

Regulations for the Award of Doctorate in Education

EdD

Research Degrees Committee

Revised August 2020

**Further information and advice on any aspect of these regulations is available from
the Doctoral School, Research and Innovation Services,
exts. 2045/4047/4053.**

Contents

E1	Aims & Objectives	3
E2	Admissions	4
E3	Registration Period	5
E4	Phase I and II taught Modules	6
E5	Progression from Phase II taught Modules to Phase III (research project element)	8
E6	Supervision in Phase III of the Programme	9
E7	The Thesis	10
E8	Phase III Examinations – General	12
E9	Phase III Examination Procedures	14
E10	The Candidate's Responsibilities in the Phase III Examination Process	15
E11	Phase III Examiners	15
E12	First Examination in Phase III	16
E13	Re-examination in Phase III	18
E14	Recommendation for Award of EdD or MProf (Educational Research)	20
E15	Appeals against recommendations of the Examiners in Phase III of the programme	21
E16	Student Complaints Policy and Procedure	21

Appendices:

1.	The EdD Module Assessment Board	22
2.	Criteria for MProf Award	27
3.	Confirmation of Doctorate in Education procedure	29
4.	Evidence to support Extenuating Circumstances	35

Revised 2020

E1 AIMS & OBJECTIVES

E1.1 The Doctorate in Education (EdD) 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.

E1.2 The specific objectives of the EdD are to enable candidates to:

- a) deepen their professional knowledge base in relation to research and improvement in professional policy and practice;
- b) further develop a high level of effective intellectual, organisational, personal, communication and professional skills;
- c) produce work which represents an independent and original contribution to knowledge and/or practice and which, at least in part, merits publication in an appropriate academic journal;

E1.3 The University shall ensure that EdDs awarded and conferred are comparable in standard with similar awards granted and conferred throughout higher education in the United Kingdom.

E1.4 The University shall encourage co-operation with other organisations for the purposes of research leading to the award of the EdD. Such co-operation shall be intended:

- a) to encourage outward-looking and relevant practice-related 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 thesis and degree certificate (see Section E7).

E2 ADMISSIONS

E2.1 Applicants will normally be expected to have:

- a) A UK or equivalent Masters' degree together with at least three years relevant professional experience;
- b) at least two satisfactory references from line managers or other higher education institutions;
- c) demonstrated, through letter of application and interview, the capacity to contribute to, and to benefit from, the experience of academic and professional study at doctoral level;
- d) access to the internet and to email in order to fully benefit from the electronic means of support offered on the programme.

E2.2 Exceptionally, admission may be granted to applicants who, although lacking a UK or equivalent Masters' degree, (as specified at E2.1.a) 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.

E.2.3 Where English is not the applicant's 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 and/or a TOEFL score of 620 (paper-based exercise) or 260 (computer-based exercise).

E2.4 Applicants may be considered for exemption from up to half of the taught Modules in Phases I and II of the EdD programme (Section E4), on the basis of relevant prior certificated and/or experiential learning. Such applicants would need to demonstrate successful completion of a recognised advanced research methods course, or have substantial experience of undertaking research activity. Applicants would be considered under the University's APCL/APEL procedures against the learning outcomes specified for the taught Modules in Phase I and II of the programme.

E3 REGISTRATION PERIOD

E3.1 The normal minimum and maximum periods of registration are as follows:

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
Full-time	3 years	5 years
Part-time	4 years	7 years

E3.2 Where there is evidence that the research is proceeding exceptionally well in Phase III of the Programme - hereafter 'Phase III' (Section E5), Research Institute approval may be given for the Thesis to be submitted before the normal minimum period of registration indicated in E3.1 above.

E3.3 Where necessary in Phase III, the candidate may seek approval from the Research Institute for a change of mode of study.

E3.4 Where a candidate is prevented, by ill-health, personal reasons or other valid cause, from being able to meaningfully engage in their research and make progress, Research Institute-level approval may be given for study to be suspended, under the **Break in Study Policy and Procedure for Research Degree Students**. Candidates can apply for time out from their research via the RFBIS form, for periods of between 2 and 12 months in any one application. The Policy, RFBIS and Guidance Notes can be found on the Research Degrees Blackboard Site. The period of the agreed break will not count against the maximum permissible time indicated in E5.1 above.

E3.5 The candidate must submit a thesis within the appropriate registration period outlined in E3.1 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 thesis within this period, Research Institute approval may be given to extend his/her period of registration for not more than one year in total. In such cases, Research Institute approval will be subject to endorsement by the University's Research Degrees Committee.

E3.6 Where a candidate has discontinued the research in Phase III, the withdrawal of registration shall be notified to the University's Research Degrees 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.

E4 PHASE I AND II TAUGHT MODULES

E4.1 The progress of candidates through the taught Modules in Phase I and II will be overseen by an EdD Module Assessment Board. This Board will have no powers relating to conferment of the EdD award (see E8.4); its main purposes will be to:

- agree the final moderated results for each taught Module within the Programme; and
- decide candidates' entitlement to progress between Phases I and II.

The purpose, constitution, duties and actions of the Board are set out at Appendix 1.

E4.2 Taught Module Pass Marks

4.2.1 Module Assessment Schedule

An assessment schedule will be published for each Module, which specifies the assessment components and their relative weighting.

E4.3 Progression from Phase I to II

Unless a candidate exercises his/her right to reassessment under regulation 4.4, s/he will normally be expected to complete and pass all Modules of Phase I before being allowed to progress to Phase II. Exceptionally, the EdD Module Assessment Board may exercise its discretion to allow progression to Phase II of a candidate who has failed one or both Phase I Modules provided that the Board is satisfied that successful reassessment is likely and that reassessment in addition to Phase II work represents a viable student loading.

E4.4 Failure and Referral; in Phase I and II Taught Modules

Failure of Module

Where a candidate fails a Module in Phase I or II, the candidate will be referred in that Module and has the right to be re-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 EdD Module Assessment Board will permit further reassessment only in exceptional circumstances.

E4.5 Reassessment in Phase I and II Taught Modules

Reassessment requirements

The EdD Module 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 students to be reassessed in the same elements or by the same method as the first attempt, the Board will determine appropriate alternative arrangements.

E4.6 Compensation for failure in Phase I and II Taught Modules

Compensation for failure in any of the Modules in Phase I or II is not permitted.

E4.7 Extenuating Circumstances affecting performance in assessments for Phase I and II Taught Modules

4.7.1 Responsibilities of students

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 EdD Module Assessment Board

The EdD Module 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 Module. This will only be done on an exceptional basis where the Board is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of the candidate's achievement.

E4.8 Appeals against the decisions of the EdD Module Assessment Board in relation to taught Modules in Phases I and II

A candidate may appeal against a decision of the EdD Module Assessment Board in respect of assessment of taught Modules in Phases 1 and II. Information on the procedure to be followed can be found in the Appeals

Policy and Procedure Further details can be found under the University's Rules and Regulations web pages at [https://students.shu.ac.uk/regulations/appeals and complaints/Appeals%20Policy%20and%20Procedure.pdf](https://students.shu.ac.uk/regulations/appeals%20and%20complaints/Appeals%20Policy%20and%20Procedure.pdf).

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

E5 PROGRESSION FROM PHASE II TAUGHT MODULES TO PHASE III (RESEARCH PROJECT ELEMENT)

E5.1 Before being allowed to progress to Phase III, a candidate:

- **must** have passed all taught modules required in Phases I and II;
- **must submit an Application for Research Programme Approval within 15 months of the enrolment start date and** have the research project proposal approved, with no outstanding approval conditions, by the University's Research Degrees 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 EdD, including the emergence of an independent and original contribution to knowledge and/or professional practice;
 - c) include details of a suitable nominal Director of Studies to assist the candidate in developing their project ahead of the Confirmation of Professional Doctorate process (see E5.3).

E5.2 Candidates are also required to consider their development needs at this time. Candidates are expected to use the Vitae Researcher Development Framework (RDF) Planner 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.

E5.3 All candidates registered for Doctorate in Education must undertake the Confirmation of Doctorate process. The Confirmation process has both a formal progress and review function. It includes a report from the EdD Module Assessment Board on the candidate's performance in Phases I and II of the Programme and allows for a formal evaluation of student progress involving assessment by academic staff who are not the student's supervisors. Candidates are assessed through a two-part process; a presentation/examination of the work produced so far to test candidate s' oral skills, and the submission of a report to assess writing ability at Doctoral level. The process is managed in Research Institute. Although the decision on the Confirmation of Doctorate application is recommended by Research Institute staff, the decision is approved at University level by the Research Degrees Committee. The stipulated timescale for submitting the report is a maximum of 32 months part-time after the enrolment start date with the oral assessment taking place within 4 weeks of submission of the report. Full details can be found in the Procedure for Confirmation of EdD which can be found in Appendix 3 of these regulations.

E6 SUPERVISION IN PHASE III OF THE PROGRAMME

E6.1 A candidate for EdD intending to progress to Phase III shall seek approval for a thesis Supervisory team from the University's Research Degrees Committee. This will normally be done as part of the process of securing approval for the research project proposal (E5 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 thesis;
- * the need for a Supervisory team which is research- or professionally-active to assist the candidate to develop the research 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.

E6.2 A candidate for EdD shall normally have two and not more than three Supervisors.

E6.3 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.

- E6.4 In addition to the Supervisors, an adviser or advisers may be approved by the University's Research Degrees Committee to contribute specialised knowledge or a link with an external organisation.
- E6.5 A candidate for a research degree or EdD at any institution of higher education, shall be ineligible to act as a Director of Studies but may act as a second Supervisor or as an Adviser.
- E6.6 Research Institute approval must be obtained for any change in supervision arrangements.

E7 THE THESIS

- E7.1 Except with the specific permission of the University's Research Degrees Committee, the thesis shall be presented in English.
- E7.2 The thesis must contain an abstract of approximately 300 words which provides a synopsis of the thesis stating the nature and scope of the work undertaken and the contribution made to knowledge in the subject. This should sit after the Title page and be single-spaced. A loose copy of the abstract must be submitted with the thesis. The loose copy of the abstract must have the name of the author, the degree for which the thesis is submitted, and the title of the thesis as a heading.
- E7.3 The following format requirements must be adhered to in the submitted thesis as follows:
- a) Theses must be submitted in line with E7.4 and be no more **than 60,000 words in length**;
 - b) Theses must normally be in A4 format; the Research Degrees Committee may give permission for a thesis to be submitted in another format where it is satisfied that the contents of the thesis can be better expressed in that format);
 - c) the size of character used in the main text, including displayed matter and notes, must not be less than a font size 12. Preferred fonts are Arial, Calibri and Times New Roman;
 - d) the soft-bound thesis for assessment must be printed on the recto side of the page only; the paper must 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 must be numbered consecutively through the main text including photographs and/or diagrams included as whole pages. Page numbers must be positioned centrally at the bottom of the page 20 mm above the edge; the left (binding edge) for soft-bound theses should have a margin of 40mm;
 - g) the title page must give the following information:

- the full title of the thesis **in a maximum of 12 words**;
- 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.

E7.4 Candidates are required to submit their thesis prior to examination through Turnitin on the Research Degrees Blackboard site. For the assessment process, candidates are required to print copies of the electronic file for the benefit of the examiners. These will be submitted for examination to The Doctoral School in a temporary (soft-bound) format which is sufficiently secure to ensure that pages cannot be added or removed.¹ A thesis submitted in a temporary bound form must be in its final form in all respects except for the binding, the incorporation of any amendments required by the examiners and the removal of any previously published material.

Following examination and the incorporation of any amendments required by the examiners, the thesis must be submitted in electronic form (PDF/A format) to rdcadmin@shu.ac.uk together with a Thesis Deposit Form. PDF/A is a standardised version of the PDF format which is suitable for the University's long-term archiving requirements.

The candidate must confirm that the contents of the electronic thesis are identical with the version submitted for examination, except the incorporation of any required amendments.

E7.5 The thesis must include a statement of the candidate's objectives and must acknowledge published or other sources of material consulted (including an appropriate bibliography) and any assistance received.

E7.6 Where a candidate's research programme is part of a collaborative group project, the thesis must indicate clearly the candidate's individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration.

E7.7 The candidate is free to publish material in advance of the thesis and reference must be made in the thesis to any such work. Copies of published material may be submitted with the initial soft bound copy of the thesis for examination. However, to respect copyright laws, any such published material must be removed from the final electronic copy of the thesis before it is submitted as the Version of Record.

E7.8 Following the award of the degree, The Doctoral School ' staff will send the electronic copy of the thesis in PDF/A format to the University Library. The thesis will be uploaded to the Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) and the metadata will be made available through the Electronic Thesis online Service (EThoS) of The British Library. The Director of Studies will be responsible for sending a link to the thesis to any Collaborating Organisation.

¹ For example, thermal-binding which is a method of binding single pages by gluing them together on the spine of a document.

However, in cases where candidates are granted an embargo period, usually of 12 months, to curtail dissemination of their research for other publishing reasons, then the full text of thesis will not be made available until the embargo period expires.

E7.9 The Research Degrees Committee may agree (see R4.14) that a confidentiality restriction is placed on the thesis for a specified period. In such cases, for the duration of the period, the full text of the thesis will not be made available on SHURA. Instead, only the author's name, thesis title, research degree award, year of submission, research centre/department and name of the supervisors will be published.

The Research Degrees Committee may approve an application for confidentiality normally only in order to enable a patent application to be lodged, to protect commercially or politically sensitive material, or to protect material which may result in competitive advantage. However, the thesis must not be restricted in this way in order to protect researchers and research leads. Although the normal maximum period of confidentiality restriction is two years, in exceptional circumstances the Research Degrees Committee may approve a longer period. However, where a shorter period would be adequate, the Research Degrees Committee will not automatically grant confidentiality for two years.

E7.10 Copyright in the thesis submitted for examination remains with the candidate. The physical copies of the thesis submitted for assessment become the property of the University, whilst other artefacts for assessment remain the personal property of the candidate.

E8 PHASE III EXAMINATIONS - GENERAL

E8.1 The Phase III examination for the EdD has two stages: firstly the submission and preliminary assessment of the thesis and secondly its defence at an oral examination. Reasonable adjustments will be made to the oral examination for students with disabilities.

E8.2 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 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 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 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

- E8.3 An oral examination shall normally be held in the UK. In special cases the University's Research Degrees Committee may give approval for the examination to take place abroad.
- E8.4 Supervisors may, with the consent of the candidate, attend the oral examination and speak if called upon, but must not participate in the preliminary private meeting of the examiners, and must withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination.
- E8.5 Following completion of the examination, the examiners will make a recommendation on the award of the EdD, via the Doctoral School ' staff, to the Vice Chancellor, who acts on behalf of the University's Academic Board in conferring the degree.
- E8.6 The degree of EdD may be awarded as an aegrotat or posthumously on the basis of a thesis 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 Committee shall seek evidence that the candidate would have been likely to have been successful had the oral examination taken place. Please see **Policy for Aegrotat and Posthumous Awards** which can be found on the Research Degrees Blackboard site.
- E8.7 The University's Policy and Procedure for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct against Doctoral and Masters Research Students details the procedures for dealing with allegations of plagiarism, collusion, or any other form of dishonest conduct, which apply to research degree candidates. Details can be found on the University's Rules and Regulations web pages at <https://www.shu.ac.uk/research/ethics-integrity-and-practice>.
- E8.8 The University's Research Degrees 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 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.

E9 PHASE III EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

- E9.1 The Director of Studies shall propose to the University's Research Degrees Committee for approval the candidate's examination arrangements, including the title for the candidate's thesis 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.
- E9.2 The Doctoral School staff shall make known to the candidate the procedure to be followed for the submission of the thesis (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.
- E9.3 The Doctoral School staff shall notify the candidate, all Supervisors and the examiners of the date of the oral examination.
- E9.4 The oral examination will normally be held in the UK. Exceptionally, on receipt of a justifiable case by the candidate's Director of Studies, the Research Degrees Committee may give approval for the examination to take place overseas via video-conferencing or similar technology. However, the candidate must be at the same physical location as at least one of the examiners or the Independent Chair (see E9.6) to ensure they are fully supported during the assessment.
- E9.5 The staff shall ensure that all the examiners have completed and returned their preliminary reports to the University before the oral examination takes place.
- E9.6 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 judgement. 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 thesis 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 thesis 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.

E10 THE CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE PHASE III EXAMINATION PROCESS

- E10.1 The candidate shall submit the thesis to the Doctoral School staff before the expiry of the registration period (see E3.1 above).
- E10.2 The submission of the thesis for examination shall be at the sole discretion of the candidate. While a candidate would be unwise to submit the thesis 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 thesis guarantees the award of the degree.
- E10.3 The candidate shall satisfy any conditions of eligibility for examination required by the University.
- E10.4 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.
- E10.5 The candidate must confirm their intention for the thesis 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 thesis has not been submitted for a comparable academic award. 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).
- E10.6 The candidate shall ensure that the thesis format is in accordance with the requirements of the University's regulations (see section E7). Theses 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 thesis shall be presented in a permanent binding of the approved type (see paragraph E7.11) before the degree may be awarded. A thesis 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 thesis are identical with the version submitted for examination, except where amendments have been made to meet the requirements of the examiners.

E11 PHASE III EXAMINERS

- E11.1 A candidate shall be examined by at least two and normally not more than three examiners (except where paragraphs E12.6, E13.2, or E13.8 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.

E11.2 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 the candidate's Supervisory team may not be appointed as examiners for that candidate.

E11.3 Where the candidate and the internal examiner are both on the staff of the same organisation, a second external examiner shall be appointed.

E11.4 Examiners shall be experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's thesis and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined.

E11.5 At least one external examiner shall have substantial experience (ie at least several instances) of examining doctoral candidates in the UK, as either an internal or an external examiner. Where this is not possible, for example in emerging subject areas, the Research Degrees Committee may exercise its discretion by ensuring that the proposed examining team includes an internal examiner who has significant examining experience outside the University.

E11.6 An external examiner must be independent both of the University and any Collaborating Organisation and must not have acted previously as the candidate's Supervisor or adviser. An external examiner must 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 Committee shall also ensure that an external examiner is not approved so frequently that his/her familiarity with the Programme might prejudice objective judgement.

E11.7 No candidate currently registered for a research degree, may act as an examiner.

E12 FIRST EXAMINATION IN PHASE III

E12.1 Each examiner shall read and examine the thesis and submit, on the appropriate form, an independent preliminary report on it to the Doctoral School staff before any oral examination is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the thesis provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree (as set out in paragraphs E1.1 and E1.2) and where possible make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of any oral examination.

E12.2 Following the oral examination the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit to the Doctoral School staff, on the appropriate form, 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 E12.3)

Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted.

E12.3 Following the completion of the examination the examiners may recommend that:

- a) the candidate be **awarded** the degree; or
- b) the candidate be awarded the degree **subject to amendments** being made to the thesis (see paragraph E12.4); or
- c) the candidate be permitted to resubmit for the degree and be **re-examined**, with or without an oral examination (see section E13);
- d) the candidate be awarded the degree of **MProf** subject to the presentation of the thesis being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.

Where amendments are required (as in option b) above) the candidate shall submit the corrected thesis **within four months FTE** of the date of the oral examination. The University's Research Degrees Committee may, where there are good reasons, approve an extension of this period.

E12.4 Where the examiners recommend that the degree be awarded subject to the candidate amending the thesis to the satisfaction of the internal and/or the external examiner(s), (see sub-paragraph E12.4.b), they must indicate on the appropriate form what amendments are required.

E12.5 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the University's Research Degrees 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 – especially if the internal examiner(s) disagree(s) strongly with the view of the external examiner; any such appointment shall be made in accordance with the approved procedures for the appointment of examiners.

E12.6 Where an additional external examiner is appointed under sub-paragraph E12.5c, s/he shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the thesis 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 examination process will be completed as set out in paragraph E8.4.

E12.7 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 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 Committee permits otherwise. Any such examination shall be deemed to be part of the candidate's first examination.

E13 RE-EXAMINATION IN PHASE III

E13.1 One re-examination may be permitted by the University's Research Degrees Committee subject to the following requirements:

- a) a candidate who fails to satisfy the examiners at the first oral examination, or (see paragraph E8.2) or any further examination required under paragraph E12.7 may, on the recommendation of the examiners and with the approval of the University's Research Degrees Committee, be permitted to revise the thesis and be re-examined;
- b) the examiners shall provide the candidate, through the Doctoral School staff, 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 Committee may, where there are good reasons, approve an extension of this period.

E13.2 The University's Research Degrees 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.

E13.3 There are four forms of re-examination:

- a) where the candidate's performance in the first oral examination (see paragraph E8.2) or further examination (see paragraph E12.7) was satisfactory but the thesis was unsatisfactory and the examiners on re-examination certify that the thesis as revised is satisfactory, the University's Research Degrees Committee may exempt the candidate from further examination, oral or otherwise;
- b) where the candidate's performance in the first oral examination (see paragraph E8.2) or further examination (see paragraph E12.7) was unsatisfactory and the thesis was also unsatisfactory, any re-examination shall normally include a re-examination of the thesis and an oral (but see E13.11) examination (see paragraph E8.2);
- c) where on the first examination the candidate's thesis 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 thesis;
- d) where on the first examination the thesis 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 Committee.

E13.4 In the case of a re-examination under sub-paragraphs E13.3a, b or c, each examiner shall read and examine the thesis and submit, on the appropriate form, an independent preliminary report on it to the Doctoral School staff before any oral examination is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the thesis provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree (as set out in paragraphs E1.1 and E1.2) and where possible make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of any oral examination.

E13.5 Following the re-examination of the thesis under sub-paragraph E13.3a or following an oral or other examination under E13.3b, c, d or e, the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit to the Doctoral School staff, on the appropriate form, 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 (E13.6)

Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted.

E13.6 Following the completion of the re-examination the examiners may recommend that:

- a) the candidate be awarded the degree;
- b) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to amendments being made to the thesis (see paragraph E13.7);
- c) the candidate be not awarded the degree and be not permitted to be re-examined (see paragraphs E13.11 and E13.12).
- d) the candidate be awarded the degree of MProf subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the examiners.

E13.7 Where the examiners recommend that the degree be awarded subject to the candidate amending the thesis to the satisfaction of the internal and/or the external examiner(s) (E13.6.b), they must indicate on the appropriate form what amendments are required.

E13.8 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the University's Research Degrees 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.

E13.9 Where an additional external examiner is appointed under sub-paragraph E13.8c, s/he shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the thesis 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 examination process will be completed as set out in paragraph E8.4.

E13.10 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 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 Committee permits otherwise.

E13.11 In the case of a re-examination under sub-paragraph E13.3b, where the examiners are of the opinion that the revised thesis is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting an oral examination, they may recommend that the University's Research Degrees Committee dispense with the oral examination and not award the degree under sub-paragraph E13.6c (see also paragraph E13.12).

E13.12 The Academic Board may decide, on the recommendation of the examiners, that the degree be not awarded, and that no re-examination be permitted. In such cases, the examiners shall prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the thesis and the reason for their recommendation, which shall be forwarded to the candidate by the Doctoral School staff .

E14 RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD

E14.1 Award of the Doctorate in Education (EdD)

Subject to the requirements in Regulation E1.1 & E1.2, the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the examiners, will award a Doctorate in Education to all candidates who have:

- * passed all the taught Modules required in Phases I and II of the programme; and
- * passed the thesis element in Phase III (including the completion and approval of any amendments required by the examining team)

E 14.2 Award of Master of Professional Studies in Educational Research (MProf)

The award of MProf in Educational Research 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 EdD 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).

E15. APPEALS AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXAMINERS IN PHASE III OF THE PROGRAMME

The University has an Appeals Policy and Procedure which allows research degree candidates to appeal against decisions made by the University Research Degrees Committee on Confirmation of Professional Doctorate decisions or Research Degree Examiner Panels for final award decisions. Candidates can appeal a decision and request for it to be reviewed on the following grounds:

- There has been an irregularity in the application of the published regulation, policy or procedure which has had an impact on the decision
- There is relevant new evidence or information which the candidate did not provide and the candidate has valid reason why it was not submitted at the time of the assessment.

Further details can be found under the University's Rules and Regulations web pages at https://students.shu.ac.uk/regulations/appeals_and_complaints/Appeals%20Policy%20and%20Procedure.pdf.

E16. STUDENT COMPLAINTS

The University has a Student Complaints Policy and Procedure which facilitates investigation and resolution of issues of dissatisfaction raised by students against teaching/supervision or service-related provision. Further details can be found under the University's Rules and Regulations web pages at https://students.shu.ac.uk/regulations/appeals_and_complaints/Student%20Complaints%20Policy%20and%20Procedure.pdf.

THE EdD MODULE ASSESSMENT BOARD

1 PURPOSE

The main purposes of the EdD Module Assessment Board are to

- i) agree the final moderated results for each taught Module within the EdD Programme. The Board will moderate the standards for each Module, by overseeing the moderation processes carried out by internal examiners and by agreeing the final moderated results.

The Board must

- moderate sets of Module marks
 - agree the marks for each Module
- ii) decide candidates' entitlement to progress between Phases I and II of the Programme.

The Board will agree:

- decisions on progression
- decisions on referrals
- all reassessment requirements
- decisions on extenuating circumstances
- decisions on action to be taken for missing marks
- decisions on cases of suspected cheating
- decisions following admission of a candidate's appeal relating to the taught Modules.

2 CONSTITUTION

The EdD Module Assessment Board shall be appointed by the Board of Studies of the Research Institute of Development and Society.

Members of the Board shall be:

Chair
Programme Leader

One Internal Examiner for each Module
External Examiner(s)
Secretary appointed by the Director of

The Chair of the Board shall be appointed by the Research Institute of Development and Society Board of Studies for a fixed period of office, normally 4 years. The Chair

- shall be a member of the teaching staff, normally based within the Research Institute of Development and Society
- shall have substantial course management/leadership experience or prior substantial experience as an examiner in another institution
- shall not be the Director of the Research Institute of Development and Society, nor the Programme Leader
- shall not have any significant involvement in the administration or delivery of the programme.

3 DUTIES

The EdD Module Assessment Board shall

- agree results for each Module, by
 - checking the marking standards and range within each Module
 - comparing sets of Module marks to ensure comparability, adjusting marks sets as a whole, if deemed appropriate

If necessary the Board may ask for a set of assessments to be remarked

- consider the overall performance of each registered candidate in the taught Modules within the programme, taking account of information provided on extenuating circumstances, in order to:
 - decide entitlement to progress from Phase I to Phase II
 - agree the arrangements for reassessment for each candidate including methods and timing
 - agree action to be taken in the case of missing marks
 - consider cases of alleged cheating and determine the action to be taken

- inform the Research Degrees Committee of candidates' performance in the taught Modules of the Programme
- consider APL claims in accordance with University procedures
- consider appeals relating to the taught Modules referred to the Board by the Director of or the Academic Board, in accordance with the University's Appeals Regulations
- refer to the Research Institute Board of Studies or to the Academic Board such matters as it considers relevant

4 ACTION BEFORE THE MEETING

Documentation for the EdD Module Assessment Board

The Board shall receive for each taught Module within the Programme

- a list of all candidates registered for the Module
- for each candidate, the marks for all assessment components of the Module, together with the overall Module mark
- any explanation for any missing marks, together with any supporting evidence and recommendation from internal examiners on action to be taken
- information on extenuating circumstances submitted by candidates in explanation of failure or poor performance, and any staff recommendations for action
- information on any alleged cases of cheating

* any additional information about the assessment of a Module

Documentation for External Examiner/s

To perform their duties, including moderation and sampling, external examiners should:

- be involved in all aspects of assessment contributing to decisions on Module marks

- receive samples of candidates' work, with copies of assignments and marking schemes contributing to decisions on Module marks
- agree sampling with the Module Team, to encompass all assessment modes and all levels of performance across the full marks range
- note that moderation is only possible for the marks for the Module as a *whole*, not for individual candidates on the basis of sampling only. If a potential problem with a mark(s) is identified as a result of sampling, this should be referred back to the Module team for review, in context of the marking for the Module as a whole.

Administrative process

The Chair, Secretary and Programme Leader should work together to:

- ensure all documentation is available for the Board and that the External Examiner/s and all members receive the necessary details
- co-ordinate Module results by candidate profile where straightforward, and annotated where discussion is expected (eg extenuating circumstances/borderlines)
- co-ordinate/collate all extenuating circumstances forms, relevant documentary evidence and other relevant notes on individual students; if appropriate arrange meeting of filtering committee to consider extenuating circumstances

5 ACTION AT THE MEETING

Confidentiality

All proceedings of the meeting should be strictly confidential; the Chair should read out the confidentiality statement included in the University's Assessment Handbook at the start of the meeting.

Moderation Process / Business of the Board

The Board should follow the same moderation procedures as described in the University's Assessment Handbook for the operation of Subject Assessment Boards.

The operation of the Board should follow the same procedures as described in the University's Assessment Handbook for the operation of Award Assessment Boards.

6 ACTION AFTER THE BOARD

The same procedures should be followed as described in the University's Assessment Handbook for the operation of Award Assessment Boards.

The EdD Module Assessment Board also has a responsibility to inform the University's Research Degrees Committee of the performance of candidates in Phases I and II (see Regulations Section E5) to enable the RDC to form a judgement of candidates' fitness to proceed to the Thesis stage. The programme leader or secretary to the board shall inform students of the progression requirements.

Appendix 2

Intermediate Award – Master of Professional Studies (Educational Research)

MProf in Educational Research award

The MProf in Educational Research can be awarded to candidates who do not wish to proceed to the thesis stage but have successfully completed the four modules of the cohort phase of the EdD and who successfully complete an additional Thesis of 15,000 words. It is not anticipated that this award will be actively marketed or recruited to, but that it will simply provide an award, where appropriate, for some candidates who are unable to progress to the thesis stage. However, students must have passed all assessment tasks to be eligible to apply for the award.

The overall aim is to enable candidates to reflect on their learning during the cohort phase by synthesising material from the four modules in the form of a thesis in which they review and evaluate their research thinking and development. They will review the work of the cohort phase, including the papers written for the modules and write a reflective account that summarises the contribution this work has made to their research and professional knowledge and practice.

The Thesis will be presented along with the four papers produced for the modules taken during the cohort stage (including assessment feedback and comments). There is no need to revise these four papers, though it is expected that the Thesis will refer in details to these papers and to assessment feedback received on them, as well as to the longer term impact on and development of professional practice. The thesis is also likely to indicate how the academic work undertaken for these modules has been developed and how the candidate's thinking has changed as a result.

The four papers from the cohort stage, representing 28,000 words in total (submitted as a portfolio) will be considered alongside the narrative of the Thesis (15,000 words) and candidates 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 in Educational Research Award

1. Re-presentation (incorporating feedback and comments) of **the four papers from the cohort stage**: 28,000 words.
2. Submission of a **Thesis** reviewing and evaluating the candidate's research thinking and development over the period of the cohort phase and subsequently: 15,000 words.
3. **Oral examination**

Transfer to MProf in Educational Research Award

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

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



Procedure for Confirmation of Doctorate in Education (EdD) - 2017-18 starters

1. What is Confirmation of EdD?

Confirmation of EdD is a formal assessment point for progression on the EdD programme. It is undertaken by all EdD candidates at SHU and always comprises written and oral components.

Due to differences between academic disciplines, details of the Procedure for Confirmation of doctoral assessment vary between different subjects. These variations are motivated by a desire to provide candidates with the most appropriate and useful assessment for their field of study. It is important to note, though, that each Procedure has been checked and reviewed by SHU's Research Degrees Committee, so as to ensure equivalence of assessment level across all academic disciplines.

What does Confirmation of EdD Assessment involve?

Application for Confirmation of EdD is assessed via two elements:

- a) The ED1 Confirmation of EdD form. This can be downloaded from the Research Degrees BlackBoard site (please ensure that you use the latest version). A key part of the ED1 form is a 6,000 word EdD Research Proposal (see below for details)
- b) Oral Assessment (see below for details)

When should Confirmation of EdD occur?

In the Research Institute of Development and Society (D&S), the written report and ED1 are completed and submitted BEFORE the oral assessment takes place. There is a hard deadline for submission of a candidate's application for confirmation of EdD (the ED1) and the written report. In D&S the guidelines for this are as follows:

	Target for submission of ED1 (including research proposal)	Absolute Deadline for submission of ED1 (including research proposal)	Oral assessment
Part-time	28 months	32 months	Target 2 weeks after submission of report. Normally a maximum of 4 weeks.

These timescales will be adjusted accordingly for candidates with approved suspensions of study and for candidates with disabilities who have learning contracts.

Candidates who do not submit their ED1 by the appropriate deadline will be referred. If they then fail to submit within the timescales for a referred assessment, or their resubmission is assessed as falling below the required standard, they will not progress to full EdD study.

2. What is required for the written assessment on the EdD?

The 6,000 word EdD Research Proposal (part of the ED1 Confirmation of EdD report) should be produced by the candidate, under the guidance of their supervisory team. It should review progress made, detail the intended further work and the contribution to knowledge that will likely emerge. The report should include:

- a discussion of the aims and objectives of the research;
- a review of relevant literature showing understanding of the current state of knowledge in the field appropriate to the discipline. Candidates should also aim to demonstrate an understanding of the context for the research and make reference to theoretical concepts as appropriate;
- evidence that an appropriate methodology has been established and can be defended. Candidates should aim to demonstrate that the proposed work is feasible and that research methods have been tested;
- evidence of progress towards achieving the research aims e.g. pilot study results, preliminary fieldwork, examples of creative practice;
- a statement of intended further work including a work plan. The work plan should indicate the key research tasks remaining alongside a feasible timescale for their completion;
- an indication of the original contribution to knowledge and practice of management that is likely to emerge, providing a suitable basis for work at doctoral standard. It should indicate how the work would add to current knowledge and make a significant contribution to literature and practice in the subject/field.

The report should be presented and referenced according to the academic conventions appropriate to the candidate's discipline.

Submission of the Confirmation of EdD report (ED1)

1. When a candidate has nearly finalised their report, they should complete sections 1, 2 and 3 of the ED1 "Application for Confirmation of EdD" form, and then pass it to their DoS who is required to complete sections 4 & 5. These sections comprise a progress report and endorsement of the candidate's completion of research ethics approval and their initial training programme and acknowledgement that any future research plans will receive appropriate ethical scrutiny. **Successful completion of assignments of the four EdD modules in phases I & II is mandatory prior to submission of the ED1.**

2. The completed ED1 form (which includes the 6,000 word EdD Research Proposal) should then be submitted to the D&S Research Student Administrator (either as hard copy or as e-mail attachments). **E-mail submissions should be sent to p.hibberd@shu.ac.uk**

3. The date of receipt will be recorded as the 'date submitted'.
4. The candidate's DoS will have previously been invited to nominate two independent assessor(s) (IA(s)), subject to the approval and advice of the appropriate Postgraduate Research Tutor (PGRT) or Head of Research Degrees (HoRD) and taking note of the eligibility criteria in the SHU *Research Degree Procedures*². The D&S Research Student Administrator will send the report for review by the IAs prior to the candidate's Oral Assessment (see below)

Deadlines for First Submission of the Confirmation of EdD report (ED1)

1. Whilst a target date of 28 months (for part-time students) is highly recommended, the Confirmation of EdD report (ED1) can be submitted to the D&S Research Student Administrator up to an absolute maximum of 32 months from the candidate's registration start date for part-timers.
2. Candidates who do not submit by the absolute deadlines above will be referred. This means they will have just one assessment opportunity rather than the normal two.

3. What is required for the oral assessment on the EdD?

On their first assessment opportunity, all candidates are required to deliver a seminar presentation for their oral assessment.

The EdD team will make arrangements for Confirmation of EdD Symposia to be scheduled following the completion of module 4. These will provide an opportunity for candidates to present and defend their research in a conference presentation format. The presentation should normally run for around 30 minutes, with a further 15-20 minutes for extended questions and discussion. Each Symposium will be chaired by a Postgraduate Research Tutor (PGRT) and the audience will include two Independent Assessors (IAs) for each candidate. The candidate's Director of Studies (DoS) will be invited to nominate IAs, subject to the approval and advice of the appropriate PGRT/HoRD and taking note of the eligibility criteria in the SHU *Research Degree Procedures*³. The IAs will be invited to the Symposium by the D&S Research Student Administrator.

Candidates who:

- a) miss the deadline for the first assessment opportunity and are referred;
- OR
- b) are required to resubmit their application (with oral assessment) after first assessment;
- OR

² The criteria for the appointment of independent assessors are that they should: have a contract of employment with the university; be familiar with the candidate's discipline and/or proposed methodology but have no involvement in the candidate's supervision; have supervision experience at masters or doctoral level; be, or have a record of having been, research active. Assessors will be independent of the student, but not of one another.

³ The criteria for the appointment of independent assessors are that they should: have a contract of employment with the university; be familiar with the candidate's discipline and/or proposed methodology but have no involvement in the candidate's supervision; have supervision experience at masters or doctoral level; be, or have a record of having been, research active. Assessors will be independent of the student, but not of one another.

c) cannot attend the symposium because of extenuating circumstances;

may be offered an alternative form of oral assessment.

In any of these circumstances, please consult the appropriate PGRT for advice. The alternative assessment offered will normally be a research seminar of a similar format to that detailed above. This will be scheduled by the DoS, to take place after the submission of the written report and ED1 but normally NO LATER than 2 weeks after that submission.

The seminar will typically run for about 50 minutes and will involve the candidate presenting their proposal and being questioned on their research programme and their Confirmation of EdD report by their DoS, IAs and (optionally) Supervisor(s). The candidate's DoS will be invited to nominate IAs, subject to the approval and advice of the appropriate PGRT/HoRD and taking note of the eligibility criteria in the SHU *Research Degree Procedures*.

Whilst DoS and, optionally, supervisor(s) contribute to the oral presentation via their questioning, they are not formally involved in the subsequent assessment decision. This decision is made by a panel comprising at least one IA and an appropriate PGRT/HoRD.

Any feedback given to the candidate following the oral assessment is therefore informal and for guidance only. It should not be construed as definitive.

4. Assessment

How is confirmation of EdD assessed?

A candidate's performance against the standard assessment criteria (listed below) is assessed by a panel which is **independent of the supervisory team**. For a candidate's first assessment, the panel comprises at least one Independent Assessor (IA) and an appropriate Postgraduate Research Tutor (PGRT) or Head of Research Degrees (HoRD). Whilst supervisor(s) contribute to the evidence base via their ED1 progress report and their questioning during the oral assessment, they do not contribute directly to the completion of the ED1 panel assessment form.

The panel judges the quality of the candidate's written report and their performance in the oral assessment against the criteria listed below. In some cases, separate IAs may consider the written and oral components. Two IAs are always required for a second assessment and both are required to evaluate the written and oral elements of the submission. In all cases, the PGRT/HoRD provides a research-institute-wide perspective and moderates different candidates' assessments.

Assessment Criteria relevant to both the written and oral components:

- are ethics and health & safety issues being addressed appropriately?
- has the candidate satisfactorily completed the programme of related studies?
- has the candidate demonstrated an understanding of the current state of knowledge in the field as evidence by relevant literature?
- has the candidate demonstrated mastery of the methodologies appropriate to his/her research enquiry?

- has the candidate settled on a methodology or is he/she keeping their options open?
- is there evidence that progress has been made and some results obtained?
- is there clarity over the intended further work? Does the proposed time-line appear practicable?
- is there a clear indication of the original contribution to knowledge that will emerge from this project to make it a suitable basis for work at doctoral standard?
- is the quality of the academic/technical writing used in the candidate's report appropriate standard to complete the doctoral project?

Assessment Criteria particularly relevant to the oral component:

- has the candidate demonstrated an ability to defend his/her work, i.e. to confidently to critical questioning?
- are the candidate's language skills strong enough to a) complete a thesis and b) undertake a viva/presentation successfully in English?
- are there other presentation-skills issues that should be addressed?

Assessment Panel Outcomes

Candidates are entitled to two assessment opportunities for Confirmation of EdD unless the timescales for first submission were not met. Possible outcomes following first assessment are:

- a) approve Confirmation of EdD
- b) approve Confirmation of EdD with specific conditions
- c) significant development of written or oral component needed. Applicant required to re-submit for second assessment (i.e. **referral**)

These outcomes are formally noted at RDC and communicated to the candidate by Registry Services. However, to ensure timely communication, candidates who are required to meet conditions or to resubmit are also notified by e-mail from the D&S Research Student Administrator.

For outcome b) candidates should submit their response to conditions directly to the IA(s), copying in the relevant PGRT. IA(s) should inform the D&S Research Student Administrator using p.hibberd@shu.ac.uk when they judge that the conditions have been met. Deadline for meeting conditions is 2 months **from the date of the panel decision** for part-time students. Candidates who do not meet this deadline may be considered for referral by the HoRD.

For outcome c) the deadline for resubmission to the D&S Research Student Administrator is 6 months **from the date of the panel decision** for part-time students. Where referral is in relation to the written component, candidates should submit a revised 6,000 research proposal with a completed ED1 form. Where referral is also in relation to the oral component, the oral assessment model described above is followed again. If candidates fail to submit within the timescales for a referred assessment, they will not progress to full EdD study – see c) below.

Possible outcomes following second assessment (in the case of a referred application) are:

- a) approve Confirmation of EdD
- b) approve Confirmation of EdD with specific conditions
- c) **not approve** confirmation.

These outcomes will be formally noted at RDC and communicated to the candidate by Registry Services. However, to ensure timely communication, candidates who are required to meet conditions will also be notified by e-mail from the D&S Research Student Administrator.

For outcome b) candidates should submit their response to conditions directly to the IA(s), copying in the relevant PGRT. IA(s) should inform the D&S Research Student Administrator using p.hibberd@shu.ac.uk that the conditions have been met. Deadline for meeting conditions is 2 months **from the date of the panel decision** for part-time students. Candidates who do not meet this deadline may be considered for non-approval by the HoRD. For outcome c), candidates will be advised to submit for an MProf or, if appropriate, be counselled to withdraw or be withdrawn from study.

What should candidates or supervisors do if they have a query regarding the procedures described in this document?

All candidates and supervisors are encouraged to raise issues with the appropriate PGRT or HoRD at any time.

This guidance has been adapted from the 'Evidence to support a Request to Repeat an Assessment Attempt (RRAA) application' for Taught Students under the Extenuating Circumstances Policy

If your circumstances are having a detrimental impact on your ability to undertake an oral examination for a research degree award, you will need to make a case to the Chair of the University Research Degrees Committee in line with Regulation R9.3.

Your request needs to be accompanied with evidence to enable us to understand your situation fully. The evidence should confirm the circumstances that have affected you, confirm the start and end dates of when you have been affected, and be from an independent and authoritative third party.

Independent means that they are not personally connected with you in any way.

Authoritative means that they are a recognised expert for the evidence they are providing. All medical certificates or statements should be:

- written by appropriately qualified professionals who are independent to you;
- original, on headed paper and signed by the author;
- dated, to confirm that the date of the illness is around the dates of assessment;
- in English with any translation of supporting documentation undertaken by an authorised translator (which you will be required to organise and, if required, pay for).

Evidence Requirements:

The table below gives examples of the type of evidence the Chair of the Research Degrees Committee, in consultation with the examiners, would expect to see to support your request to postpone an oral examination. The examples of how these circumstances can be evidenced are illustrative and should not be read as exhaustive:

Bereavement of a family member/friend	<p>Purpose: to confirm the death. Should include the name of the deceased, and either the date of the death or the ceremony/service.</p> <p>Evidence: death certificate; order of service; letter from a minister of religion, medical practitioner⁴ or officer of the law; obituary notice; newspaper announcement.</p>
Ongoing impact from a	<p>Purpose: to support the impact of the bereavement.</p>

⁴ Medical practitioner can be a GP, specialist, or a registered professional in a psychiatric practice.

bereavement	<p><u>Evidence:</u> letter of confirmation from a relevant support organisation or network; letter from a medical practitioner¹ or accredited counsellor. This must contain your name.</p>
Hospital admission	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the date of admission, length of stay and nature of the treatment.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> an appointment or discharge letter from the hospital, outpatient's appointment or A&E attendance. This must contain your name.</p>
Worsening of an ongoing condition	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the exacerbation of the circumstances (not just the circumstances themselves).</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> letter from a medical practitioner¹. This must contain your name.</p>
Symptoms of an illness or condition awaiting a formal diagnosis	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the treatment attendance dates, when tests were undertaken and when a diagnosis is expected. Note: this should not solely be related to routine tests.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> letter from a medical practitioner¹. This must contain your name.</p>
Personal illness or impact of prescribed medication	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the dates when the illness affected the student and how.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> letter from a medical practitioner¹; doctor's notes; hospital letter; hospital appointment letter; image copy of prescription medication (date of prescription must be visible) and noted side effects. This must contain your name.</p> <p>To account for absence from an examination, you can submit a self-certification medical form (found on Shuspace) as evidence.</p>
Illness of a close family member/dependent or friend	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the dates and nature of the illness.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> letter from a medical practitioner¹; doctor's notes; hospital letter; hospital appointment letter; letter of confirmation from a relevant support organisation.</p>
Serious personal accident or injury of self or close family member/friend	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the date of the accident or injury.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> a copy of an accident report provided by a police officer, Magistrate or Magistrate's Clerk; a formal insurance claim; or a letter from a medical practitioner¹. This must contain the name of the person concerned.</p>
Significant adverse personal or family circumstances	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the circumstances being reported, time when they occurred and whether they are continuing.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> letter from one or more of the following: a medical practitioner¹, a social worker, a registered psychological therapist, a registered professional in a psychiatric practice, an officer of the law, a teacher outside of the University, a minister of religion.</p>

Impact of natural disaster (e.g. severe weather which prevents attendance or submission, major breakdown in transport system)	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the incidence in terms of its nature and severity.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> letter from the police or other authority (depending on the nature of the incidence); newspaper article; evidence of flight cancellations or local conditions with supplementary evidence to link the delays to the disaster.</p>
Serious personal disruption (e.g. victim of crime, court attendance, breakdown of a long term relationship, service with reserve forces)	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the events reported.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> letter of confirmation from a relevant organisation; solicitor's letter; letter from courts; divorce petition; written evidence from: the police (including, but not limited to, a crime reference number), counsellor, social worker, victim support, etc. This must contain your name.</p>
Evidence of a requirement for reasonable adjustments provided too late to be taken into account in the delivery or assessment of a module.	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the situation regarding a recently disclosed medical condition/disability.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> statement from a SHU Disability or Wellbeing Advisor.</p>
Personal participation in activities at a national/international level (e.g. sport, drama, art and design, writing)	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the requirement for the student to be available on specified dates.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> official correspondence from the relevant organisation.</p>
Work commitments for a part time student	<p><u>Purpose:</u> to confirm the unexpected and higher than usual workload for the student which has reduced the time available for study.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> letter from employer on company headed paper.</p>

Registry Services