XVI. Doctor of Philosophy by Published Work
Examination Conventions

A. Introduction

1. These conventions are for members of staff who choose to submit for examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Published Work. Members of staff who wish to submit for examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Thesis shall follow the conventions set out in section XV, the same as those for student candidates.

Note: The regulations below are supplementary to the progress regulations and examination conventions for candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Thesis. Where the Doctor of Philosophy progress regulations and examination conventions refer to a thesis, this also applies to a Published Work submission.

B. Basis for the Award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Published Work

2. The basis for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to staff candidates shall be the same as the basis for the award of the degree to student candidates.

3. Additionally, a member of staff who wishes to be a staff candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on the basis of the submission of published work must have held an appointment in the University for a continuous period of at least three years at the time of submission and the study and research carried out during the candidate's period of appointment must have formed a significant contribution to the published work.

C. Submission for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy on the Basis of Published Work

4. A staff candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on the basis of published work shall be required to submit published work in the approved form in accordance with the Rules for the Submission of Work for Higher Degrees and the guidelines detailed in section K. The published work submitted should overall be seen to be broadly comparable to a PhD thesis in the same discipline, so that it is evidently the result of a sustained level of recent research activity normally in a single field of study to which it makes an original contribution.

5. The submission shall consist of a collection of published material including papers, chapters, monographs or books. The publication of papers shall normally have taken place in refereed journals, or other journals held in high standing by academics working in the relevant field. Books, monographs, and chapters in books shall normally have been published by established publishing houses or other recognised publishing media. The publications
submitted shall normally relate to work undertaken during a minimum period of three years and a maximum period of six years.

6. Work shall only be regarded as published if at the time of submission copies of the work are generally obtainable through normal sources, such as publishing houses, bookshops and academic libraries. Proofs of papers not yet published but accepted for publication are acceptable. However, reports or other documents prepared for organizations such as private companies, government departments or charities or for internal University purposes are not acceptable unless they have been published widely outside the organization for which they were prepared.

7. In addition to submitting the published works, which shall be bound in the approved form in accordance with the Rules for the Submission of Work for Higher Degrees and the Rules for the Form of Theses (see items XIX and XX), the candidate shall submit:

a) a list of the published works submitted;

b) an accompanying Doctoral Statement concerning the work submitted and setting out the proposed basis for the award of the degree and placing the work in its wider context;

c) the relevant submission form or forms.

8. The number and scope of the works required for a submission, and the nature and length of the accompanying Doctoral Statement must be specified in guidelines concerning the submission of published work for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to be drawn up in each faculty and subject to approval by the University Teaching Learning and Student Experience Committee.

9. In the case of joint publications included in a candidate's submission, the candidate shall submit an approved form for each such work submitted indicating the percentage share of the work attributable to the candidate. The candidate will be required to obtain, before submission of each form, signatures from each co-author and collaborator certifying the candidate's share of the work concerned.

D. Establishment of a Prima Facie Case for the Award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy on the Basis of Published Work

10. In the case of staff candidates for the degree on the basis of the submission of published work, the dean of postgraduate studies shall appoint, on the recommendation of the relevant head of school, an internal assessor to consider whether a prima facie case for the award of the degree can be established (see Regulations 12 to 14).

11. A candidate's submission shall be initially referred to the internal assessor. The internal assessor shall consider whether a prima facie case for the award of the degree has been established, bearing in mind the criteria normally applicable to examinations for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, whether by thesis or on the basis of published work.
Note: the establishment of a prima facie case for the award of the degree does not constitute a formal examination of the submission and does not imply that after consideration of the submission and an oral examination the examiners will recommend the award of the degree.

12. Where the internal assessor is satisfied that a prima facie case has been established, a recommendation shall be made by the assessor on the appropriate form, supported by the relevant head of school, to the dean of postgraduate studies that examiners be appointed.

13. Where the internal assessor is not satisfied that a prima facie case has been established, a recommendation shall be made by the assessor on the appropriate form, supported by the relevant head of school, to the dean of postgraduate studies that the candidate be informed that the submission has not been found satisfactory. In such a case the examination shall not proceed. The internal assessor shall provide a report indicating the areas in which the submission has been found to be unsatisfactory and the information contained in this report shall be communicated to the candidate by the relevant head of school.

E. Examination for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy on the Basis of Published Work

14. Where a prima facie case for the award of the degree has been established, the candidate's submission shall be examined by two external examiners. The examiners will be nominated by the relevant head of school in consultation with the candidate's internal assessor. The examiners will then be appointed by the dean of postgraduate studies acting on behalf of Senate. In addition, the dean of postgraduate studies will also appoint an independent member of University staff who will chair the oral examination. The independent chair is not an examiner of the thesis but provides guidance on University regulations and procedures to ensure that the oral examination is conducted in accordance with normal University practice.

15. The examination shall consist of a review and assessment of the candidate’s submission by the examiners appointed and of an oral examination on the content of the work and subjects related thereto. The viva shall be conducted in accordance with the guidelines in the University’s Handbook for Examiners of Research Degrees.

16. The examiners should independently write a preliminary report indicating their provisional assessment of the submission and of the issues to be explored in the oral examination. It is expected that, if the criteria for the award of the degree have clearly been met, the preliminary reports will be very brief (a single paragraph). If, on the other hand, the examiners have serious concerns about whether the criteria have been met, fuller reports will be expected. Each examiner's preliminary report should be sent to the relevant graduate school administrator in advance of the oral examination taking place. Examiners should not consult with each other before both independent reports have been submitted to the graduate school administrator. The reports will be forwarded to the relevant dean of
postgraduate studies. They must not be shown to the candidate or the supervisory team in advance of the oral examination, but examiners should be aware that preliminary reports will be made available to candidates after the oral examination if they request them under the provisions of the Data Protection Act.

17. Exceptionally, and two weeks or more in advance of a scheduled viva, if the external examiner upon initial independent review of the submitted work is unequivocally of the view that work is not worthy of defence without significant re-work by the candidate, s/he shall contact the graduate school administrator. The dean of postgraduate studies shall then determine whether it is appropriate for extraordinary arrangements to be put in place for the examiners to confer before the scheduled meeting. If approved by the dean, the examiners will be permitted to prepare a joint report. The decision reached under these arrangements shall be limited to Convention 29(b) only – i.e. permitting resubmission within 12 months. An oral examination will be required after resubmission.

18. The purpose of the viva is to enable the examiners to:
   a) establish that the research has been undertaken by the candidate;
   b) test the ability of the candidate to defend his or her work;
   c) establish whether the candidate has a satisfactory knowledge of the wider field surrounding the research topic.

19. In exceptional circumstances the dean of postgraduate studies may, subject to the agreement of the examiners, exempt a candidate from the oral examination, subject to alternate arrangements being in place to assess the above aspects.

20. In examining a candidate’s submission, the examiners should take into consideration both the extent, merit and quality of the work submitted. With regard to the extent of the work, the examiners should satisfy themselves that the candidate’s work shows evidence of adequate industry and application. With regard to the merit of the work, the candidate is expected to show distinct ability in conducting original investigations and in testing ideas, whether the candidate’s own or others’.

21. In the case of any work done jointly, or in wider collaborations, or under direction, it is important that the extent of the candidate’s own contribution is made clear.

F. Public Presentation

22. In association with the examining process, a candidate may be encouraged to give a presentation of the work embodied in the submission in the form of a public lecture or seminar. Such a presentation shall not, however, form part of the formal examination and shall not contribute to the examiners’ decision on the candidate’s performance.
G. Role of Internal Staff during the Examination

23. The internal assessor shall not be present during the oral examination.

24. The academic supervisor may, at the request of the candidate, be present at (but will make no contribution to) the oral examination. S/he should in all cases be available to be consulted by the examiners on the occasion of the oral examination. The supervisor will have the right to confer with the examiners following the examination, and to be given an oral report on its outcome.

25. The academic supervisor will co-ordinate the arrangements for the oral examination and inform the graduate school administrator of the details.

26. Under no circumstances should the arrangements for the viva be delegated to the candidate. There should normally be no direct contact between the candidate and the examiners before or after the viva.

H. Examiners' Final Reports

27. Having considered all the evidence presented to them, the examiners shall submit, on the approved form, a joint report on the examination. The report shall include a written statement concerning the candidate’s performance and the manner in which the work submitted has contributed to the advancement of knowledge and understanding, together with a recommendation as to the outcome of the examination. The report should also address directly any concerns raised in the preliminary reports and make clear the areas required for amendment if they require revisions or resubmission.

28. The joint report must be sent to the relevant graduate school administrator. The report will be forwarded to the dean of postgraduate studies who shall consider it and decide whether due process has been followed. Exceptionally, the dean of postgraduate studies may require further information from the examiners to justify their decision. After consideration of the report by the dean of postgraduate studies, copies of the final report will be sent to the candidate and the supervisory team by the relevant graduate school administrator (unless there is disagreement between the examiners, see examination conventions for candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Thesis. A copy shall also be sent to the head of school, unless otherwise directed by the dean of postgraduate studies.

J. Recommendations Open to the Examiners

29. Following the first submission and examination of a candidate, the examiners may make the following recommendations:
   a)  
   i. that the candidate be admitted immediately to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; or
   ii. that the candidate be admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to minor corrections e.g. of detail or presentation but not involving changes to the substance to the doctoral statement, made
to the satisfaction of a nominated examiner, normally within a period of one month of receiving formal notification of the corrections to be made; or

iii. that the candidate be admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to minor revisions of a more substantial nature than in ii above, but not involving a major revision of the doctoral statement, being made to the satisfaction of a nominated examiner, normally within a period of up to six months of receiving formal notification of the revisions to be made.

b) i. that the candidate’s submission be deemed to be of a satisfactory standard, but that the candidate be adjudged to have failed to satisfy the examiners in the oral examination and that the candidate therefore be required to submit within six months either for a second oral examination or for a written examination, as the examiners shall determine in their written report.

ii. that the candidate be adjudged to have failed to satisfy the examiners in their submission and the candidate be permitted to revise and re-submit their submission in line with the joint report recommendations within twelve months for re-examination by both examiners, without a further oral examination. Or

iii. that the candidate be adjudged to have failed to satisfy the examiners and the candidate be permitted to revise and re-submit their submission in line with the joint report recommendations within twelve months for re-examination by both examiners and be examined orally; or

c) i. that the candidate has reached the standard required for the appropriate Masters Degree and should immediately be awarded that degree instead; or

ii. that the candidate has reached the standard required for the appropriate Masters Degree and should be awarded that degree instead subject to minor corrections of the doctoral statement made to the satisfaction of the nominated examiner, normally within a period of one month of receiving formal notification of the corrections to be made; or

iii. that the candidate has reached the standard required for the appropriate Masters Degree and should be awarded that degree instead subject to minor revisions being made to the satisfaction of the nominated examiner, normally within a period of up to six months of receiving formal notification of the revisions to be made.

d) that the candidate be permitted to revise and re-submit their submission for the appropriate Masters Degree within twelve months for re-examination by both examiners and be re-examined orally if the examiners so require by indication in their written report.
e) that no degree be awarded and that the candidate be adjudged to have failed.

30. In the case of a candidate subject to recommendations 29(c) above, the revisions and additions expected of the candidate shall be more substantial than in the case of a recommendation under regulation 29(b). However, this recommendation shall nonetheless only be made where the examiners are of the view that the submission is basically acceptable for the degree and/or that it is reasonable to expect the candidate to be able to attempt to revise and add to the submission successfully in the normal time available.

31. In all cases where a candidate is required to make corrections or revisions to a submission or to submit additional published material, it shall be the responsibility of the examiners to provide details of the corrections, revisions or nature and extent of additional material required. The appointed independent chair will agree with the examiners who will be responsible for examining any required revisions or resubmission. Any recommendations for revision or amendment will follow the procedure as detailed in the Doctor of Philosophy by Thesis Examination Convention XV.

32. Where a candidate has been permitted to revise and resubmit in accordance with regulation 29 the options open to the examiners when re-examining the submission shall be those set out in the Examination Conventions for the Doctor of Philosophy by Thesis.

K. Guidelines concerning the Submission of Published Work for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

33. Humanities and Social Sciences

a) Publications selected for submission by a candidate should demonstrate progressive development or coherence in research activity.

b) The amount of research activity should be equivalent to that expected from a three year full-time PhD.

c) Candidates would normally be expected to submit at least five articles in refereed journals or the equivalent in books, monographs, works of art, performances and chapters in books or any combination of these types of publication. Papers must have been published either in established, refereed journals, in chapters in edited books or, when appropriate, may be in a professional journal held in high standing by academics and senior practitioners working in the field. The significance of artworks and performances must be demonstrated by the standing of the exhibition venue, the nature of commissioning process or the level of critical appraisal of the work.

d) Candidates should not include multiple versions of the same paper in their submission.
e) All items must have been produced within a minimum of three years and a maximum of six years.

f) Where the publications submitted have been jointly authored, a form will be submitted detailing the contribution of the candidate to each. The number of publications should be increased pro-rata if jointly authored publications are submitted.

g) The Doctoral Statement should normally be of about 5000 words in length but can be longer (up to a maximum of 10,000 words) where the publications submitted do not address all key aspects of the research conducted.

h) The Doctoral Statement should set out the proposed basis for the award of the degree, placing the work in its wider context, particularly drawing out linkages between the different pieces of work. It should demonstrate the required development or coherence in the work across the period covered by the publications and should incorporate a critical appraisal and discussion of the corpus.

34. Medical Sciences

a) The submission should normally be based on at least four original articles in peer reviewed journals and must be based on work in which the candidate has had a major contribution.

b) The submission should include an introductory section which reviews the relevant literature in the candidate’s field of research and which puts his/her original observations into a broader scientific context. This should normally be at least 10,000 words in length.

35. Science, Agriculture and Engineering

a) The submission should normally comprise of at least four original articles in peer reviewed journals and should represent a significant contribution to knowledge in the candidate’s field.

b) Where the publications submitted have been jointly authored, additional information must be submitted detailing the contribution of the candidate to each. The number of publications should be increased pro-rata if jointly authored publications are submitted.

b) The accompanying Doctoral Statement should normally be a minimum of 10,000 words. It should summarise the relevant literature, set the work carried out in its wider context, include a critical appraisal of what has been achieved and provide ideas for future work.