

**SEN16D001**

**Title:** Confirmation of Chair's Action – Learning and Teaching Committee  
**Author:** Dr Andrea Blanchflower  
**Circulation:** The Senate – 9 November 2016  
**Agenda:** SEN16A001  
**Status:** Open

---

**Issue**

To report that the Vice Chancellor, as Chair of Senate, resolved to accept the following recommendations from the Learning and Teaching Committee:

- 1) Revisions to General regulations 1-12
- 2) a proposed set of regulations, policies and procedures for Brooksby Melton College and Easton and Otley College
- 3) proposed amendments to the 2016/17 BIM Regulations
- 4) recommendations for proposed amendments to the Common Masters Framework regulations from 2016/17.
- 5) proposals for revised instructions to examiners for the Masters by Research, MPhil, PhD, PhD by Publication, EdD AND MEd
- 6) that a new institutional partner be approved, subject to the standard due diligence process and an Institutional Approval event.
- 7) amendments to Regulations for the PhD by Publication.
- 8) Updates to INTO regulations
- 9) Mountview admissions, recruitment and selection process
- 10) Updates to CCN's regulations

**Background**

Details of each of the items approved can be found in the minutes and papers of the Learning and Teaching Committee meetings on 11 May, 22 June and on 6 July 2016 with extracts of the relevant items given below.

In addition in August 2016, the Chair of the Learning and Teaching Committee took Chair's action on behalf of the Learning and Teaching Committee to recommend approval by Senate of amendments to UEA Regulations for the PhD by Publication, some updates to INTO and CCN regulations and changes to Mountview view admissions, recruitment and selection processes.

**Extracts from the minutes of the LTC meeting held on 11 May 2016**

1. REVIEW OF GENERAL REGULATIONS 1-12 (Minute 134)

Considered

a proposal to remove the requirement for students to live within a 50km radius of UEA in General Regulation 8 (3) Students in external accommodation. In its place a note will be added to indicate that students are responsible for the impact, if any, on their ability to successfully engage with their course arising from their choice of residence.

Recommended

approval by Senate of the proposed revision

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/12569572/ltc15d145+Review+of++General+Regulations+1-12.pdf/06f4b9b1-9c7c-451a-b0d1-257cc02f3f14>

2. BROOKSBY MELTON COLLEGE AND EASTON & OTLEY COLLEGE REGULATIONS, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES (Minute 131)

Considered

a proposed set of regulations, policies and procedures for Brooksby Melton College and Easton and Otley College

Recommended

approval by Senate of the regulations, policies and procedures.

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/12569572/ltc15d142+Brooksby+Melton+College+and+Easton+Otley+College+Regulations+Policies+and+Procedures.pdf/93c5377e-7aae-4c50-b27d-e9e01a377759>

**Extracts from the minutes of LTC held on 22 June 2016:**

3. BACHELORS AND INTEGRATED MASTERS REGULATIONS (BIM) 2016-17 (Minute 151)

Considered

proposed amendments to the 2016/17 BIM Regulations. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref. LTC15D164)

- a) Change the title of the regulations to Regulations for Bachelors, Integrated Masters Awards and Certificates to reflect that the Certificate in Common Law now operates under BIM;
- b) Following the LTC review of Concessions Regulation 5.5 to be amended to allow students to have up to 3 weeks rather than 2 in the autumn semester to change their modules.
- c) Insert an additional regulation (5.6) to enable students to vary their course profile by a maximum of 30 credits (options only) during their period of study, subject to approval from the Course Director;
- d) An addition to Regulation 12.8.2 to clarify the position of a student who has both a delayed assessment and a reassessment.

Recommended

1) approval by Senate of the proposals in a) to d) above;

2) the addition that in Regulation 3, reference to electives should change to optional modules rather than option modules.

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/13040341/ltc15d164+divider+g+Bachelors+and+Integrated+Masters+Regulations+BIM+2016+17.pdf/481eac8f-f618-4ea2-8c7f-221bfa96de2c>

4. REVIEW OF COMMON MASTERS FRAMEWORK (Minute 153)

Considered

recommendations for proposed amendments to the Common Masters Framework regulations from 2016/17. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref. LTC15D166)

- a) reassessment at item level in place of synoptic reassessment;

- b) recording module marks as integers and rounding up rules (stage marks to one decimal place);
- c) simplification of classification of borderline candidates by algorithms;
- d) compensation replaces condoned failure
- e) Master of Research (MRes) no longer covered by the regulations

Recommended

- 1) approval by Senate of the changes proposed in a) to e) above;
- 2) that there be further discussion of with the proposals relating to the inclusion of level 6 modules on pgt courses.

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/13040341/ltc15d166+divider+i+Review+of+Common+Masters+Framework.pdf/5728ecd8-f5bb-4a16-b361-2bb43cb43427>

**Extracts from the Minutes of LTC held on 6 July 2016:**

5. REVISED INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS FOR THE DEGREES OF MASTERS BY RESEARCH, MPHIL, PHD, PHD BY PUBLICATION, EDD AND MED (Minute 193)

Considered

proposals for revised instructions to examiners for the above courses. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref. LTC15D203);

- a) Addition of Instruction 5 stating that the term ‘thesis’ also includes the body of published work, dossier of practical work etc.;
- b) Criteria for the awards of research degrees section removed – as these are verbatim in the Regulations. There are also contained in the Examiners’ Report Forms;
- c) Recommendations available to examiners for the degrees concerned moved to Appendix A Incorporation of the PhD by Publication into the Instructions;
- d) An additional recommendation has been added – resubmission of the critical analysis (with same publications) within 6 months. This reflects practice at other HEIs and is in line with the resubmission period for the Masters by Research;
- e) Incorporation of the EdD and MEd into the Instructions.

Recommended

approval by Senate of the proposals in a) to e) above.

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/13238938/ltc15d203+Revised+Instructions+to+Examine+rs+for+the+Degrees+of+Masters+by+Research+mphil+phd+phd+by+publication+edd+and+med.pdf/e34dee2d-7721-4dc2-a877-cfb80aa09019>

6. A REVIEW OF THE COMMON MASTERS FRAMEWORK: CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSAL TO ALLOW LEVEL 6 MODULES IN PGT COURSES (Minute 181)

This is included for information only and relates to Item 4 (Minute 153) above:

Considered

a proposal from SCI that students on taught postgraduate courses should be permitted to take level 6 modules. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref. LTC15D191).

Resolved

that taught postgraduate courses should only comprise Level 7 modules.

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/13238938/ltc15d191+divider+f+A+Review+of+the+Common+Masters+Framework+Consideration+of+a+Proposal+to+Allow+Level+6+Modules+in+PGT+Courses.pdf/d62f96e1-2fef-4d44-a9f1-d528f55addce>

## 7. PROPOSED NEW INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIP

(Minute 190)

Considered

confidential proposals for a new institutional partnership. (A copy is filed in the Minute Book, ref. LTC15D200).

Recommended

approval by Senate of the new institutional partner, subject to the standard due diligence process and an Institutional Approval event.

### **Recommendations to Senate from the Chair of the Learning and Teaching Committee on behalf of the Committee**

#### 1) REGULATIONS FOR THE PhD BY PUBLICATION

Considered

proposed changes to the regulations for PhD by Publication to bring PhD by Publication and EdD/MEd processes into line with standard practices for the PhD. (Appendix 1)

Recommended

by the Chair of LTC on behalf of the Committee on 23 August 2016, for approval by Senate of the revised regulations.

#### 2) UPDATES TO INTO REGULATIONS

Considered

Updates to the regulations which have been written to follow the same format and structure as UEA's current taught programme regulations. The regulations contain a number of minor updates to reflect current practice at INTO UEA...

Recommended

by the Chair of LTC on behalf of the Committee on 25 August 2016, for approval by Senate of the revised regulations.

#### 3) MOUNTVIEW ADMISSIONS, RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION PROCESS

Considered

An Admissions, Recruitment and Selection Process which has been updated to reflect activity that takes place in practice.

Recommended

by the Chair of LTC on behalf of the Committee on 25 August 2016, for approval by Senate of the revised regulations.

4) CITY COLLEGE NORWICH (CCN)

Considered

Updates to CCN's regulations (the Norfolk Regulatory Framework) to incorporate changes necessary for PSRB requirements for the newly validated BSc Professional Aviation Engineering Practice. The changes are on p29 of the regulations.

Recommended

by the Chair of LTC on behalf of the Committee on 25 August 2016, for approval by Senate of the revised regulations.

**Attachments**

Appendix 1 - Regulations for the Degree of PhD by Publication

## Regulations for the Degree of PhD by Publication

### 1 SCOPE OF THESE REGULATIONS

- 1.1 These regulations govern the awards of degrees of Doctor of Philosophy by Publication..
- 1.2 In these Regulations, unless explicitly stated otherwise, Head of School may be taken to refer also to the Chair of NBI Graduate School Executive for candidates based in the Norwich Bioscience Institutes. The Head of School's nominee shall normally be the School Director of Postgraduate Research, and there may also be a nominated Institute Director of Postgraduate Research for candidates based in the John Innes Centre, Institute of Food Research, The Sainsbury Laboratory or the Earlham Institute.

### 2 GENERAL PRECONDITIONS TO AN AWARD

- 2.1 A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Publication must be a graduate of this University or another approved university or possess some other qualifications approved by the University.
- 2.2 A candidate must, after consultation with a teacher in the University, submit to the appropriate Head of School (or nominee):
- (1) evidence of published work of a type and nature which is consistent with the award of a degree at this level.
  - (2) evidence of adequate industry and application of an extent characteristic of more than seven years' active research effort in the candidate's field.
  - (3) the name of the teacher in the University who has been consulted.
  - (4) where any work to be submitted for the award has been carried out in collaboration with others, a statement of the extent of the contribution by others.
- 2.3 Before being admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Publication, the candidate must:
- (1) Be approved by the appropriate Head of School (or nominee) as a candidate for the degree;
  - (2) Engage in advanced study under the direction of teachers in the University appointed by the Head of School (or nominee) as the candidate's supervisory team;
  - (3) Undertake research in a field of study approved by the Head of School (or nominee);
  - (4) Satisfactorily present the results of the research and study in the published work submitted and critical analysis, and pass such oral and other examinations as may be prescribed by these Regulations.

### 3 DURATION OF COURSE

- 3.1 The period of study shall normally be six months, extendable at the discretion of the Head of School (or nominee) to a maximum of twelve months. This shall be by part-time study at 0.5FTE.

### 4 PROGRESS

- 4.1 The supervisory team shall also report to the Head of School or nominee at any time when the candidate appears not to be making satisfactory progress, is otherwise not fulfilling the conditions that have been laid down or appears unlikely to reach the standard of the degree.

### 5 SUBMISSION OF PUBLICATIONS AND CRITICAL ANALYSIS

- 5.1 In the submitted material and examination the candidate is required to show distinct ability to conduct original investigations, to test ideas whether the candidate's own or those of others and to understand the relationship of the theme of the investigations to a wider field of knowledge. The submitted material should show evidence of adequate industry and application. The candidate is expected to take due account of previously published work on the subject, to show distinct ability in conducting original investigations and in testing ideas whether the candidate's own or those of others. The candidate is also expected to show understanding of the relationships of the special theme to a wider field of knowledge. The submitted material should represent a significant contribution to the development of understanding, for example, through the discovery of new knowledge, the connection of previously unrelated facts, the development of a new theory or the revision of older views.

Examiners shall take into account that the substance and significance of the submitted material should provide evidence of adequate industry and application of an extent characteristic of more than seven years' active research effort in the candidate's field.

- 5.2 During the period of study a candidate shall prepare, with the guidance of the supervisory team, the following material:
- (1) A list of the publications on which the assessment for the degree is to be based;
  - (2) In cases where multi-authored works are included in the submission, evidence (preferably in the form of written confirmation by at least one co-author per published work) of the candidate's own original contribution to the work in respect of:
    - (a) design of the investigation
    - (b) conduct of the research
    - (c) analysis of the outcome
    - (d) preparation of the work for publication;
  - (3) A critical analysis of the work submitted (between 10,000 and 20,000 words in length covering the development of the candidate's submitted work and its contribution to the field in general).
- 5.3 A candidate who wishes to make a submission shall apply to the Head of Postgraduate Research Service (or nominee). The material listed in Regulation 5.1 must be submitted, along with the published work to be assessed, by the end of the period of study. In exceptional circumstances the Academic Director of Research Degree Programmes may extend the period within which the submission must be presented on the recommendation of the Head of School (or nominee) concerned.

## **6 APPOINTMENT OF EXAMINERS**

- 6.1 The Head of School (or nominee) shall recommend for approval by the Faculty Associate Dean of Postgraduate Research the names of two examiners, one of whom shall be an external examiner. This recommendation shall normally be made not later than three months before the expected date of the submission of the material listed in Regulation 5.

## **7 EXAMINATION**

- 7.1 A candidate shall be examined orally on the submitted material and on subjects relevant to it. The examination shall normally be held within three months of the date of submission of the material. Exceptions to this shall require approval by the Academic Director of Research Degree Programmes.
- 7.2 Prior to the oral examination of the thesis the examiners shall each prepare independent preliminary reports regarding the candidate's performance.
- 7.3 In exceptional circumstances the Academic Director of Research Degree Programmes may, on sufficient grounds submitted by the examiners and on the recommendation of the Head of School (or nominee), excuse the candidate from the oral examination or agree to its replacement by a written examination.
- 7.4 In order to recommend the award of the degree, the examiners must be satisfied that the submitted material:
- (1) Illustrates a coherent programme of research undertaken by the candidate;

and (2) Represents a significant contribution to understanding.

Candidates for the degree of PhD by Publication shall be required to meet the same standards for award as candidates for the PhD by supervision.

7.5 The examiners having examined the candidate shall send their joint final report and recommendation to the Head of School (or nominee) concerned. If the examiners do not agree upon their recommendation or if for any other reason the Head of School (or nominee) needs a further opinion, they shall recommend to the Senate the appointment of an additional external examiner who shall conduct a further examination of the candidate.

7.6 The Head of School (or nominee) having considered the final report and recommendation of the examiners shall then proceed in one of the following ways:

(1) If the published work, critical analysis and performance in the oral examination are of sufficient merit, they shall recommend that the candidate be approved for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Publication;

(2) If the published work and performance in the oral examination are of sufficient merit, but that minor corrections are required to the critical analysis, they shall recommend that the candidate be approved for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Publication, subject to completion of minor corrections to the critical analysis within three months;

(3) If the critical analysis is not of sufficient merit for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Publication but there is reasonable expectation that the critical analysis, if revised, could reach the standard required for the degree, the Head of School (or nominee) shall recommend that the candidate be asked to submit a revised critical analysis. A candidate who submits a revised critical analysis shall do so within six months and may be required to undergo further oral examination. A candidate shall not be allowed to submit a revised critical analysis on more than one occasion;

(4) If the criteria for the award as set out in Regulation 6.4 above are not yet met but there is a reasonable expectation that they may be fulfilled if further publication(s) are achieved within twenty-four months, the Board shall recommend that the candidate be permitted an opportunity to make a revised submission.

A candidate who makes a revised submission shall do so within a period proposed by the examiners (not to exceed twenty-four months) and may be required to undergo further oral examination. A candidate shall not be allowed to make a revised submission on more than one occasion;

(5) If the published work, critical analysis and performance in the oral examination are not of sufficient merit and there is no reasonable expectation that the submission could meet the requirements for the award within 24 months from the date of assessment, they shall recommend that no degree be awarded and that no reassessment be offered;

7.7 In all cases the recommendations of the Head of School (or nominee) shall be laid before the Head of the Postgraduate Research Service or their nominee, who shall ensure that appropriate action is taken on behalf of the Senate.

## **8 FINAL SUBMISSION OF THESIS**

8.1 The candidate shall submit two copies of all material required to be assessed under these regulations, in accordance with rules approved by the Senate.

8.2 If the candidate is approved for the award of the degree, the Head of Postgraduate Research Service (or nominee) shall deposit one copy of the submitted material in the University Library where it can be available for consultation. The second copy of the submission shall be deposited with the School of Studies concerned. The Head of the School (or nominee), at the request of the candidate, may determine that all or part of the submitted material shall, for a period of up to three years specified by the Head of School (or nominee), be available only to those who have the candidate's written permission to consult it.



## **9 MODIFICATIONS FOR CATEGORY A CANDIDATES, INCLUDING STAFF CANDIDATES**

- 9.1 Candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy will be designated as Category 'A' (including faculty of Schools and such other candidates as Senate shall determine) or Category 'B'. Candidates in Category 'B' shall proceed to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in accordance with Regulations 1 to 8 above. Category 'A' candidates shall be permitted to proceed to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in accordance with Regulations 1 to 8, subject to the following modifications.
- 9.2 In the case of Category 'A' candidates references to the Head of School (or nominee) in Regulations 2 (General Preconditions to an Award), 3 (Duration of Course) and 7 (Examination) shall be interpreted as references to the Academic Director of Research Degree Programmes, or to their nominee if they have a conflict of interest. Thus the examination of any Category 'A' candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy shall be conducted exclusively by external examiners appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the Academic Director of Research Degree Programmes.
- 9.3 In the case of Category 'A' candidates, references to the Faculty Associate Dean of Postgraduate Research in Regulation 6 (Appointment of Examiners) shall be interpreted as references to Academic Director of Research Degree Programmes, or to their nominee if they have a conflict of interest.
- 9.4 The Academic Director of Research Degree Programmes shall be advised of any application from any Category 'A' candidate to continue the period of study as a candidate for the degree after ceasing to be a member of staff.