



# Queen Margaret University

EDINBURGH

## RESEARCH STRATEGY COMMITTEE

### PhD by Published Work

Unless otherwise stated in these regulations, the over-arching Research Degree Regulations apply.

#### 1 Criteria for award

1.1 The criteria for award are as set out in the Research Degree Regulations. Candidates are allowed to demonstrate they meet these criteria through presentation of work already completed, rather than through undertaking a new research project.

PhD criteria	Assessed by
<p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A critical and detailed knowledge at the forefront of the specialist area of study, with the ability to provide an overview of the field.</li> <li>• Knowledge and understanding that is generated through personal research or equivalent work which makes a significant contribution to the development of the subject/discipline.</li> <li>• The ability to develop creative and original responses to theoretical or practice-based problems and issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical appraisal plus viva</li> <li>• Publications of appropriate level; personal contribution to joint publications to be established through critical appraisal and viva</li> <li>• Publications (personal contribution established as above)</li> </ul>
<p>Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use and enhance a range of complex skills and techniques at the forefront of developments within the subject.</li> <li>• Design and execute research or development projects to deal with new problems and issues.</li> <li>• Practice in the context of new problems and circumstances.</li> <li>• Exercise a high level of autonomy and initiative</li> <li>• Challenge established ideas and show initiative in shaping change and development</li> <li>• Communicate at the standard of published academic work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidenced through research underpinning publications</li> <li>• Personal contribution to be established through critical appraisal and viva. Viva will be particularly important in assessing the candidate's skills as an independent researcher.</li> <li>• Publications</li> </ul>

**1.2** Candidates may register only for a PhD by publication. The option of MPhil by publication is not open.

**1.3** For the purposes of these regulations, 'publications' includes: papers in peer-reviewed journals; books or book chapters; consultancy reports (where these are in the public domain); creative works; patents; or any other works of scholarly or professional standing. To count as being 'published' the work must have been subject to editorial control. It must be traceable through ordinary catalogues, abstracts or citation indices or otherwise available to the general public. Work that is 'in press' can only be submitted if it has been through the review / editorial process and has definitely been accepted. Students may not graduate until all work has been published.

## **2 Application**

**2.1** Applicants must be a current member of staff of the University. Applicants should discuss the possibility of registering on the award with their Dean of School as part of Performance Enhancement Review. Early career researchers might wish to discuss the possibility of working towards the PhD by publication as a means of directing their research activity, but should be counselled against applying formally until ready.

**2.2** Applicants must submit an application to the Secretary of the Research Strategy Committee. The application should list the applicant's publications and indicate the level of individual contribution to each. Applications will be assessed by the Dean of School and the Convener of the Research Strategy Committee, according to (a) the prima facie suitability of the candidate and (b) the availability of a suitable supervisor. No application may be accepted if an appropriate supervisor cannot be identified from within the University.

**2.3** Once the application is accepted, a supervisor is allocated and the student will be given three months to make a prima facie case to the Scrutiny Committee.

**2.4** The student should matriculate but will not be charged fees until formal registration (see 3 below).

**2.5** Applications may be submitted at any time of year.

## **3 Supervision**

**3.1** One supervisor will be appointed. The supervisor must:

- be fully familiar with the field of research
- have supervised two research or professional doctorate students to successful completion

Where necessary an external adviser may be appointed to provide additional specialist input.

**3.2** The supervisor's role will be:

- to advise the student on the selection of publications
- to advise the student on the presentation of the prima facie case
- (following successful registration) to advise the student on writing the critical appraisal
- if the student requests it, to accompany the student to the oral examination as an observer
- if necessary, to advise the student on minor amendments

The supervisor will also be responsible for providing advice on regulations and interfacing with University committees on the student's behalf.

- 3.3** Regular meetings should be held. The supervisor should keep notes of the meetings and any actions agreed.
- 3.4** If the supervisor is absent for more than three months, or is expected to be absent for more than three months, a new supervisor must be appointed.
- 3.5** If the student has concerns or difficulties about the supervisory relationship, he or she should contact the Dean of School. The Dean is responsible for ensuring the appropriateness of supervision.
- 3.6** For the purposes of the Research Degree Regulations, supervision of a PhD by Publication candidate shall count equally with other doctorate supervision.

## **4 Registration**

- 4.1** To be formally registered, the student must present a prima facie case to the Scrutiny Committee within three months of initial matriculation.
- 4.2** The Scrutiny Committee will be formed of members of the Research Strategy Committee. The Scrutiny Committee will not necessarily be subject experts but may seek the advice of an external reviewer as required.
- 4.3** The applicant must provide:
- A list of the publications/works on which the application is based.
  - One copy of each publication.
  - Written statements from co-authors regarding the nature of the applicant's individual contribution (as far as possible).
  - A supporting statement of approximately 2000 words, making the case for registration. For each piece of output a brief statement must be made outlining (a) the applicant's contribution to the work (if based on a joint project) and (b) explaining which aspects of this contribution were at doctoral level, in terms of both (i) the quality of the output and (ii) their personal input. The statement may include evidence of impact, such as invitations to speak at conferences, citations, effect on public policy, prizes or commercial recognition. The submission should also contain a list of any other published output to which the candidate has contributed. It may also contain a statement explaining why the portfolio can be formed into a coherent body of work, if this is not self-evident, and clarifying any seemingly excessive overlap between output.
- 4.4** Normally, the submission will list five or six papers published in a peer-reviewed journal to which the applicant has made a significant contribution. Fewer publications may be required in the case of work which is solely authored. The totality of the submission must be sufficient to indicate a substantial programme of research equivalent to that undertaken in a research degree. The works must be connected in such a way as to indicate a focussed and sustained investigative process. The applicant should be the sole or lead author on the majority of the publications.
- 4.5** The Scrutiny Committee may make one of three decisions:
- (a) Register on PhD
  - (b) Defer decision pending further information. A meeting with the applicant may be requested.
  - (c) Refuse registration
- 4.6** Applicants have the right of appeal against refusal of registration. The only permissible grounds of appeal are as set out in the main Research Degree Regulations, Section 11.

**4.7** Once registration has been approved, the student has one year to submit the critical appraisal. Fees may be charged if appropriate. Any decision to waive or partially waive fees is the responsibility of the Dean of School. The full fee will be equivalent to the annual part-time fee for a research student.

**4.8** Decisions to accept students for registration do not guarantee a successful outcome.

**4.9** Where registration is refused, the Scrutiny Committee must supply the applicant with a written report setting out the reasons for refusal and indicating what additional work is needed. Applicants may reapply at any time.

## **5 Examination**

**5.1** The candidate must submit within one year of registration. Applications for extension may be submitted to the Research Strategy Committee.

**5.2** In good time prior to submission, the candidate and supervisor should apply to the Research Strategy Committee for approval of the examination team. The procedure for identifying and nominating examiners is as set out in the Research Degree Regulations, Section 9.

**5.3** There will be two external examiners and one internal examiner. The internal examiner will act as Chair. All examiners must have previously examined at least one research degree candidate. All other stipulations of the Research Degree Regulations apply.

**5.4** The submission consists of a portfolio with four sections:

- (a) A critical appraisal of approximately 10,000 words.
- (b) The supporting publications
- (c) Statements from co-authors confirming the candidate's contribution
- (d) An academic CV

In addition, all candidates must undertake an oral examination.

The critical appraisal should demonstrate how the candidate meets the PhD criteria set out in 1.1 above. It should set out the links between the publications and integrate them into a coherent whole. The document should be written as an academic publication to which other scholars could refer. The critical appraisal should not repeat any material within the publications but should add to the supporting material, providing greater depth and drawing wider conclusions.

**5.5** The examiners will assess the submission and the performance at viva against the criteria set out in 1.1 above. Their judgement will not be made solely on the quality of the papers, but also on their assessment of the candidate's ability to write and act as an independent researcher. There will be five decisions available to the examiners:

- (a) Pass
- (b) Pass, subject to minor amendments to the critical appraisal, such amendments to be completed within 2 months
- (c) Resubmit the critical appraisal within 6 months, supported by the same publications.
- (d) Resubmit the critical appraisal with different or additional publications. The examiners should specify the timescale within which the amended portfolio should be submitted, up to a maximum of three years.
- (e) Fail

**5.6** Candidates may appeal against the decision. The appeals procedure and permissible grounds of appeal are as set out in Section 11 of the Research Degree Regulations.

- 5.7** Where minor amendments are specified, these should be dealt with in accordance with Section 9 of the Research Degree Regulations.
- 5.8** Resubmission shall be allowed where the examiners are satisfied that the candidate broadly meets the criteria relating to an independent researcher but are either dissatisfied with the quality of the critical appraisal or feel that additional publications are required. The examiners must specify whether or not an additional oral examination will be required.
- 5.9** A student who fails may not reapply until a minimum of three years after the examination.
- 5.10** Following award, and prior to graduation, one bound and one electronic copy of the critical appraisal must be lodged in the library. Copies of the supporting publications should be bound with the hard copy.