

Senate

Paper Title	Academic Regulations and Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes: proposed changes for 2022-23
Outcome requested	Senate is asked to approve the proposed changes to the Academic Regulations Chapter 8 and the Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes for 2022-23 recommended by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board.
	Senate is asked to delegate to the Chair of the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board (RDPEB) the authority to approve any final minor revisions to the text of the Code of Practice. These would usually be editorial changes or factual corrections e.g updates to weblinks.
Points for members to	The attached paper summarises the proposed changes.
note and further information	The recommendations in this paper were considered by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board and the Education Quality and Standards Board on 18 May 2022.
Questions to consider	 The Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board recommendations of changes to the Academic Regulations Chapter 8 and the Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes for 2022-23 are set out in the attached paper (section references are to the following paper): (section 1) Roles of the Dean and Faculty Deputy Deans for Postgraduate Research; (section 2) Associate Research Students – authority to approve extension of duration of visit; (section 3) MB PhD and concurrent study on the MBBS; (section 4) Attendance in the UK for studies; (section 5) Appointment of FMD Honorary Contract holders as supervisors; (section 7) Second supervisor external to Queen Mary; (section 9) Transfer to writing-up status - Covid-19 mitigation; (section 10) Submission of thesis for examination; (section 12) Examination outcomes.
	The draft Code of Practice and Chapter 8 of the Academic Regulations are provided for information only as separate documents.

Regulatory/statutory reference points	 Queen Mary Strategy 2030 Queen Mary Academic Regulations Queen Mary Code of Practice for Research Degrees Programmes OfS regulations and policies.
Strategy and risk	Compliance with OfS regulations and policies.
Reporting/ consideration route for the paper	Draft proposals are considered by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board and the Education Quality and Standards Board (EQSB). Final recommendations are proposed by RDPEB to the Senate for approval.
Authors	Mary Childs Research Degrees Office
Sponsor	Dean for Postgraduate Research / Chair of the Research Degrees Programmes and Examination Board



Academic Regulations and Code of Practice for Research Degrees Programmes Recommended changes for 2022-23

Introduction

This paper summarises the proposed changes to the Academic Regulations and Code of Practice for 2022-23 for Research Degrees Programmes on the recommendation of the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board.

A separate paper proposes regulations for the new award of Master by Research (ResM).

Key:

Regulations – the Academic Regulations for Research Degree Programmes Code – the Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes Board / RDPEB – the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board RDO – Research Degrees Office

Paragraph references in the Code of Practice for Research Degrees Programmes and regulations in the Academic Regulations refer to the 2021-22 editions.

Summary of changes recommended for 2022-23

1. Roles of the Dean and Faculty Deputy Deans for Postgraduate Research, and DGSs

(PGR Code, paras. 9 & 10)

It is planned to include role descriptions for the Dean for Postgraduate Research, the Faculty Deputy Deans for Postgraduate Research and departmental Directors of Graduate Studies as annexes to the PGR Code if these are finalised and approved before 1 August.

2. Associate Research Students – authority to approve extension of duration of visit

(Regs 8.13, delegation 2.128 to be changed to 8.13)

An associate research student enrols with Queen Mary normally for a period of up to six months and a maximum of 12 months. The student is normally required to terminate their studies at the end of the period of registration as an associate

student.

The delegation from Senate states that "Authority to extend the enrolment of an associate research student beyond 12-months is delegated to the Deputy Dean for Research (Research Degrees) on the advice of the Director of Graduate Studies. Requests will be raised through the admissions process or on the request of a school/institute."

The Board recommends that the delegated authority is changed to departmental Directors of Graduate Studies as DGSs are best placed to assess the availability of school/institute research resources and the impact, if any, of extending an associate student's study visit.

3. MB PhD and concurrent study

(Regs 2.48 and 2.49)

A change to Regulation 2.49 is required to permit MBBS students to intercalate their studies to study for the new MB PhD being introduced in 2022-23.

2.48 A person cannot simultaneously be registered for a programme of study at Queen Mary and another programme of study (at Queen Mary or elsewhere) without the express permission of the Senate, or its delegated authority (the Head of Admissions, or nominee).

2.49 Intercalated medical and dental programmes are an exception to the rule on concurrent study. A student remains registered on their primary programme while undertaking the intercalated programme. There must be no overlap between the intercalated programme and the subsequent year of the primary programme unless the intercalation period is for a <u>one-year masters-postgraduate</u> programme.

4. Attendance in the UK for studies

(PGR Code, para.34)

It is implied in the Code and the Regulations that all research students should be resident in the UK as Queen Mary does not currently offer distance learning doctoral degrees. This is to be made clearer. It is proposed that a new clause, used in the PGR studentship funding terms and conditions for 2022-23, should be included in the Code after para. 34 in the section on "Attendance".

The guidance is based on UKRI requirements for their funded students at <u>https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/UKRI-050422-</u> <u>TrainingGrantTermsConditionsGuidance-Apr2022.pdf</u>

Students must be resident in the UK for the majority of their studies. This will enable students to attend regular supervision meetings in person with their supervisory team, attend doctoral training and research activities as required by their School/Institute, and to use the research facilities provided by Queen Mary. This will ensure that the student receives the support, mentoring, training and access to facilities required to complete their research successfully. The only exceptions to these requirements are to cover periods of absence that are an essential part of their study e.g. fieldwork, study visits or conference attendance.

Regulation 8.46 provides that students may exceptionally be permitted to undertake the majority of their studies at a research organisation external to Queen Mary as part of a formal agreement or contract with joint supervision provided by staff at Queen Mary and the partner research organisation.

5. Appointment of FMD Honorary Contract holders as supervisors (PGR Code, para.42)

RDPEB recommends a clarification of the requirements for Barts NHS Trust staff holding an honorary contract at Queen Mary to be a primary supervisor for a research student as this is not addressed specifically in the Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes. This text will be included in the Code in the section concerning supervisors after para. 42:

Barts NHS Trust staff who hold a current honorary contract with Queen Mary at the level of Senior Lecturer, Reader or Professor, and who meet the other supervisor requirements set out in section [X] of the Code, may act as a primary or secondary supervisor subject to approval by the institute Director of Graduate Studies or the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Deputy Dean for Postgraduate Research. A primary supervisor who holds an honorary Queen Mary contract must be partnered with a second supervisor who is a member of Queen Mary staff (not an honorary contract holder) and who meets all the supervisor requirements in this Code.

6. Research Integrity Training for research students

(PGR Code, para.60 and new para. 103)

Online training in research integrity is being developed for research students for introduction in 2022-23. New research students enrolling in 2022-23 will be required to complete the course and to report this as part of their first year progression review. The training will be made available to all other research students but will only be mandatory for new students enrolled with effect from 1 August 2022.

Revised text para 60.

The requirements for progression are set by each School/Institute. These should usually include the submission of written work by the student, a training needs analysis review using the Skills Assessment and Personal Development Plan (https://www.qmul.ac.uk/queenmaryacademy/researcherdevelopment/resourcesframeworks--surveys/phd-students/personaldevelopment-plan/) jointly prepared by the student and their supervisory team, completion of online training in research integrity to be introduced in 2022-23, a written report by the primary supervisor and/or supervisory team, and an oral examination. Other requirements for certain programmes may be specified in School/Institute guidance. Progression decisions are made by the Director of Graduate Studies following a report on the student's progress and recorded on MySIS.

New para. 103

Online training in research integrity is being developed for research students for introduction in 2022-23. New research students enrolling in 2022-23 will be required to complete the course when it becomes available and to report this as part of their first year progression review. The training will be made available to all other research students and students are strongly encouraged to complete the training. However, it will only be mandatory for new students enrolled with effect from 1 August 2022.

7. Second supervisor external to Queen Mary

(PGR Code, paras.42-43)

The Code sets out the membership of a research student's supervision team in para.42 below.

42. Each supervisory team must normally include at least two members of academic staff from Queen Mary, of which either the primary or secondary supervisor or both must be research-active. The primary and second supervisors' contract periods will normally extend to cover at least the expected duration of the student's research programme. Additional members of the supervisory team can include members of post-doctoral research staff, industrial partners or other external collaborators. The division of roles and responsibilities between members of the supervisory team will be clearly set out and agreed with the student at the start of the research programme, and when any changes are made to the team.

RDPEB recommends to make provision for arrangements where the second supervisor may be external to Queen Mary as part of a collaborative doctoral training or research agreement as follows:

Insert after para. 43

The second supervisor may be appointed from the members of research active staff at another UK University or Research Institute if this is specifically required by the studentship funding scheme or other collaborative agreement between Queen Mary and the research organisation. External second supervisors must be able to provide evidence that they have completed PhD supervisor training and meet the supervisor criteria required within their own institution, and agree to follow Queen Mary policies. In these instances another Queen Mary member of staff, who meets the supervisor requirements, must be appointed as an additional supervisor. Supervisory arrangements where an external second supervisor is proposed must be approved by the School/Institute DGS.

8. Chair of Annual Progression Review Panel

The annual review of academic progression is a formal process that permits a student to continue to the next stage/period of their research studies programme. The Board has decided to introduce guidance on the criteria for the appointment of the chair of an annual progression review panel. The Board considered that the panel chair should have direct experience as a primary supervisor of the operation of a panel for one of their supervisees, the requirements of progression in their academic department, and the relevant Regulations and guidance about progression.

The Board recommends that this sentence is added to Regulation 8.64 and para.61 of the Code of Practice concerning academic progression:

<u>The Chair of the panel should have experience of being a Queen Mary primary</u> <u>supervisor who has taken their student successfully through one annual</u> <u>progression review event.</u>

9. Requirements for transfer to writing-up status - Covid-19 mitigation (PGR Code paras. 65-66)

The Regulations state that

"8.20 A student may transfer to 'writing up' status with the approval of Senate or its delegated authority provided that they have completed the minimum registration period and not exceeded the maximum registration period. In order to transfer to writing up status, a student is normally required to have completed all experimental work or collection of material related to their thesis, to have passed annual progression in the second year of study (fourth year of study for part-time students) and, in the judgement of the primary supervisor, be in a position to submit the thesis within 12 months."

The Research Degrees Board agreed in May 2021 a Covid-19 mitigation for research students giving Schools and Institutes the flexibility to waive the above requirement in bold so that students may continue some experimental work or collection of material once transferred to writing-up status with the agreement of their supervisor and DGS. Students who have received funded and unfunded extensions due to the impact of Covid-19 on research studies have been advised that the additional time will be added to their programme end date and thesis submission deadline, and that they should apply to transfer to writing-up status at the normal time.

RDPEB agreed to review this mitigation every year while the Covid-19 pandemic continues to impact research student studies and the final thesis.

RDPEB recommends the continuation of this mitigation in 2022-23. The footnote in the Code reads (year references updated for new edition): In the academic year 2022-23 Schools and Institutes have the flexibility to waive the requirement that a student must have completed all experimental work or collection of material related to their thesis before applying to transfer to writing-up status where the delay in research progress has been due to the impact of Covid-19 on a student's research studies. Students should discuss the progress of their research studies with their supervisor and make an assessment of the outstanding experimental work or collection of material and timetable for completing the thesis before making an application. This policy will be reviewed in 2022-23 for the 2023-24 academic year

10. Submission of thesis for examination

(Regulation 8.81)

RDPEB recommends that the formal requirements for thesis submission are changed from two printed bound copies of the thesis to submission of an electronic copy to the Research Degrees Office. This would adopt the changes made due to Covid-19 online working. This has worked well and the RDO has received very few requests for printed copies of the thesis from examiners since the end of the Covid lockdown periods.

The revised Regulation would read:

8.81 A student is required to submit their thesis in a form that meets the requirements for a thesis. A student is required to submit <u>two printed copies_an</u> <u>electronic_copy</u> of their thesis <u>to the Research Degrees Office</u> in the approved format <u>and (a digital (PDF) file) which is an exact electronic copy of the submitted thesis. A third copy of the thesis may be required where a third examiner is <u>appointed</u>.</u>

11. The oral examination

(Regulation 8.91)

RDPEB recommends that the formal requirements for in person attendance of the candidate and examiners at the viva are changed to adopt as policy the more flexible approach to online vivas introduced due to Covid-19 online working.

The revised Regulation would read:

8.91 The examination process is held in private, and is not a public examination. Normally, t<u>The candidate must be consulted on their preference for the format of</u> the examination, and the candidate and the examiners must agree whether to hold the viva in person or remotely. The oral examination may be:

<u>i.</u> is held at Queen Mary with the candidate and both the examiners present in person;

ii. - held by video-link with the candidate and the examiners attending remotely; or

<u>iii. organised as mixed mode of attendance i</u>If agreed by the candidate. <u>Either the</u> <u>candidate or one of the examiners may attend the examination by video-link.</u>, <u>Senate or its delegated authority may under exceptional circumstances permit</u> <u>one of the examiners to attend the examination by video-link.</u> In such cases an independent chair <u>if required or viva convenor</u> must be appointed in attendance with those attending in person for the duration of the examination.

-8.92 If requested by the candidate, Senate or its delegated authority may under exceptional circumstances permit the candidate to attend the examination by video link. Both examiners must be present in person at Queen Mary. The candidate must attend the examination from an approved location in a recognised University or other approved body, such as the British Council, and a member of that organisation's academic or professional staff must act as invigilator and be present in the room with the candidate for the duration of the examination.

12. Examination outcomes - time permitted for amendments to the thesis

(a) Minor amendments to the thesis

In 2021 RDPEB amended Reg. 8.102 (ii) concerning the time permitted for minor amendments, to extend this from 3 months to up to 6 months as follows:

if the thesis otherwise fulfils the criteria but requires minor amendments and if the candidate satisfies the examiners in all other parts of the examination, the examiners may require the candidate to make minor amendments as specified by them in full and in writing, in or with their joint report, **normally within three months, but up to six months may be allowed at the student's request.**

In practice this is being applied as a six month deadline and therefore RDPEB is *asked to approve* the proposed change to refer to six months only:

..... the examiners may require the candidate to make minor amendments as specified by them in full and in writing, in or with their joint report, normally within three months, but up to six months may be allowed at the student's request:

(b) Major amendments to the thesis

In light of the above proposed change to the period for minor amendments, RDPEB *is asked to approve* that the time permitted to make major amendments should be changed from "six to nine months, as specified by the examiners" to "within 9 months". 8.102 (iii) if the thesis otherwise fulfils the criteria but requires major amendments and if the candidate satisfies the examiners in all other parts of the examination, the examiners may require the candidate to make major amendments as specified by them in full and in writing, in or with their joint report, within six or nine months (as specified by the examiners). The amended thesis shall be submitted to both the examiners for confirmation that the amendments are satisfactory;

These changes also apply to Regs. 8.104 (ii) and (iii), the outcomes for DrPS, DPsych and DClinDent.

Professor Tim Warner Dean for Postgraduate Research Chair of the Research Degrees Programmes and Examination Board

Mary Childs Research Degrees Office 06.06.22