

Regulations for the Award of Doctorate in Professional Studies (Faculty of Health and Wellbeing)

DProf

Research Degrees Sub-committee

Revised June 2014

**Further information and advice on any aspect of these regulations is available from
Student Systems and Records (Research Degrees), Registry Services,
Secretary and Registrar's Directorate, exts. 6498/4047/4053.**

REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF THE UNIVERSITY'S DOCTORATE IN PROFESSIONAL STUDIES (DProf)

Contents

PS1	Aims & Objectives	3
PS2	Admissions	4
PS3	Registration Period	5
PS4	Taught Elements	6
PS5	Progression from taught modules to Research Phase (Research project element)	8
PS6	Supervision in Research Phase of the Programme	10
PS7	The Doctoral Project Report	11
PS8	Research Phase Examinations – General	14
PS9	Research Phase Examination Procedures	15
PS10	The Candidate's Responsibilities in the Research Phase Examination Process	16
PS11	Research Phase Examiners	17
PS12	First Examination in Research Phase	18
PS13	Re-examination in Research Phase	20
PS14	Recommendation for Award of DProf/MProf	23
PS15	Appeals against recommendations of the Examiners in Research Phase of the programme	24
Appendix 1	Extract from the SHU Code of Practice for Research Students and Supervisors regarding Responsibilities of Students and Supervisors	25
Appendix 2	Criteria for MProf Award	30

Revised 2014

PS1 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

PS1.1 The Faculty of Health and Wellbeing's Professional Doctorate programme in Professional Studies (DProf) shares the general educational aims of all Sheffield Hallam University's professional doctorates; these are to:

- a) Provide a programme of in-depth study and personal scholarship in a specialist professional area, including the development of expertise in appropriate methods of research and enquiry, through sustained and independent high quality work, which demonstrates critical judgement via a project of advanced research and/or enquiry; *and to*
- b) Enable the development of knowledge, critical understanding and/or modes of professional practice which make a significant and distinctive contribution to the advancement of the profession, and to the development of a community of professionals committed to evidence-based practice.

PS1.2 The specific aims of the DProf are to enable candidates to:

- Conceptualise, design and complete projects that impact on organisational and professional development and contribute to the creation of new knowledge and extend the forefront of the discipline.
- Achieve their potential to innovate through the facilitation of change, organisational development and professional innovation in their field of practice.
- Effectively and creatively take a lead in promoting the culture of 'learning organisations' within their workplace (DoH, 2000)
- Effectively communicate with academic and practice communities through the dissemination of work that is of publishable quality

PS1.3 The University shall ensure that DProfs awarded and conferred are comparable in standard with similar awards granted and conferred throughout higher education in the United Kingdom.

PS1.4 The University shall encourage co-operation with other organisations for the purposes of research leading to the award of the DProf. Such co-operation shall be intended:

- a) to encourage relevant practice-related and/or organisationally orientated research;
- b) to extend the candidate's own experience and perspectives of the work;

- c) to provide a wider range of experience and expertise to assist in the development of the project;
- d) to be mutually beneficial; and,
- e) where appropriate, to enable the candidate to develop as a member of a community of professional practitioners.

Co-operation may be formalised with one or more bodies external to the University, referred to as Collaborating Organisations. Formal collaboration shall normally involve essential access by the candidate to one or more of the following categories of resource at the Collaborating Organisation:

- Equipment;
- Facilities;
- Premises;
- Staff;
- Data.

If formal collaboration occurs, the name(s) of the Collaborating Organisation(s) shall appear on the candidate's Doctoral Project report and degree certificate (see Section 7).

PS2 ADMISSIONS

PS2.1 For entry to this programme applicants will normally be required to demonstrate:

- The possession of a Master's qualification in a subject relevant to the applicant's professional practice or an equivalent advanced professional qualification.
- Applicants with other academic/professional qualifications will be considered individually on their merits. In such cases relevant academic and work experience, previous experience or training in research or other experience that indicates the applicant is likely to be successful will be taken into consideration

AND

- At least 3 years relevant professional experience and be engaged in professional practice in the public, voluntary or private sectors such as will enable the conduct of work-based projects

AND

- Through interview, completion of application form and submission of a 2000 word rationale, demonstrate the ability to manage their own learning and the capacity to contribute to and benefit from the doctoral programme

AND

- Access to the internet and email in order to fully benefit from the electronic means of support offered on the programme

AND

- Willingness to seek support from an identified work-based supporter.

PS2.2 Exceptionally, admission may be granted to applicants who, although lacking a UK or equivalent Master's degree, (as specified at PS2.1a above), have extensive and relevant equivalent experience. Under this regulation, applicants with the following qualifications may be considered:

- a first or upper second class honours degree in an appropriate discipline from a UK or recognised overseas university;
- an undergraduate qualification to diploma level together with relevant extensive professional experience and the ability to demonstrate doctoral research potential through the submission of research papers and/or internal reports

PS2.3 Where English is not your first language, the applicant must show evidence of English language ability, to the following (or equivalent) minimum level of proficiency: an IELTS score of 7.0 with no lower than 6.5 in any individual component, and/or a TOEFL score of 600 (paper-based), 250 (computer-based) or 100 (internet-based).

PS2.4 Applicants may be considered for Advanced Standing Entry to the research phase of the course in Recognition of prior learning (RPL). In exceptional circumstances, by virtue of an applicant's recent study or experience, a convincing prima facie case can be made for Advanced Standing Entry to the research phase following successful registration of a Doctoral Project with the Research Degrees Sub-Committee. In such applications the university will use the evidence provided by the applicant that s/he has acquired the theoretical understanding that would be demonstrated through completion of modules one, two, three and four of the programme and has the range of necessary skills to equip him/her to complete the research phase of the programme within the maximum permissible time.

PS3 REGISTRATION PERIOD

The programme comprises taught elements and a research phase. The taught elements include modules provided in years one and two of the programme and the Critical Professional Practice and Development module. The research phase includes the Doctoral Project Module and the second part of the Critical Professional Practice and Development module normally during years three and four.

PS3.1 The normal minimum and maximum periods of registration are as follows:

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
Part-time	4 years	7 years

- PS3.2 Where there is evidence that the research is proceeding exceptionally well in the research phase of the programme, the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may approve a shorter minimum period of registration.
- PS3.3 Where the candidate is prevented, by ill health or other cause, from making progress in the research phase of the programme, registration may be suspended by the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee normally for not more than one year at a time.
- PS3.4 The candidate must submit a Doctoral Project Report within the appropriate registration period outlined above. If the candidate has not presented his/her work within this period, his/her registration will lapse. If the candidate has good cause for not being able to submit a Doctoral Project Report within this period, the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may extend his/her period of registration for not more than one year in total.
- PS3.5 Where a candidate has discontinued the research in Doctoral Project Module (i.e. the research phase of the programme), the withdrawal of registration shall be notified to the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee. Also, members of academic staff, who will normally be the supervisory team, may instigate a student withdrawal based on relevant evidence and sound academic judgment. Some examples of reasons for instigating a student withdrawal are as follows:
- lack of progress
 - lack of engagement
 - failing to meet the required standard of academic writing
 - failing the assessment process from year 2 to the research phase
 - not meeting the student responsibilities as outlined in the University's Code of Practice.

Other internal or external factors which impact on candidates' registration status may also be taken into account when instigating a withdrawal. This could be for example where Home Office rules apply and where candidates do not have a valid visa for continuing their study at the University.

PS4 TAUGHT ELEMENTS

- PS4.1 The progress of candidates through the taught elements (i.e. Review of Learning and Professional Experience; Research for the Working World (doctoral level); Project Planning 1; Project Planning 2 and Critical Professional Practice and Development) will be overseen by a DProf Taught Elements Assessment Board. This Board will have no powers relating to conferment of the DProf award (see PS8.4); its main purposes will be to:

- agree the final moderated results for each taught unit within the programme; and
- decide candidates' entitlement to progress between each year of the candidates' programme.

Candidates will submit assessed work for Review of Learning and Professional Experience and Research for the Working World (doctoral level) towards the end of year 1 and assessed work for Project Planning module towards the end of year 2. The portfolio of evidence of Professional Practice and Development and associated critical review will be submitted for assessment towards the end of each candidate's programme (i.e. normally towards the end of year 4).

PS4.2 Taught Element Pass Marks

4.2.1 Taught Element Assessment Schedule

An assessment schedule will be published for each taught element, which specifies the assessment components.

4.2.2 Taught elements will be graded pass/fail

PS4.3 Progression from year 1 to year 2 of the programme

Unless a candidate exercises his/her right to reassessment under regulation PS4.5, s/he will normally be expected to complete and pass both taught modules of year 1, (i.e. Review of Learning and Professional Experience and Research in the Working World (doctoral level), before progressing to the Project Planning modules in year 2. Exceptionally, the DProf Taught Element Assessment Board may exercise its discretion to allow progression to year 2, if a candidate's work has been referred in either or both of the taught modules, provided that the Board is satisfied that successful reassessment is likely and that reassessment in addition to year 2 work represents a viable student loading.

PS4.4 Failure and Referral; in Taught Modules and Seminar Scheme

Failure of Taught Modules

Where a candidate fails to achieve a pass grade in a module in year 1 or 2, the candidate will be referred in that module and has the right to be assessed in the module on one occasion only. This will apply to candidates who have attempted the assessment and failed to meet the pass criteria and those who have failed due to non-submission of coursework.

Where the candidate fails one or more referred modules, the DProf Taught Element Assessment Board will permit further reassessment only in exceptional circumstances.

PS4.5 Reassessment in Taught Elements

Reassessment requirements

The DProf Taught Element Assessment Board will determine the method and timing of reassessments. The Board may require a period of attendance prior to further reassessment.

Where it is not practicable for candidates to be reassessed in the same elements or by the same method as the first attempt, the Board will determine appropriate alternative arrangements.

PS4.6 Compensation for failure in Taught Elements

Compensation for failure in any of the units in taught modules and the Seminar Scheme is not permitted.

PS4.7 Extenuating Circumstances affecting performance in assessments for Taught Elements

4.7.1 Responsibilities of candidates

Candidates must inform the Programme Leader of any extenuating circumstances which may have affected their performance in any assessment or part of assessment, if they wish these circumstances to be taken into account.

All claims must be submitted by the candidate on the standard form, in accordance with the University procedures and timetable.

4.7.2 Responsibilities of the DProf Taught Element Assessment Board

The DProf Taught Element Assessment Board will decide whether the circumstances described by candidates are valid extenuating circumstances. The Board will take only valid claims into account when considering candidates' performance.

If the Board is satisfied that a candidate's absence, failure to submit work, or poor performance in all or part of an assessment, was due to a valid cause, the Board shall make one of the following decisions:

- to assess the candidate 'as if for the first time' in any or all of the assessments. The Board shall exercise its discretion in determining the particular form the assessment should take.
- to award the candidate a pass mark in the relevant unit. This will only be done on an exceptional basis where the Board is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of the candidate's achievement.

PS4.8 Appeals against the decisions of the DProf Taught Element Assessment Board in relation to taught elements

A candidate may appeal, under the procedure outlined at Appendix 2, against a decision of the DProf Taught Element Assessment Board in respect of assessment of taught elements, and request that it be reviewed, on one or more of the following grounds:

- that his/her performance in assessment may have been adversely affected by extenuating circumstances which s/he was unable or unwilling to divulge for valid reasons before the Board reached its decision. An appeal of this type must be supported by appropriate documentary evidence.
- that there has been a material administrative error.
- that the assessments were not conducted in accordance with current regulations.
- that some other serious irregularity occurred during the assessment process.

Disagreement with the academic judgement of the DProf Taught Element Assessment Board in agreeing marks or progression **cannot** in itself constitute grounds for appeal.

PS5 PROGRESSION FROM YEAR 2 TO DOCTORAL PROJECT MODULE AND CONTINUATION OF CRITICAL PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND DEVELOPMENT (RESEARCH PHASE)

PS5.1 Before being allowed to progress to the Doctoral Project Module and continuation of Critical Professional Practice and Development (the research phase of the programme), the candidate will normally be expected to:

- have passed modules one to four (Review of Learning and Professional Experience; Research for the Working World (doctoral level) and both of the Project Planning modules)
- must have had a research project proposal approved, with no outstanding approval conditions, by the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee. To secure approval, proposals must:
 - a) be of an intellectual level consistent with doctoral study;
 - b) provide a basis for satisfying the educational aims and specific objectives of the DProf, including the emergence of an independent and original contribution to knowledge and/or professional practice;
 - c) have been successfully defended via an oral assessment involving at least one person external to the supervisory team.

- d) include confirmation of the candidate's satisfactory performance in years 1 and 2 of the Programme.

PS5.2 Candidates are also required to consider their development needs at this time. The Development Needs Analysis (RFDNA form) which was adopted in the 2005-6 session to highlight skills training needs was replaced for the start of the 2013-14 session by the Vitae Researcher Development Framework (RDF) Planner. Candidates are expected to use this resource for finding, updating and recording skills development activity. The University requires candidates to complete the 'my actions' and 'my action plan' parts of the planner as a minimum during the induction period. Any other skills development activity is at the discretion of the candidate. Particular care is needed in the case of a part-time candidate to agree an appropriate programme of related studies which is realistically achievable within the time and funding constraints of part-time study.

The RDF Planner is available through shuspace and can be used by all research degree candidates to:

- keep a record of professional development activities
- identify candidates' expertise and capabilities to plan a career
- print reports for discussions with mentors, supervisors, career advisors etc.
- identify learning and development needs and monitor progress
- upload files such as CVs, conference details, testimonials to record achievements.

Candidates will be able to access information on training and development activities and events via shuspace.

PS6 SUPERVISION IN THE RESEARCH PHASE OF THE PROGRAMME

PS6.1 A candidate for DProf intending to progress to the research phase of the programme shall seek approval for a project supervisory team from the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee. This will normally be done as part of the process of securing approval for the research project proposal (5 above) and will need to take account of the following criteria:

- the need for a supervisory team which has academic expertise appropriate to the nature and focus of the project;
- the need for a supervisory team which is research- or professionally-active to assist the candidate to develop the proposal in terms of its design and the underpinning literature search;
- the need for *combined experience* across the supervisory team of:
 - a) successful supervision of at least two doctoral students at a UK higher education institution; or

b) successful supervision of at least one doctoral student together with a completion of the University's Supervisor Development Programme.

- PS6.2 A candidate for DProf shall normally have two and not more than three supervisors.
- PS6.3 The Director of Studies shall be responsible for supervising the candidate on a regular and frequent basis. The Director of Studies must be a member of the permanent staff of, or have a contract of employment with, the University. Emeritus and Visiting Professors cannot be Director of Studies but can be first or second supervisors.
- PS6.4 In addition to the supervisors, an adviser or advisers may be approved by the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee to contribute specialised knowledge or a link with an external organisation.
- PS6.5 The University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee's approval must be obtained for any change in supervision arrangements.

PS7 THE DOCTORAL PROJECT REPORT

The Doctoral Project report is the equivalent to the standard research thesis but the term *doctoral project report* has been selected to emphasise the professionally orientated and practice based nature of professional doctorates as described by the UK Council for Graduate Education.

- PS7.1 Except with the specific permission of the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee, the Doctoral Project Report shall be presented in English.
- PS7.2 There shall be an abstract of approximately 300 words bound into the report which shall provide a synopsis of the project stating the nature and scope of the work undertaken and of the contribution made to knowledge and/or practice. A loose copy of the abstract shall be submitted with the Doctoral Project report. The loose copy of the abstract shall have the name of the author, the degree for which the Doctoral Project report is submitted, and the title of the project as a heading.
- PS7.3 The Doctoral Project report shall include a statement of the candidate's objectives and shall acknowledge published or other sources of material consulted (including an appropriate bibliography) and any assistance received.
- PS7.4 Where a candidate's project is part of a collaborative group project, the candidate shall indicate clearly his/her individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration.
- PS7.5 The candidate shall be free to publish material in advance of the project report but reference shall be made in the Doctoral Project report to any

such work. Copies of published material should either be bound in with the Doctoral Project report or placed in an adequately secured pocket at the end of the Doctoral Project report.

- PS7.6 The text of the Doctoral Project report should normally not exceed 50,000 words in length (excluding ancillary data):
- PS7.7 Following the award of the degree, the Secretary and Registrar's staff shall:
- a) send one loose copy of the abstract, table of contents and title page to the British Library and;
 - b) lodge one copy of the Doctoral Project report in the Learning Centre of the University and in the library of any Collaborating Organisation.
- PS7.8 In exceptional circumstances, in order to protect commercially or politically sensitive material, the Research Degrees Sub-Committee may agree that the confidential nature of the candidate's work is such as to preclude the Doctoral Project report being made freely available in the Learning Centre of the University (and Collaborating Organisation, if any) and the British Library. In such circumstances, the Doctoral Project report shall, immediately on completion of the programme of work, be retained by the Secretary and Registrar's staff on restricted access and, for a time not exceeding two years, shall be made available only to those who were directly involved in the project.

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall normally approve an application for confidentiality only in order to enable a patent application to be lodged or to protect commercially or politically sensitive material. A Doctoral Project report shall not be restricted in this way in order to protect research leads. While the normal maximum period of confidentiality is two years, in exceptional circumstances the Research Degrees Sub-Committee may approve a longer period. Where a shorter period would be adequate the Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall not automatically grant confidentiality for two years.

- PS7.9 The copies of the Doctoral Project report submitted for examination shall remain the property of the University but the copyright in the Doctoral Project report shall be vested in the candidate. The candidate shall be required to sign a statement to this effect which will be submitted together with the Doctoral Project report.
- PS7.10 The following requirements shall be adhered to in the format of the submitted Doctoral Project report. Where a candidate desires further guidance, reference may be made to the British Standards Institution Specification BS 4821 (1990). Where the University's regulations differ from BS 4821 in points of detail (other than a) below), a candidate may follow either.

- a) Doctoral Project reports shall be bound in purple binder's cloth;
- b) Doctoral Project reports shall normally be in A4 format; the Research Degrees Sub-Committee may give permission for a Doctoral Project report to be submitted in another format where it is satisfied that the contents of the Doctoral Project report can be better expressed in that format;
- c) Copies of the Doctoral Project report shall be presented in a permanent and legible form either in typescript or print; where copies are produced by photocopying processes, these shall be of a permanent nature; where word processor and printing devices are used, the printer shall be capable of producing text of satisfactory quality; the size of character used in the main text, including displayed matter and notes, shall not be less than 2.00 mm for capitals and 1.5 mm for x-height (that is, the height of lower-case x);
- d) the Doctoral Project report shall be printed on the recto side of the page only; the paper shall be white and within the range 70 g/m² to 100 g/m²;
- e) double or one-and-a half spacing should be used in typescript except for indented quotations or footnotes where single spacing may be used.
- f) pages shall be numbered consecutively through the main text including photographs and/or diagrams included as whole pages;
- g) the title page shall give the following information:
 - the full title of the Doctoral Project report;
 - the full name of the author;
 - that the degree is awarded by the University;
 - the award for which the degree is submitted in partial fulfilment of its requirements;
 - the Collaborating Organisation(s), if any; and
 - the month and year of submission.

PS7.11 The University Learning Centre copy shall be bound as follows:

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

PS8 RESEARCH PHASE EXAMINATIONS - GENERAL

Note: The DProf oral examination may differ slightly from the traditional PhD defence in that, if candidates choose, they may present their work via an appropriate medium before engaging in discussion with the examiners.

PS8.1 The Research Phase examination for the DProf has two stages: firstly the submission and preliminary assessment of the Doctoral Project report and secondly an optional presentation and discussion of the work with the examiners in which the candidate presents a 'persuasive argument' demonstrating the rigour of the work and its contribution to the creation of new knowledge and impact on practice and/or the organisation at an oral examination.

PS8.2 A candidate will normally be examined orally on the programme of work and on the field of study in which the programme lies. Where for exceptional reasons of sickness, disability or comparable valid cause over and above the normal difficulties experienced in life, the Research Degrees Sub-Committee is satisfied that a candidate would be under serious disadvantage if required to undergo an oral examination on the due date and time previously set, the Sub-Committee may agree that the oral examination be postponed to a suitable later date.

Requests for consideration of such exceptional extenuating circumstances should be made by letter, as soon as possible before the date of the oral examination, to the University's Student Systems and Records (Degrees Degrees) for consideration by the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee in consultation with the examiners. The candidate must also provide independent documentary evidence in support of the request, such as medical evidence. Letters from family members, friends, or supervisors are not normally acceptable. The letter should include the following information:

- Summary of the nature of the circumstances;
- Period of time to which the circumstances apply and the candidate's view of the effect of the circumstances on his/her ability to undertake the oral examination;
- An indication of the documentary evidence attached (e.g. medical note, self-certification form) in support of the extenuating circumstances;
- Any other effects, or anything else which should be taken into account.

The Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee and the Examiners will normally disregard circumstances which candidates are expected to cope with as part of the normal difficulties and distressing aspects of life which may occur. Their consideration will include the following:

- Severity and timescale of the circumstances

- Extent to which the circumstances can be linked to timing of the oral examination
- Documentary evidence available e.g. medical note

PS8.3 An oral examination shall normally be held in the UK. In special cases the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may give approval for the examination to take place abroad.

PS8.4 The University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall make a recommendation on the reports and recommendation(s) of the examiners in respect of the candidate. The power to confer the degree shall rest with the Academic Board of the University.

PS8.5 The degree of Doctorate of Professional Studies or Master of Professional Studies may be awarded as an aegrotat or posthumously on the basis of a Doctoral Project report completed by a candidate that is ready for submission for examination (or equivalent published material or papers accompanied by a critical introduction for an aegrotat award). In such cases the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall seek evidence that the candidate would have been likely to have been successful had the oral examination taken place (see PS14.2).

PS8.6 Any allegation of plagiarism, collusion, or any other form of dishonest conduct in the preparation of the Doctoral Project report shall be made in the first instance to the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee under the remit of the university's Research Misconduct Policy. The Chair will decide on the appropriate form of action, which shall be appropriate to the gravity of the offence, and may result in the candidate being required to resubmit part or all of the Doctoral Project report.

PS8.7 The University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall ensure that all examinations are conducted and the recommendations of the examiners are presented wholly in accordance with the University's regulations. In any instance where the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee is made aware of a failure to comply with all the procedures of the examination process, it may declare the examination null and void and appoint new examiners.

PS9 RESEARCH PHASE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

PS9.1 The Director of Studies shall propose to the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee for approval the candidate's examination arrangements, including the title for the candidate's Doctoral Project report and the proposed examining team; this will be done normally no later than four months before the expected date of the examination. The examination may not take place until the examination arrangements have been approved.

PS9.2 The Secretary and Registrar's staff shall make known to the candidate the procedure to be followed for the submission of the Doctoral Project report

(including the number of copies to be submitted for examination) and any conditions to be satisfied before the candidate may be considered eligible for examination.

- PS9.3 The Secretary and Registrar's staff shall notify the candidate, all supervisors and the examiners of the date of the oral examination.
- PS9.4 The Secretary and Registrar's staff shall arrange for a copy of the Doctoral Project report to be sent to each examiner, together with the examiner's preliminary report form and the University's regulations, and shall ensure that the examiners are properly briefed as to their duties.
- PS9.5 The Secretary and Registrar's staff shall ensure that all the examiners have completed and returned their preliminary reports to the University before the oral examination takes place.
- PS9.6 All research degree oral examinations from the 2013-14 session onwards will have oversight by an independent chair. In line with the QAA's UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Part B, Chapter 11) the chair will be a non-examining chair who may not contribute to the assessment judgment. The overarching role of the Chair is to ensure that:
- the viva voce examination process is rigorous, fair, reliable and consistent;
 - the candidate has the opportunity to defend the Doctoral Project report and respond to all questions posed by the examiners;
 - the questioning of the candidate by the examiners is conducted fairly and professionally;
 - the examiners adhere to the University's regulations and procedures;
 - advice is given about the regulations to the examiners and the candidate if required.

Although the chair will not take part in the formal assessment process, they will normally have the following:

- access to a copy of the Doctoral Project report during the examination,
- sight of the examiner's preliminary reports before the examination commences, and
- will sign off the examiners' joint recommendation form when the examiners have completed their assessment in order to verify that due process has been followed
- will complete a short report on the oral examination for audit purposes.

PS10 THE CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RESEARCH PHASE EXAMINATION PROCESS

- PS10.1 The candidate shall submit the Doctoral Project report to the Secretary and Registrar's staff before the expiry of the registration period (see 3.1 above).

- PS10.2 The submission of the Doctoral Project report for examination shall be at the sole discretion of the candidate. While a candidate would be unwise to submit the Doctoral Project report for examination against the advice of his/her supervisory team, it is his/her right to do so. Similarly, candidates should not assume that a Supervisor's agreement to the submission of a Doctoral Project report guarantees the award of the degree.
- PS10.3 The candidate shall satisfy any conditions of eligibility for examination required by the University.
- PS10.4 The candidate shall take no part in the arrangement of the examination and shall have no formal contact with the external examiner between the approval of the examining team and the oral examination.
- PS10.5 The candidate must confirm (see List of Forms at Appendix B) their intention for the Doctoral Project report to be assessed by completing a declaration form. This must be done at first assessment and also for resubmissions. The declaration will confirm that the Doctoral Project report has not been submitted for a comparable academic award (for example at another institution). The candidate will not be precluded from incorporating in the thesis, covering a wider field, work which has already been submitted for a degree or comparable award, provided that it is indicated, on the declaration form and also in the thesis, which work has been so incorporated (for example where some of the work may have been developed from masters study).
- PS10.6 The candidate shall ensure that the Doctoral Project report format is in accordance with the requirements of the University's regulations (see section 7). Doctoral Project reports may be submitted for examination either in a permanently bound form or in a temporarily bound form which is sufficiently secure to ensure that pages cannot be added or removed (*Note 4*). The Doctoral Project report shall be presented in a permanent binding of the approved type (see paragraph 7.11) before the degree may be awarded. A Doctoral Project report submitted in a temporarily bound form shall be in its final form in all respects except the binding. In such cases the candidate shall confirm that the contents of the permanently bound Doctoral Project report are identical with the version submitted for examination, except where amendments have been made to meet the requirements of the examiners.

PS11 RESEARCH PHASE EXAMINERS

- PS11.1 A candidate shall be examined by at least two and normally not more than three examiners (except where paragraphs PS12.6, PS13.2, or PS13.8 apply), of whom at least one shall be an external examiner. The examining team must have suitable experience and expertise, be unbiased, and be clearly independent of the supervisor, of the student, and of each other in order that no conflicts of interest arise.
- PS11.2 An internal examiner shall be defined as an examiner who is:

- a) a member of staff of the University; or
- b) a member of staff of the candidate's Collaborating Organisation.

Members of staff of the candidate's supervisory team may not be appointed as examiners for that candidate.

- PS11.3 Where the candidate and the internal examiner are both on the staff of the same organisation, a second external examiner shall be appointed.
- PS11.4 Examiners shall be experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's Doctoral Project report and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined.
- PS11.5 The external examiner shall have experience of examining doctoral candidates in the UK, as either an internal or an external examiner.
- PS11.6 The external examiner must be independent both of the University and any Collaborating Organisation and may not have acted previously as the candidate's supervisor or adviser. An external examiner may not normally be a supervisor of another candidate at the University. Former members of staff and former students of the University shall normally not be approved as external examiners until three years after the termination of their association with the University.

The University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall also ensure that an external examiner is not approved so frequently that his/her familiarity with the Programme might prejudice objective judgement.

PS12 FIRST EXAMINATION IN THE RESEARCH PHASE

- PS12.1 Each examiner shall read and examine the Doctoral Project report and submit, on the appropriate form, an independent preliminary report on it to the Secretary and Registrar's staff before any oral or alternative form of examination is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the Doctoral Project report provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree (as set out in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2) and make a declaration to assess the candidate at an oral examination.
- PS12.2 Following the oral examination the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit to the Secretary and Registrar's staff, a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree. The preliminary reports and joint recommendation of the examiners shall together provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to justify the chosen recommendation (see 12.3 below).

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

- PS12.3 Following the completion of the examination the examiners may recommend that (*Note 5*):
- a) the candidate be awarded the degree; or
 - b) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to minor amendments being made to the Doctoral Project report within 4 months of the oral examination (see paragraph 12.5); or
 - c) the candidate be permitted to resubmit for the degree and be re-examined, with or without an oral examination within 12 months of the oral examination (see section 13).
 - d) the candidate be awarded the degree of MProf subject to the presentation of the Doctoral Project report being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.

Where amendments are required in option b above, the candidate shall submit the corrected Doctoral Project report within four months of the date of the oral examination. For option c where the candidate is required to resubmit for the degree, the corrected Doctoral Project report should be submitted within the period of one calendar year from the date of the oral examination. The University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may, where there are good reasons, approve an extension of this period.

- PS12.4 Where the examiners are satisfied that the candidate has in general reached the standard required for the degree, but consider that the candidate's Doctoral Project report requires some minor amendments and corrections not so substantial as to call for the submission of a revised Doctoral Project report, and recommend that the candidate has passed the Doctoral Project component subject to the candidate amending the Doctoral Project report to the satisfaction of the internal and/or the external examiner(s) (see sub-paragraph 12.3b), they shall indicate to the candidate in writing what amendments and corrections are required.

- PS12.5 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may:
- a) accept a majority recommendation (provided that the majority recommendation includes at least one external examiner);
 - b) accept the recommendation of the external examiner; or
 - c) require the appointment of an additional external examiner; any such appointment shall be made in accordance with the approved procedures for the appointment of examiners.

PS12.6 Where an additional external examiner is appointed under sub-paragraph 12.5c, s/he shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the Doctoral Project report and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further oral examination. That examiner must not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. On receipt of the report from the additional external examiner the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall complete the examination as set out in paragraph 8.4.

PS12.7 A further examination in addition to the oral examination may be requested by the examiners. In such cases the approval of the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall be sought without delay. Where such an examination is arranged following an oral examination, it shall normally be held within two calendar months of the oral examination unless the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee permits otherwise. Any such examination shall be deemed to be part of the candidate's first examination.

PS13 RE-EXAMINATION IN RESEARCH PHASE

PS13.1 One re-examination may be permitted by the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee subject to the following requirements:

- a) a candidate who fails to satisfy the examiners at the first examination, including where appropriate the oral examination (see paragraph 8.2) or any further examination required under paragraph 12.7 may, on the recommendation of the examiners and with the approval of the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee, be permitted to revise the Doctoral Project report and be re-examined;
- b) the examiners shall provide the candidate, through the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee, with written guidance on the deficiencies of the first submission; and
- c) the candidate shall submit for re-examination within the period of one calendar year from the date of the oral examination. The University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may, where there are good reasons, approve an extension of this period.

PS13.2 The University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may require that an additional external examiner be appointed for the re-examination; any such appointment shall be made in accordance with the approved procedures for the appointment of examiners.

PS13.3 There are four forms of re-examination:

- a) where the candidate's performance in the first oral examination (see paragraph 8.2) or further examination (see paragraph 12.7) was satisfactory but the Doctoral Project report was unsatisfactory and the

examiners on re-examination certify that the Doctoral Project report as revised is satisfactory, the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may exempt the candidate from further examination, oral or otherwise;

- b) where the candidate's performance in the first oral examination (see paragraph 8.2) or further examination (see paragraph 12.7) was unsatisfactory and the Doctoral Project report was also unsatisfactory, any re-examination shall normally include a re-examination of the Doctoral Project report and an oral (but see 13.11) examination (see paragraph 8.2);
- c) where on the first examination the candidate's Doctoral Project report was satisfactory but the performance in the oral and/or other examination(s) was not satisfactory, the candidate shall be re-examined in the oral and/or other examination(s), within six months, without being requested to revise and re-submit the Doctoral Project report;
- d) where on the first examination the Doctoral Project report was satisfactory but the candidate's performance in relation to the other requirements for the award of the degree was not satisfactory, the examiners may propose instead a different form of re-examination to test the candidate's abilities; such examination may take place only with the approval of the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

PS13.4 In the case of a re-examination under sub-paragraphs 13.3a, b or c, each examiner shall read and examine the Doctoral Project report and submit, on the appropriate form, an independent preliminary report on it to the Secretary and Registrar's staff before any oral or alternative form of examination is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the Doctoral Project report provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree (as set out in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2) and where possible make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of any oral examination.

PS13.5 Following the re-examination of the Doctoral Project report under sub-paragraph 13.3a or following an oral or other examination under 13.3b, c, d or e, the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit, on the appropriate form, a joint report and recommendation relating to the Doctoral Project report component of the programme to the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee. The preliminary reports and joint recommendation of the examiners shall together provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to enable the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee to satisfy itself that the recommendation chosen in paragraph 13.6 is correct. Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted. The recommendations shall be made on the appropriate form.

PS13.6 Following the completion of the examination the examiners may recommend that (*Note 5*):

- a) the candidate be awarded the degree;
- b) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to minor amendments being made to the Doctoral Project report (see paragraph 13.7);
- c) the candidate be not awarded the degree and be not permitted to be re-examined (see paragraphs 13.11 and 13.12).
- d) the candidate be awarded the degree of MProf subject to the presentation of the Doctoral Project report being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.

PS13.7 Where the examiners are satisfied that the candidate has in general reached the standard required for the degree, but consider that the candidate's Doctoral Project report requires some minor amendments and corrections not so substantial as to call for the submission of a revised report, and recommend that candidate has passed the Doctoral Project component subject to the candidate amending the Doctoral Project report to the satisfaction of the internal and/or the external examiner(s) (see paragraph 13.6b), they shall indicate to the candidate in writing what amendments and corrections are required.

PS13.8 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee may:

- a) accept a majority recommendation (provided that the majority recommendation includes at least one external examiner); or
- b) accept the recommendation of the external examiner; or
- c) require the appointment of an additional external examiner; any such appointment shall be made in accordance with the approved procedures for the appointment of examiners.

PS13.9 Where an additional external examiner is appointed under sub-paragraph 13.8c, s/he shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the Doctoral Project report and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further oral examination. That examiner should not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. On receipt of the report from the additional examiner the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall complete the examination as set out in paragraph 8.4.

PS13.10 A further examination in addition to the oral examination may be requested by the examiners. In such cases the approval of the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee shall be sought without delay. Where such an examination is arranged following an oral examination, it shall normally be held within two calendar months of the oral examination unless the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee permits otherwise.

- PS13.11 In the case of a re-examination under sub-paragraph 13.3b, where the examiners are of the opinion that the revised Doctoral Project report is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting an oral examination, they may recommend that the University's Research Degrees Sub-Committee dispense with the oral examination and not award the degree under sub-paragraph 13.6c (see also paragraph 13.12).
- PS13.12 The Academic Board may decide, on the recommendation of the examiners, that the degree be not awarded. The examiners shall prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the Doctoral Project report and the reason for their recommendation, which shall be forwarded to the candidate by the Secretary and Registrar's staff.

PS14 RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD

PS14.1 Award of the Doctorate in Professional Studies (DProf)

Subject to the requirements in Regulation PS1.1 & 1.2, the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the examiners, will award a Doctorate in Professional Studies to all candidates who have:

- submitted and passed all the taught elements required of the programme including taught modules prior to submission of the Doctoral Project Report and
- passed the Doctoral Project report element (including the completion and approval of any amendments required by the examining team).

PS 14.2 Award of Master of Professional Studies (MProf) - Faculty of Health and Wellbeing

The award of MProf Faculty of Health and Wellbeing will be awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic/area of professional practice, and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended a thesis by Viva Voce to the satisfaction of the examiners.

The MProf is a staged exit award providing a potential alternative exit point for a candidate who may be unable to, or does not wish to, complete the full DProf programme. Provided a candidate has satisfied all requirements for the award of MProf, the examiners may also recommend this award should doctoral standard not be met after the oral examination assessment process has been concluded (see appendix 2 for details).

PS14.3 Aegrotat and Posthumous awards

In cases where a candidate is unable to complete the research through ill health (on medical grounds) an *aegrotat* DProf or MProf may be awarded. However, sufficient evidence of the student's achievement at the level in question would need to be presented for examination. A doctoral project report, dissertation or alternative form of submission such as a collection of published material, papers or reports with a critical introduction and presented as a bound report, would be acceptable for this purpose. Candidates will also be assessed on an individual basis by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee (on the advice of the supervisory team) to determine whether an oral examination would be necessary or would need to be dispensed with.

In such cases the Research Degrees Sub-Committee will seek evidence that the candidate would have been likely to succeed had the oral examination taken place.

PS15 APPEALS AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXAMINERS IN THE DOCTORAL PROJECT PHASE OF THE PROGRAMME

PS15.1 The University has specific appeals procedures for research degree candidates. These were reviewed and updated during the 2005-6 academic session to meet statutory requirements of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. The appeals procedures were updated again for the 2014-15 session to include appeals against decisions made at the progression point from year 2 to the research phase of professional doctorate programmes as well as those made at the final assessment stage. The revised procedures can be found on shuspace in the 'Rules and Regulations' section.

PS15.2 A candidate's appeal may be made only in relation to a recommendation of the examiners. Complaints by a candidate on the inadequacy of supervision or other arrangements during the period of study are governed by the student complaint procedure which can be found on shuspace in the 'Rules and Regulations' section.

SHU CODE OF PRACTICE FOR RESEARCH STUDENTS AND THEIR SUPERVISORS (EXTRACT)

Introduction

The University believes that the establishment, development and management of the relationship between a research degree candidate and their supervisor(s) is key to the successful completion of the research programme.

To assist this process, the University has developed a code of practice for research students and their supervisors. The core of the Code outlines the responsibilities of candidates and supervisors and is supported by a statement of supervisory policy. We would very much welcome feedback from students and supervisors on the code as it stands, comments should be sent to the Student Systems and Records (Research Degrees Team) in the Registry Services.

Responsibilities of the Research Degree Candidate

In order to meet the expectations of supervisors and to complete the research in a timely manner, we expect students to follow these steps as a guide to good practice:

- 1 maintain regular contact with the supervisory team ie. at least every month for full-time students, around every 3 months for part-time students (principally, with the Director of Studies) throughout the research programme, ensuring that accurate and up-to-date records of how and where you can be contacted are held on my student record
- 2 agree with the Director of Studies:
 - topic or focus of the research;
 - work-plan or timetable for the research programme, the methodological approach, (which may require redefinition as the programme proceeds) and the aims and objectives of the research;
 - training and development plan integrated within the research programme i.e. training required in generic research skills, subject-specific research skills and other skills and competencies;
 - attendance at appropriate external events, e.g. conferences, meetings of learned societies and externally held seminars in the area, or related areas, of your research;
 - the amount of time to be devoted to the research at the University and elsewhere, in accordance with the plan of work, and the timing and length of holidays or any other period of absence from the University;
- 3 discuss with the Director of Studies and the supervisory team the amount and type of advice, guidance and comment that is likely to be most helpful, and agree a schedule of meetings. Be well prepared when attending such

- meetings and take note of the guidance and feedback from the supervisory team;
- 4 fully utilise the resources, expertise, facilities and development and learning opportunities offered by the academic environment and, in particular, interactive contact with your supervisory team, other staff and research students, and contribute to the development of the University's research environment;
 - 5 be motivated to make a conscientious and positive commitment in terms of both time and effort towards the successful completion of your research programme within the prescribed timescales;
 - 6 take responsibility and ownership for your own research programme, recognising that the role of the supervisory team is to provide guidance and advice;
 - 7 understand and comply with the University Regulations and procedures for research degrees, and other relevant codes, policies, procedures and regulations of the University, e.g. health and safety, ethics, IPR, indemnity and public liability insurance;
 - 8 attend the University's Research Training Induction Programme and other induction events for researchers organised by the Faculty, and other training according to the plan agreed with the Director of Studies (see 2 above);
 - 9 take responsibility for your personal and professional development by completing the vitae RDF planner (from 2013/14 academic session) at the outset of the programme and updating it at regular intervals through the programme using the action plans you develop to review progress with your Director of Studies (see 2 above);
 - 10 maintain comprehensive records of your research and of meetings with the Director of Studies and the members of the supervisory team, which will form the basis of progress reports for monitoring purposes, required by the Director of Studies, the Faculty Head of Programme Area (Research Degrees) or the funding body, where appropriate;
 - 11 keep the supervisory team informed of others with whom you are discussing your research work;
 - 12 submit written work to the supervisory team in sufficient time to allow for comment and discussion. This enables an assessment of progress, before proceeding to the next stage of the research programme, in accordance with the agreed plan of work;
 - 13 make seminar presentations to research colleagues of your research findings to date whenever the opportunity arises, or instigate the opportunity yourself through discussion with the Head of Programme Area (Research Degrees) or relevant Postgraduate Research Tutor;

- 14 participation in institutional and external discussion/training forums is encouraged, with the presentation of research outcomes where relevant;
- 15 when appropriate, prepare research publications and be involved in their presentation at conferences. Such publications can be individually authored or authored jointly with the Director of Studies or other members of the supervisory team, but where the student has undertaken the bulk of the work, they should appear as first-named author. All work resulting from a registered research degree project must contain an acknowledgement to SHU so that the University as well as the student takes public credit;
- 16 actively seek out the Director of Studies, or other members of the supervisory team, and take the initiative in raising any problems or difficulties as they arise, aim to recognise when you need extra help and support and seek it;
- 17 decide, in close consultation with the Director of Studies, when to formally submit the thesis for examination, within the time allowed by the Regulations. Note: in this context, the opinions of the supervisory team are advisory only.

Responsibilities of the Supervisor

In order to meet the expectations of students and to complete the research in a timely manner, we expect supervisors to follow these steps as a guide to good practice:

- 1 be responsible for the overall academic direction and administration of their candidates' research programmes, providing pertinent, timely and constructive criticism to support the programme while allowing the candidate to own the programme and develop as an independent researcher. Assisting the candidate in acquiring the knowledge, understanding, skills and competences necessary to successfully complete the research programme, providing the platform for a successful future career as a professional researcher;
- 2 help the candidate to define the research programme and how it may be done, developing a work-plan and a timetable, giving guidance and advice on the nature of research, planning, requisite investigative and analytical techniques and methodologies, literature and sources, plagiarism, presentation of data, footnotes and bibliography, ethical and legal issues and information on intellectual property rights;
- 3 be accessible and available to respond to difficulties raised by the candidate at other appropriate times when he/she may need advice or support;
- 4 be alert to the signs of isolation, loneliness, loss of confidence which tend to affect some research degree candidates; and the particular difficulties faced by part-time students and many overseas candidates, who may initially need very frequent contact and advice, particularly in the early stages of their

- research programme. Be prepared to step in with help and advice, referring candidates to specialist support services and counselling where appropriate;
- 5 ensure that candidates are aware of and prepared for the demands of writing the thesis and that they are fully aware of the standards of work expected at the level of their award and are immediately made aware of any inadequacy of progress or of standards of work below those expected and acceptable, and agree with the candidate any necessary supportive action;
 - 6 fully understand the University regulations and procedures for research degrees, and other relevant codes, policies, procedures and regulations of the University, e.g. health and safety, ethics, IPR, indemnity and public liability insurance; and ensure compliance;
 - 7 agree with the candidate a Development Needs Analysis to assist the candidate in drawing up a training and development plan which will fully integrate into the research programme, and regularly review progress against it;
 - 8 maintain regular contact with the candidate, agreeing a schedule meetings, setting aside adequate time to discuss progress and future work, in a conducive atmosphere. ***The frequency of meetings should be appropriate to the research being undertaken and the stage of the research programme;***
 - 9 attend and make records of such meetings, providing a basis for the monitoring and assessment of the candidate's progress; assess progress against the agreed work-plan and give detailed advice on the necessary completion dates of successive stages of the work, particularly the confirmation of PhD registration (formerly known as 'transfer from MPhil to PhD'), to ensure timely completion;
 - 10 ensure the candidate makes regular seminar presentations to research colleagues of their research findings to date, attending those presentations and giving feedback;
 - 11 ensure that the candidate is introduced to fellow researchers and staff within the University and encourage contact with the wider research community, including academic bodies and learned societies, outside the University and to attend relevant conferences, seminars and research workshops, and use facilities away from Sheffield;
 - 12 manage the operation of the supervisory process by effectively co-ordinating the contributions from the second supervisor(s) and any advisers, ensuring that supervision will be continuous;
 - 13 regularly request written work from the candidate, returning it within a reasonable time and providing constructive criticism, using it as a vehicle to assess and monitor progress;

- 14 endeavour to be supportive in times when the candidate has changing needs or where circumstances might warrant registration being suspended or extended, and making arrangements for this without unnecessary delay;
- 15 encourage the candidate to publish the research, advising on its form and the vehicle for publication. Such publications can be individually authored by the student or authored jointly with the Director of Studies or other members of the supervisory team, but where the student has undertaken the bulk of the work, they should appear as first-named author. All work resulting from a registered research degree project must contain an acknowledgement to SHU so that the University as well as the student takes public credit;
- 16 advise the candidate on the suitability of the final draft of the thesis for submission and on the preparation for the oral examination, arranging for a mock or practice oral if needed. **Note: the supervisor's role here is advisory only.** Arrange the candidate's oral examination;
- 17 ensure that all the University's procedures relating to the approval of the various stages of registration to completion of the programme are followed and that the necessary documentation for such approvals is complete, accurate and submitted to the Graduate Studies Team by the published submission dates for consideration by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee. **This may involve liaison with the rapporteurs acting on behalf of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee and clarifying with the candidate the decisions of the Committee.**

The Professional Doctorate in Professional Studies (Faculty of Health and Wellbeing) was initially validated in 2004 and subsequently revalidated in 2009. Therefore, the programme structure is different for each version and thus there are 2 different sets of requirements are presented below for the criteria of MProf. ***In order for any student to apply for MProf, they must have passed all assessment tasks throughout the programme and meet the criteria specified below. All students will have an oral examination in addition to the written material.***

Intermediate Award – Master of Professional Studies (Faculty of Health and Wellbeing - 2004 Definitive Document)

MProf Award

This award will enable students who are unable to, or who may be advised not to, complete the full DProf award to exit their programme of study with an alternative intermediate award. It is not anticipated that this award would be actively marketed or recruited to, but that it would simply provide an award, where appropriate, for some students.

Students wishing to exit with this award will be required to re-present the written work that they produced for: the Review of Learning and Professional Experience (6,000 words); the Research for the Working World Module (6,000 words) and the Project Planning Module (8,000 words). They may, if they wish to, revise and further develop these assignments in the light of feedback and changing circumstances from the first submission of these pieces of work prior to presenting them for their MProf. They will also require to submit a Reflective Account of Learning (8,000 words), which together with the Project Planning work will form a dissertation for submission in partial completion of the MProf.

This work should be presented in an integrated, synthesised manner and include a 2000 word introduction and critical appraisal of the submission's demonstration of achievement of the stated MProf learning outcomes.

These five pieces of written work, representing 30,000 words in total (submitted as a dissertation) will be assessed and students will be required to respond to questions and engage in discussion of their work in a *viva voce* examination with an examination panel including at least one external examiner.

Summary of Assessment requirement for MProf Award

1. Re-presentation (incorporating feedback and comments) of:

- A modified version of assignment 'Review of Learning and Professional Experience', which presents a critical reflection and review of previous

learning and professional experience at the commencement of the course. It will contain the argument of how their scholarly and professional history both enabled and, through the development of a plan of learning, was built upon for the doctoral programme. (6,000 words)

- A modified version of assignment 'Research for the Working World', which identifies the types of problems or areas of inquiry that are relevant to your work-place and area of practice and, with reference to underpinning epistemological, ethical and philosophical issues, methodologies that have the potential to address the complexities and ambiguities of the work-place will be explored. (6,000 words)
- A modified version of assignment Project Planning 1: which presents a detailed plan of systematic work-based research, that is intended to advance individual or organisational learning that is academically valid and organisationally relevant to their own situation. (8,000 words)

2. Submission of:

- An introduction and critical appraisal of the submission's demonstration of achievement of the stated MProf learning outcomes. (2,000 words)
- A Reflective Account of Learning that presents a critical discussion and evaluation of the student's key intellectual, personal/professional, and organisational concerns. Including an informed critical awareness of the theoretical and philosophical perspectives, which have helped them develop new insights into advanced organisational research issues and a critical literature review. (8,000 words)

3. Oral examination

3.3 Transfer to MProf (Faculty of Health and Wellbeing) Award

Transfer to an MProf award may occur at any time following completion of the first four modules, i.e. normally after the first two years, of a student's study on the programme. In some cases transfer may be planned in the sense that a student recognises or is advised that they are unlikely to be capable of successfully completing a full DProf award. In other cases transfer to the MProf award may be a consequence of an unanticipated change in circumstances that prevent a student from continuing with their DProf studies. The MProf award option will also be available for a student who submits a final DProf Doctoral Project Report but fails, in the end, to satisfy examiners.

The minimum duration of an MProf is therefore two and a half years while the maximum duration is seven years the same as the maximum duration of a full DProf award.

Intermediate Award – Master of Professional Studies (Faculty of Health and Wellbeing - 2009 Definitive Document)

MProf award

This award will enable students who are unable to, or who may be advised not to, complete the full DProf award to exit their programme of study with an alternative intermediate award. It is not anticipated that this award would be actively marketed or recruited to, but that it would simply provide an award, where appropriate, for some students.

Students wishing to exit with this award will be required to re-present the written work that they produced for Modules Project Planning One (6,500 words) and Project Planning Two (6,500 words). They may, if they wish to, revise and further develop these assignments in the light of feedback and changing circumstances from the first submission of these pieces of work prior to presenting them for their MProf. They will also require to submit a Critical Professional Practice and Development Portfolio (15, 000 words), which together with the Project Planning work will form a dissertation for submission in partial completion of the MProf.

This work should be presented in an integrated, synthesised manner and include a 2000 word introduction and critical appraisal of the submission's demonstration of achievement of the stated MProf learning outcomes.

These four pieces of written work, representing 30,000 words in total (submitted as a dissertation) will be assessed and students will be required to respond to questions and engage in discussion of their work in a viva voce examination with an examination panel including at least one external examiner.

Summary of Assessment requirement for MProf Award

1. Re-presentation (incorporating feedback and comments) of:

- A modified version of assignment Project Planning 1: which presents a literature review demonstrating critical understanding of the theory, evidence and discourse within which their own research interests are situated. 6,500 words
- A modified version of Project Planning 2: which presents criticality and understanding of possible methodologies and methods relevant to their research interest and actively and reflectively engages with relevant data collection and analysis methods. 6,500 words

2. Submission of:

- An introduction critical appraisal of the submission's demonstration of achievement of the stated MProf learning outcomes. 2,000 words
- A Critical Professional Practice and Development Portfolio that presents a critical discussion and evaluation of the student's key intellectual, personal/professional, and organisational concerns. Including an informed critical awareness of the theoretical and philosophical perspectives which have helped them develop new insights into advanced organisational research issues and a critical literature review. 15,000 words

3. Oral examination

3.3 Transfer to MProf (Faculty of Health and Wellbeing) Award

Transfer to an MProf award may occur at any time following completion of the first four modules, i.e. normally the first two years, of a student's study on the programme. In some cases transfer may be planned in the sense that a student recognises or is advised that they are unlikely to be capable of successfully completing a full DProf award. In other cases transfer to the MProf award may be a consequence of an unanticipated change in circumstances that prevent a student from continuing with their DProf studies. The MProf award option will also be available for a student who submits a final DProf Doctoral Project Report but fails, in the end, to satisfy examiners.

The minimum duration of a MProf is therefore two and a half years while the maximum duration is seven years the same as the maximum duration of a full DProf award.