



## Quality Assurance Code of Practice

### Research Degrees

#### This document is primarily intended for:

- Associate Deans (Research)
- Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies
- Directors of Studies
- Supervisors
- Doctoral Students
- Assistant Registrars (Faculty/School)
- Admissions Tutors
- Doctoral College staff

#### Queries:

First point of contact –

- Assistant Registrars (Faculty/School)

#### Technical/specialist contact

- Doctoral College

1	Purpose and Scope .....	2
2	Principles .....	3
3	Roles and Responsibilities .....	3
4	Recruitment and Admissions.....	4
5	Induction.....	5
6	Approval of Candidature .....	6
7	Collaborative Provision .....	7
	Scope and Definitions.....	7
	Principles and Overview .....	8
	Roles and Responsibilities .....	8
8	Supervision .....	10
	Criteria for appointment of members of the supervisory team.....	10
	External Supervisors .....	11
	Confirming the appointment of a supervisory team.....	11
9	Establishing a Programme of Work.....	12
	Career planning.....	13
	Skills development for doctoral students.....	13
	Researcher Integrity .....	14
	Sponsor's requirements.....	14
	Temporary suspension of studies .....	15
10	Review and Progress Arrangements for Students .....	15
11	Progression points .....	16
	Transfer to PhD registration from another research degree.....	18
	EngD Mid-term review .....	19
	Professional Doctorate programmes .....	20
12	Preparation of a Thesis for Submission .....	20
13	The Board of Examiners for the award.....	22

Roles of the Examiners.....	22
14 Criteria for the Appointment of Examiners .....	24
External Examiners for the award.....	24
Internal Examiners for the award.....	24
15 Pre Viva Report .....	25
16 Procedure for a Viva Voce Examination.....	25
17 Outcomes of a Viva Voce Examination .....	26
Award of degree with no corrections.....	27
Minor corrections (trivial or typographical) .....	27
Minor corrections (significant or substantial) .....	27
Revised Thesis .....	28
Fail .....	28
Outcomes for a Revised Thesis Submission.....	28
18 Doctoral Student Feedback and Liaison.....	29
19 Annual Monitoring of Research Degree Provision .....	29
20 Staff Development and Training.....	30
21 Complaints and Academic Appeals.....	31
22 Declaration of Interests.....	32

## 1 Purpose and Scope

---

- 1.1. This QA statement sets out the principles on which doctoral study provision is undertaken at the University of Bath. The statement sets out the main stages of higher degrees by research.
- 1.2. It applies to:
- Degrees based solely on research (PhD, MPhil);
  - The research elements of Professional Doctorates (EdD, DBA, EngD, DClinPsy, DPRP and DHealth) or research degrees with a formally assessed taught element (Integrated PhD or a PhD programme offered via a Doctoral Training Entity (DTE)). Taught elements of these programmes will be subject to the relevant QA Code of Practice Statements.
- 1.3. Information on the admission and recruitment of doctoral students is covered in [QA22: Recruitment, Selection and Admission of Students](#). Information on the use of doctoral students in teaching activities is set out in [QA9: Professional Development and Recognition for all Staff and Students who Teach and Support Learning](#). Staff/Student Liaison Committees are covered in QA48 Student Engagement with Quality Assurance and Enhancement, [Annex A](#). Approval of new doctoral programmes with a taught element is covered in [QA3 Approval of New Programmes of Study](#) and [QA20 Collaborative Provision \(Taught\)](#). Where required by a Professional Doctoral Programme, [QA13](#), Degree Scheme Reviews will apply.
- 1.4. This QA statement may need to be read in conjunction with:

- The University [Regulations](#) (in particular Regulation 16: Admissions Regulations and Conditions for the Award of Higher Degrees);
- University [Ordinance](#) 15 on Examiners and Examinations.

## 2 Principles

---

- 2.1 The University of Bath has an outstanding national and international reputation for the quality of its research, its research-led teaching and its distinct academic approach.
- 2.2 The University recognises that doctoral students should be fully included in research life within the Faculties/School and all Departments, and this document sets out the principles by which it seeks to ensure that a consistently high quality of education is delivered to all those registered for research degrees.
- 2.3 The University of Bath Research Strategy is available [here](#).

## 3 Roles and Responsibilities

---

- 3.1 The following Committees and Boards have a formal role in matters relating to postgraduate research provision:
- [University Doctoral Studies Committee](#) is responsible to Senate for strategic coordination, the maintenance of high academic standards and the continuous improvement of the student experience for all doctoral study, including taught components of doctoral programmes and all Doctoral Training Entities;
  - The [Board of Studies \(Doctoral\)](#) is responsible to Senate for the organisation of academic matters for doctoral study, including all matters concerning the candidature, confirmation, progression and examination of doctoral students.
  - [Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committees](#) are responsible to the University Doctoral Studies Committee for the quality and academic standards of doctoral study within the Faculty/School. They are responsible for providing specialist advice in respect of the progression of individual doctoral students to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) and for liaising with Faculty/School Boards of Studies on matters concerning the quality and strategic direction of doctoral study at faculty level.
- 3.2 The following professional services/staff are responsible for supporting and overseeing particular matters in relation to postgraduate research provision:
- The [Doctoral College](#) is responsible for operational management of doctoral recruitment and admissions procedures; for providing administrative leadership including the management of processes relating to doctoral student progression, and quality and standards; for the identification, development and delivery of doctoral skills training, and for supporting and advising on all aspects relating to the support and enhancement of doctoral student provision;
  - [Academic Registry](#) is responsible for overseeing the maintenance of doctoral student records in conjunction with Doctoral College administrators, and for advising on Regulatory matters and the QA Code of Practice;
  - **Supervisory Teams** are responsible for ensuring that doctoral students receive appropriate guidance and support throughout their registration with the University. All supervisors should be aware of Students Services' [advice for staff](#), which covers topics such as: dealing with serious incidents and supporting students (including those with disabilities). The supervisory team and the student should work together to determine the most appropriate way of supporting the student throughout the duration of their studies. The Supervisory Team are responsible for

implementing strategies that meet specific requirements or needs identified by the student when these have been developed in consultation with the relevant support services. For example, reasonable adjustments outlined in a Disability Action Plan generated in consultation with the Disability Service.

- **Lead Supervisors** are responsible for supporting their doctoral students to progress satisfactorily and in accordance with the University's Regulations and Quality Assurance expectations. Appendix 1 summarises the main responsibilities of the lead supervisor and supervisory team.
- **Directors of Studies** are responsible for the oversight and co-ordination of research degree provision across a Department or individual doctoral programme;
- **Faculty/School Directors of Doctoral Studies** promote a consistent approach across each Faculty/School and ensure that there is effective academic and operational management of the Faculty/School's doctoral programmes. They are responsible for reviewing the details of candidature, and monitoring doctoral student progression, triaging cases where necessary to reduce the academic decision making caseload of the Faculty Doctoral Studies Committee and Board of Studies (Doctoral). Where the School Director of Studies (Doctoral) is also the programme Director of Studies, the Associate Dean for Research will assume this responsibility.
- The **Associate Deans for Research** act as Chairperson of the Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committees and are responsible for promoting and co-ordinating doctoral provision within their Faculty or School. They work in collaboration with the Doctoral College to develop strategies to assure and improve the doctoral student experience and environment. They have a role in monitoring doctoral student progression, dealing with urgent paperwork via Chair's Action and supporting the triaging of cases where necessary to reduce the academic decision making caseload of the Board of Studies (Doctoral).
- **Heads of Departments/ Dean of School** are responsible for ensuring that sufficient resources, including adequate and appropriate supervision, are made available to support provision for doctoral students in their Department/School.

- 3.3 **Doctoral students** are responsible for carrying out research, undertaking appropriate skills training, maintaining the progress of their work, taking the initiative in raising problems or difficulties, and deciding when to submit their thesis- within the constraints of the University's Regulations. Doctoral students are responsible for informing the University of any changes to their personal contact details, including periods of fieldwork or research visits that last for more than 14 days. Appendix 2 summarises these responsibilities.

## 4 Recruitment and Admissions

---

- 4.1 General information about the recruitment and admission of doctoral students is available in [QA22 Recruitment, Selection and Admission of Students](#). Specific guidance is available from the Doctoral College.
- 4.2 [Regulation 16](#) sets out the admissions requirements for all higher degrees of the University.
- 4.3 Wherever possible, a doctoral student will be given the opportunity during the admissions process of discussing the selection of their supervisor(s) after meeting the potential supervisor(s). It is recognised that in some cases, because of the distances involved and funding arrangements, it may be necessary to agree a supervisor by correspondence.

- 4.4 Offer letters specify as far as possible an outline of the intended research topic and the name(s) of the proposed supervisor(s), but these are subject to confirmation at the time of approval of candidature (see Section 6). In the case of Professional Doctorates and doctoral degree programmes offered by Doctoral Training Entities, the research topic and supervisory arrangements may not be established until after the doctoral student has registered, so the offer letter therefore may not include this information.
- 4.5 International doctoral students must comply with the conditions of their visa. The Student Immigration Service team will provide immigration advice regarding Tier 4 and the Doctorate Extension Scheme (DES) for both applicants and current students. Recruitment and support for international doctoral students is outlined in [QA31 Recruitment and Support for International Students](#).
- 4.6 In the case of Professional Doctorates, where doctoral students may experience greater work-related pressures, employers are asked to provide written confirmation that they undertake to release the doctoral student for a specific amount of time per week for study. This helps ensure that study time is preserved and not eroded over time.

## 5 Induction

---

- 5.1 The University of Bath is committed to providing doctoral students with clear and accessible information at the time of their registration to make them aware of, and to assist them in taking full advantage of, the academic and social environment in which they will be undertaking their studies. This information is provided in the form of a Doctoral College handbook, a dedicated Doctoral Induction [webpage](#) and at central, Faculty/School and/or departmental induction events.
- 5.2 The Doctoral College is responsible for organising the central induction and welcome for new doctoral students; additionally advising on the arrangement of Faculty/School/Departmental induction provision to ensure a consistent doctoral student experience across the institution.
- 5.3 The Doctoral College will work with the Students' Union to ensure that new doctoral students have access to an appropriate induction to the support services offered by the University and the Students' Union, and are given an opportunity to network with fellow students.
- 5.4 Departments, Faculties and the School are responsible for arranging a local induction programme tailored to meet the needs of their doctoral student community.
- 5.5 Local induction programmes may include:
- a welcome pack of information about the Department/School/Faculty;
  - a Departmental/School/Faculty handbook or other source of information, providing local administrative information, as well as providing an introduction to the academic culture of the Department/School/Faculty and the doctoral student experience whilst studying for a doctoral degree;
  - an initial meeting with members of the supervisory team;
  - an introduction to key people within the Department/School/Faculty;
  - social events with opportunities to meet other doctoral students, both new and current;
  - sharing information about the research interests of other doctoral students across the University;
  - a Health and Safety briefing;

- an initial meeting with their Subject Librarian.
- 5.6 Unless there is a particular and valid reason (such as provision of the main induction event online), all doctoral students are expected to participate in scheduled induction activities appropriate to their programme.
- 5.7 Doctoral students who are studying within a Doctoral Training Entity may be required to attend further induction events organised by their training centre, which will outline the aims and requirements of their specific training programme.
- 5.8 Induction events will take place at the start of the academic year and at other points when doctoral students typically join the University, as appropriate. Students will be invited to attend the next scheduled induction event. The Doctoral College will work with Faculties, the School, Academic departments and other stakeholders to ensure that doctoral students who arrive mid-year, and those studying part-time or at a distance, can receive an appropriate induction.
- 5.9 Between events, information for new doctoral students is provided in the Doctoral College handbook and on the Doctoral Induction webpage, including details of any local induction programmes.
- 5.10 The relevant Department/School is responsible for ensuring that the following minimum facilities are available to all full-time campus-based doctoral students:
- a desk and appropriate chair in a suitable, non-hazardous environment;
  - a reasonable amount of secure space for personal possessions;
  - a reasonable amount of shelving and/or filing space;
  - access to Departmental/School photocopying facilities;
  - access to networked PC and associated printing facilities, as appropriate for each student's programme of research.

## 6 Approval of Candidature

---

- 6.1 The process of approval of candidature for a doctoral student seeks to ensure that the topic of research and supervisory arrangements are clearly defined as soon as possible following the student's registration (see [Section 8](#) for supervisory requirements). In the case of part-time students, or students studying at a distance, it is particularly important that the attendance requirements are clearly established as early as possible following the student's registration.
- 6.2 The candidature form is accessed via [SAMIS](#), and sections will be completed by the student, supervisor and Director of Studies.
- 6.3 A doctoral student's lead supervisor is responsible for ensuring that all the arrangements and information required for the approval of candidature are in place as soon as possible after the student has registered. The lead supervisor is also responsible for ensuring that the finalised thesis title is approved by the Board of Studies (Doctoral) as soon as possible; any substantive changes to the thesis title or project description that occur later during the student's registration will also require formal approval. The final thesis title must be confirmed in the documentation in which approval for the appointment of the Board of Examiners is sought ([Section 13](#)).
- 6.4 The doctoral student, lead supervisor and Director of Studies are jointly responsible for completing the candidature form, via [SAMIS](#). The candidature form should normally be submitted within one month (full-time students) or three months (part-time students)



of the student's initial registration. Where it is not possible to submit the candidature form within this time, a report should be made to the Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committee, outlining progress with the submission.

- 6.5 Where doctoral students are registered for doctoral programmes that include a taught element, the candidature form must be submitted in accordance with the particular programme regulations and normally within one month (full-time students) or three months (part-time students) of the student embarking upon the research element of the programme.
- 6.6 The Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committee is responsible for confirming the details of the candidature and for ensuring that:
- the candidate is appropriately qualified;
  - the proposed programme of research work can be completed within the timescale allowed, and to the depth required, to obtain the degree for which the candidate is ultimately expected to be registered;
  - proper supervision can be provided and maintained throughout the research period;
  - any ethical issues that are likely to be raised by the research have been considered and appropriate action taken by the Faculty/School, including referring the issue to the [Ethics Committee](#) where appropriate;
  - the appropriate resources are available;
  - the candidate's training requirements are clearly established and that any supplementary studies are identified;
  - a date for the candidate's first attempt at confirmation of PhD registration is set, normally within twelve months of the candidate commencing the research phase of their programme, and communicated to the candidate and the lead supervisor.
- 6.7 Where a doctoral student has transferred into the University from another institution and the minimum period of study is reduced in order to take into account previous study, the candidate will, in accordance with Ordinance 14.5, be registered for no fewer than 12 months of full-time study or 24 months of part-time study before submission of the thesis/portfolio.
- 6.8 Should the Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committee have concerns about any aspect of the candidature as set out on the form, these should be referred to the Director of Studies for resolution. Where necessary the Director of Studies should refer to the supervisor and/or doctoral student as appropriate. In the event that the Director of Studies is a member of the student's supervisory team, the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies should be consulted instead. In the event that the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies is also a member of the supervisory team, the Associate Dean for Research should be consulted.

## 7 Collaborative Provision

---

### Scope and Definitions

- 7.1 Collaborative provision denotes educational provision leading to an award, or to specific credit, of the University of Bath delivered and/or supported and/or assessed through an arrangement with a partner organisation.
- 7.2 Within research degree provision collaborative activity takes two main forms: individual student-based, and programme-based:
- **Student-based**: students who are registered on an individual basis for a doctoral award at another university conduct research at Bath, and students registered on

an individual basis for a doctoral degree awarded solely by the University of Bath conduct some or all of their research elsewhere;

- **Programme-based:** students who are registered on a doctoral programme run by the University of Bath and at least one other institution and where the award(s) is/are made either by one institution, or separately by more than one institution.

### Principles and Overview

- 7.3 The University of Bath is committed to supporting enriched doctoral student learning experiences through collaborative provision where appropriate, whilst working to ensure the overall academic standard of the awards conferred by the University of Bath and the quality of the learning experiences and associated support for students.
- 7.4 The University takes a risk-based approach to developing and managing its collaborative activity, whereby effort expended will be proportionate to factors such as the nature of the partner organisation, and the complexity of the arrangements, thereby ensuring that the quality and standards of all collaborative provision will be as rigorous, secure and open to scrutiny as those for programmes delivered entirely by the University of Bath.
- 7.5 The development of collaborative doctoral provision should be set within the context of the Doctoral College Plan, the [University's Research Strategy](#), the [University's Education Strategy](#), if applicable, and the [University's International Strategy](#).
- 7.6 The process for approving new **joint** research degrees (resulting in either a joint qualification, double/multiple qualification or a dual award qualification) is described in detail in [QA20 Collaborative Provision](#), within annexes L and M. However, the University does not support proposals for joint research degrees on an individual basis (for individual students) except in very exceptional circumstances (see QA20 1.5).
- 7.7 The development of collaborative arrangements involving international partners should be set within the context of the University's International Strategy helping to develop and maintain institutional and Departmental/School links and long-term multi-stranded research, teaching and knowledge-transfer partnerships with internationally renowned research-intensive universities around the world.
- 7.8 The University does not permit serial arrangements i.e. where a partner of the University offers approved collaborative provision to a third party.

### Roles and Responsibilities

- 7.9 Arrangements made on a student-by-student basis are subject to scrutiny by the Faculty/ School Doctoral Studies Committee under the processes described in Section 6 (approval of candidature) of this statement.
- 7.10 Arrangements which are programme-based require wider scrutiny and approval, and responsibilities depend upon the extent to which the programme includes formally-assessed taught elements.
- 7.11 A member of Department/School staff should be identified as being the Lead Proposer of a collaborative proposal (this should usually be an academic member of staff). This person is responsible for managing the process of approving the proposal; acting as a key liaison person with the proposed collaborative partner; and for overseeing the monitoring, review and renewal of the arrangement once approved. Where a lead person leaves the University the responsibility for overseeing the arrangement will rest with the Faculty/School Associate Dean for Research until a replacement is identified.



- 7.12 Staff from the following areas are responsible for providing advice, as appropriate, as part of the process of considering a proposal, as appropriate:
- The relevant academic Department(s)
  - The relevant Faculty/School executive
  - Doctoral College
  - International Relations Office
  - Academic Registry
  - Student Immigration Service
  - Legal Office
  - Finance
  - Policy and Planning.
- 7.13 The following committees are responsible for scrutinising the strategic advisability and/or academic case for a collaborative arrangement at programme level:
- **University Doctoral Studies Committee** is responsible for giving strategic consideration to proposals from the School/Departments for academic collaboration and for recommending proposals to the Academic Programmes Committee (including new Doctoral Training Entities);
  - [Academic Programmes Committee](#) is responsible for recommending to Senate for approval of new partner organisations and for giving initial approval for research degree collaborative arrangements. It is also responsible for approving amendments, renewals and termination of any collaborative arrangements;
  - [Senate](#) is responsible for giving strategic approval to new partner organisations. Senate is also responsible for the academic standards of all programmes leading to an award of the University of Bath.
- 7.14 In the case of programmes involving significant formally-assessed taught elements (for example Integrated PhD programmes in which the first year consists of a master's programme, and Professional Doctorate qualifications), **Faculty/School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees** are responsible for scrutinising the taught elements of proposals for collaborative partners to deliver new or existing programmes, proposals for amending such arrangements, and proposals for renewing such arrangements, and providing comments to the University Doctoral Studies Committee, which will consider the proposal in its entirety.
- 7.15 [University Doctoral Studies Committee](#) is responsible for scrutinising proposals for collaborative partners to deliver new or existing programmes, proposals for amending such arrangements, and proposals for renewing such arrangements, and to make recommendations to the Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee (CPAC);
- 7.16 [Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee \(CPAC\)](#) is responsible (following recommendation from University Doctoral Studies Committee), for approving proposals for collaborative partners to deliver new or existing programmes, proposals for amending such arrangements and proposals for renewing such arrangements;
- 7.17 [University Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee](#) is responsible for overseeing the success of collaborative arrangements and for the effectiveness of the approval, amendment, renewal and withdrawal procedures set out in this statement. University Doctoral Studies Committee is responsible for advising University Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee in this area.
- 7.18 The approval process for programme-based collaborative research degrees is set out in [QA20 Collaborative Provision](#). Please refer all queries to Academic Registry.

## 8 Supervision

---

- 8.1 The University of Bath is committed to providing each doctoral student with supervisory arrangements that provide appropriate support and guidance to facilitate successful study. A supervisory team must be appointed for every doctoral student.

### Criteria for appointment of members of the supervisory team

- 8.2 The aim of establishing a supervisory team is to ensure that each doctoral student has access to a breadth of experience and knowledge not only in their discipline(s) but also in terms of general doctoral training and support. The following criteria for the appointment of members of the supervisory team are based upon this principle. Hence it is expected that at least one member of the supervisory team will be currently engaged in research in the relevant discipline(s), so as to ensure that the direction and monitoring of the student's progress is informed by relevant subject knowledge and research developments. Further to this, the range of experience and knowledge across the supervisory team will mean that a doctoral student always has access to someone with experience of supporting student(s) through to successful completion of their degree.

- 8.3 A doctoral student's supervisory team will normally consist of a lead supervisor and at least one other person of appropriate academic standing. Within this team:

- the lead supervisor must normally be a member of the University's academic staff (as defined in Section 25 of the [University's statutes](#)). If the supervisor is not employed on a full-time basis by the University, the other members of the supervisory team must be available to offer the required support to the doctoral student;
- the lead supervisor must have appropriately detailed knowledge in the doctoral student's area of research;
- the lead supervisor must be able to make available to the doctoral student sufficient time and resource (including having access to appropriate equipment) to support the student's work;
- supervisors must not assume responsibility for lead supervision of an inappropriately large number of students; this number will vary according to the discipline and nature of the research as specified by the Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committee and indicated on the candidature form. Heads of Department/School are responsible for ensuring supervisory loads are reasonable;
- if the lead supervisor does not have experience of successfully supervising doctoral students to graduation with research degrees, then the supervisory team must include another member of the University's academic staff who does;
- if the lead supervisor does not hold a doctoral degree, the supervisory team must include another member of the University's academic staff who does;
- if the lead supervisor is still under probation, the supervisory team must include another member of the University's academic staff who is not under probation;
- research staff and visiting professors/fellows may be members of the supervisory team.

Exceptionally:

- visiting professors/fellows may be designated the lead supervisor, provided that the Department/ School can demonstrate that they are properly trained and supported and all other supervisory roles are fulfilled;
- emeritus professors may be appointed as members of the supervisory team on an annual basis, provided they are not the lead supervisor.

- 8.4 The supervisory team should be constituted in accordance with the principles set out in 8.2, in order to provide advice and support in relation to the research topic, training requirements and pastoral care.
- 8.5 The supervisory team are responsible for providing appropriate levels of pastoral care and signposting students to further sources of support within the University. The allocation of specific roles within the supervisory team is left to the discretion of Departments/Schools, in recognition that this may vary according to the discipline and the student's needs.
- 8.6 The lead supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the newly formed supervisory team discuss and agree their respective roles within the team. Aspects of this arrangement will be captured in the candidature form.
- 8.7 In cases where the team includes a supervisor or lead supervisor who is new to supervision, a more experienced member of the team will assume responsibility for mentoring the new supervisor.

### External Supervisors

- 8.8 Doctoral students registered as 'externally-based' are required to have an external supervisor (see Regulations 16.3 (i), 16.5 (j)) and where doctoral students are undertaking work outside the University or pursuing research which involves collaboration with an external body it may be appropriate for an external supervisor to be appointed as a member of the supervisory team. The Departments/Schools are responsible for ensuring that any newly appointed external supervisor is made aware of the requirements of the role and the University guidance relating to it by directing them to this document and Regulation 16. Some Doctoral Training Entities arrangements may also require an external supervisor (for example, based at a partner institution). The need for an external supervisor must be outlined in the candidature form submitted to the Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committee, and internal supervisors must also be appointed. The Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committee must be satisfied that provision has been made for adequate contact between the internal and external supervisors.
- 8.9 The Director of Studies must ensure that the potential supervisory team meets the criteria stated in 8.3 above, and that there is sufficient academic expertise available in order to:
- make reasonable provision for continuity of supervision for the expected duration of the student's registration;
  - allow for Internal Examiner(s) to be appointed from outside the supervisory team for the final submission;
  - where applicable, allow for Examiners of the PhD confirmation report to be appointed from outside the potential supervisory team.
- 8.10 The supervision arrangements for each of the named Professional Doctorates are set out in the Regulations for the particular programme.

### Confirming the appointment of a supervisory team

- 8.11 The provisional supervision arrangements for PhD (or MPhil) applicants should normally be stated in the formal offer letter (see Section 4), and any subsequent changes made before initial registration notified to the applicant in writing, and to the Doctoral College, so that the Doctoral College may change the student's record in conjunction with Academic Registry. Applicants to programmes that include a taught

first stage will receive notification of supervisory appointments at a suitable point as they progress.

- 8.12 When the candidature of the doctoral student is submitted to the Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committee (see Section 6), this must include a statement from the Director of Studies confirming that the supervision arrangements conform to the criteria set out in 8.3 above.
- 8.13 Changes to supervisory arrangements made after the approval of the candidature require a further statement by the Director of Studies that the criteria set out above have been met, and will need approval by the Board of Studies (Doctoral).
- 8.14 In cases where the original lead supervisor leaves the employ of the University, is on formal leave of absence for a period in excess of two months or, exceptionally, is no longer able to supervise the doctoral student for other reasons, the Director of Studies will make appropriate recommendations to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) to provide for the continuance of supervision (normally by a member of the academic staff of the University in accordance with paragraph 8.3 above).
- 8.15 Where a supervisor is absent for a more limited time, arrangements should be made for a deputy to undertake the duties of the lead supervisor on a temporary basis. It may be appropriate for another member of the team to occupy the role of lead supervisor on a temporary basis. The doctoral student should be consulted when changes of this kind are being made to supervisory arrangements and should be kept informed of any changes made.
- 8.16 Details of procedures for resolving problems that may arise in the supervisory relationship, including conflicts of interest, are detailed in Section 21 and Section 22.

## 9 Establishing a Programme of Work

---

- 9.1 It is important that, at the start of a doctoral student's studies, the student and the lead supervisor discuss and agree the following:
- a schedule of regular formal meetings. (These may be supplemented where appropriate by more frequent informal meetings);
  - supervisory team and student work patterns, including any planned periods of leave (e.g. sabbatical, parental);
  - suitable methods of contact between them and reasonable response times;
  - any formal courses of study or seminars, colloquia, etc. that the doctoral student is required to attend and/or be assessed in and, where stated in the scheme of studies, successfully complete as part of the programme (see 9.4 below);
  - a date for the completion of the programme of work required in connection with the first progression point for that doctoral degree (see Section 11);
  - a date by which the first progress report should be completed;
  - a workplan that will meet the school/faculty expectations for confirmation (or the next progression point of the doctoral degree), including those relating to the mandatory researcher skills training;
  - where appropriate, a date for the submission of the thesis outline;
  - a date for the submission of the completed thesis/portfolio (which should comply with the timescales set out in University Regulation 16, and be considerably before the expiry of the maximum period of registration, in order to allow time for examination and, where necessary, corrections, before the registration is normally due to expire);
  - where there is a budget associated with the project work, the supervisor and doctoral

student should plan and agree the expenditure arrangements.

It is important that the doctoral student and lead supervisor establish early in the student's studies clear expectations about the timing and requirements of these significant academic milestones in order to minimise difficulties later.

- 9.2 It is expected that, throughout the course of the research degree, the supervisory team and the doctoral student will periodically revisit the discussion points above.
- 9.3 Candidates registered for a doctoral degree that permits a choice between thesis submission formats (see [Regulation 16.1](#) (j)), should discuss potential publishable outputs, and the most appropriate thesis submission format with the supervisory team at a suitably early point in their studies (see Specifications for Higher Degree Theses and Portfolios, Appendix 6 to this statement).
- 9.4 Where doctoral students are registered for a degree with a formally assessed taught element which must be successfully completed, the timings within the programme of work for candidature (see 6.5), confirmation (see 11.4) and progress review meetings (see 10.4) may, within reason, be different from those outlined in this statement, but must be in accordance with the approved scheme of studies.

### Orientation

- 9.5 At the start of the project the supervisory team should take action to acquaint the doctoral student with their home department or school; introducing them to the local academic culture, key contacts, and the facilities available. This could include, for example, information about a departmental research seminar series, the location of other doctoral student offices, and an overview of local working practices. For cross-departmental or interdisciplinary projects, the second supervisor may be required to take an active role in these orientation activities. It is important (as at all stages) to consider how part-time students, those studying from a distance and those on interdisciplinary projects can be fully orientated into the department(s). Within departments that operate a peer mentoring or buddy system, the local co-ordinator will introduce newly arrived doctoral students to the scheme.

### Career planning

- 9.6 All doctoral students should be strongly encouraged to access Careers Education, Information, Advice and Guidance (CEIAG) provision before, during and after their time at University. The principal specialist provider of CEIAG services is the [Careers Service](#), which provides tailored careers support for research postgraduates and information on potential career paths. The student's career aspirations should be discussed at candidature, and the lead Supervisor is responsible for signposting their students to the Careers Service and DoctoralSkills for support on career planning, where necessary.

### Skills development for doctoral students

- 9.7 Doctoral students are expected to engage in professional development activities alongside their studies. The lead supervisor is responsible for undertaking a training needs analysis and discussing requirements for skills training and personal development planning with a student at the beginning of their studies and at least on an annual basis. Doctoral students are expected to engage in the equivalent of at least 10 days of skills development activities per year (pro-rated for part time students i.e. 5 days for 0.5 FTE). Skills training should be discussed at candidature, and students are responsible for ensuring that their participation is recorded in their SAMIS record. Except where explicitly stated otherwise, completion of training specified for the first year of a student's registration during candidature approval is a condition of transfer



to/confirmation of PhD registration. Some Doctoral Training Entities may require additional formal monitoring of training activities.

- 9.8 The researcher skills training programme for doctoral students at the University (DoctoralSkills) is mapped against the internationally recognised [Researcher Development Framework](#) (RDF) which should be used when planning research postgraduate development. The lead supervisor is responsible for bringing to the attention of their doctoral students any appropriate training opportunities available at the University of Bath and, where appropriate, outside of the University of Bath.
- 9.9 The [DoctoralSkills](#) programme of courses and workshops is coordinated by the Doctoral College. The programme covers University level generic skills provision, and content is informed by doctoral student and research staff feedback. Doctoral students and supervisors can seek information about training courses from the Doctoral Skills Coordinator (Doctoral College), including details of any courses offered by GW4 partners (University of Bristol, Cardiff University and University of Exeter), that are open to University of Bath students.

### Researcher Integrity

- 9.10 In accordance with the University's [Code of Good Practice in Research Integrity](#) and [Research Data Policy](#), all doctoral students first registered after 1<sup>st</sup> August 2016 are required to complete researcher integrity training, pass the academic integrity test, obtain ethics committee approval, and produce a data management plan, in order to be permitted to progress with their doctoral degree.
- 9.11 Supervisory teams should encourage their doctoral students to complete the required training soon after enrolment. Compliance will be checked at the most suitable progression point on each doctoral degree – for example, at the point of confirmation for those registered as probationer PhD candidates.
- 9.12 The data management plan is intended to be a 'live' document and should be periodically updated and reviewed throughout the duration of the research project. The Library research data team are able to provide advice on this topic, and [training courses on Research Data Management](#) are run repeatedly throughout the year.
- 9.13 The [Academic Skills Centre](#) offer support in all aspects of academic writing. The University of Bath's central services (Library, Computing Services, and Careers Service) offer a wide variety of skills training. In addition, faculties and the school coordinate development opportunities and training programmes for doctoral researchers in their discipline.

### Sponsor's requirements

- 9.14 Sponsors of research, such as Research Councils, government departments or industrial and commercial organisations, may insist on certain obligations being met by the University. Staff and doctoral students working on projects funded by external sponsors should make sure they are fully aware of the conditions of the funding including the title to and protection of the intellectual property rights in the results.
- 9.15 Advice and guidance in the negotiations of, and compliance with, such contractual obligations is available from [Research and Innovation Services](#), the Studentships Team, and the University Legal Office as appropriate. The Alumni team can advise on donor-funded studentships. See also Ordinance 22 'Intellectual Property'.



### Temporary suspension of studies

- 9.16 If a doctoral student is unable to work for any significant length of time because of circumstances largely beyond their control, a suspension of study may be granted for a period of up to 12 months (see [Regulation 16.1](#) (d)). Applications supported with appropriate corroborating evidence should be made to the Board of Studies (Doctoral). As soon as the situation arises, students should contact the Doctoral College to begin the application process.
- 9.17 All doctoral students are entitled to a period of parental leave. The [Maternity, Paternity and Adoption leave policy](#) for research students outlines parental leave entitlements and stipend allowances for doctoral students.

## 10 Review and Progress Arrangements for Students

---

- 10.1 Regular review of the progress of doctoral students is necessary to ensure that students are progressing satisfactorily with their research work and training specified on the candidature form. This also enables both doctoral student and supervisor(s) to identify any potential problems at the earliest opportunity and to help ensure that work is completed to an agreed timescale.
- 10.2 The Director of Studies is responsible for ensuring that doctoral students are advised at the start of their studies of the schedule and procedures for undertaking reviews of students' progress in that Department/School.
- 10.3 Formal reviews of progress will normally be undertaken every six months, starting six months after the student's initial registration.
- 10.4 Where students are registered on a doctoral programme with a formally assessed taught element, the first review will normally take place six months after the student commences on the research element of the programme.
- 10.5 The approved scheme of studies for the named Professional Doctorates and PhD programmes with a formally assessed taught element will set out the requirements for meetings of the doctoral student and the supervisory team.
- 10.6 Doctoral students and supervisors must agree on the form and frequency of other progress reports which may be required.
- 10.7 If a supervisor is dissatisfied with the progress being made by a doctoral student then this should be brought to the attention of the student at the earliest opportunity and, wherever possible, in time to consider ways of resolving issues ahead of submission of a formal review report.
- 10.8 If a doctoral student is dissatisfied with progress, whether due to reasons beyond their control or because of difficulties in establishing an effective working relationship with the supervisor, the Director of Studies should be informed by the student of these problems as soon as possible. In the event that the Director of Studies is a member of the student's supervisory team, the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies should be informed. In the event that the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies is also a member of the supervisory team, the Associate Dean for Research should be consulted. In situations where a doctoral student does not feel comfortable raising their concern in this way they may discuss the matter in confidence with the Academic Director of the Doctoral College. In the event that this action does not resolve the matter, the

doctoral student may approach the University Independent Advisor for Postgraduate Research students (see Section 21).

- 10.9 The supervisor is responsible for ensuring that formal 6 monthly progress review reports are completed on time and submitted to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) (in accordance with the schedule in 10.3). These reports include comments from the supervisor on the student's progress to date, including any skills training requirements. The progress report form is accessed via [SAMIS](#) and includes provision for the doctoral student to add his or her own comments. In the event that significant differences of opinion are reflected in the report, advice should be sought from the Director of Studies. In the event that the Director of Studies is a member of the student's supervisory team then advice should be sought from the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies. In the event that the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies is also a member of the supervisory team, the Associate Dean for Research should be consulted.
- 10.10 The Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies is responsible for giving appropriate scrutiny to the review reports and will highlight specific cases to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) for further discussion. In cases where the School Director of Doctoral Studies is also the programme Director of Studies, the Associate Dean for Research will assume this responsibility. Some cases may also be referred to the relevant Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committee, where the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies (or Associate Dean for Research) believes that it may benefit from broader discussion at Faculty/School level, before the case is referred to Board of Studies (Doctoral). Where the Board has concerns these should be referred to the Director of Studies for resolution. Where necessary the Director of Studies should refer to the supervisor and/or doctoral student as appropriate. In the event that the Director of Studies is a member of the student's supervisory team then the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies should be consulted instead. In the event that the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies is also a member of the supervisory team, the Associate Dean for Research should be consulted.
- 10.11 To help ensure the quality of doctoral degree provision across a Department/School, Directors of Studies are expected to undertake annual monitoring of doctoral programmes

## 11 Progression points

---

- 11.1 Confirmation of PhD registration is a significant indicator to a doctoral student and supervisor(s) of the student's progress and potential.
- 11.2 PhD students are first registered as probationer PhD candidates in accordance with the provision of Regulation 16.5 (a) (iii).
- 11.3 Probationer PhD candidates are allowed to seek confirmation of their PhD student status on a maximum of two occasions. Submission of work to be considered for the first attempt must take place on or before the deadline specified during the process of formal approval of candidature (see Section 6).
- 11.4 Students admitted as probationer PhD candidates will normally be expected to submit work in support of their confirmation as PhD students within 12 months of first registration (18 months for those studying part-time).

- 11.5 In the case of probationer PhD candidates registered on a PhD programme with a formally assessed taught element, this will be within 12 months of commencing on the research element of the programme.
- 11.6 Failure to submit the work by the specified deadline will normally mean the probationer PhD candidate is deemed to have failed the first attempt. If the first attempt is failed, submission of work for the second attempt must take place on or before a further deadline specified by the Progression Board of Examiners, normally within six months of the first attempt (nine months for those studying part-time). A probationer PhD candidate who fails to submit the work by this new deadline will normally be deemed to have failed their second attempt.
- 11.7 Where a confirmation decision is being made outside the timing recommended in 11.4 above, the Board of Studies (Doctoral) should set a new time limit and monitor progress at each subsequent meeting.
- 11.8 Supervisors should ensure that probationer PhD candidates are aware of the Departmental/Faculty/School/Doctoral College guidelines regarding the contents of the confirmation report.
- 11.9 The requirements to successfully confirm PhD candidature are outlined in Regulation 16.5 (b). In addition, in order to progress within their degree programme, any probationer PhD candidate first registered on or after 1<sup>st</sup> August 2016 must also have:
- completed the training module in research integrity and;
  - completed the training module in academic integrity and passed the associated test and;
  - drawn up an appropriate data management plan for the research project in accordance with the University's Research Data Policy and;
  - obtained ethics committee approval for the project (where applicable).
- The probationer PhD candidate and supervisor are asked to consult the student's SAMIS training record and confirm that these training requirements have been met.
- 11.10 In accordance with Regulation 16.5 b (i), confirmation of PhD registration is only permissible on the recommendation to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) of a Progression Board of Examiners.
- 11.11 The Progression Board of Examiners will consist of at least two members of academic staff, neither of whom may have been involved in the supervision of the student or have any other specific interest in the outcome of the decision which might bring the impartiality of the Examiner into question. Examiner nominations are made by the lead supervisor in liaison with the Director of Studies / Head of Department, and are approved by the Board of Studies (Doctoral).
- 11.12 In order to recommend confirmation, the Progression Board of Examiners must submit a written report to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) confirming that the student has:
- been the subject of a written report from the lead supervisor conveying satisfactory progress by the student. The report should include a description of the work, the value of the work completed and the potential displayed by the student and;
  - submitted a satisfactory report on the work, together with an outline of the research to be undertaken in the remaining period of registration and a signed declaration that the work is the student's own, other than where specifically indicated and;
  - passed at an appropriate standard an oral examination conducted by the Progression Board of Examiners. The student may be required to give a presentation as part of the oral examination. The supervisor(s) may attend the oral

examination by invitation of the student or the panel (by permission of the student).

- 11.13 Before the written report can be sent to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) for consideration, the Director of Studies will be responsible for confirming that the training outlined at candidature has been completed, and that (where applicable) ethics committee approval has been obtained, and if not, that there is a plan in place for the student to do so.
- 11.14 In accordance with Regulation 16, and depending on whether the progression attempt is the first or second, the Progression Board of Examiners has a range of recommendations open to it:
- the probationer PhD candidate's registration as a PhD student be confirmed;
  - the probationer PhD candidate be permitted to make a second submission for confirmation their registration;
  - the probationer PhD candidate's registration be transferred to the degree of Master of Philosophy;
  - the probationer PhD candidate, having failed to achieve the standard required for continuation as a candidate for the degree of Master of Philosophy, be required to withdraw.
- The recommendation is considered by the Board of Studies (Doctoral) ([Regulation 16.1 \(b\)](#)).
- 11.15 Procedures relating to allegations of plagiarism and other assessment offences during the examination process are set out in [QA53 Examination and Assessment Offences](#), section 7.
- 11.16 Students whose registration has been transferred from probationer PhD candidate to an MPhil registration may not subsequently seek to transfer from MPhil to PhD.
- 11.17 Further information about confirmation is given in Appendix 5, and both students and supervisors should read the guidance document produced by the Doctoral College that explains the newly digitised confirmation process.

#### Transfer to PhD registration from another research degree

- 11.18 Research students registered on MPhil or Professional Doctorate programmes may request to transfer their registration to the Doctor of Philosophy. Research students will be assessed for their suitability to enter the PhD programme, based on their progress to date on their current programme, and the merits of the proposed research project.
- 11.19 In order to recommend that an MPhil student is permitted to transfer to a PhD registration, the Progression Board of Examiners must submit a written report to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) confirming that the research student has:
- been the subject of a written report from the lead supervisor conveying satisfactory progress by the student. The report should include a description of the work, the value of the work completed and the potential displayed by the student and;
  - submitted a satisfactory report on the work, together with an outline of the research to be undertaken in the remaining period of registration and a signed declaration that the work is the student's own, other than where specifically indicated and;
  - passed at an appropriate standard an oral examination conducted by the Progression Board of Examiners. The student may be required to give a presentation as part of the oral examination. The supervisor(s) may attend the oral examination by invitation of the student or the panel (by permission of the student).

- 11.20 Before the written report can be sent to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) for consideration, the Director of Studies will be responsible for confirming that the training outlined at candidature has been completed, and that (where applicable) ethics committee approval has been obtained, and if not, that there is a plan in place for the student to do so.
- 11.21 MPhil candidates are allowed to seek transfer to PhD registration on a maximum of two occasions. Submission of work to be considered for the first attempt must normally take place within 12 months of first registration (18 months for those studying part-time) (see [Regulation 16.5\(b\)\(ii\)](#)).
- 11.22 Professional Doctorate candidates may transfer to either a probationer PhD candidature, or confirmed PhD student status, depending upon their progress through the taught and research phases of their original programme. Credits accumulated during the taught phase of a professional doctorate programme may result in the award of a Postgraduate Certificate or Diploma where permitted.

### EngD Mid-term review

- 11.23 Confirmation of EngD registration is a significant indicator to a Research Engineer and their supervisor(s) of the candidate's progress and potential.
- 11.24 EngD students are enrolled in accordance with the provision of [Regulation 16.15](#) (a); and undergo a mid-term review to confirm their candidature for the degree of Doctor of Engineering ([Regulation 16.15](#) (d)).
- 11.25 Research Engineers are allowed to seek confirmation of their EngD candidate status on a maximum of two occasions. Submission of work to be considered for the first attempt must take place within 24 months of first registration.
- 11.26 Failure to submit the work by the specified deadline will normally mean the Research Engineer is deemed to have failed the first attempt. If the first attempt is failed, submission of work for the second attempt must take place on or before a further deadline specified by the Progression Board of Examiners, normally within six months of the first attempt. A Research Engineer who fails to submit the work by this new deadline will normally be deemed to have failed their second attempt.
- 11.27 The requirements to successfully pass the mid-term review and confirm EngD registration are outlined in [Regulation 16.15](#) (d). In addition, any Research Engineer first registered on or after 1<sup>st</sup> August 2016 must also have:
- completed the training module in research integrity and;
  - completed the training module in academic integrity and passed the associated test and;
  - drawn up an appropriate data management plan for the research project in accordance with the University's Research Data Policy and;
  - obtained ethics committee approval for the project (where applicable).
- The Research Engineer and supervisor are asked to confirm these requirements have been met.
- 11.28 In accordance with [Regulation 16.15](#) (d), confirmation of EngD registration is only permissible on the recommendation to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) of a Progression Board of Examiners the constitution of which is specified in the scheme of Studies.

- 11.29 In order to recommend confirmation, the Progression Board of Examiners must submit a written report to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) confirming that the Research Engineer has:
- submitted a satisfactory major report on the work, and;
  - passed at an appropriate standard an oral examination conducted by the Progression Board of Examiners. The supervisor(s) may attend the oral examination by invitation of the candidate or the panel (by permission of the candidate).
- 11.30 Before the written report can be sent to the Board of Studies for consideration, the Director of Studies will be responsible for confirming that the training outlined at candidature has been completed, and that (where applicable) ethics committee approval has been obtained, and if not, that there is a plan in place for the Research Engineer to do so.
- 11.31 In accordance with [Regulation 16.15](#) (d), and depending on whether the progression attempt is the first or second, the Progression Board of Examiners has a range of recommendations open to it:
- the Research Engineer's registration for the degree of Doctor of Engineering be confirmed;
  - the Research Engineer be permitted to make a second submission for confirmation of their registration;
  - the Research Engineer be awarded an exit award of either a Postgraduate Diploma or the Degree of Master;
  - the Research Engineer, having failed both to achieve the standard required for continuation on the programme and the standard required for the award of Postgraduate Diploma or the Degree of Master, be required to withdraw.

### Professional Doctorate programmes

- 11.32 Progression arrangements on the Professional Doctorate programmes are set out within the specific programme regulations.
- 11.33 Programmes such as the EdD, DBA, DPRP, and DHealth require the student to undergo a progression checkpoint prior to entry onto the research stage; when satisfactory completion of the taught units must first be confirmed by the Board of Examiners. For students who first enrolled after 1<sup>st</sup> August 2016, completion of the mandatory training in Academic Integrity, Researcher Integrity and completion of a data management plan will be confirmed at this checkpoint.
- 11.34 On the DClinPsy programme completion of the mandatory training elements will be checked at the relevant exam board.
- 11.35 Procedures for making an academic appeal against the outcome of the progression examination process are set out in [Regulation 17](#).

## 12 Preparation of a Thesis for Submission

---

- 12.1 In accordance with the Regulation for the particular degree for which they are registered, a doctoral student shall present either a thesis or a portfolio for examination. If the Regulations for the degree permit, a doctoral thesis may be submitted in one of two alternative but equivalent formats: as a traditional thesis consisting of chapters, or in an alternative format which integrates academic papers into the text.



- 12.2 Requirements for the submission of the thesis, portfolio or other work to be assessed for the award of a research degree (excluding the taught elements of Professional Doctorates) is given in [Regulation 16.1](#) and in the University Specification for Higher Degree Theses and Portfolios ([Appendix 6](#) to this statement).
- 12.3 Additional expectations will be set out in programme regulations for the particular degree.
- 12.4 A thesis/portfolio must be presented to the standard expected for a University of Bath doctoral degree, and meet the requirements for the award of that degree (Regulations 16.3 (m) (MPhil), 16.4 (m) (EdD), 16.5 (n) (PhD), 16.7 (e) (DSc and DLitt), 16.10 (g) (staff candidature), 16.12 (m) (DBA), 16.14 (m) (DHealth), 16.15 (o) (EngD), 16.16 (l) (DClinPsy) and 16.17 (m) (DPRP).
- 12.5 Doctoral students should discuss with their supervisory team at an appropriately early stage in their studies (dictated by discipline) the format in which they wish to submit their thesis. The outcome of these discussions are to be recorded in the next 6 monthly progress report and must be indicated in the 30 month report. This ensures that appropriate advice is given and that the student is adequately supported in the writing of their thesis. It also enables the University to monitor the uptake of this option, the point at which writing begins, and the submission rate of theses written in the alternative format.
- 12.6 Students are strongly advised not to use registration time to rewrite material from one format into another. Later decisions to change the format of submission would not normally be sufficient cause to warrant an extension to registration (Regulation 16.1 (e)).
- 12.7 The doctoral student is responsible for:
- ensuring that any reports and the final thesis for presentation to the supervisor(s) have been prepared in a professional manner with the correct use of English (or, for students in the Department of Politics, Languages and International Studies, a foreign language as set out in [Regulation 16.1](#) (j) (ii));
  - preparing the thesis for formal submission and ensuring that it conforms to the format required by the University (as set out in the Specification for Higher Degree Theses ([Appendix 6](#) to this statement)). Doctoral students can seek additional guidance on the structure of the thesis and on the presentation of tables, references, figures etc. from their supervisor;
  - deciding when submission is to be made (subject to the constraints of the Regulation for the particular degree, and before the date of expiry of the student's registration), taking due account of the supervisor's opinion. The supervisor's agreement to a submission should not be taken as an indication that the Examiners will find the thesis acceptable for the award of a degree;
  - giving at least two months prior notice to the Doctoral College, of the intended date of submission ([Regulation 16.1](#) (j) (iii)). This is done via the [Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis for a Higher Degree form](#) which is accessed via the SAMIS in-tray
  - providing written certification that the work presented in the thesis is the student's own, other than where specifically indicated.
- 12.8 The lead supervisor is responsible for advising the doctoral student on the format of the thesis to be adopted and for carrying out a critical reading of the draft thesis. On the request of the student, the lead supervisor should read a complete draft of the thesis and advise the student of any changes or additions that should be made prior to submission. The doctoral student should give the supervisor as much notice as

possible (not less than two weeks) of submission of the draft thesis and at least six weeks for reading the draft thesis. The supervisor's opinion is only advisory and the student has the right to decide when (subject to the requirements of the Regulations for the degree for which the doctoral student is registered) to submit and if to follow the advice of the supervisor.

- 12.9 The process for the formal submission of a thesis is detailed in University [Regulation 16.1](#) (j) (i).
- 12.10 Regulations state that a viva voce (oral) examination is mandatory once a candidate has submitted their thesis (with the exception of an MPhil, DSc, DLitt, or PhD via staff method B registration). The main purpose of the compulsory viva voce examination is to establish that the candidate can defend the content of the thesis or portfolio and that they fully understand the implications and context of its main findings or argument.
- 12.11 If there are reasons not to make the thesis publicly available immediately following examination, the Board of Studies (Doctoral) should be requested to consider placing restrictions on access to the thesis. The request can be made at any point during the research phase by using a [Restriction of Access to a Thesis form](#). For sponsored research projects this may be a pre-condition of funding; other projects may develop a need for these restrictions as the work progresses. All requests for thesis restrictions should be made prior to the final submission of the thesis to the University Library.

### 13 The Board of Examiners for the award

---

- 13.1 The University is committed to fair and consistent examination processes. It seeks to achieve this by:
- providing clear information about examination processes to both candidates and Examiners;
  - incorporating into the role of the External Examiner an explicit expectation that the External Examiner will monitor and report upon the fair and consistent treatment of students;
  - Utilising, where required, an independent chairperson in accordance with the criteria outlined in Section 14.

#### Roles of the Examiners

- 13.2 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 candidates are treated fairly and consistently.
- 13.3 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.
- 13.4 Examiners for the Professional Doctorates should also follow any additional roles and responsibilities set out in the specific programme regulations.

- 13.5 A Board of Examiners will normally comprise at least one Internal and one External Examiner. [Regulation 16](#) sets out the requirements for constituting Boards of Examiners for each doctoral programme.
- 13.6 Information on the examination of taught elements of Professional Doctorates is available in [QA12 External Examining \(Taught Provision\)](#), [QA28 Conduct of Examinations](#) and [QA35 Assessment Procedures for Taught Programmes of study](#).
- 13.7 Members of the supervisory team will not normally be present at a viva voce examination, unless the candidate notifies the Doctoral College on form HD2 at the point of submission of the thesis that they wish 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.
- 13.8 It is the responsibility of the Head of Department/School or Director of Studies, after consultation with the supervisory team, to recommend appropriately qualified individuals in accordance with the criteria set out in Section 14, to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) for appointment to the Board of Examiners for the thesis. The Head of Department/School or Director of Studies should complete the [Appointment of Examiners form](#) when nominating individuals.
- 13.9 The Board of Studies (Doctoral) will consider the appointment of an External Examiner on the basis of documentary evidence which demonstrates that the nominee has fulfilled the criteria outlined in Section 14. The Board of Studies (Doctoral) minutes should record the qualifications and current employment of the proposed External Examiner.
- 13.10 Senate is responsible for formally confirming the appointment of appropriately qualified individuals.
- 13.11 Following appointment by the Board of Studies (Doctoral) the Secretary to the Board will advise Human Resources of the appointment.
- 13.12 Human Resources is responsible for issuing a letter of appointment to all Examiners, together with the [Guidelines for Examiners](#) for the degrees being examined (the Guidelines for Examiners include extracts from the University Regulations and this QA Code of Practice statement).
- 13.13 Following appointment of the Examiners the Doctoral College is responsible for ensuring that the following is sent to each of the Examiners:
- the thesis to be examined;
  - the document 'Guidelines for Examiners';
  - a copy of, or a link to access, Regulation 16 and QA7:Research Degrees (for reference if needed);
  - the composition of the Board of Examiners;
  - report form and pre-viva report form;
  - External Examiners only: expense claim form and a list of reimbursable expense limits.
- 13.14 Departments/the School are responsible for the authorisation of the payment of expense claims. Departments/School are also responsible for the authorisation of the payment of External Examiners on completion of their duties.

## 14 Criteria for the Appointment of Examiners

---

- 14.1 The criteria for the appointment of Examiners set out in this section relate to the degrees of MPhil, PhD and EdD. Examiners for the Professional Doctorate degrees must meet the criteria set out in the specific programme regulations.
- 14.2 Each Examiner of a research degree should normally be required to meet at least two of the following criteria, and the Board of Examiners as a whole must meet all three criteria:
- that s/he should hold the degree for which they are examining or equivalent;
  - that s/he should have recent experience of successfully supervising doctoral students to graduation at an equivalent level to that being examined;
  - that s/he should have recent experience of examining doctoral students at an equivalent level to that being examined in the relevant subject area.

### External Examiners for the award

- 14.3 It is recognised that in exceptional cases, the most suitable person to act as an External Examiner for a particular research candidate might be, for example, an industrialist who has ample experience of examining research degrees, but has neither a PhD nor experience of supervising research students. In such cases, the Board of Studies (Doctoral) must receive as much supporting evidence as possible of the individual's suitability for the position including a full CV. Particular attention must be paid to the additional support needs of these potential Examiners.
- 14.4 Appointment of retired academics is permissible but should not normally take place more than three years after the date of retirement. Retired academics should provide evidence of their recent work in the field, for example recently published material.
- 14.5 An External Examiner will not be a former student or a former member of staff of the University of Bath unless there has been a lapse of at least five years before the start of the date of appointment as an Examiner.
- 14.6 External Examiners should have no existing, or prior, connection with the University or doctoral student that would call into question their ability to exercise objective, impartial and independent judgements.
- 14.7 Where there appears to be a case for appointing an External Examiner who does not meet exactly the requirements outlined above, advice must be sought from the Doctoral College or Academic Registry.

### Internal Examiners for the award

- 14.8 Anyone who has taken a significant or recent supervisory role in the doctoral student's research may not be appointed as an Examiner.
- 14.9 In exceptional circumstances when no suitable Internal Examiner is available, a second External Examiner will be appointed. Advice on this should be sought from the Doctoral College or Academic Registry.
- 14.10 A non-examining independent chairperson may be appointed to attend the confirmation or final viva voce examination. The independent chairperson should not be involved in the supervision of the doctoral student nor have any other specific interest in the outcome of the decision. The independent chairperson will be experienced in examining at the University of Bath, and will therefore be familiar with the Code of Practice and Policies of the University. The role of the independent chairperson is to

assist in ensuring that the examination is fair and conducted in accordance with the University's Regulations. They are not required to be a subject specialist, nor to have read the thesis under examination. An independent chairperson will be appointed when the Director of Studies considers that the presence of an experienced academic would be of assistance..

## 15 Pre Viva Report

---

- 15.1 All Examiners are required to independently complete a preliminary report recording their initial thoughts about the work presented for examination. The preliminary reports must be submitted to the Doctoral College at least one week before the examination is due to take place and before any discussion between the Examiners occurs. It is the responsibility of the Director of Studies to ensure that the completed forms have been submitted. Preliminary reports must be completed for all research submissions, including the submission of a revised thesis, even if, as permitted by Regulation 16.3 (m) for the award of MPhil, the Examiners do not require a viva voce examination. If the Director of Studies is an Examiner, the forms should be submitted to the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies (or the Associate Dean for Research in the School of Management).
- 15.2 Examiners should note that, in accordance with Data Protection legislation, the preliminary reports may be made available upon request to the candidate after the examination has taken place.

## 16 Procedure for a Viva Voce Examination

---

- 16.1 A viva voce examination is required in all cases, except where the candidate has submitted a thesis for the degree of MPhil - where a viva voce examination is at the discretion of the Board of Examiners (see Regulation 16.3 (m)). In cases where, in accordance with Regulation 16.3 (m), the Examiners agree that a viva voce examination is not required and do not therefore meet each other, they should make arrangements to ensure that the comments on the Examiner's Report Form represent fully and accurately the views of all the Examiners.
- 16.2 Where a revised thesis is submitted for a second attempt at examination for a doctoral award, a second viva voce examination will *normally* be required in the case of Professional Doctorate degrees (with the exception of the DClinPsy degree where the Programme Board of Examiners shall determine whether a second viva is necessary based on the recommendations of the research portfolio Examiners). A second viva voce examination *may* be required for the degree of PhD or EngD, at the discretion of the Board of Examiners.
- 16.3 In cases where the Examiners agree that a second viva voce examination is not required and do not therefore meet each other, they should make arrangements to ensure that the comments on the Examiner's Report Form represent fully and accurately the views of all the Examiners. Even if a second viva voce examination is not held, all members of the Board of Examiners must examine a revised thesis/portfolio submission and contribute to the joint report.
- 16.4 The viva voce examination should normally take place within three months of the submission of the thesis/portfolio. The candidate must be advised of the date of the viva voce examination as soon as possible after the thesis has been submitted. As a minimum, the candidate must be given at least one week's notice of the date of the viva voce examination.

- 16.5 The venue for the viva voce examination should be appropriate. In particular, consideration should be given to providing a quiet, comfortable environment free from interruptions. It is expected that viva voce examinations will be held at the University of Bath. Where there appears to be a compelling case for holding the examination elsewhere, advice should be sought from the Doctoral College.
- 16.6 It is the candidate's responsibility to bring forward, at the earliest opportunity, details of any reasonable adjustments they may require to enable them to participate fully in a viva voce examination. Student services can provide advice about reasonable adjustments, and will generate a Disability Action Plan to record them. The University is responsible for ensuring that appropriate facilities are made available in such circumstances.
- 16.7 Video conferencing facilities may be used in viva voce examinations only when either an Examiner or the candidate is based at such a distance from the University (normally outside the UK) that s/he is not able, for reasons of prohibitively high cost, difficulties of time or restricted mobility, to travel to the University of Bath in order to conduct or participate in a viva voce examination at an appropriate time. The option of video conferencing should not normally be made available solely for the reasons that the candidate has left Bath after submitting a thesis and does not wish to return to the University for the viva voce examination. Details about the procedures for video conferencing are available in Appendix 3. If the use of video conferencing is being considered for a viva voce examination, advice should first be sought in good time from the Doctoral College.

## 17 Outcomes of a Viva Voce Examination

---

- 17.1 In accordance with Regulation 16 the Board of Examiners has a range of recommendations open to it:
- award of degree (with no corrections required);
  - award of degree subject to satisfactory completion of minor corrections, consisting of predominantly trivial or typographical errors;
  - award of degree subject to satisfactory completion of minor corrections, consisting of more significant or substantial corrections, but which do not alter the substance of the thesis in any significant or fundamental manner and therefore do not require major reworking or reinterpretation of the intellectual content of the thesis;
  - award of degree subject to satisfactory performance at a second viva voce examination and subject also to any minor corrections to the thesis required by the Examiners;
  - that a revised thesis must be submitted before recommendation of the award can be considered. The Examiners may require the candidate to undergo a second viva voce examination. In the case of PhD and EngD the Examiners may also offer the candidate the opportunity to accept the degree of MPhil subject to any minor corrections;
  - award of a lower degree (MPhil), subject to any minor revisions to the thesis which may be prescribed by the Examiners (PhD, EdD and EngD only);
  - fail and be awarded neither the doctoral degree nor the degree of Master of Philosophy (with no opportunity for resubmission).
- 17.2 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.



- 17.3 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 (Doctoral).
- 17.4 Following the viva voce examination, the Board of Examiners should complete the appropriate Examiners' Report Form, which summarises its deliberations and recommendations to the Board of Studies (Doctoral). In accordance with Data Protection legislation the Examiners' Report Form may be made available to the candidate after the examination has taken place.
- 17.5 It is the responsibility of the Director of Studies to ensure that as soon as possible after the examination, and in no case more than two weeks later the Examiners provide for the candidate and the lead supervisor clear written notification of:
- the Examiners' unconfirmed recommendation, and
  - the details of the additional work, if any, required
  - the recommended timeline for the completion of any required additional work (subject to approval by the Board of Studies).

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 (Doctoral).

#### **Award of degree with no corrections**

- 17.6 Where the approval of an award is recommended with no corrections required, the Board of Examiners' recommendation can then be submitted to the Board of Studies (Doctoral). 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 (Doctoral) 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 (Doctoral) by the Secretary to the Board of Studies (Doctoral).

#### **Minor corrections (trivial or typographical)**

- 17.7 Where approval of an 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 (Doctoral). 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 (Doctoral) 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 (Doctoral) 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 (Doctoral) 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 (Doctoral) by the Secretary to the Board of Studies (Doctoral).

#### **Minor corrections (significant or substantial)**

- 17.8 Where approval of an 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 (Doctoral), 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 (Doctoral) 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 (Doctoral) will approve the award under delegated powers of Senate. It is essential that the full Board of Studies (Doctoral) 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 (Doctoral) by the Secretary to the Board of Studies (Doctoral).

### Revised Thesis

- 17.9 Where a candidate is permitted to submit a revised thesis, the initial recommendation of the Board of Examiners should be formally approved by the Board of Studies (Doctoral), or the Chair acting on its behalf. The Examiners must complete the Examiners' Report Form, indicating the maximum length of time permitted to complete the work and submit the revised thesis/portfolio. 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.

### Fail

- 17.10 The Examiners' recommendation and completed form must be submitted to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) for approval. The candidate will be formally notified in writing of the decision of the Board of Studies (Doctoral) by the Secretary to the Board of Studies (Doctoral).

### Outcomes for a Revised Thesis Submission

- 17.11 Both Examiners will examine the revised thesis submission. The jointly completed Examiners' Report Form, together with a report signed by each of the Examiners confirming whether or not the revisions specified have been carried out satisfactorily, and whether or not the thesis now meets the assessment criteria for the award should be submitted to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) as soon as possible after the second examination process has been completed.
- 17.12 A revised thesis submission may be passed subject to any minor corrections, or may be awarded an MPhil, subject to any minor corrections, or may fail. There is no option to further revise and submit for a third time.
- 17.13 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 (Doctoral) 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 (Doctoral) by the Secretary to the Board of Studies (Doctoral).
- 17.14 The Board of Studies (Doctoral) will regularly scrutinise External Examiner comments on the examination process and take appropriate action in light of these comments.
- 17.15 As noted in Section 19, procedures for making an academic appeal against the outcome of the examination process are set out in [Regulation 17](#).

## 18 Doctoral Student Feedback and Liaison

---

- 18.1 The University is committed to providing students with opportunities to contribute to the ongoing process of enhancement of the student experience through a range of feedback and liaison mechanisms, both formal and informal, with which doctoral students are encouraged to engage.
- 18.2 The Centre for Learning & Teaching is responsible for conducting the Higher Education Academy's annual Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) and the University's annual Professional Doctorate Experience Survey (PDES). The results of the surveys will be considered by the University Doctoral Studies Committee and Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committees. It is the responsibility of the University Doctoral Studies Committee to ensure that feedback is provided, as appropriate, to Faculties/School, and via Faculties/School to doctoral students on issues identified in the survey and/or actions taken in response to issues raised. The Doctoral College will oversee and coordinate the institutional response to any issues raised through the surveys and will work with the Centre for Learning & Teaching and departments to ensure that appropriate actions are taken and communicated to the doctoral student body.
- 18.3 The Centre for Learning & Teaching is responsible for arranging other surveys of the learning experience of doctoral students. The results of these surveys will be considered by the University Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, the University Doctoral Studies Committee and the Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committees. Other opportunities for doctoral students to provide feedback include externally administered surveys. It is the responsibility of the University Doctoral Studies Committee to ensure that feedback is provided, as appropriate, to Faculties/Schools and to students, on issues identified in the internal or external surveys and/or actions taken in response to issues raised.
- 18.4 The Postgraduate Association encourages doctoral students to participate in both academic and social activity across Departmental, School and Faculty boundaries. It is a formally recognised section of the Students' Union and sends a representative to key University committees.
- 18.5 Doctoral students are encouraged to participate in Faculty/School/Departmental Staff/Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs) to represent the views of doctoral students and provide a two-way channel of communication with the University.
- 18.6 The Students' Union is responsible for collating an overview report that draws out institutional themes, for consideration by the University Doctoral Studies Committee (for themes of relevance to research programmes).

## 19 Annual Monitoring of Research Degree Provision

---

- 19.1 The University is committed to the regular evaluation of its research degree provision in order to:
- maintain the quality and validity of its provision;
  - facilitate continuous enhancement of provision to reflect developments in the sector, institution and discipline;
  - record the quality and standards of its provision.

- 19.2 To help ensure the quality of doctoral degree provision across a Department/School, Directors of Studies are expected to undertake annual monitoring of doctoral programme provision, and to present these reports to the University Doctoral Studies Committee. The template for the report is available as Appendix 4. Under the guidance of Associate Deans (Research) Directors of Studies are also expected to ensure that actions agreed by the University Doctoral Studies Committee are completed. During 2018/9, whilst a review of the annual monitoring procedure is undertaken by the Doctoral College, no *routine* reporting will be required through completion of reports. Directors of Studies and Faculty/School Directors of Doctoral Studies will continue to monitor programme performance via feedback gained from SSLC meetings, external examiner reports, and from the PRES and PDES responses (and responding to this feedback via departmental PRES / PDES action planning).
- 19.3 Annual Monitoring: The University recognises that the process of evaluation and enhancement of doctoral degree provision is iterative and happens through a range of formal and informal mechanisms. Annual monitoring provides Departments/School with a defined opportunity to take a holistic view of their doctoral degree provision and the environment in which it occurs, reflecting upon a range of evidence and indicators in order to identify actions to be taken and report on progress being made.
- 19.4 Annual monitoring reports should be concise, evidence-based and evaluative. The report should include commentary on/evaluation of statistical data (provided by Academic Registry) on doctoral student admissions, registrations, confirmations and/or transfers to PhD and completion rates, Destinations of Leavers from HE data (provided by the Careers Service), data from the annual PRES survey, and data from the Directors of Studies including feedback from External Examiners, and reference to action taken as a result of points raised in previous annual monitoring reports. The Directors of Studies should highlight any issues that have arisen over the preceding year, and propose action where necessary and include a summary of any issues and good practice with a wider impact, to be raised at School/Faculty or institutional level.
- 19.5 The University Doctoral Studies Committee is responsible for considering annual monitoring reports. The aim of undertaking scrutiny of annual monitoring reports for research degrees at institutional level is to:
- ensure accountability for action plans and issues for concern;
  - offer an opportunity for wider themes to be highlighted at institutional level;
  - promote enhancement and to disseminate good practice across the University.
- 19.6 Completion rate data: University Doctoral Studies Committee considers summarised data compiled by Academic Registry, including forecast information. After consideration by University Doctoral Studies Committee Associate Deans (Research) work with Directors of Studies to ensure that the data are considered in detail and any action specified by University Doctoral Studies Committee is carried out.

## 20 Staff Development and Training

---

- 20.1 The University is committed to providing doctoral students with effective supervision and recognises that in order to achieve this, staff who are members of supervisory teams must be appropriately trained for their roles.
- 20.2 The Academic Staff Development team in the Centre for Learning & Teaching is responsible for working together with the Doctoral College to consider and provide opportunities for appropriate training for staff involved in supporting doctoral students.

Departments/Schools are responsible for ensuring that all of their staff involved in supporting doctoral students are adequately prepared and trained for their roles.

- 20.3 It is the responsibility of the Head of Department/Division to ensure that:
- Any University employee, upon their initial appointment to a supervisory team, attends an intensive training programme on supervision, either prior to, or within six months of assuming supervisory responsibility.
  - Any member of a supervisory team employed by the University who is new to supervision at the University of Bath, but with experience of doctoral supervision elsewhere, attends a University training session on supervision to provide an understanding of supervisory practice specific to the University of Bath. This must be prior to, or within six months of, assuming supervisory responsibility.
  - Any member of a supervisory team employed by the University undertakes a refresher session on supervision on the recommendation of the Department/School in order to keep up-to-date on practice.
- 20.4 Any member of a supervisory team not employed directly by the University, may also attend the supervisory training sessions run by Academic Staff Development.

## 21 Complaints and Academic Appeals

---

- 21.1 The University's principles on which student complaints are dealt with are outlined in the [Student Complaints Procedure](#).
- 21.2 Part of the aim of approving the candidature of a doctoral student and establishing a clear programme of work at an early stage in a doctoral student's studies is to build a constructive relationship between the student and their supervisor. This should help to avoid problems or assist in their early identification and resolution. However, it is recognised that problems can occur during a doctoral student's registration and the University has mechanisms in place to deal with such situations.
- 21.3 All employees and doctoral students have a right to be treated, and have an obligation to treat others, with dignity and respect. Expected standards of behaviour and professional conduct are outlined in the [Dignity and Respect policy](#) and the [personal and professional relationships policy](#), while misconduct and the disciplinary procedure for students are described Regulation 7 and 8.
- 21.4 Usually problems with doctoral supervision can be resolved at Department/School level either by consultation with the Director of Studies, the Head of Department/School, the Faculty/School Director of Doctoral Studies or the Academic Director of the Doctoral College. However, for cases where this appears to be ineffective or where the doctoral student considers this route inappropriate or inadvisable, the [University Independent Advisor for Postgraduate Research Students](#) should be contacted.
- 21.5 Consultations are treated in strict confidence and staff from the Department/School in question are only contacted by the University Independent Advisor for Postgraduate Research Doctoral students at the request of the research student.
- 21.6 In accordance with the University's [Policy on Personal and Professional Relationships](#) supervisory staff are strongly advised not to enter into a personal relationship with a doctoral student. Where a personal relationship exists, it is the responsibility of the member of staff concerned to declare the relationship.

- 21.7 Procedures for requesting an Academic Appeal of the outcome of the examination process are set out in Regulation 17.

## 22 Declaration of Interests

---

- 22.1 Doctoral students, members of the supervisory team and potential Examiners are advised to be aware of other potential conflicts of interest and where possible to avoid entering into any kind of relationship that may create a potential conflict of interest, for example:
- situations unrelated to the academic work conducted by the student, such as the establishment of a financial relationship arising between a member of the supervisory team or Examiner and the student, for example, but not limited to, situations in which one party is the landlord of a property inhabited by the other; or where money is lent or borrowed;
  - situations in which the student is asked to conduct paid or unpaid academic or other work unrelated to the area of research for which they are registered, for a member of the supervisory team or Examiner.
- 22.2 Where either party has concerns that there may be a conflict of interests, the concerned party is responsible for informing the Director of Studies, Head of Department/School or Dean of the existence of that relationship without delay.
- 22.3 Any such disclosure relating to personal or other relationships will be treated sensitively and in strict confidence. The person to whom such a disclosure is made is responsible for ensuring, where necessary, that appropriate alternative arrangements are made with respect to the student's admission, assessment, supervision, teaching and/or pastoral care.



<b>Statement Details</b>		
<b>Issue Version:</b>	<b>3.4</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>November 2018</b>	
Antecedents:	<i>Quality Assurance Committee</i>	Minutes 164(b), 269(a), 305, 362(a), 403(a), 412, 461(d), 578, 742, 1 July 2008 Minute 857(6),(8) 29 January 2009 Minute 934 3 July 2009 Minute 976(2) 22 July 2009 Chair's Action 13 July 2010 Minute 1095(2)
	<i>University Learning Teaching and Quality Committee</i>	13 July 2011 Minute 121 10 July 2012 Minute 276 25 September 2012 Minute 318 9 July 2013 Minute 428 8 July 2014 Minute 552 5 July 2016 Minute 807 16 January 2017 Minute 1002 6 Nov 2018 Minute 1103
	<i>University Research Students Committee</i>	2008/09 Minutes 24, 37, 38, 41, 42, 62, 102 29 May 2014 Minute 6
	<i>University Doctoral Studies Committee</i>	September 2017 Minute 13 July 2018 Minute 92
	<i>Graduate Studies Committee</i>	Minutes 165, 251, 257, 306, 328, 441
	<i>Academic Studies Committee</i>	Paper ASC 93/94 – 5
	<i>Senate</i>	Minutes 9234, 9316 Paper S93/94 – 164
	<i>Regulations</i>	Appendix to Regulations : Student Complaints Procedure
		QA11 v1.8, Examination of Research Degrees
		QA50 v1.0, Appointment of External Examiners for Research Degrees
		QA53 Examination and Assessment Offences, Section 7 and 9.
		QA55 Careers Education, Information, Advice and Guidance, Section 3
		QAA Code of Practice, Section 1 - Postgraduate Research Programmes, September 2004
	Related Documentation:	QAA Quality Code Chapter B11: <a href="#">Research Degrees</a> <a href="#">Vitae Researcher Development Framework</a> <a href="#">UUK Concordat to Support Research Integrity</a> <a href="#">University of Bath Code of good practice in research integrity</a> <a href="#">University of Bath Maternity, Paternity and Adoption Leave Policy for Research Students</a>
Author:	Doctoral College	