Sheffield Hallam University

Regulations for PhD on the Basis of Published Work

Issued by the Doctoral School
For the 2024-25 Academic Year

SHEFFIELD HALLAM UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH DEGREES COMMITTEE

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

Table of Contents

Preface

These regulations outline the principles and procedures for the university to award the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to candidates who have an established research publication background which is equivalent in standard to the PhD. In the Quality Assurance Agency's Doctoral Degree Characteristics document published in September 2015[1], it states that doctorates on the basis of retrospective publication are:

"Normally awarded on the basis of a thesis containing a series of peer-reviewed academic papers, books, cited works or other materials that have been placed in the public domain as articles that have been published, accepted for publication, exhibited or performed, accompanied by a substantial commentary linking the published work and outlining its coherence and significance, together with an oral examination at which the candidate defends his/her research".

Research Publications and Outputs

For the purposes of this award and in order to ensure an inclusive approach to all types of published work and research outputs, the HEFCE definition of research outputs is being used to establish the types of outputs which are accepted as 'published work'. These are:

- Research outputs that embody original research can be in any form appropriate to the discipline and may include, but not limited to: books, chapters in books, journal articles, published conference papers, digital artefacts, broadcast film and media, exhibitions and performances, creative writing and compositions, curatorship and conservation, artefacts, designs, software design and developments.
- Where original artefacts or documentation of outputs of practice-based research are submitted, an additional descriptive or contextualising statement of 300 words should be added to each publication to elucidate the research imperative.

Document Object Identifier (DOI) codes must be used in applications where publications and outputs are available to view online.

[1] http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Doctoral-Degree-Characteristics-15.pdf

P1 Principles

P1.1 Sheffield Hallam University (hereinafter referred to as 'the University') awards the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) on the Basis of Published Work to registered candidates, provided that there is clear evidence, to the satisfaction of the examiners at oral examination, that the candidate has carried out a critical investigation and evaluation of an appropriate topic(s) which has led to a significant independent and original contribution to knowledge in the chosen field.

P1.2 The University will ensure that research degrees awarded and conferred are comparable in standard with research degrees granted and conferred throughout the higher education sector in the United Kingdom.

P1.3 Candidates may submit work for the degree in any field of study which fits within the subject remit of the University, provided that together the submitted works form a coherent programme of published research over a minimum period of three years.

P1.4 For the purposes of these regulations, a work is regarded as published only if copies are available to the general public via a publisher. Proofs of works not published at the time of application for registration (PF1 stage) are not submissible. Reports to Government Departments, local or industrial organisations and those not grounded in academic research are also not submissible.

P1.5 Where any work submitted for the award has been carried out in collaboration with others, the candidate must provide a clear breakdown of their individual contribution to each output including, if appropriate, an estimated percentage.

P1.6 None of the publications submitted for the award may 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.

P1.7 Candidates must present and defend the submitted work in English unless by prior permission of the Research Degrees Committee which may normally only be given if the subject matter of the submitted work involves language and related studies. Such permission may normally be sought at the time of application for registration.

P2 Eligibility

P2.1 An applicant for registration for the degree of PhD on the Basis of Published Work must be a current member of staff of Sheffield Hallam University (full-time, part-time, visiting, honorary or emeritus), its Associate or Partner Colleges, or a Collaborating Organisation. For the purposes of this award, there must be clear evidence that a member of staff of a collaborating organisation has either an individual or departmental connection with

Sheffield Hallam which relates directly to the research activity of the University.

P2.2 In approving an application for registration, the Research Degrees Committee will satisfy itself of the validity of the candidate's relationship with the University.

P3 Registration

P3.1 The candidate will submit an application in writing for consideration by the Research Degrees Committee, using the appropriate form (see Annex 1), which shall include:

a) details of the candidate's relationship with the University.

b) a numbered list of the published works on which the application for registration is based, including the DOI; if the DOI is not available, then clear evidence will need to be provided that the published work satisfies regulation ***(P1.4)***.

c) an abstract, not normally exceeding 300 words, summarising the contribution to knowledge represented by the published works.

d) where any work submitted has been carried out in collaboration with others, the candidate must provide a clear breakdown of their individual contribution to each output including, if appropriate, an estimated percentage ***(P1.5).***

Note: the university reserves the right to consult with any of the co-authors or collaborators in respect of this declaration.

e) a signed declaration that the works submitted have not been submitted for a research degree at any other university (see **P1.6**).

f) payment of the appropriate fee.

P3.2 The Research Degrees Committee, after taking appropriate advice, will **determine whether the candidate has established a *prima facie* case for the award of the degree.**

P4 Appointment of Examiners

P4.1 Following the establishment of a *prima facie* case, the Research Degrees Committee will normally appoint three examiners, of whom at least two will be external examiners and one will be a member of staff of the University.

P4.2 Examiners must be experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's submitted work and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist and appropriate professional expertise in the topic(s) to be examined.

P4.3 At least one external examiner will have substantial experience of examining research degree candidates in the field at Doctoral level.

P4.4 An external examiner will be independent of the University, its Associate Colleges and of any organisation associated with the candidate's work, will not be a co-author of any of the candidate's cited works and will not normally be a supervisor of another candidate at the University. Former members of staff of the University, its Associate Colleges or a Collaborating Organisation which contributes to the research ethos of the University shall normally not be approved as external examiners until three years after the termination of their employment with that institution.

P4.5 The Research Degrees Committee will also ensure that an external examiner is not approved so frequently that his/her familiarity with the Research Institute/Centre might prejudice objective judgement.

P4.6 Staff registered as research degree candidates either at the University or elsewhere, cannot act as an examiner.

P5 Presentation of Submitted Work

P5.1 Except with the specific permission of the Research Degrees Committee the submitted works will be presented in English (see ***P1.7***).

P5.2 Following the approval of registration by the Research Degrees Committee, the candidate will submit to the Doctoral School, **one set** of documentation **for each examiner by email,** which will include:

a) a critical appraisal of between 5,000 and 10,000-words, of the cited published works, stating the aims and providing a description of the research programme, an analysis of its component parts and a synthesis of the works as a coherent study. The significant and original independent contribution to knowledge of the works in the field of study must also be stated, to assist the examiners in their assessment.

b) an electronic copy of all the published works, in an appropriate and secure format which cannot be edited, which were originally cited in the application for registration. The works will be numbered and correspond exactly with the list cited in the application for registration including DOIs or other unique identifiers where possible (see **P3.1b**). No additional works are allowed.

c) for practice-based submissions, the material/outputs to be submitted for assessment will be agreed in advance at the registration stage and in what electronic format they will be presented.

d) payment of the appropriate fee.

P5.3 The abstract (see **P3.1c**) and copies of all the published works will have a title page presented as follows:

a) - an appropriate title relating to the candidate's area of research.
- the full name of the candidate.
- include the following wording:

.

Published works submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Sheffield Hallam University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on the Basis of Published Work.

- the month and year of submission.

b) a contents page comprising the numbered list of the published works submitted and the DOIs or other unique identifiers where possible (see **P3.1b**).

P5.4 Following the award of the degree, one copy of the submitted works will be lodged in the University Library.

P6 The Examination - General

P6.1 The examination for PhD has two stages:

a) submission and preliminary assessment of the published works; and
b) a defence by oral examination.

P6.2 The Research Degrees Committee will make a recommendation on the reports and recommendation(s) of the examiners in respect of the candidate. The power to confer the degree rests with the Dean of Research.

P6.3 The degree of PhD may be awarded posthumously on the basis of published works completed by a candidate which are ready for submission for examination. In such cases the Research Degrees Committee will seek evidence, initially via the mentor, that the candidate would have been likely to be successful had the oral examination taken place.

P6.4 Any allegation of plagiarism, collusion, or any other form of dishonest conduct in the preparation of the thesis should be made in the first instance to the Head of Research Ethics. In conjunction with the Chair of the Research Degrees Committee and a specialist knowledgeable in the field of the thesis, drawn from the membership of the Committee, the Head of Research Ethics will investigate the matter, explaining to the candidate the exact nature of the allegation and giving the candidate an opportunity to reply. If this arises subsequent to the recommendation of the examiners, the examiners will be consulted. If it is decided that a prima facie case has been established, it will be put forward to the Research Degrees Committee for consideration, and the candidate will be invited to submit written evidence to Committee. The Research Degrees Committee will decide on the appropriate form of action.

P6.5 The Research Degrees Committee will ensure that all examinations are conducted and that the recommendations of the examiners are presented wholly in accordance with the University's regulations. In any instance where the Research Degrees Committee is made aware of a failure to comply with all the procedures of the examination process, it may declare the examination null and void and appoint new examiners.

P7 Examination Procedures

P7.1 Doctoral School staff will make known to the candidate the procedure to be followed for the submission of the documents and any conditions to be satisfied before the candidate may be considered eligible for examination.

P7.2 The arrangements for the oral examination will be made by a candidate's academic mentor in consultation with the candidate and the appointed examiners and notified to all parties concerned by Doctoral School staff. The Research Institute Head of Research Degrees will nominate an independent chair to have oversight of the oral examination.

P7.3 Doctoral School staff will email a copy of the submitted works to each examiner, together with the examiner's preliminary report form (see Annex 1) and the University's regulations. The Doctoral School will also ensure that all the examiners have completed and returned their own preliminary reports to the University, have received copies of all preliminary reports and recommendations before the oral examination takes place and that, at all stages of the examination process, the examiners are properly briefed as to their duties.

P8 The Candidate's Responsibilities in the Examination Process

P8.1 The candidate will satisfy any conditions of eligibility for examination required by the Research Degrees Committee.

P8.2 The candidate will take no part in the arrangement of the examination and have no formal contact with the examiner(s) between the appointment of the examiners and the oral examination.

P8.3 The candidate will confirm, through the submission of a signed declaration (see **P3.1e**), that the published works included have not been submitted for a comparable academic award.

P8.4 The candidate will ensure that the format of the submitted works is in accordance with the requirements of the University's regulations (see section **P5**).

P9 Examination

P9.1 Each examiner will read and examine the submitted works, the candidate's critical appraisal and declaration (see **P5.2***)* and submit, on the appropriate form, an independent preliminary report on it to the Doctoral School before

any oral examination is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the works submitted provisionally satisfy the requirements of the degree (see **P1.1**) and make a declaration that they will assess the candidate through an oral examination.

P9.2 The oral examination will be concerned with the content of the works submitted and any other matters the examiners deem to be relevant to the works. The examiners must establish that the candidate has made a systematic study in a single field or a number of related fields, has displayed originality and independent critical powers and has thereby carried out a coherent programme of work comparable with that required for a successful traditional PhD thesis in the field concerned.

P9.3 Following the oral examination the examiners will, where they are in agreement, submit, on the appropriate form (see Annex 1), a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree, to the Research Degrees Committee. The preliminary reports and joint recommendation of the examiners will together provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to enable the Research Degrees Committee to satisfy itself that the recommendation chosen in paragraph **P9.4** is correct.

Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations must be submitted on the appropriate forms.

P9.4 Following the completion of the examination, the examiners may recommend* that:

a) the candidate is awarded the degree; or

b) the candidate is awarded the degree subject to minor amendments being made to the critical appraisal within a **4 months (FTE)** timescale of the oral examination date.

c) the candidate is referred and is permitted a re-examination - the candidate is required to revise the critical appraisal **within a 12-month** timescale, either with or without an oral examination (see section R15).

d) the candidate is not awarded the degree and is permitted to be re-examined once only within four years of the date of the examination (when their publication portfolio has been enhanced).

* *Examiners may indicate informally their recommendations on the result of the examination to the candidate, but they should make it clear that the final decision rests with the Dean of Research, on the recommendation of the Research Degrees Committee.*

P9.5 Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the Research Degrees Committee may:

a) accept a majority recommendation (provided that the majority recommendation includes at least one external examiner).

b) accept the recommendation of the external examiner, or

c) require the appointment of an additional external examiner; any such appointment shall be made in accordance with the approved procedures for the appointment of examiners.

P9.6 Where an additional external examiner is appointed under sub-paragraph **P9.5c**, they will prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the submitted works and the candidate's critical appraisal (see **P5.2a**) and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further oral examination, in the presence of an independent chair, normally within two months of the first examination. That examiner should not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. On receipt of the report from the additional external examiner the Research Degrees Committee will consider the recommendations of all the examiners and take a final decision.

P9.7 Where the Research Degrees Committee recommends to the Dean of Research that the degree is not awarded, an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the candidate's submission and the reason for their recommendation, prepared by the examiners, will be forwarded to the candidate by the Doctoral School.

P9.8 Candidates to whom the degree is not awarded may submit a new application, which will be subject to the same regulations and application procedures (see section **P.3**), within four years of the date of the examination, provided that such an application contains additional published work relevant to the field of study.

P10 Final Submission

P10.1 Following the award of the degree, candidates are required to provide an electronic copy of the Critical Appraisal in PDF/A format, including title page, contents page and abstract, to Doctoral School staff at ! RDCadmin if internal to the university or rdcadmin@shu.ac.uk if external to the university. Doctoral School staff will send the file to the University Library. The Critical Appraisal will be uploaded to the Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) and will be included in the Electronic Thesis Online Service (EThOS) of The British Library.

P10.2 If other copies of the Critical Appraisal are required by the candidate's organisation or any other parties, it is their responsibility to ensure copies are received.

P11 Appeals Against the Recommendations of the Examiners

P11.1 The University has an Appeals Policy and Procedure which allows research degree candidates to appeal against decisions made by the University

Research Degrees Committee on Confirmation of Doctorate decisions or Research Degree Examiner Panels for final award decisions. Candidates can appeal a decision and request for it to be reviewed on the following grounds:

- There has been an irregularity in the application of the published regulation, policy or procedure which has had an impact on the decision
- There is relevant new evidence or information which the candidate did not provide and the candidate has valid reason why it was not submitted at the time of the assessment.

Further details can be found under the University's Rules and Regulations web pages at Appeals Policy and Procedure.

P11.2 The Appeal Panel will consider the validity of the grounds for appeal against the decision of the examiners. If the Appeal Panel agrees that a candidate has valid grounds for appeal, it must either:

a) recommend that the examiners reconsider their decision; or
b) recommend that a new examiner/or examiners are appointed.

However, the Appeal Panel is not constituted as a Board of Examiners and has no authority to make recommendations upon the award of the degree.

Annex 1

List of the University's Research Degrees Forms for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy on the Basis of Published Work

Form	Stages
PF1	Registration and Declaration *(completed by the candidate)*
PF3	Appointment of Examiners *(completed by the mentor)*
PF4	Arrangements for Oral Examination (*completed by the mentor)*
PF5	Examiner's Preliminary Recommendation on a Candidate for the Degree of PhD on the Basis of Published Work (*completed by each examiner)*
PF6	Examiners' Joint Recommendation on a Candidate for the Degree of PhD on the Basis of Published Work (*completed by the examining team)*