

Regulations for PhD by Published Work

Proposed changes

- 7.5.2 Replace "Principal academic unit" with "Head of School" to ensure consistency with other Regulations and Codes of Practice
- 7.5.3(c) To ensure consistency with Regulation 7.4.1(i) applicable to research degree programmes
- 7.5.4(a) To ensure consistency with Regulations and Code of Practice for the Assessment of Research Degree Theses
- 7.5.4(b) To ensure consistency with Regulations and the Code of Practice for the Assessment of Research Degree Theses
- 7.5.6(b) Replace "Principal academic unit" with "Head of School" to ensure consistency with other Regulations and Codes of Practice
- 7.5.8 To ensure consistency with Regulations and the Code of Practice for the Assessment of Research Degree Theses
- 7.5.9 To ensure consistency with Regulations for Higher Doctorates & Code of Practice for Assessment of Research Degree Theses

Revised Regulation

7.5.2 Adviser

7.5.2 The ~~Head of Principal Academic Unit~~ **Head of School** concerned shall appoint a member of Academic Staff as an adviser to support, advise and guide the individual through the process of submission and examination of the published work.

7.5.3 Submission of Work

7.5.3 (a) Individuals may submit a body of work for assessment under these Regulations on one occasion only.

7.5.3 (b) Individuals shall submit their work within one year of the confirmation of approval of their candidature.

7.5.3 (c) The work submitted shall comprise:

(i) ~~an abstract: a succinct summary of the work containing all of the main concepts and conclusions of the work. It shall be no more than 200 words in length;~~ **a synopsis of not more than 200 words in length of the work presented containing all of the main concepts and conclusions of the work. The examiners shall be required to certify that the synopsis is an accurate summary**

(ii) a critical review of 5,000 to 10,000 words stating the aims and nature of the research, the inter-relationship between the material published and the main contribution and/or addition to learning of the work;

(iii) a summary sheet numbering the submitted papers, chapters, monographs and books (all of which must have been published) and a copy of each publication numbered as per the summary sheet;

(iv) a statement, in the case of multi-authored, joint or collaborative work, of the extent of the candidate's own contribution, substantiated by the co-author(s) or collaborator(s). It is expected that the candidate will normally have been the primary author.

7.5.3 (d) The total word length of the published work should be broadly comparable to that of the standard route PhD (i.e. up to 80,000 words).

7.5.3 (e) Work that has been submitted in support of a successful award or pending application for any award of any higher education institution may not be included.

7.5.3 (f) The submitted work shall be in English. ~~Exemptions to this requirement shall be as specified above.~~

7.5.3 (g) Candidates shall be required to submit three copies of the work, bound in accordance with University requirements, in the format set out in the guidelines published by the Director of Academic Services.

7.5.3 (h) ~~Individuals~~ Candidates shall pay any applicable fee on submission of the work.

7.5.4 Examiners

7.5.4 (a) ~~One internal examiner and at least~~ Two external examiners shall be appointed for each individual in accordance with the Code of Practice for Assessment of Research Degree Theses wherein references to supervisor should be read as adviser.

7.5.4 (b) An individual's candidate's adviser shall not be appointed as the internal examiner or chairperson of the oral examination.

7.5.5 Oral Examination

7.5.5 (a) In respect of the degree of PhD by published work, the individual shall be required to undergo an oral examination on the research and work submitted, unless an exemption is agreed by the Senate or a delegated authority. Such exemptions shall only be granted in exceptional circumstances.

7.5.5 (b) The arrangements for and conduct of the oral examinations shall be as specified in Code of Practice for Assessment of Research Degree Theses wherein references to supervisor should be read as adviser.

7.5.6 Examiners' Reports

7.5.6 (a) The examiners shall prepare reports in accordance with the Code of Practice for Assessment of Research Degree Theses.

7.5.6 (b) The candidate individual, his or her adviser and the relevant ~~Head of Principal Academic Unit~~ Head of School shall have the right to see the examiners' reports. This requirement will be made clear to examiners at the time of their appointment.

7.5.7 Examiners' Recommendations

7.5.7 The examiners shall recommend that either:

(a) the degree of PhD be awarded;

(b) the degree of PhD be not awarded.

7.5.8 Failure of Examiners to Reach Agreement

~~7.5.8 If the examiners are unable to reach agreement then the majority recommendation shall apply.~~ Where the examiners are unable to reach a joint recommendation, an adjudicator shall be appointed. The procedure for appointing an adjudicator shall be as laid down by the Senate or delegated authority. The adjudicator shall be given access to the original reports and submission and shall make a final recommendation.

7.5.9 Candidates may be permitted, at the discretion of the Senate or delegated authority, to reapply for candidature after three years where examiners recommend that the degree be not awarded.