part is the original work of the candidate. Or: a candidate may submit a substantial body of published work or works embodying the results of personal observations or research in some aspect of Medicine or Surgery. There should be an accompanying account of the candidate's rôle in initiating and carrying out the research which should normally be the result of sustained work in a single field to which it makes an original contribution.

Examiners' Decision

(f) AWARD OF THE DEGREES OF DOCTOR OF MEDICINE OR MASTER OF SURGERY

The degree of Doctor of Medicine or Master of Surgery may be awarded by the Board of Studies either if:

(i) the candidate has presented a thesis which satisfies the examiners as containing original work worthy of publication, having been supervised for a minimum of twelve months; or: the candidate has submitted

published work (see Regulation 16.6(e)(i)). In either case the examiners must be satisfied that the submitted work:

- (a) makes an original and significant contribution to knowledge in a particular subject of Medicine or Surgery
 - (b) gives evidence of originality of mind and critical judgement in a particular subject of Medicine or Surgery
 - (c) contains material worthy of peer-reviewed publication
 - (d) is satisfactory in its literary and/or technical presentation and structure with a full bibliography and references
 - (e) demonstrates an understanding of the context of the research: this must include, as appropriate for the subject of the thesis, the scientific, engineering, commercial and social contexts, and
- (ii) the candidate passed a *viva voce* examination conducted by the examiners on the broader aspects of the field of research in addition to the subject of the submitted work. A *viva voce* examination is mandatory once a Doctor of Medicine or Master of Surgery candidate has submitted a thesis or other work.
- (iii) If the thesis or other submission, though inadequate, shall seem of sufficient merit to justify such action, the Board of Examiners may at their discretion permit the candidate to represent the work in a revised form not later than a date to be prescribed by the examiners.

DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION Regulation 16.12

Thesis

m) AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Degree of Doctor of Business Administration shall be awarded to a candidate who shall have:

i) pursued a programme of study as prescribed under Regulation b) above:

And

ii) presented a thesis on the candidate's advanced study and research which satisfies the Board of Examiners as:

- (a) making an original and significant contribution to knowledge
- (b) giving evidence of originality of mind and critical judgement in a particular subject
- (c) containing material worthy of peer-reviewed publication
- (d) being satisfactory in its literary and/or technical presentation and structure with a full bibliography and references
- (e) demonstrating an understanding of the context of the research: this must include, as appropriate for the subject of the thesis, the scientific, engineering, commercial and social contexts, and

iii) passed a *viva voce* examination conducted by the examiners on the broader aspects of the field of research in addition to the subject of the thesis. A *viva voce* examination is mandatory once a Doctor of Business Administration candidate has submitted a thesis. Where a candidate satisfies the examiners regarding the contents of the thesis but fails to satisfy the examiners at the *viva voce*, the candidate shall be given an opportunity of re-examination at a second *viva voce*: failure to satisfy at the second *viva voce* shall constitute failure of the submission for the Doctor of Business Administration.

Candidates at the discretion of the examiners may be required to pass a written examination to test their knowledge of the chosen field of research.

Examiners' decision

1) BOARD OF EXAMINERS

The Board of Examiners shall be constituted in accordance with Ordinance 15. The Board of Examiners shall make recommendations as detailed below. A report on the thesis must be provided by the examiners. If the Board of Examiners cannot agree, the Board of Examiners shall report this disagreement to the Board of Studies which may recommend to Senate that a new Board of Examiners be appointed, without prejudice to the candidate.

The Board of Examiners may recommend to the Board of Studies:

- either: (1) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Business Administration;
- or: (2) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Business Administration, subject to minor corrections to the thesis being executed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner(s);

or: (3) that the candidate not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Business Administration but be given the opportunity of submitting a revised thesis for examination. The examiners shall normally require the candidate to undergo a second viva voce examination if a revised thesis is submitted;

or: (4) that the candidate fail and not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Business Administration.

Where resubmission has been recommended candidates may, with the approval of the Board of Studies, be permitted to submit a revised thesis, within such a lapse of time as may be prescribed, and present themselves for re-examination; no further resubmission is permitted if the candidate fails to satisfy the Board of Examiners at this second attempt.

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION Regulation 16.4

Thesis

m) AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

The Degree of Doctor of Education shall be awarded to a candidate who shall have:

- (i) pursued a programme of study as prescribed under Regulation 16.4(b)...; and
- (ii) presented a thesis on the candidate's advanced study and research which satisfies the Board of Examiners as:
 - (a) making an original and significant contribution to knowledge
 - (b) giving evidence of originality of mind and critical judgement in a particular subject
 - (c) containing material worthy of peer-reviewed publication
 - (d) being satisfactory in its literary and/or technical presentation and structure with a full bibliography and references
- (e) demonstrating an understanding of the context of the research: this must include, as appropriate for the subject of the thesis, the scientific, engineering, commercial and social contexts
- (iii) passed a viva voce examination conducted by the examiners on the broader aspects of the field of research in addition to the subject of the thesis. A viva voce examination is mandatory once a Doctor of Education candidate has submitted a thesis. Where a candidate satisfies the examiners regarding the contents of the thesis but fails to satisfy the examiners at the viva voce, the candidate shall be given an opportunity of re-examination at a second viva voce; failure to satisfy at the second viva voce shall constitute failure of the submission for the Doctor of Education.

Candidates at the discretion of the examiners may be required to pass a written examination to test their knowledge of the chosen field of research.

Recommendation of the Examiners

(1) BOARD OF EXAMINERS

(i) Where, in place of a research enquiry, a candidate submits a portfolio of published papers, the Board of Examiners shall include two external examiners, at least one of whom shall be a recognised authority in the field of the candidate's work. The Board of Examiners shall make recommendations as detailed below. A report on the thesis must be provided by the examiners. If the Board of Examiners cannot agree, the Board of Examiners shall report this disagreement to the Board of Studies which may recommend to Senate that a new Board of Examiners be appointed, without prejudice to the candidate.

(ii) The Board of Examiners may recommend to the Board of Studies:

- either: (1) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Education;
- or: (2) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Education, subject to minor corrections to the thesis being executed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner(s);
- or: (3) that the candidate not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Education but be given the opportunity of submitting a revised thesis for examination. The examiners shall normally require the candidate to undergo a second viva voce examination if a revised thesis is submitted;
- or: (4) that the candidate fail and not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Education.

(iii) Where submission of a revised thesis has been recommended candidates may, with the approval of the Board of Studies, be permitted to submit a revised thesis, within such lapse of time as may be prescribed, and

present themselves for re-examination; no further resubmission is permitted if the candidate fails to satisfy the Board of Examiners at this second attempt.

DOCTOR OF HEALTH Regulation 16.14

Thesis

(m) AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HEALTH

The Degree of Doctor of Health shall be awarded to a candidate who shall have:

- (i)* pursued a programme of study as prescribed under Regulation 16.14(b) above; and
- (ii)* presented a thesis on the candidate's advanced study and research which satisfies the Board of Examiners as:

- (a)* making an original and significant contribution to knowledge
- (b)* giving evidence of originality of mind and critical judgement in a particular subject
- (c)* containing material worthy of peer-reviewed publication
- (d)* being satisfactory in its literary and/or technical presentation and structure with a full bibliography and references
- (e)* demonstrating an understanding of the context of the research: this must include, as appropriate for the subject of the thesis, the scientific, engineering, commercial and social contexts, and

(iii) passed a viva voce examination conducted by the examiners on the broader aspects of the field of research in addition to the subject of the thesis. A viva voce examination is mandatory once a Doctor of Health candidate has submitted a thesis. Where a candidate satisfies the examiners regarding the contents of the thesis but fails to satisfy the examiners at the viva voce, the candidate shall be given an opportunity of re-examination at a second viva voce; failure to satisfy at the second viva voce shall constitute failure of the submission for the Doctor of Health.

Recommendation of the Board of Examiners

(l) BOARD OF EXAMINERS

(i) The Board of Examiners shall make recommendations as detailed below. A report on the thesis must be provided by the examiners. If the Board of Examiners cannot agree, the Board of Examiners shall report this disagreement to the Board of Studies which may recommend to Senate that a new Board of Examiners be appointed, without prejudice to the candidate.

(ii) The Board of Examiners may recommend to the Board of Studies:

either: (1) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Health;

or: (2) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Health, subject to minor corrections to the thesis being executed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner(s);

or: (3) that the candidate not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Health but be given the opportunity of submitting a revised thesis for examination. The examiners shall normally require the candidate to undergo a second viva voce examination if a revised thesis is submitted;

or: (4) that the candidate fail and not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Health.

(iii) Where submission of a revised thesis has been recommended candidates may, with the approval of the Board of Studies, be permitted to submit a revised thesis, within such lapse of time as may be prescribed, and present themselves for re-examination; no further resubmission is permitted if the candidate fails to satisfy the Board of Examiners at this second attempt.

DOCTOR OF ENGINEERING Regulation 16.15

Thesis

(n) AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF ENGINEERING

The Degree of Doctor of Engineering shall be awarded to a candidate who shall have:

- (i)* pursued a programme of study as prescribed under Regulation 16.13(c) above; and
- (ii)* presented a portfolio on the candidate's advanced study and research which satisfies the Board of Examiners as:

- (a)* making an original and significant contribution to knowledge
- (b)* giving evidence of originality of mind and critical judgement in a particular subject
- (c)* containing material worthy of peer-reviewed publication
- (d)* being satisfactory in its literary and/or technical presentation and structure with a full bibliography and references;

(e) demonstrating an understanding of the context of the research: this must include, as appropriate for the subject of the thesis, the scientific, engineering, commercial and social contexts

(iii) passed a viva voce examination conducted by the examiners on the broader aspects of the field of research in addition to the subject of the thesis. A viva voce examination is mandatory once a Doctor of Engineering candidate has submitted a portfolio. Where a candidate satisfies the examiners regarding the contents of the thesis but fails to satisfy the examiners at the viva voce, the candidate shall be given an opportunity of re-examination at a second viva voce not more than six months after the first viva voce examination; failure to satisfy at the second viva voce shall constitute failure of the submission for the Doctor of Engineering. Candidates at the discretion of the examiners may be required to pass a written examination to test their knowledge of the chosen field of research.

Recommendation of the Board of Examiners

(ii) The Board of Examiners may recommend to the Board of Studies:
either:

(1) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Engineering;

or:

(2) that the candidate be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Engineering, subject to minor corrections to the portfolio being executed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner(s); or:

(3) that the candidate not be awarded the Degree of Doctor of Engineering but be given the opportunity of submitting a revised portfolio for examination. The examiners may require the candidate to undergo a second viva voce examination if a revised portfolio is submitted;

or:

(4) that the candidate not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Engineering but be required to present her/himself for a second viva voce examination within six months of the first viva voce examination;

or:

(5) that the candidate be awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy;

or:

(6) that the candidate fail and not be awarded either the Degree of Doctor of Engineering or the Degree of Master of Philosophy.

(iii) Where submission of a revised portfolio has been recommended candidates may, with the approval of the Board of Studies, be permitted to submit a revised portfolio, within such lapse of time as may be prescribed, and present themselves for re-examination; no further resubmission is permitted if the candidate fails to satisfy the Board of Examiners at this second attempt.