



ACADEMIC REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF PHD BY PUBLISHED WORK (1 SEPTEMBER 2018)

All candidates for this degree are bound by and must satisfy these regulations.

1. Criteria for the award of PhD by published work

1.1 The degree of PhD by published work is awarded to a candidate who:

- a) Provides evidence of:
 - i. an independent and original contribution to knowledge and understanding, and
 - ii defends the submission by oral examination to the satisfaction of the examiners;

and

- b) Produces evidence of published work which constitutes a coherent whole;
- c) Incorporates an abstract and a substantial introduction and conclusion which both puts the total work submitted into the context of knowledge as it then existed; and indicates the candidate's contribution; and
- d) Is presented to a professional standard.

2. Requirements for Admission and Registration

2.1 Applicants for the award of PhD by Published Work will normally be limited to members of the University, its alumni, individuals with an existing formal academic association with the University, and staff of partner institutions.

2.2 To be eligible to register for the degree, applicants must:

- a) meet the normal entry requirements for PhD. The minimum qualifications for PhD entry are normally an upper second class honours degree (UK) or equivalent, or a Masters degree.
- b) normally have at least five years' relevant experience at postgraduate level;
- c) be able to produce evidence of published work as prescribed in regulation 3 below; and
- d) register as appropriate as a research degree candidate of the University once a *prima facie* case has been established [see regulation 4.5 following].

3. The published work which will be submitted for the degree

3.1 The published work submitted for the degree should reflect a sustained level of coherent research which has currency in the academic community and has been published within the last ten years, determined from the submission date of the *prima facie* application.

3.2 The publications can consist of a collection of papers, chapters, monographs, books or other manuscripts which have been published by:

- a) refereed journals or
- b) journals of high academic standing or
- c) journals held in high standing by academic peers, or
- d) publishing houses or
- e) similar publishing media in the field.

- 3.3 Where a candidate's own creative practice has been used as an instrument of inquiry and reflection, the work submitted for the degree must be in the public domain, e.g. public exhibitions with published catalogues.¹
- 3.4 For the purpose of the award of PhD by Published Work, the University will normally regard a work as **published** only:
- a) if it is traceable in ordinary catalogues, and
 - b) only if copies of it are accessible at the time of the Prima Facie application by members of the general public through normal trade channels, including the internet; if the latter, the DOI (digital object identifier) number should be provided.

Proofs of papers not yet published cannot be included, and memoranda and reports of Government Departments and the like are not submittable unless they have actually been published, in the sense of the University's interpretation of the word, however wide a circulation they may otherwise have had.

- 3.5 Jointly authored work may be submitted provided that, at the time of application, evidence is provided on the appropriate form (available from the Graduate School) declaring the candidate's share of the work.
- 3.6 No publications submitted for the degree can have been submitted by the candidate for a research degree of any other institution.

4. Stage 1: Making a *prima facie* case

- 4.1 The candidate first must establish a *prima facie* case for submitting for the degree. This stage is formal and rigorous, and constitutes the application process.
- 4.2 To assist the applicant at this preliminary stage and in the preparation of his/her *prima facie* application, informal but detailed advice/guidance is available from the Graduate School.²
- 4.3 In order to establish their case, the applicant submits to the relevant University Committee (Graduate School Committee):
- (a) a list of the published work on which the application is based. Where the list includes co-authored work, the applicant is required to provide a statement, on the relevant standard form, which sets out his/her individual contribution to each co-authored work³
 - (b) a summary, not normally exceeding 300 words, of the contribution to knowledge and understanding represented by the published work;
 - (c) a working title;
 - (d) the appropriate registration fee.
- 4.4 The University's Graduate School Committee may seek internal and/or external advice when considering a *prima facie* case.
- 4.5 The application can only proceed if the Graduate School Committee determines that a *prima facie* case has been established.

¹ Examples of types of output can be found in HEFCE circular 01/2006 (O), *RAE2008 Panel Criteria and Working Methods*: Panel O, UOA 63 Art & Design, paragraph 8

² Both academic and administrative advice is available

³ The statement should make clear whether the applicant's contribution was as a 'principal author', 'joint author' or 'minor contributing author'

5. Stage 2: Preparing the Full Submission for examination

- 5.1 If a *prima facie* case is established, the University's Graduate School Committee appoints two advisers to assist the candidate in preparing the work for submission. The advisers will have previous experience of supervising PhD candidates to successful completion. At this point, Faculty PGR Committee (FPGRC) will ask the lead advisor to nominate examiners for approval by FPGRC. The candidate will also be expected to provide an Abstract of his/her submission [see regulation 7.2 a) following] and a final title for the Full Submission.
- 5.2 The candidate is expected to complete his/her submission for examination within a maximum period of twelve months from the date on which the *prima facie* case is established by the Research Degrees Committee. If the submission is not received in the University's Graduate School within this timescale, the candidate will be required to re-register his/her application and will also be required to pay the appropriate registration fee afresh.
- 5.3 The submission should contain a written commentary and relevant outputs [as described in Annex A I b)] which are presented in English.
- 5.4 The required contents of the submission are listed at Annex A.
- 5.5 Normally two copies of the full submission (i.e. the written commentary and copies of the relevant published outputs) must be submitted. In addition, a separate electronic copy of the submission, in PDF format, must also be submitted (including for a re-submission following an oral examination). The electronic version of the submission must be identical to (and must accompany) the hard copies submitted to The Graduate School. The candidate is also required to produce an identical copy for themselves and a further copy for their Adviser.

6. Stage 3: Examination

- 6.1 An oral examination is required in all cases.
- 6.2 The candidate takes no part in the nomination of the examiners and, following appointment of the examination team, has no formal contact with any member of the examination team before the oral examination takes place.

7. Appointment of Examiners

- 7.1 Assessment is undertaken by two independent examiners, both of whom are external to the University.
- 7.2 The appointed examiners, approved by the Faculty PGR Committee must satisfy all of the following criteria:
- a) Each examiner is experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's submission and has experience as a specialist in the area(s) to be examined.
 - b) The viva voce (oral) examination team as a whole has substantial experience (i.e. three or more previous examinations) of examining research degree candidates at the level being examined or above. At least one member of the examination team must have a minimum of one examination experience, at the level being examined or above, in the UK.
 - c) The examiners must be independent. Independence means that the:
 - i) examiners have not previously acted as a member of the candidate's advisory team;

- ii) external examiners are not appointed so frequently⁴ that familiarity with the University might prejudice objective judgment;
- iii) external examiners have not normally been engaged in the capacity of supervisor to another student within the University during the previous five years;
- iv) external examiners have not been employed by the University as a member of staff or as a consultant to the University during the previous three years;
- v) examiners must confirm before appointment, that they have no informal/personal connection with the candidate, which might prejudice the independence of the examination. Co-authorship or other forms of collaboration between the candidate's Advisers and Examiners are not evidence against the independence of the examiners.

7.3 A person registered for a research degree will not normally be appointed to act as an examiner.

7.4 The oral examination shall have an Independent 'non-examining' Chair, whose role will be to facilitate a professional and authoritative setting for the examination, and to ensure that the assessment process is conducted rigorously, equitably, appropriately, fairly and consistently, according to the University's regulations and procedures. The Chair shall have a neutral role and take no part in the actual assessment of the candidate or the submission. The Chair will advise the examiners on the University's research degree regulations, procedures, policy and practice, and provide a report (in standard format) to the Research Degrees Committee on the conduct of the viva voce (oral) examination.

The Independent 'non-examining' Chair shall be nominated by the relevant Faculty Committee (Faculty Research Degrees Sub-Committee) and appointed by the relevant University Committee (Research Degrees Committee) when the examiners are appointed, and in accordance with the following criteria:

- a) is a current member of the University's academic staff;
- b) has successfully supervised to completion at least one research degree student (PhD or Professional Doctorate);
- c) Has experience of examining for the degree being examined;
- d) Has experience of management of staff;
- e) Has sufficient experience and seniority to command respect and, if necessary, intervene in the viva voce (oral) examination; and
- f) Is independent. Independence means that the Independent Chair:
 - has not previously acted as a member of the candidate's advisory team;
 - confirms before appointment that they have no informal/personal connection with the candidate, and no conflict of interest, which might prejudice the independence of the examination.

8. **Conduct of the Examination**

8.1 The viva voce (oral) examination should normally take place within two months of the candidate handing in the submission.

8.2 One member of the candidate's advisory team may attend the viva voce (oral) examination as an observer only. A written request from the candidate for attendance by the adviser must be made in advance of the examination date. The examination team will be informed if the adviser is to attend. The adviser must withdraw from the

⁴ An external examiner cannot be appointed more than three times in five years

examination venue with the candidate prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination.⁵

- 8.3 At the conclusion of the viva voce (oral) examination, the examiners provide a report on the examination which contains their recommendation, which will be one of the following:
- A) award the degree of PhD by Published Work.⁶
 - B) award the degree of PhD by Published Work subject to modifications⁷ to the commentary being carried out to the satisfaction of the nominated examiner/s.
 - C) that the degree be not awarded.

The award of MPhil may not be recommended.

- 8.4 The examiners' report states in detail the reasons underlying the recommendation and provides the evidence to substantiate their conclusion; and, where appropriate, lists the alterations and/or additions required to the commentary. The report is normally word-processed and always completed, in full, immediately after the viva voce (oral) examination has concluded, i.e. on the same day.
- 8.5 The examiners' recommendation is submitted to the University's Graduate School Committee for approval. Very exceptionally, the Graduate School Committee may decide not to approve the examiners' recommendation (e.g. where examiners' recommendations are at variance with the content of their report or contrary to the University's regulations or inconsistent). In such cases, the Committee should determine the appropriate action.
- 8.6 The Independent 'non-examining' Chair facilitates the examiners reaching a consensus recommendation.
- 8.7 If a consensus to make a recommendation to award the degree is not possible, the examiners provide separate reports which should clearly indicate the examiners' individual recommendations and the reasons for these. The Independent Chair will also be required to report on why a consensus was not possible. The relevant University Committee (Graduate School Committee) may then appoint two new external examiners.
- 8.8 The relevant University Committee (Graduate School Committee) will, in each case, determine the timescale and deadline for completion of the corrections to the commentary required by the examiners, taking into account the scale of the amendments required.
- 8.9 Where the degree is not awarded, a candidate cannot submit for PhD by Published Work until two years from the date of the original oral examination have elapsed. Any further submission must include evidence of additional work published within that two year period.

9 Access

⁵ Regulation approved by Academic Board on 14 November 2001

⁶ Examiners may recommend this outcome, i.e. *Award the degree*, despite typographical/spelling or minor textual corrections being needed in the commentary, provided that the Examiners do not wish to review these corrections after the candidate has made them.

⁷ *"Modifications" may include revision of material in the commentary that the examiners specify, in detail, and which in their judgement are necessary for the commentary to reach an acceptable standard. This can include revisions that rectify omissions as well as improvements to the contextualisation/arguments/discussions within the commentary, and removal of sections/other re-structuring of the commentary. The award of the degree is withheld until the examiners confirm that all requested modifications have been completed to their satisfaction*

- 9.1 Following successful examination, a fully bound printed copy of the submission is normally placed in the University Library and an electronic (PDF) copy will be placed in *Northumbria Research Link*, the University's institutional research repository. A PDF copy will also be included in the British Library's national theses repository through its Electronic Theses Online System (EThOS).
- 9.2. The copyright of the submission rests with the candidate. A submission copyright declaration must be included in the submission - guidance on the specific wording on this should be obtained from The Graduate School.

10 Appeals against the outcome of the examination

- 10.1 The principles and procedures for a candidate to appeal against the outcome of a research degree viva voce examination are published in the *Handbook of Student Regulations*, Annex 3.

ANNEX A – Instructions to candidates for the submission

- I. Following successful application (the establishment of a *prima facie* case), the candidate submits to the University, via the Graduate School, **two** sets of documentation ('The Submission'), each of which includes:
 - a) an off-print or high quality photocopy of each of the published works cited, if necessary giving proof of authenticity. The works should be numbered and correspond exactly with the list cited in the candidate's original *prima facie* application (a copy of this approved list should also be included). No additional work can be included.
 - b) a written commentary on the cited published outputs (it is anticipated that 8,000 – 10,000 words will normally be submitted) which:
 - (i) gives the final title of the Commentary;
 - (ii) incorporates an abstract;
 - (iii) provides a substantial introduction and conclusion which both puts the total work submitted into the context of knowledge as it then existed and also indicates the candidate's contribution;
 - (iv) provides evidence of an independent, coherent and original contribution to knowledge and understanding, and states the significant contribution of the candidate's original work to the advancement of the field of study;
 - (v) is presented to an excellent standard and securely bound. Details of the format of the binding and style of presentation are issued separately and available from the Graduate School web pagesⁱ
 - (vi) should not be a replication, elaboration or enhancement of material contained in previously published work.
 - c) any forms relating to the submission of jointly authored work, fully signed by each of the co-authors to confirm the candidate's individual contribution to each co-authored work (see *regulation 3.5*)
 - d) the declaration that the publications have not been submitted for another award (see *regulation 3.6*).

The (two) hard copies must be accompanied by an electronic copy of the submission in PDF format - including for re-submissions following an oral examination though examiners may ask for a pdf only copy. The electronic version must be identical to the hard copies.

- II. Where a significant part of the candidate's own creative practice has been used as an instrument of inquiry and reflection, the candidate submits three sets of documentation, as described in section I above. However, in addition to the instructions above, the written commentary should clearly present the artistic work and set it in its relevant theoretical, historical, critical or design context.
- III. Each Submission, excluding books, is presented in A4 format and bound (spiral binding is sufficient). The Graduate School Committee may permit an alternative format to be used for the documentation where it is satisfied that this would be more appropriate.
- IV. Each bound copy of the Submission contains:
 - a) an Abstract
 - b) a contents page and
 - c) a title page which includes the following information:

- (i) an appropriate title relating to the candidate's area of research covered by the published work submitted for the degree;
 - (ii) the full name of the candidate;
 - (iii) the following statement: *"A commentary submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the University of Northumbria at Newcastle for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Published Work"*;
 - (iv) the date of submission.
- d) A declaration (signed and dated by the candidate) as follows *"I declare that no outputs submitted for this degree have been submitted for a research degree of any other institution"*

ANNEX B – Procedures

I Making an Application, i.e. establishing a *prima facie* case

To establish a *prima facie* case, the application (as described in regulation 4.3) should be submitted to the University via the Graduate School Where jointly authored work is included, the candidate requests from the nominated Graduate School staff a copy of the required forms; these must be partly completed at this stage, to show the candidate's contribution as principal, joint or minor contributing author. It is not necessary at this stage to secure the signatures of co-authors on the forms.

II Co-authored work

If a *prima facie* case is made, where jointly authored work is submitted (*as described in regulation 3.5*) the nominated Graduate School staff will request, from the applicant, the contact details of each of the co-authors and will then ensure that the forms are forwarded to the co-authors for counter-signature and subsequently returned to the applicant for inclusion in his/her full written submission for the award.

III Examiners

The Graduate School will issue to each examiner a copy of the Submission, and will provide each examiner with a copy of the relevant report form, which each examiner is required to complete to record his/her independent preliminary assessment of the Submission. The report forms must be returned to the University before the oral examination is held.

On the day of the oral examination, the Graduate School will provide the examiners with the relevant (second) report form on which they will make their recommendation; this report is completed in full immediately after the oral examination has concluded, i.e. on the same day.

APPENDIX 1

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF PHD BY PUBLISHED WORK ON THE SUBMISSION OF THE WRITTEN COMMENTARY AND RELEVANT OUTPUTS FOR EXAMINATION

1. Submission

- i) The candidate is responsible for submitting the final work for the assessment of the award; the “work” relates to the written commentary, as described at section 5 above, together with the relevant published outputs. The work must be presented to an excellent standard of presentation and securely bound. Details of the format of the binding and style of presentation are issued separately. The candidate must ensure that the format and standard of submission fully meet the requirements of the University’s regulations.
- ii) The candidate is responsible for ensuring that the work acknowledges opinions, ideas and contributions from the work of others; and does not incorporate, without acknowledgment, material derived from the work (published or unpublished) of another individual. This should be confirmed, before submission, by the candidate using *Turnitin* software for the original commentary material submitted for examination, and consulting the First Adviser on the interpretation of the resulting report.
- iii) The submission must be submitted to The Graduate School (including re-submissions). The Graduate School will advise the candidate of the number of copies required (normally two, possibly three) which will include a one page Abstract of not more than 300 words of the written submission for the examination.
- iv) The oral examination should normally take place within two months of the candidate handing in the submission. The Graduate School cannot accept the submission if the Examination Team has not been appointed. An electronic copy of the full submission in PDF format must also be submitted – see *section 1 vi* below.
- v) A declaration that the work has not been submitted for any other award must be included. Where appropriate, this declaration will specify the relationship of the submission to any wider project or collaborative project. Guidance on the specific wording required for this is contained in the Graduate School document *Requirements for Presentation of Master of Philosophy or Doctor of Philosophy*.⁸
- vi) A copyright declaration must accompany the Submission.
- vii) The candidate should also provide, with the submission, copies of any material which he/she may have published (alone or jointly), to enable the examiners to be fully informed of the contribution to knowledge actually made by the submission. In addition, a separate electronic copy of the full submission in PDF format must also be submitted (including for re-submissions following an oral examination). In all cases, the electronic version of the submission must be identical to (and must accompany) the hard copy versions submitted to The Graduate School.

⁸ see the document [Submitting for Examination – Guidance for Research Degree Students and Supervisors](#) on the Graduate School web pages

- viii) Submission of the work for examination is at the sole discretion of the candidate. It would be unwise for the candidate to submit against the advice of their Advisory team, but they do have the right to do so. The candidate should also not assume that an Adviser's agreement to the work being submitted guarantees the award of the degree.
-