**UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM**

# CODE OF PRACTICE ON ASSESSMENT AND AWARD OF PHD BY PUBLISHED WORK

**Index of points**

1. Introduction

2. Definition

3. Eligibility

4. Application

5. Submission

6. Assessment

7. Failure of Examiners to reach agreement

8. Re-application and appeals

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This Code of Practice sets out the eligibility criteria, application process and the assessment and award of the degree of PhD by published work.

## 2. Definition

2.1 The work submitted should be broadly comparable to that submitted for other doctoral degrees in this University, based upon research with a common theme in the form of a series of publications.

## 3. Eligibility

3.1 Candidates shall be members of staff of this University. They shall have held an appointment in this University for a continuous period of at least three years on a full-time basis (or the part-time equivalent) immediately prior to the submission of the published work. Candidates shall be members of staff at the time of the examination of the published work

3.2 Postgraduate Researchers of this University registered under Regulation 5.2.4 shall not be eligible to register for the degree of PhD by Published Work under this Code of Practice.

3.3 Postgraduate Researchers of this University registered under Regulation 5.2.4 and who are members of staff of this University may transfer to this mode of registration, providing that they fulfil all of the required criteria.

## 4. Application

4.1 Candidates shall apply to the Head of School submitting:

i) an indication of the subject of study and research

ii) details of their employment at this University

The Head of School shall approve or reject the candidature. The decision shall be ratified by the relevant Head of College and reported to The Registry.

4.2 Where the candidature is approved, the Head of School will appoint a member of academic staff as an advisor to support, advise and guide the candidate through the process of submission and examination of the published work.

4.3 The Registry will formally confirm approval of the candidature, the name of the appointed adviser and the deadline for submission, which is permitted within one year of the date of the letter from the Registry.

4.4 The candidate should not infer from any approval that the proposed submission will ultimately merit the award of the degree of PhD.

## 5. Submission

5.1 Candidates may submit a body of work for assessment under these Regulations on one occasion only.

5.2 The work submitted shall comprise:

(i) 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.

5.3 The total word length of the published work should be broadly comparable to that of the standard route PhD (See regulation 7.4.2 (d)).

5.4 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.

5.5 The submitted work shall be in English.

5.6 Candidates shall be required to submit two softbound copies of the work, bound in accordance with University requirements, in the format set out in the guidelines published by Library Services (https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/as/libraryservices/library/services/research/thesis/index.aspx),together with the prescribed fee, to The Registry.

## 6. Assessment

6.1 Two external examiners shall be appointed for each candidate. The criteria for the appointment of examiners shall be in accordance with the Code of Practice for Assessment of Research Degree Theses Section 4 wherein references to supervisor should be read as adviser.

6.2 Copies of the examiners reports will be made available to Heads of Schools, adviser, and candidate in order that they may benefit from examiners' comments and advice. The acceptance of an invitation to act as an examiner is on the understanding that examiners are willing to have their reports made available in this way.

6.3 An oral examination is compulsory and the arrangements for the oral examination shall be in accordance with the criteria set out in the Code of Practice for Assessment of Research Degree Theses Section 5 wherein references to supervisor should be read as adviser

6.4 The examiners shall prepare independent reports on the submitted work before the oral examination takes place.

6.5 After the oral examination the examiners shall prepare separate or joint reports,

as they prefer, taking into account the original independent reports and the candidate's performance in the oral examination and, including, where possible, an agreed recommendation.

6.6 The PhD by Published Work shall be awarded to candidates who, in the opinion of the examiners, have demonstrated:

(i) has made a substantial original contribution and addition to knowledge in a coherent line of research;
(ii) has provided evidence of knowledge of the general field in which the subject of the research lies;
(iii) has the ability for independent critical judgement;
(iv) a common theme with an identifiable link must run throughout the work submitted.
(v) (v) Normally only work that has been carried out during the candidate's period of appointment in this University shall be admissible

6.7 Having considered the work, the examiners shall submit a recommendation to The Registry that:

(i) The degree of PhD be awarded,

or

(ii) The degree of PhD be awarded subject to minor corrections to the critical review to be approved by one of the examiners,

or

(iii) The degree of PhD be not awarded

## 7. Failure of Examiners to Reach Agreement

7.1 Where the examiner' recommendations differ, an appropriately qualified adjudicator, who may or may not be a member of staff of the University, shall be appointed by the Head of College and approved by Senate or delegated authority. The adjudicator shall be given access to the submission and the assessors' reports and shall make a final recommendation. The candidate will be advised of the name of the adjudicator.

7.2 The candidate shall be sent the adjudicator's report confirming the adjudicator's recommendation.

## 8. Re-application and Appeals

8.1 Where assessors or adjudicator recommend that the PhD by Published Work not be awarded, candidates may reapply for candidature after three years using a different set of publications.

8.2 Where recommendation is made that the PhD by Published Work not be awarded, a candidate shall have the normal right of appeal as set out in the Code of Practice on Primary Appeals, wherein the candidate shall have the rights and responsibilities of a Registered Student on a research programme in making an appeal.