National Doctor of Education (EdD) Wales Regulations

February 2024

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This document sets out the regulatory framework for the National Doctor of Education [EdD] (Wales), governed by the partnership of the following Universities:

    Aberystwyth University
    Bangor University
    Cardiff Metropolitan University
    University of South Wales
    University of Wales Trinity Saint David
    Wrexham University

1.2 This document seeks to reflect nationally recognised good practice as stated in the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education and other relevant policies and codes of practice (aligned with FHEQ and CQFW) issued by the UK higher education funding councils and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI).

1.3 These regulations were designed to be applied to the National Doctorate of Education (EdD) Wales (hereafter termed 'the EdD'). They were produced as the result of the cooperation of six Welsh Universities, who have agreed these regulations to ensure equitability and parity of academic experience across the institutions. There is reference to and a requirement that students of the programme understand these regulations. Students should however note that the character and evolution of the individual Institution may mean that there are subtle differences in approach to doctoral supervision and support. In addition, the individual institutions doctoral regulations may differ; both between the institutions and from these regulations. Examples where the differences are most apparent will be in the approaches to the supervision, monitoring students' progression and IT and record systems used to support and track the progress of doctoral candidates. Please ensure that you collaborate with your supervisory team to ensure that an appreciation of the application of the National Regs and the Institutional regulation as part of your road to doctoral success.

1.4 The EdD Quality Assurance group have gone as far as possible to unify the regulations. Please familiarise yourself with these regulations and those of your respective Institution. Carefully follow the guidance provided in the Programme Handbook. Where the difference may be most apparent or the there is a need to signpost to the specifics of the institution; reference will be made to '… or the equivalent …' in the text.

1.5 These regulations are subject to annual review via the National Management Board, members of which will report the outcomes of the review to the relevant University's Research Degrees Group (RDG) or equivalent. A list of amendments made at each annual review will be made available alongside these regulations. EdD students will normally be subject to the version of these regulations which was extant at the time of their initial enrolment. However, when changes are made to these regulations, students will be informed of the changes and invited to be subject to new regulations.

1.6 In addition to the annual review, these regulations are subject to periodic review, as part of each partner University's quality assurance systems. Such review aims to ensure that standards are comparable with those in place across the UK HE sector and consistent with QAA requirements; and to ensure that the quality of provision provides students with a fair and reasonable expectation to achieve their award within an acceptable timeframe.

1.7 Under these regulations, the EdD may be awarded in recognition of the successful completion of the Taught Phase (*i.e.*, Phase 1) and the Independent Research Phase (*i.e.*, Phase 2). The results of this completion are judged to constitute the systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of the chosen area of study within the recognised academic discipline, the creation and generation of new knowledge, through original research that is deemed by examiners to be at the forefront of the practice and academic discipline, merits publication and/or results in changes to working practices within an organisation or profession, adds value to the chosen field of study and the critical reflection in relation to the work completed and provision of a scholarly contribution that is recognised at level 8, and is a significant piece of coherent, empirically based scholarly work. The degree of Doctor of Education (EdD) may not be conferred as an honorary degree.

1.8 Students should ensure they are familiar with the contents of this document, and any other Programme related literature (*e.g.*, the Programme Handbook). They should also ensure familiarity with the Code of Practice for all research degree programmes within the partner University where they are studying.

1.9 All teaching and learning documents are available on the Education Workforce Council (EWC) Professional Learning Passport (PLP) platform.

2. ADMISSION, MODE OF STUDY, AND ENROLMENT

2.1 Applicants will apply and enrol for the EdD at one of the partner Universities identified in paragraph 1.1. Consequently, the term 'the University' will be adopted for the remainder of this Regulatory document, to represent the Partner University governing the applicant's period of study on the EdD

2.2 An applicant must enrol as a part-time student.

2.3 The minimum entry requirement for the EdD is a Master's (Level 7) award in Education or related discipline which must comprise at least a 20 credits research methods module. Applicants are required to provide evidence of this Masters qualification as part of the application process. Applicants who have successfully completed the National MA Education (Wales) will progress onto to Phase 1 of the National EdD programme with 120 Level 7 taught credits being imported (or transferred/exempted) to the EdD degree. In order to evidence academic currency, the National MA award must be imported into the National Doctor of Education (EdD) Wales within five years of being awarded the MA. Students who have completed any other equivalent master's degree can apply to import 120 credits of Level 7 taught credits to the EdD degree via RPL process.

2.4 In addition to the above entry requirements, applicants must be capable of satisfying the University that they have applied to regarding their proficiency in the English or Welsh language (whichever they have chosen to pursue the award in) at a level necessary to complete the programme of work and to prepare and defend a thesis in that language.

2.5 In order to establish proficiency in the English language, overseas applicants whose first language is not English will normally be required to provide evidence of a minimum IELTS score (or equivalent) of 6.5 at application with a minimum of 6.5 in the reading and written components, or of a Master's Level qualification, gained through the medium of English from a recognised institution. Students will be required to provide such evidence as part of the admissions process.

2.6 Once in receipt of an offer letter from the University, applicants are required to confirm acceptance of the offer and to subsequently enrol via the University's online enrolment system.

2.7 The enrolment point will be January of each academic year.

2.8 Applicants will be advised of the Programme fees during the application process. All applicable fees must be paid upon enrolment, or the applicant will be subject to the University's Debtor Policy.

3. PROGRAMME STRUCTURE

3.1 An enrolled student will follow a taught phase of study (*i.e.*, Phase 1; 60 credits), together with a programme of applied research (*i.e.*, Phase 2; 360 credits) for the duration prescribed in paragraph 6.1, and, subsequently, will be required to present themselves for an examination of a thesis.

4. APPOINTMENT OF SUPERVISORS, AND INDEPENDENT PROGRESSION ADVISOR

4.1 Each student will have at least two supervisors and a maximum of three, with any proposal for additional supervisors to be presented to the University's Research Degrees Group (RDG) (or institution equivalent) for review. One of the supervisors will be appointed as a Director of Studies (DoS) and will have overall responsibility for the development and work of the student, the work of the supervisory team, and for the progression and exam arrangements. Alternatively, a team of two supervisors will be supported by a Supervisory Team Coordinator (STC) who will have responsibility for mentoring the supervisory team in their specific responsibilities. To be approved as part of the team, all supervisors must appear on the University's List of Approved Supervisors and the proposed DoS or STC must appear on the RDG List of Approved DoSs/STCs.

4.2 A DoS/STC must be a member of the University's academic staff with a contract equivalent to at least 0.2 of a full-time position.

4.3 Each student will also be assigned an Independent Progression Advisor (IPA) (or institution equivalent) who will be part of the review process for student at all progression points, from and including the six-month progression point. Specifically, the role of the IPA (or institution equivalent) will be to determine whether there is evidence of adequate progress, whether the student is engaging in appropriate skills development, whether there is an adequate plan for on-time completion of the thesis, and whether there are adequate resources available to the student to support timely completion.

5. SUPERVISORY TEAM MEETINGS

5.1 Each student is expected to keep in regular contact with their supervisory team, with at least six formal meetings per academic year (including the progression reviews), that must be face-to-face (either in person or remotely). Remaining meetings can also be remote using a secure communications platform, advocated by the University.

5.2 Should concerns be raised by the supervisory team, the student and/or the University's RDG (or equivalent) about the progress of the student, the University's RDG can insist on more regular meetings to be scheduled. Failure to adhere to the frequency of meetings directed by the University's RDG may result in the student being withdrawn from their studies.

5.3 All supervisory team meetings are the responsibility of the student to arrange and should ideally include all supervisory team members. All supervisory team meetings, except the progress reviews, must be recorded through the appropriate doctoral platform/system. E.g. *what was discussed; what the agreed actions for the supervisee are by the next meeting; what the agreed actions for the supervisors are by the next meeting; and when the next meeting will take place*.

5.4 Students are recommended to organise their supervisory team meetings with an agenda. The following may act as a guide of what could be covered: 1) *review of current progress against objectives set in previous meeting (and any current or future concerns affecting performance);* 2) *key discussion point(s) of the meeting;* 3) *set targets to be achieved by next meeting;* 4) *professional development/training;* 5) *Student well-being;* and, 6) *key administration requirements (e.g., preparation for next formal progress review)*.

5.5 Failure to record these meetings on an *appropriate doctoral platform/system* will result in progress being denied and the candidature being withdrawn at the next progress review, due to an evidenced lack of engagement.

5.6 From the start of the second academic year onwards (*i.e.*, from the start of month 13), should a student fail to record any formal meetings on the a*ppropriate doctoral platform/system* over a six-month period, the DoS will be sent an email through the a*ppropriate doctoral platform/system* to complete a brief review of the student's progress. If little progress has been confirmed by the DoS, or the student has been reported to have not been in communication with the supervisory team over that period, then the School's Graduate Studies Lead (or equivalent) will write formally to the student to request an update in relation to the objectives set at the previous milestone within a one-month timeline (from the date the letter is received). No response to this formal approach will result in the student being withdrawn.

5.7 A member of the supervisory team may also upload comments about the progress of their student outside of the Progression Review process, through the Supervisor Meeting Record on the appropriate doctoral platform/system. These comments must be reviewed and commented upon and/or approved by the student within an appropriate timeframe (see institution guidelines) the supervisor uploading the comments.

6. PERIODS OF STUDY, STUDY BREAK/INTERUPTION OF STUDIES, AND MITIGATION

6.1 The maximum candidature for the EdD is six years, with a minimum candidature of four years.

6.2 The expectation is for students to submit their thesis one year prior to the end of candidature.

6.3 **Study Breaks/interruption of studies.** In instances where a student's progress has been, or is likely to be, impeded thereby preventing satisfactory progress, they may apply for a break in their period of study (*i.e*., a Study Break/interruption of studies). Study Break/interruption of studies requests will be made by the student and their supervisory team through the relevant function on the appropriate doctoral platform/system to the University's RDG (or equivalent) and will be supported by appropriate independent documentary evidence. All applications will be reported to the National Management Board.

6.4 A formal Study Break/interruption of studies period may not exceed twelve months, unless the proposed Study Break/interruption of studies includes a retrospective period. During the Study Break/interruption of studies period, students will not have access to any University staff or resources.

6.5 ***Mitigating Circumstances (Taught Phase [Phase 1] only).*** Mitigating Circumstances, often called Exceptional Circumstances, are significant changes in the student's circumstances during their studies, which are acute, unexpected, and outside the control of the student, for example, a short illness, family emergency, an accident. A student may apply if they believe such circumstances will adversely affect their ability to engage with their studies to the extent that they may be unable to complete work to a high standard by the required deadline.

6.6 If granted mitigation, the student will be given an extended deadline, and they will continue to have access to university staff and resources.

6.7 Longer-term or ongoing difficulties which are likely to prevent the student from engaging with their studies for a period of weeks or months will likely require a student to apply for a Study Break/interruption of studies (see paragraphs 6.3 to 6.4).

6.8 All applications for mitigation must be made by the student and their supervisory team through the Relevant function on *the appropriate doctoral platform/system* to the University's RDG (or equivalent) and will be supported by appropriate independent documentary evidence.

6.9 ***Resumption of Studies.*** When a study break/interruption of studies period ends, students will be reminded of their resumption of studies through an email generated from *the* appropriate doctoral platform/system two weeks prior to the end of the Study Break/interruption of studies date. If a student wishes to extend the candidature period, they (or a supervisory team member) must apply

for this extension through the *Relevant function* on the appropriate doctoral platform/system prior to the end of the initial study break/interruption of studies period.

6.10 As students in a Study Break/interruption of study period have access to their student account revoked; the process for resumption is outlined in the regulations of the individual institution.

6.11 Maximum periods of candidature listed in 6.1 above do not include periods of Study Break/interruption of studies but do include periods where mitigation has been approved. Any approved Study Break/interruption of studies period will be added to the maximum candidature period upon resumption of studies.

6.12 Maximum periods of candidature may only be exceeded in exceptional circumstances and following formal approval through an Extension Request application reviewed at the University's RDG (or equivalent). Applications to extend candidature will normally be made by the DoS (or Lead Supervisor) in conjunction with the student and other members of the supervisory team through the Change Request option on the appropriate doctoral platform/system.

6.13 Should a student fail to submit their thesis without any approved Study Break/interruption of studies or mitigation by the end of their maximum candidature length, the student will be confirmed as exited from the programme without completion and informed via email and letter.

7. PROGRESSION REVIEWS

7.1 All students must fulfil the requirements of each Progression Review within the specified time period to progress and continue to be enrolled on the relevant programme of study. The individual institution will detail the process of progression within their regulations.

7.2 **Students with a Study Break/interruption of studies or Mitigation.** For a student who has had an approved Study Break/interruption of studies or mitigation period over a Progression Review month, the student will be required to meet with their supervisory team and IPA as soon as possible, on return. The expectation would be that the objectives set in the previous Progression Review are amended in proportion to the length of the Study Break/interruption of studies.

7.3 If the Study Break/interruption of studies does not occur during a 'Progress Month', then the student should still complete the Progression Review during that month but focus on the work completed over the period of time that they were actively studying. It is, therefore, expected that the students would not have addressed all the objectives set in the Progression Review meeting.

7.4 **Assessing each attempt.** At each Progression Review, each student will be assessed against the completion of specified requirements for the Milestone being completed, the quality of the work completed against level 8 doctoral criteria, and their progress from the previous Progression Review.

7.5 A student may appeal against the decision of the University's RDG (or equivalent) in accordance with that University's Appeals Procedure for Research Degrees.

7.6 The Commencement of Phase 2 of Study

7.6.1   All students will be required to meet formally with supervisory team members <u>one-month post re-enrolment/registration for phase 2</u>, either face-to-face or remotely through Microsoft Teams/Zoom, to discuss with them, and confirm, the potential objective(s) for the next five months and assess training needs to support the achievement of the identified objective(s).

7.6.2   After the meeting, the student <u>must</u> record the objective(s) and training needs on an appropriate doctoral platform/system.

7.6.3   **Failure to complete the first attempt.** Students and the supervisory team will be sent an email reminder of this requirement via an appropriate doctoral platform/system two weeks prior to the deadline. Failure to complete the meeting, presentation and record the relevant information on an a*ppropriate doctoral platform/system* without mitigation by the given deadline will result in the student being sent a first warning (via the a*ppropriate doctoral platform/system*) to complete the requirements within a further two-week period.

7.6.4   **Failure to complete the second attempt.** Failure to complete the requirements within the further two-week period without mitigation (including the uploading of relevant information to the a*ppropriate doctoral platform/system*) will result in the student being sent a final warning (via *Appropriate doctoral platform/system*) to complete the requirements within a final two-week period.

7.6.5   **Failure to complete the third and final attempt.** Failure to complete the requirements within the final two-week period without mitigation will result in the student being withdrawn from the programme.

7.7 Phase 2, Month 6: The first Progression Review

7.7.1   All students will be required to meet formally with supervisory team members six months post enrolment, either face-to-face or remotely through Microsoft Teams/Zoom, to present to them, and then discuss, the following:

(i)   Their work against the objectives set during the commencement meeting;

(ii)   The development of a programme of work towards addressing level 8 criteria;

(iii)   The potential objective(s) for the remainder of the programme and those that will be addressed in the next six months;

(iv)   A justified and detailed plan of work to address the objectives, with deadlines provided against each identified step;

(v)   The training requirements to support appropriate progress;

(vi)   Ethical considerations, mitigations, and a deadline for ethical approval application.

7.7.2   After the meeting, the students <u>must</u> record all the presented and agreed upon detail in the relevant sections on the appropriate doctoral platform/system.

7.8 Phase 2, Month 12: First Annual Progression Review

7.8.1   All students will be required to meet formally with supervisory team members on the first anniversary of enrolment, either face-to-face or remotely through Microsoft Teams/Zoom, to present to them, and then discuss, the following:

> i.   A review of their work against the objectives set during the 'Month 6' Progression Review;
>
> ii. A brief critique of development of programme of work towards addressing level 8 criteria;
>
> iii. The justification for potential objective(s) for the remainder of the programme and those that will be addressed in the next 12 months;
>
> iv. A justified and detailed plan of work to address the objectives, with deadlines provided against each identified step;
>
> v.   The training requirements to support appropriate progress;
>
> vi. Ethical considerations, mitigations, and a deadline for ethical approval application.

7.8.2   After the meeting, the student <u>must</u> record all the presented and agreed upon detail in the relevant sections on *an appropriate doctoral platform/system.*

7.9 Phase 2, Months 24, and 36, 48, 60 and 72: Annual Progression Reviews

7.9.1   All students will be required to meet formally with supervisory team members on each anniversary of their enrolment, either face-to-face or remotely through Microsoft Teams/Zoom, to present to them, and then discuss, the following:

> (i)   A review of their work against the objectives set at the previous Progression Review;
>
> (ii) A brief critique of the development of their programme of work towards addressing level 8 criteria;
>
> (iii) The justification for potential objective(s) for the remainder of the programme and those that will be addressed in the next 12 months;
>
> (iv) A justified and detailed plan of work to address the objectives, with deadlines provided against each identified step;
>
> (v)   The training requirements to support appropriate progress;
>
> (vi) Any ethical considerations that may still be pending, mitigations and a deadline for ethical approval application.

7.9.2   After the meeting, the student must record all the presented and agreed upon detail in the relevant sections on the appropriate doctoral platform/system.

8 ETHICS APPROVAL

8.1 All research projects conducted by EdD students will require ethics approval before any work on those projects can be commenced. Ethics approval must, therefore, be discussed with the supervisory team on a regular basis to ensure that applications for ethics approval are part of the planning process. All relevant forms and guidance are available on the University's Research Ethics page.

8.2 Applications for ethics approval of a research project are considered by the Ethics Committee of the University (or equivalent) where the applicant is based.   Specific queries regarding the ethics approval process should, therefore, be directed to the appropriate University contact in the first instance.

9 ASSESSMENT: TAUGHT PHASE (PHASE 1)

9.1 The assessment of the programme of directed study within the taught phase will comprise assessment of an advanced character, as described in the Programme Handbook and Module Guide.

9.2 The pass mark for the taught phase submission will be 50%, which must be passed.

9.3 Assessment outcomes for all students will be presented at Examining Boards scheduled near the end of the academic year.

9.4 Students will have a maximum of two re-assessment attempts. It is expected that the student will undergo formative assessment procedures with the supervision team to ensure the assessment product is of the appropriate standard (against the assessment criteria) prior to assessment submission. For each re-assessment, the student will have two months from the point of receiving feedback to resubmit. This time period may change if an application for a Study Break/interruption of studies or Mitigation is approved.

9.5 If the student does not progress to phase 2, a transcript of performance will be awarded acknowledging the achievement of the 60 credit taught module. No other exit award is attached to the EdD.

9.6 As a bilingual programme, the normal expectation is that the assessment will be presented in the same language in which the programme or modules are delivered.

10 ASSESSMENTS: INDEPENDENT RESEARCH PHASE (PHASE 2)

10.1 The programme shall be completed by the presentation of a thesis and Research Plan

10.2 The thesis will be assessed via a *viva voce* within a formal exam board. In order to qualify for the National Ed Wales, the student must successfully defend the work during the *viva voce*, with the exam board then recommending approval of the award to the University's RDG (or equivalent).

10.3 A candidature shall lapse if the thesis is not submitted, in the form and manner prescribed by regulation, within six years of the date of initial enrolment, unless the student has had a requested Study Break/interruption of studies approved. In these cases, time will be added to the candidature, equivalent to the time approved for Study Break/interruption of studies. Given the nature of the programme, it is expected that parts of the programme will be conducted externally to the University. In such cases, the provisions of the Research Degrees Code of Practice shall still apply.

10.4 The student shall sign a declaration to certify that the work submitted has not been accepted in substance for any other degree or award and is not being submitted concurrently in candidature for any other degree or award. The signed declaration shall be included in all copies of the works submitted for examination.

10.5 Every student's research shall be completed by the presentation of a thesis, the form of which should be agreed with the supervisory team.

10.6 As a bilingual programme, the normal expectation is that the assessment will be presented in the same language in which the programme or modules are delivered.

11 PROPOSING EXAMINATION BOARDS

11.1 **Eight months before** a student intends to submit their thesis, the supervisory team must start to discuss their examination arrangements with the student. The Director of Studies (DoS) being tasked with contacting the potential examination board panel members on the student's behalf. Guidance can be found in the respective University internal portal. Factors such as conflicts of interest and partner specific requirements regarding panel membership should be taken into account in nominating a panel.

11.2 **Six months before** a student intends to submit their final thesis, the student's DoS must submit those examination arrangements for review and approval, to allow time for them to be approved and for examination arrangements to then be expedited on submission *or* where arrangements are not approved, for appropriate replacements to be considered.

11.3 The composition of the Examination Board will be determined by the nature of the student's relationship with the University. Where the student is either not employed by the University or holds an HPL contract for six hours or less per week (averaged across the academic year), their Examination Board will consist of a chair, one internal examiner, and one external examiner. Where the student holds an employment contract with the University, including an HPL contract for more than six hours per week (averaged across the academic year), their Examination Board will consist of a chair and two external examiners.

11.4 Should it not be possible to appoint an internal examiner, a second external examiner may be appointed.

11.5 In all instances, the chair will be a member of staff of the University who has undertaken the appropriate University's Chair's Training, and who is normally from the same School (or equivalent) as the student. The chair will be reviewed and approved by the University's RDG (or equivalent).

11.6 One supervisor can also be proposed to be present at the examination, with this requirement being presented at this proposal stage.

11.7 When proposing each examiner (not chair) on Appropriate doctoral platform/system, a brief, but sufficient, narrative on why each examiner is suitable is required. In addition, a short CV to complement this narrative, and a completed and signed declaration form are also needed. Guidance can be found in the University's internal portal.

11.8 The University's RDG (or equivalent) will approve the appointment of an examiner only in instances where it is satisfied that they are sufficiently familiar with the nature and purpose of the degree for which the student is being examined and that they possess sufficient knowledge and expertise in the subject area of the research project. Any rejected Proposed Exam Board application (or equivalent) will usually be resolved within four weeks of receipt of outcome.

11.9 **Students must not submit their thesis until their examination arrangements have been approved** - unless they are approaching the end of their candidature. If they are approaching the end of candidature date, then students should submit or request an extension to study. Please note that the *viva voce* process **WILL NOT** progress until the examination arrangements are approved.

12 PRESENTATION AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS

12.1 Full details of the requirements of the University regarding the presentation of a thesis are provided in the Student Handbook.

12.2 The submission, including footnotes, must not exceed 60,000 words. The word count would not include Tables, Figures, reference list, and appendices. Students who submit a thesis which is longer will have their submission returned to them to address the word count – with a deadline of two months provided to address the word count. Failure to achieve this new deadline without mitigation will result in the student exiting without an award.

12.3 In all cases, the thesis must contain an abstract not exceeding 300 words and a Declaration Form (which can be found in the University's internal portal), signed by the student which includes:

(i)   a statement showing to what extent the work submitted is the result of the student's own investigation.

(ii)   a declaration certifying that the work has not already been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any other degree.

(iii)   a declaration of which work/chapter(s) that is included in the thesis that has been through a peer review process and published in a recognised journal outlet.

(iv)   a statement regarding the availability of the thesis.

12.4 A submitted thesis will be made openly available and will not normally be subject to any security or restriction of access. In cases where this is not appropriate, a student's Director of Studies will make an application to the University RDG (or equivalent) to prohibit copying and/or access to the thesis for a specified period. Such applications should be made as soon as any issues relating to confidentiality arise. In such cases the title and summary of the thesis will normally be made freely available.

12.5 Students are required to submit an electronic copy of the thesis and any additional material via an Appropriate doctoral platform/system. Hard copies of the thesis may be required if expressly stipulated by the examiners. If required, this will be communicated to the student by the University's Research Degree Examination Administrator and the cost of the printing, binding, and postage will be covered by the student's School (or institutional equivalent) Further details can be found on this in the University's internal portal.

12.6 The electronic submission will be uploaded to Turnitin, the plagiarism detection platform, to generate an originality report with a 'similarity index'. The report will be reviewed by members of the Exam Board Report and Turnitin Review Group (a sub-committee of the University's Research Degrees Group (or institutional equivalent). Any submission whose academic integrity is deemed to be of concern will be forwarded to the University's Registry Services to be formally considered under the unfair practice procedures.

12.7 Once the thesis has been submitted, the student is not permitted to make any amendments, additions, or deletions to it prior to examination, except where consent has been explicitly granted by the University RDG (or equivalent).

13 THE EXAMINATION BOARD FOR THE THESIS

13.1 An EdD student is examined on their thesis, which is included in the work that is submitted.

13.2 The examination process for all students consists of two stages:

(i) preliminary independent assessment of the thesis by the examiners, who will each prepare a pre-viva report on the thesis (or equivalent) and submit to Appropriate doctoral platform/system no later than five working days prior to the viva voce examination date.

(ii) an oral examination (the viva voce) conducted by the Examination Board.

14 EXAMINATION OUTCOMES

14.1 For *viva voce* examinations for the EdD, the recommendations available to board members are:

A: The student fulfils the criteria for the award. Examiners may recommend that the award be made:

i)   Without further correction or amendment to the thesis.

ii)   Subject to minor amendment of the thesis as indicated by the examiners, which can reasonably be completed within a maximum of 3 months.
Amendments will be approved by one or both examiners.

iii) Subject to major amendment of the thesis; which could include addressing deficiencies in terms of content, analysis, and/or presentation in areas indicated by the examiners, and which can reasonably be completed within a maximum of 6 months.
Amendments will be approved by both examiners although no re-examination will be required.

This option is not available to examiners when considering a resubmitted thesis from a student whose outcome was Bi (below) in the first examination.

B: The student does not currently fulfil the criteria for the award. Examiners may recommend that one of the following courses of action are taken:

i)   *Referred for resubmission:* The student does not currently fulfil the criteria of the award for which they are enrolled due to significant deficiencies of content and/or presentation as indicated by the examiners. The student is permitted to revise and resubmit the thesis and be re-examined on one further occasion, with or without a *viva voce.* Required revisions should be completed within a maximum of 12 months.

All examiners will conduct the re-examination.

This option is not available to examiners when considering a resubmitted thesis from a student whose outcome was Bi in the first examination**.**

C: The student is not awarded the degree and is not permitted to be re-examined either for the award or an alternative award.

14.2 In cases where the examiners cannot agree on an examination outcome, the exam board chair will try to mediate discussions between the examiners in the first instance. If agreement is not possible through this discussion, an arbitrating external examiner may be sought following the procedures set out in the University's Examination Guide.

14.3 A student may appeal against the decision of the Examination Board in accordance with Section 1 of The University's Appeals Procedure for Research Degrees (or equivalent).

14.4 The University will only consider appeals on one or more of the grounds outlined in the Appeals Procedure (Postgraduate Research Degrees) or equivalent. Appeals which question the academic judgement of the examiners will not be admissible.

14.5 Students will only have two attempts at addressing corrections, which constitutes three submissions in total and students cannot receive the same outcome as the previous submission (see Figure 1 for a flow chart of options against submission number).

14.6 Any student who receives a B:i) outcome in the first instance, cannot receive an A:iii) for the second or final submission. If the student fails to achieve at least a pass with minor amendments (A:ii) on resubmission, following a B:i) outcome, then they will receive a C outcome (dependent upon the exam board's appraisal).

14.7 In compiling the final report after the *viva voce* examination, the examiners should give clear, detailed guidelines as to the work that is required of the student to meet the minimum requirements for the award.

14.8 For outcome (A:ii)), minor corrections and amendments may consist of the addition of new material, or the removal of incorrect and/or misleading material but should not require an extension of the substance of the research.

14.9 For outcome (B:i)), should the examiners be agreed that the research design and execution of the thesis is flawed and/or the thesis requires substantial re-working, they may permit the student to re-submit the thesis within a maximum of 24 months. The examiners should be satisfied that there is evidence that the student knows what s/he is doing, that the work substantially addresses the problems or issues posed, but that its execution in the thesis requires modification of a scale capable of being accomplished by the student within the period. ***The Examination Board must confirm whether another viva voce Examination is required for the resubmission.***

14.10 All recommendations from the Examination Board are subject to approval by the University RDG (or equivalent).

14.11 Students will only have two attempts at addressing corrections, which constitutes three submissions in total, and students cannot receive the same outcome as the previous submission.