A meeting of the Postgraduate Research Degrees Sub-Committee was held on 25th February 2013.

**Present:** Deputy Principal Professor A Page (Convener), Professor P Crocker, Professor N Johnson, Mr K Mackle, Dr A Muller, Dr S Oza, Professor R Roslender, Dr K Williams.

**Apologies:** Professor D Bearn, Dr P Campbell, Ms R Doherty, Dr L McLellan.

**In Attendance:** Mr J McCaffery (for Item 5), Dr M Glover.

1. **Minutes.**

   **The Sub-Committee decided:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24th October 2012.

2. **Matters Arising**

   **Minute 2:** Membership and Remit of the Sub-Committee

   The Convener thanked the College representatives in attendance and underlined the important role of the Sub-Committee in providing expert superintendence of research degree programmes at University level.

   The Sub-Committee noted that their primary task in the current session was to have oversight of the review of the Code of Practice and related quality assurance issues in the lead into Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) in autumn 2013.

   **Minute 3:** Statistical Reporting

   The Sub-Committee noted that proposals for a defined set of Cognos reports were being developed. It was observed that the research student population had a heterogeneous complexity that had occasionally made accurate information difficult to obtain. The Sub-Committee noted that an outline of the proposed data items would be circulated for comment before the report request is made to Registry/ICS (*Appendix A*).
Minute 5: Postgraduate Research Experience

The Sub-Committee noted that the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey would launch on 5th March 2013. It was observed that the growing number of surveys that students are asked to complete sometimes led to a degree of apathy and lower response rates. It was noted that this survey was the only one dedicated entirely to the experiences of research students. The Sub-Committee agreed to promote and encourage participation, using supervisors as the most effective channel of communication.

3. Quality Assurance Framework

The Sub-Committee received a proposal for review and revision of the existing research degree quality assurance documentation and processes, motivated partly by the scheduled institutional review (ELIR) and the publication of a new Quality Code by QAA – including Chapter B11 on research degree provision.

The Convener reported a good response from School contacts to the mapping of activities at School level to the QAA indicators of sound practice in Chapter B11 and provided excellent examples of good practice that could be incorporated into the current review project.

Research Degrees Code of Practice

The Sub-Committee then discussed the proposed Review of the Code of Practice and related activity and noted that while some aspects of the current code were outdated it still represented a useful approach in setting out the roles, responsibilities and regulations associated with research degrees. The proposal to produce a more compact and tightly focused Code was agreed in principle on the basis that it would (i) build on the best practices at a local level and (ii) directly relate policy and procedure to the indicators of quality in the QAA Code.

Student FAQ sheets

The Sub-Committee noted that many Schools would already have well developed and maintained student information available – in the form of handbooks and programme level information – and any new centrally produced information should seek to augment rather than replace the current information sources.

It was suggested that a handbook template would be more useful in the long term – as this could be used at a local level to maintain information for students on a regular basis. The Sub-committee noted the scope for re-
distributing material between the revised Code and College/ School handbooks, several excellent examples of which had been identified in the course of the Chapter B11 self-audit by Schools.

**Annual Progress Review**

The Sub Committee examined the proposals to replace the current Transfer of Ordinance process with an Annual Progress Review and advised caution. It was agreed that the benefits of a very rigorous process to confirm degree candidacy at the end of the first year of study should not be diluted in any new process.

The Sub-Committee agreed that re-matriculation each year should depend on confirmation of progress, linked with reports from Thesis Monitoring Committees where appropriate, but that the end of first year review should remain as the substantive review point for research degree candidacy.

**The Sub-Committee decided:** to refer each project item to a working group who should plan to seek formal approval of new documentation and processes at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee in May 2013.

4. **Enhancement Led Institutional Review 2013**

The Sub-Committee received a summary outline of the ELIR process and noted the emphasis on student participation in quality assurance and enhancement.

**The Sub-Committee decided:** to note the report.

5. **Research Degree Theses – Submissions and Embargoes**

The Sub-Committee received a paper from the Senior Assistant Librarian on the growing number of requests for embargoes made by students upon submission of research theses to the University Library.

The Sub-Committee noted that staff in the Library & Learning Centre needed clarification on the University’s policy and procedures on approving such embargoes. The Sub-Committee agreed that the current form needed to be updated and include more information in the form of a checklist to help students and supervisors to quantify and justify requests.

The Sub-Committee also agreed that the assumption should remain that research outputs belong in the public domain and that only a limited set of
circumstances would justify withholding access – even if the copyright is held and retained by the student.

**The Sub-Committee decided:** to recommend that a new library thesis submission form is produced to help clarify the processes involved with embargoes.

6. **Date of next meetings.**
2 pm 1st May 2013 in River Room 2

---

Professor Alan Page  
Deputy Principal (Research Governance)  
Convener

---

Appendix A: Outline of Data Item for PGR Cognos Reports  
Appendix B: Code of Practice Project Outline  
Appendix C: Postgraduate Research Theses – Deposit Workflow and Restrictions.
Appendix A: Research Student Data/ Report

The tables below identify data items, for three distinct groups, that form the structure of proposed standard reports – using the Cognos tool to query the SITS Student Management System. Once these reports have been finalised it is proposed that they are used, on an annual basis, to provide information to the relevant Senate and College committees. These reports will enable the identification of any problem areas – late submissions, referred theses, poor viva outcomes, withdrawal/ non-completion rates, conversion and rejection rates in the admissions process.

Current Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>MOA</th>
<th>(Report Date) - (Max End Date)</th>
<th>Domicile/Fee Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed Students (last 5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>(Max End Date) – (Submission Date)</th>
<th>Domicile/Fee Status</th>
<th>Viva Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants (last 5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Application Year</th>
<th>Conditional Offer</th>
<th>Unconditional Offer</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Decline</th>
<th>Matriculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martin Glover, PGLA
Keith Mackle, Student Services
February 2013
Research Student Data/ Reports

The tables below identify data items, for three distinct groups, that form the structure of proposed standard reports – using the Cognos tool to query the SITS Student Management System. Once these reports have been finalised it is proposed that they are used, on an annual basis, to provide information to the relevant Senate and College committees.

These reports will enable the identification of any problem areas – late submissions, referred theses, poor viva outcomes, withdrawal/ non-completion rates, conversion and rejection rates in the admissions process.

Current Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>MOA</th>
<th>(Report Date) - (Max End Date)</th>
<th>Domicile/Fee Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed Students (last 5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Entry Year</th>
<th>(Max End Date) – (Submission Date)</th>
<th>Domicile/Fee Status</th>
<th>Viva Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants (last 5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Head Count) &amp; (FTE)</th>
<th>Application Year</th>
<th>Conditional Offer</th>
<th>Unconditional Offer</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Decline</th>
<th>Matriculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual Aim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martin Glover, PGLA and Keith Mackle, Student Services
February 2013
The University needs to demonstrate compliance with its own stated intent to review the current CoP during 2012/13.

In addition the QAA has published a new Quality Code Chapter B11 that replaced the earlier published guidance and precepts (1999 and 2004). The University will need to demonstrate compliance with Chapter B11.

QAA during ELIR in 2013 will use Chapter B11 as a reference point. The Reflective Analysis will need to include a full account of the CoP review process - this constrains the project both in scope and in timescale – a new Code will need to be approved at Senate in May 2013.

| 1. Audit of Current Practice | The Deputy Principal will sponsor an audit of current practice across all schools in late 2012/early 2013. |
| 2. Approval of Project Plan | Approval for the Project Plan will be sought at the Research Degrees Sub-Committee in February 2013. |
| 3. Remapping Exercise | A Working Group of the RDSC will map the current code and outcomes of the audit current practice during February 2013. |
| 4. Draft Code Structure and sample Chapters | The Working Group will then produce (or oversee the production of) a draft structure of the new Code and sample chapters during March 2013 and then consult with all stakeholders. |
| 5. Production of Draft Code | After consultation the Working Group will then oversee the production of a complete draft Code during April 2013 and seek approval for the document at the RDSC on 1st May, URC on 9th May and Senate on 29th May. Revisions between meetings will be by convener’s action. |
In order to focus the voice and relevance of the new Code it will be necessary to disaggregate those elements of the current code that seek to give advice and guidance to students. Instead these student focused elements will be reworked into a series of Student Frequently Asked Questions type information sheets – with input from all stakeholders and most importantly from a number of research students at different stages of their studies.

1. **Disaggregate information and plan FAQ sheets.**
   The task will be defined and the scope/content of each sheet set out in draft form for RDSC approval in February 2013. A starting point will be the extant (but out of date) Postgraduate Portal and the “Rough Guide...” section in particular (see http://www.dundee.ac.uk/advancedundee/PG/b009s.htm).

2. **Appoint Sponsor and constitute Working Group**
   RDSC will also appoint a sponsor for this element of the project. The sponsor will then invite relevant staff and students to join the Working Group to begin the task of producing the FAQ sheets.

3. **Production of Draft FAQ Sheets**
   The Working Group will meet on a regular basis to allocate tasks, agree drafts and attend to practical production issues. In addition careful liaison will be required between this Group and the Group working on the new Code to ensure coherent and compliant content and a coordinated production schedule.

4. **Focus Groups and Student Feedback**
   The timetable for the production of the FAQ Sheets will be less constrained by the need for regulatory approval and the fact that production period can continue into the late spring early summer months will enable full student testing and feedback before the official launch in September 2013.

5. **Launch of FAQ Sheets**
   The new information should be made available to new PGR students at induction in September 2013. The RDSC and Schools will need to consider online vs. print (or a mix of both) methods of production. A plan for annual maintenance of these sheets will also need to be put in place.
The co-incidence of quinquennial review, a new QAA Quality Code and ELIR in 2013 provides an opportunity for modernization of student progression and thesis monitoring procedures across the University. It is proposed that the current system of “Transfer of Ordinance” and supervision/thesis monitoring is replaced with a comprehensive but flexible Annual Progress Review (APR) that links with attendance monitoring and student re-matriculation processes.

### 3 Annual Progress Review (APR)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Business Process Review</strong></td>
<td>Information gained in the audit of current practice across all schools will need to be augmented with a clear account of current processes in each School specifically with regard to (i) transfer of ordinance (ii) thesis monitoring and (iii) student re-matriculation. This information to be compiled during February 2013 for presentation at RDSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Business Process Re-Design</strong></td>
<td>A Sponsor and working group to be agreed by RDSC will be tasked with the development of a new business process to meet the demands of the developing regulatory context. A clear set of goals, deadlines, operating constraints and deliverables will be agreed by RDSC in February 2013 and a draft design produced by May 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Implementation of the new Annual Progress Review will be expected by the start of session 2013/14: this will mean that amendments to existing regulations will need to be coordinated as part of the Research Degree Code approval process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>It is essential, even at such an early stage of development, to acknowledge that the introduction of a clear Annual Progress Review system for research degree students is undertaken for sound academic and student support objectives that will only be met through long term operation. The implementation plan will need to include a clear account of how the APR system is to be operated, enforced and evaluated (both locally and centrally) over an initial 5 year period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martin Glover  
Policy Officer (Academic Governance)  
February 2013
Policy area: Code of Practice for Supervised Postgraduate Research

Instigator(s) of Policy or changes to Policy:
- Professor Alan Page (Deputy Principal for Research Governance)
- Dr Lesley McLellan (Director of Quality Assurance)
- Dr Martin Glover (Policy Officer, Academic Governance)

Brief rationale for development or change:
The University’s current Code of Practice for Supervised Postgraduate Research (CoP) is due for its quinquennial review in 2012/13. This would normally include a survey of current School procedures, to ensure compliance with existing quality assurance and student support standards, and general maintenance of the CoP to reflect developments in University structures, nomenclature and responsibilities.

The current CoP is based on a mapping to the precepts published by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in 1999 and revised in 2004. However, these have now been superseded by the publication of a chapter (Chapter B11) of the new Quality Code by QAA – in an interim version in June 2012 with a full and final implementation in July 2013.

The scheduled review of the University’s CoP should take into account the expectations contained in Chapter B11 and a fundamental remapping exercise must now be carried out to ensure full compliance – in the knowledge that QAA will use Chapter B11 as the reference point during the Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) in October/November 2013.

However, the main impetus for a fundamental review of the University’s research degree regulatory and quality processes go beyond the need to demonstrate compliance with QAA expectations (i.e. this is not an end in itself) rather it is the need to maintain excellence in research degree provision that should be taken as the primary purpose. The focus should be maintaining and enhancing excellence in the quality of research undertaken by our graduate students, the support they receive during their studies, the relevance of skills acquired and honed – both generic and specific to their research discipline. The University’s research degrees, and the Dundee doctorate in particular must continue to be the gold standard of academic excellence that enables our students and graduates to make a significant and transformational contribution to knowledge in their chosen field of expertise and to play an increasingly leading role in the development of the intellectual life of their discipline and their University.

Version: First Draft prior to submission to Research Degrees Sub-Committee

Confidentiality: Open paper.
Resource implications: Developmental resources will be limited to staff participation in each of three work streams and associated support from the central secretariat. There will also be costs at delivery associated with a limited print run for hard copies of documents to be used in internal quality enhancement activities, staff development and student inductions or examinations.

Equality and diversity considerations: An equality and diversity impact assessment will form an integral part of the revised Code.

Action requested: To approve three work streams associated with the project and to agree deliverables and draft timetable for the project.

The Sub-Committee is invited to

(i) approve the proposals for review, remapping and disaggregation of the current CoP;
(ii) approve the proposals to develop and publish a set of student-focused FAQ sheets;
(iii) recommend to URC and Senate the revocation of elements of the Higher Degree Regulations – so as to replace the current “Transfer of Ordinance” and Thesis Monitoring processes with an Annual Progression Review (APR) to be formally linked with attendance monitoring, thesis monitoring and re-matriculation.

Contact for comments: Martin Glover, Policy Governance & Legal Affairs: m.glover@dundee.ac.uk
Postgraduate Research Theses – Deposit Workflow and Restrictions.

It would appear that some confusion surrounds the process of electronic and hard copy submission of postgraduate research theses, particularly surrounding the question of restricting access to theses by means of an embargo.

In light of this, it is proposed to replace the existing Access to Thesis form, with a new form which will clarify the responsibilities of all of the key parties involved.

In addition, some minor alteration to the existing workflow is proposed, as follows.

1. Pre-viva, when the student is ready to submit the final version of their thesis, they should complete the new Thesis Deposit Agreement form, and submit to Registry.

2. Registry supplies copy of Thesis Deposit Agreement form to Library & Learning Centre.

3. Student submits electronic copy of thesis to Discovery. A confirmation e-mail is generated and sent to the student, who takes a print copy together with the print copy of their thesis to Registry.*

   i. If the student & supervisor are in agreement that the thesis need not be restricted, the full-text is made available on Discovery.

   ii. If the student and supervisor are in agreement that the thesis must be restricted, a suitable embargo period, as indicated on the Thesis Deposit Agreement, will be implemented.

   iii. If the student & supervisor are NOT in agreement on the need for the thesis to be restricted, the full-text will not be made available on Discovery, and the Library & Learning Centre will contact the supervisor to seek a resolution.

4. If the thesis is to be restricted, an e-mail detailing Freedom of Information requirements is generated by the LLC and sent to the supervisor and Alan Bell as the FoI compliance officer.

   Should a request be received to retrospectively embargo a thesis, the LLC will take down any full-text, and will contact the relevant supervisor to obtain their agreement on whether to grant an embargo, and if so, for how long.

* It should be noted that Registry staff should NOT accept a hard copy version of the thesis if no e-mail from Discovery is presented at the same time.
UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE
ACCESS TO THESIS PRESENTED FOR HIGHER DEGREES

1. AUTHOR’S DECLARATION

The University Library receives many requests from other libraries to supply photocopies or microfilms of theses of this University. Such requests are normally complied with, provided that the consent of the author can be obtained. Occasionally, however, it is difficult or even impossible to contact an author, especially in the case of graduates from overseas.

It would greatly assist the Library if authors of theses would complete and return the certificate below, indicating whether or not they are prepared to sanction the reproduction of their theses, subject to appropriate safeguards. Further reference to an author in this connection would then be unnecessary.

It is emphasised that, if this permission is given, it in no way affects an author’s interests in his or her work under copyright law.

NAME………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

TITLE OF THESIS……………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

(a) I am willing that my thesis should be available for reproduction at the discretion of the Librarian of the University of Dundee and on the understanding that users are made aware of their obligations under copyright, or
(b) I am not willing that my thesis should be available for reproduction.

(please delete whichever is inapplicable)

Signed…………………………………………………………Date………………………………………………

2. SUPERVISOR’S DECLARATION

The University Library will restrict access to a thesis where a formal agreement exists on the confidentiality of the research. By a decision of Senate, requests for restricted access in the absence of a formal agreement will be referred to the Library Committee.

To assist Library staff, you are requested to complete the certificate below.

SUPERVISOR……………………………………………………………………………………………………

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL………………………………………………………………………………………………

(a) The subject matter of the thesis above is not confidential and there should be no restrictions on access, or
(b) Access to the above thesis should be restricted for reasons of confidentiality and I will furnish the Librarian with further details in writing.

(Please delete whichever is inapplicable)

Signed…………………………………………………………Date………………………………………………
Freedom of Information e-mail text

You may be aware that the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 has affected the ability of the Library to implement any embargo on a thesis or other document deposited in the Library. After consultation with the University’s Data Protection and Freedom of Information Officer, the following procedure is being adopted.

1. The thesis is being accepted by the Library with the embargo on disclosure in place but with the caveat that if the information is requested at any point during the embargo period, the embargo must be justifiable under the terms of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002. For the thesis to be withheld after it has been requested there must be a firm commitment to publish it within twelve weeks, or it must be part of ongoing research which will be published at its conclusion. Normally this will be indicated by a contract to publish between the author and a publishing company. If this is not the case the University Library can not guarantee that the embargo will be maintained.

2. If the thesis is requested during a closure period the request will be referred to the Data Protection and Freedom of Information Officer as quickly as possible (due to the 20 working day time limit) and s/he will take the decision about whether the information should be released after consulting the parties involved.

3. Where the University wishes to maintain an embargo the Data Protection and Freedom of Information Officer will write to the person requesting the information citing the appropriate exemption in the Act.

4. Where the University is in a position where the information has to be released, for example because an earlier intention to publish has changed, or because the author has been unable to secure a publisher, the process will be managed between the author/department, the Library and the Data Protection and Freedom of Information Officer.

As a general rule, where there is an issue surrounding the non-routine disclosure of information by the University the practice will be to keep the University Secretary informed. Due to the potential for colleagues to be upset by the thought of their information being released before they had intended it to be, his early involvement is advisable.
University of Dundee
Thesis Deposit Agreement

Authors name
Student Number
Thesis Title
Department
Supervisor(s) name

The University of Dundee requires that two copies of a thesis be submitted for archiving. Following the final examination, and including any amendments, a digital version should be submitted to the University’s institutional repository, The Discovery Research Portal at www.discovery.dundee.ac.uk. Once email confirmation of receipt has been received, a hard-bound version of the thesis must be submitted to Registry, along with a copy of the confirmation e-mail. Further information about submission of the hard-copy can be obtained from the Registry web-pages at http://www.dundee.ac.uk/registry/main/pg/thesis.htm.

Access Permissions

The Library and Learning Centre receives, and fulfils, requests from other libraries and organisations to provide access to University of Dundee theses. This ensures that your thesis is accessible to as wide an audience as possible, including being harvested by automated agents, via the World Wide Web. An electronic copy of your thesis may also be included in the British Library Electronic Theses On-line System (EThOS).

The Library and Learning Centre may also, for the purpose of long-term preservation, translate the work to other mediums and formats. This will not affect the content of the work and only serves to ensure accessibility in the future.

Authors who wish to restrict access to their thesis should be aware that the University of Dundee is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR), which give a general right of access to all information held by the University of Dundee, including theses, unless an exemption applies.

Authors who wish to restrict access through the application of an embargo should indicate their preference and reasons for doing so below:

Access Restrictions: Embargo Requirements

*Only complete this section if you wish to embargo your thesis. Any embargo requested will be applied to both the digital and the print versions of the thesis.*

I wish to delay access to my thesis for the following length of time* (Please tick one box):

- 6 months
- 1 year
- 3 years
If you have requested that an embargo be placed on your theses, please indicate your reasons below.

(Please tick one box):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent to publish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd party copyright issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security or political reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content contains confidential information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Access is not normally restricted for more than 3 years, although the embargo period can be extended upon request. If you wish to restrict access for more than 3 years please state the length required and your reasons here:

**Length of embargo:**

**Reason for embargo:**

**Inclusion of Copyright material**

*To be completed for all submissions.*

If your thesis contains material where the copyright is owned by someone other than yourself (third party copyright material) you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holder before it can be made publicly available through The Discovery Research Portal.

If you cannot obtain permission from the copyright holder you can:

a) Submit two digital versions of your thesis: one being the full version with all 3rd party copyright material retained, the second being an edited version with such material removed. The edited version of the digital thesis shall be made publicly available but the full version will not.

or
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