

# **PART B**

**Regulations for the Award of Anglia Ruskin University's Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy on the Basis of Published Work**



## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Candidates must ensure they have all relevant copyright permissions before they submit their work for examination.

## 2. PRINCIPLES

### Principle of Award

- 2.1 A PhD by Published Work is awarded to a candidate who, having already published work which has demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the field and an independent and original contribution to knowledge, defends that same published work and its critical appraisal, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

### Definition of Published Work

- 2.2 For the purpose of these Regulations “published work” shall refer to research papers, chapters, monographs, books, scholarly editions of a text, edited collections of essays or other materials, software and creative work (which may be in any field including fine art, design, architecture, music, composition, dance or performance) or other original artefacts. The precise selection of work undertaken by the candidate will depend upon the discipline concerned.
- 2.3 For the purpose of these Regulations, a work shall be regarded as published only if it is traceable through ordinary catalogues, abstracts or citation indices and copies are available to the general public. Proofs of works not yet accepted for publication are notmissible. Candidates may refer to other works in their critical appraisal that were not published at the time of the *prima facie* case. Only the publications submitted for the *prima facie* case may form the submission. Memoranda and reports to Government Departments, local or industrial organisations are notmissible unless they have been published and are publicly available.

### Research Collaboration

- 2.4 Where any work submitted for the degree has been written in collaboration with others, a statement clearly indicating the intellectual and practical input by such persons must be submitted with the candidate’s application for registration and collaborators are asked to endorse this statement.

### Currency of Publications

- 2.5 The publications submitted for the degree shall normally have been published within the last ten years and should demonstrate a continuing record of publication normally within the last two years.

### Declaration by Candidate

- 2.6 The publications shall not have been submitted by the candidate for a research degree of any other institution and a declaration to this effect must be submitted by the candidate at the time of application for registration (subject to Part A, Regulation 10.6 above).

### Submission in English

- 2.7 Candidates must present and defend the submitted work in English unless the prior permission of the RDSC has been given. Permission to present and defend a thesis in a language other than English shall normally only be given if the subject matter of the thesis involves language and related studies. Where the published works are in a language other than English, the RDSC may require a certified translation to be provided at the candidate's expense.

### Period of Registration

- 2.8 The registration period for a PhD by published work is 12 months. In exceptional and unforeseen circumstances a request for an extension to the period of registration may be considered by the Faculty RDSC where evidence is submitted to support the request. The maximum period of extension which may be granted by the Faculty RDSC is six months in total. No extensions of registration beyond six months will be permitted.

## **3. ENTRY REQUIREMENTS**

- 3.1 A candidate for the degree of PhD based on published work shall normally:
- (a) hold a first or upper second class honours degree of a UK University or a qualification which is regarded by the RDSC as equivalent to such an honours degree;
  - (b) hold any other appropriate equivalent qualification, other than those in Regulation 3.1 (a) above.

## **4. REGISTRATION STAGE**

### Application to Establish a *Prima Facie* Case

- 4.1 In order to establish a *prima facie* case the candidate shall submit an application in writing to the Secretary of the relevant FRDSC which shall include the following:
- (a) A list of the published works on which the application for registration is based (see Regulation 2.6 above);
  - (b) A summary, not normally exceeding 1,000 words, summarising the contribution to knowledge and the significance of the contribution to knowledge represented by the published work and establishing how the work constitutes a coherent study;
  - (c) A statement by the applicant identifying where, when and over what period the research contributing to the published works was undertaken;
  - (d) A signed statement by the applicant indicating the extent of the contribution by other collaborating researchers with reference to the contribution to design, analysis, conduct of the research and writing up of the publication. Collaborators are asked to endorse this statement;
  - (e) A signed declaration by the applicant that the work submitted in whole or in part has not been accepted for a research degree at any other university (subject to Part A, Regulation 10.6 above);

- (f) A signed declaration by the applicant indicating that the work received ethical approval, where required, at the time the research was undertaken;
- (g) Payment of the appropriate fee.

#### Determination of *Prima Facie* Case for the Award

- 4.2 A Panel convened by the Faculty Director of Research Students, to include a minimum of four members, two of whom are members of the FRDSC, will determine whether the candidate has established a *prima facie* case for the award of the degree.
- 4.3 A subject specialist is required to provide written feedback on the application which is considered by the Panel.
- 4.4 The Panel will consider:
  - (a) the application as detailed in Regulation 4.1 above;
  - (b) the registration status of the candidate;
  - (c) adequate supervision, in the form of an academic adviser, is available which is likely to be sustainable;
  - (d) the proposed supervisor(s) meet the regulations as detailed in section 5;
  - (e) the feedback from the subject specialist.
- 4.5 In considering the application, the Panel will ensure that the candidate's published work shows evidence of:
  - (a) an independent and original contribution to knowledge in a particular field;
  - (b) a sustained level of coherent research which has currency in the academic community;
  - (c) a coherent contribution to research in a given field at a level and scope equivalent to that of a conventional PhD thesis;
  - (d) a critical investigation and evaluation;
  - (e) a thorough understanding of research methods.

The material should also be presented to a professional standard.

#### Researcher Development

- 4.6 All candidates for PhD by Published Work are required to attend Stage 3 of Anglia Ruskin University's Researcher Development Programme.

## 5. APPOINTMENT AND ROLE OF THE SUPERVISOR(S)

- 5.1 Upon the establishment of a *prima facie* case, the FRDSC will appoint a Supervisor(s). The Supervisor(s) will normally have had experience of supervising candidates to successful completion of a PhD and must meet the criteria for appointment outlined in Part A – Section 7. The role of the Supervisor(s) is to assist the candidate and s/he is required to:
- (a) guide and support the candidate through the various stages of the process;
  - (b) evaluate their publications against developmental and/or conceptual criteria;
  - (c) provide advice to the candidate in writing the critical appraisal;
  - (d) offer advice on preparing for the oral examination;
  - (e) nominate potential examiners to the RDSC;
  - (f) be present at the oral examination, subject to the agreement of the candidate.
- 5.2 The Supervisor is required to produce a report on the candidate's progress for consideration by the FRDSC six months after the candidate's initial registration.

## 6 APPOINTMENT OF EXAMINERS

### Number of Examiners

- 6.1 Following the establishment of the *prima facie* case the RDSC shall appoint at least two examiners, of whom at least one shall be an external to Anglia Ruskin University or any Associate College. Where more than two examiners are appointed, the majority are generally from outside Anglia Ruskin University or any Associate College. Where the candidate is a member of staff of Anglia Ruskin University or any Associate College there shall be two external examiners and no internal examiner.

### Arrangements for the Appointment of Examiners

- 6.2 The arrangements for the appointment of the examiners shall be as set out in the Research Degrees Regulations (Part A, Section 11).

### Exclusion from Examining Teams

- 6.3 The candidate's Supervisor(s) cannot be appointed as an examiner and only in exceptional circumstances, and after approval by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Innovation), will co-author(s) be eligible for appointment as an examiner. Former members of staff and former doctoral candidates of Anglia Ruskin University, its Associate Colleges or a collaborative organisation which contributes to the work of Anglia Ruskin University shall normally not be approved as external examiners until three years after the termination of their employment or date of award with Anglia Ruskin University.
- 6.4 Where two external examiners are required to be appointed for an individual candidate they may not be employed by the same institution.

## 7 EXAMINATION

7.1 The candidate shall submit to the Secretary of the RDSC one set of documentation (hereafter referred to as the thesis) for each of the appointed examiners and the chair of the oral examination. Each copy of the thesis shall include:

- (a) a proposed focal theme for the collected works which will be included on the Certificate and form the title of the thesis;
- (b) an abstract, not normally exceeding 300 words, providing a statement of the nature and scope of the work presented and the contribution made to the knowledge of the subject;
- (c) a *critical appraisal*, not normally exceeding 10,000 words and not less than 7,000 words, of the cited published works, which should include the following:
  - their respective main aims;
  - an acknowledgement of sole authorship for the collective works and a detailed explanation of research/written contribution within any jointly authored works [Anglia Ruskin University reserves the right to verify the nature of such contribution(s)];
  - an outline of the overall thematic and methodological interrelationships among the works;
  - a synthesis of them as a coherent study;
  - their genesis and chronology as part of the candidate's curriculum vitae;
  - a critical review evaluating their originality, depth of scholarship achieved and the significance of their contribution to knowledge of the subject;

Candidates should comment on the public reception as indicated by any citations and reviews;

- (d) a digital copy, where possible, of all the published creative or scholarly works cited in the application giving proof of authenticity. Where a digital copy is not available, an off print or high quality photocopy is acceptable. In the case of creative work, the representation may be in other than written form (for example, video, photographic record, musical score etc.). The works shall be numbered and correspond with the list cited in the application and may be submitted as separate documents. No additional works shall normally be included;
- (e) the statements and declaration referred to in Regulation 4.1 above.

7.2 A candidate will make available to the examiners the entire body of work on which the application for the award is based.

## 8 EXAMINATION ARRANGEMENTS

8.1 The arrangements for the conduct of the examination, including the outcome and notification to the candidate, shall be in accordance with the procedures set out in Anglia Ruskin University's Research Degrees Regulations (Part A, Section 13).

## Assessment Criteria

8.2 An examination for a PhD by Published Work should reflect the same standards as those that operate for the traditional PhD based on supervised work. This requirement for comparability presents challenges to the examiners for the award of PhD by Published Work. In this case the main tasks are to:

- (a) consider and explore the nature of the critical appraisal;
- (b) evaluate the quality of the candidate's cited publications;
- (c) establish the level or pattern of coherence between the publications;
- (d) assess progression through the papers submitted by the candidate;
- (e) evaluate their originality, depth of scholarship achieved and the significance of their contribution to knowledge of the subject;
- (f) evaluate the methodologies by which the research was conducted;
- (g) place the publications within the time-frame and facilities within which the publications first appeared;
- (h) assess the candidate's contribution to the various phases of the research embodied in multi-authored works;
- (i) establish the candidate's 'ownership' of the published work and appreciation of the state of knowledge within the candidate's research area;
- (j) assess the candidate's interpersonal skills through his/her ability to defend the submission.

In assessing the above the examiners should take into account the standing of the journals in line with the statement from the candidate.

8.3 Examiners of a PhD by Published Work are asked to comment on all the above points and to include on form RD8b, a statement that the body of published works submitted:

- shows evidence of originality and independent critical judgement;
- constitutes an addition to subject knowledge.

## Failure and Resubmission

8.4 Where the examiners recommend that a degree of PhD by Published Work be not awarded, the candidate may not resubmit for a PhD by Published Work within a period of 12 months from the date of the original examination. Any further submission must include evidence of additional work.

8.5 The examiners may recommend minor amendments to the critical appraisal in accordance with Part A, Regulations 12.28-12.30 above.

### Recommendation of award of MPhil instead of PhD

- 8.6 Where the examiners are unable to recommend the award of a PhD by Published Work a candidate may be eligible to receive an MPhil by Published work subject to the presentation of the critical appraisal amended to the satisfaction of the examiners. To achieve the award of MPhil by Published Work the work must meet the criteria for the award of MPhil as set out in Part A, Regulation 1.7 above.

### Conferment of the Award

- 8.7 The RDSC (or the Chair acting on behalf of the Subcommittee) shall receive the recommendations of the examiners and shall, if appropriate, endorse the decision to confer the award. The power to confer the award shall rest with the RDSC acting on behalf of the Research Committee and the Senate of Anglia Ruskin University.
- 8.8 On rare occasions, it may become apparent that an Anglia Ruskin award has been conferred on a student who was admitted to Anglia Ruskin University on the basis of forged documents, or who has gained an unfair advantage in some other way. Alternatively, some other form of deception has occurred. Please refer to Part A, Regulations 12.46-12.48 above for further information.
- 8.9 Following the conferment of the award the candidate is invited by the Academic Registry's Assessment Service to attend a graduation ceremony.