

# Regulations for Members of Staff in Candidature for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

## Introduction

1. On the recommendation of the Faculty Graduate School directorate, and with the approval of the Associate Dean (Education) in their capacity as Chair of Faculty Education Committee following consultation with the relevant Head of School or Professional Service, a member of staff may be admitted on a part-time basis to staff candidature for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD).
2. Staff candidature requires either submission by published works as set out in Section A of these Regulations (paragraphs 6 to 21) or submission by thesis as set out in Section B paragraphs 22 to 46 of these Regulations.
3. For the purpose of these Regulations, a member of staff is defined as having been employed by the University of Southampton<sup>1</sup> for at least 12 months, and as having at least a further 12 months of unexpired contract. In exceptional cases, the Dean of the Faculty<sup>2</sup>, in consultation with the Director of the Doctoral College, may waive one or more of these requirements, reporting the decision to Faculty Education Committee under restricted items.
4. Candidates who have been members of staff for less than half of their maximum period of candidature at the time of leaving the University of Southampton's employ will, from then on, be regarded as standard doctoral candidates, and the option of Submission by Published Work (Section A of these Regulations) is not permissible. Such candidates shall be transferred to PhD – Standard Route candidature and will be examined by a panel of one internal examiner, one external examiner and an Independent Chair from a different Faculty and discipline from that in which the candidate was employed and/or in candidature for the degree.
5. Candidates who leave the employ of the University of Southampton before final submission shall continue to be treated as staff candidates for the purposes of these Regulations if, at the end of their employment, they have been registered for more than half of their initial maximum candidature.

## Section A: Submission by published work

### Overview

6. The opportunity to submit for a PhD by published work is offered only to members of University of Southampton staff as an alternative to the standard PhD route. It recognises the research activities of members of staff who have not completed a PhD. The work examined for a PhD by published work should be broadly comparable to that submitted for other doctoral degrees in the University of Southampton, based upon research with a common theme in the form of a series of publications.

---

<sup>1</sup> "University of Southampton" includes any institution accredited by the University of Southampton to supervise the degrees of Master of Philosophy and Doctor of Philosophy as awarded by the University of Southampton. In any instance where a student is in candidature at an accredited institution, the University of Southampton External Research Degrees Committee (ERDC) will undertake the role of "Faculty Education Committee", "Faculty Graduate School Committee", and "Faculty" as defined within these Regulations.

<sup>2</sup> The principal role of ERDC, which operates as a committee of Senate, is to make decisions on the admission, candidature, progress and examination of all students for research degrees in the Accredited Institution, within the academic areas approved for this purpose by the University of Southampton. ERDC may recommend the award of degrees to Senate.

## Admission

7. The following Admissions Regulation should be applied together with the [Regulations for Admission to Degree Programmes](#), the [Admissions Policy](#), and paragraphs 10 to 23 of the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#) (*Selection and Admission of Research Students*):
  - 7.1 Prior to making a formal application, a member of staff wishing to submit for a PhD by published work should have a preliminary discussion with their Head of School or Professional Service to discuss the suitability of the proposed publications and their capacity to undertake a PhD by published work.
8. The formal application should consist of:
  - a) a *curriculum vitae* setting out evidence of suitable expertise;
  - b) a brief outline of the proposed content of the thesis; and
  - c) a letter of support from the Head of School or Professional Service providing explicit confirmation that the member of staff's workload has been discussed and that the staff member has (or will be) given capacity to undertake a PhD by published work,
9. The application should be submitted to the Faculty Graduate School Office for consideration by the Faculty Graduate School directorate.
10. The Faculty Graduate School directorate should satisfy itself, as far as possible, that there is sufficient material to register the member of staff for a PhD by published work. Should it approve the application, paragraphs 11 to 21 of these Regulations (Section A: Submission by published works) shall apply.

## Candidature

11. The minimum period of candidature shall be three months, and the maximum period of candidature shall be twelve months.
12. A member of staff in candidature for a PhD by published work is not liable for supervision fees, but shall pay an examination fee at the time of submission as published in the [Fees, Charges and Expenses Regulations](#) (Section IV of the University Calendar).
13. The candidate will be allocated an academic mentor by the Faculty Director of the Graduate School. The academic mentor, who should have a substantial publication record, will provide guidance during the preparation of the candidate's published work for submission, including the writing of the supporting statement.

## Submission of published work

14. The submission of work for a PhD by published work shall:
  - a) have already been published, or have been accepted for publication. Evidence of acceptance for publication must be submitted to the Faculty Graduate School Office at the time of submission;
  - b) normally comprise of: a research monograph; one or more authored books or papers in refereed journals; chapters in edited books; technical reports; scholarly editions of text; or creative work in relevant areas;
  - c) not have been submitted in support of a successful award or pending application for any award of any higher education institution;
  - d) consist of enough publications to be broadly comparable to a PhD thesis (that is, it is evidently the result of sustained work normally in a single field to which it makes an original contribution), and to meet the criteria for the award of a PhD as set out in paragraph 5 of the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#) (*The Difference between PhD and MPhil – The PhD*). The number of publications will

vary between disciplines, but it is expected that most submissions will include between three and seven publications;

- e) consist of publications where a significant proportion of the work has been carried out by the candidate since they joined the staff of the University of Southampton; and where that work has normally been published within the 10 years previous to the date of submission;
15. During the period of study, the candidate shall prepare the following material for submission with their published work:
- a) a commentary not exceeding 12,000 words which explains: the aims and nature of the research; the coherence between the materials; how the materials fit within the context of other work in the field; and the nature and extent of their original contribution;
  - b) a full bibliography of all relevant published work, attached as an appendix;
  - c) a statement declaring (in the case of collaborative work) the extent of the candidate's own contribution which has been signed by all co-authors. It is expected that the candidate will normally have been the primary author on their submitted work;
  - d) a summary sheet numbering the submitted publications and a copy of each publication.

### Examination

16. For the award of Doctor of Philosophy, candidates must have demonstrated the criteria as detailed in paragraph 5 of the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#) (*The Difference between PhD and MPhil – The PhD*).
17. The examination will follow the same procedure as set out in paragraphs 89 to 102 of the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#) (*Examination*) with the exception of the variations set out in paragraphs 18 to 21 of these Regulations (Section A: Submission by published work).

### Examiners

18. Two external examiners and one internal examiner shall be appointed to examine a staff candidate submitting for a PhD by published work.

### Recommendations of the Examiners

19. The examiners shall recommend one of the following courses of action:
- a) That the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is awarded.
  - b) That the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is awarded subject to minor amendments to the accompanying commentary being made by a date specified.

Such amendments include: minor errors/omissions of substance, typographical errors, occasional stylistic or grammatical flaws, corrections to references, minor changes to figures, and minor changes to layout, and require no new research. These amendments need only be certified by the internal examiner.

The date specified for the submission of the minor amendments should normally be no later than three months after the formal notification to the candidate.

The examiners are permitted, on receipt of the amended commentary, to request that the candidate make a further attempt to complete the required amendments on receipt of the amended work but these should only address points raised in the original examination process (e.g. when a candidate has failed to make all

amendments required to the satisfaction of the examiners). The further attempt should be submitted by the candidate within a timescale specified by the examiners, which should be no longer than the timescale given for the first attempt.

- c) That the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is awarded subject to the correction of modest amendments to the accompanying commentary being made by a date specified.

Such amendments include: modest errors/omissions of substance and may require limited further analysis but only to an extent which will not affect the originality of the work. The amendments will be of a scale to be certified by the examiners, though will normally not be so extensive that an additional *viva voce* is required.

The date specified for the submission of the modest amendments should normally be no later than six months after the formal notification to the candidate. Should the examiners wish to request a longer time period (of nine months), an academic rationale should be provided for consideration by the Faculty Director of the Graduate School.

The examiners are permitted, on receipt of the amended commentary, to request additional amendments but these should only address points raised in the original examination process (e.g. when a candidate has failed to make all amendments required to the satisfaction of the examiners). Additional amendments should be completed and submitted within a timescale specified by the examiners, which should be no longer than the timescale given for the first attempt.

- d) That the candidate is required to attend an additional *viva voce* within three months of the date of the original examination.
- e) That the candidate is required to make, by a date specified, a revised submission (which may include different publications) for re-examination, including attendance at an additional *viva voce*, on one subsequent occasion.

The date specified for the revised submission should normally be no later than twelve months after the formal notification to the candidate. The candidate will be liable to pay a re-examination fee at the time of submission as set out in the [Fees, Charges and Expenses Regulations](#) (Section IV of the University Calendar). As a fee is payable, the Fees Office should be informed when a candidate has been asked to make a revised submission.

- f) That, in the case of a candidate who has failed to satisfy the examiners for the award of PhD and where a Master of Philosophy is available as an exit award, they are invited to apply, by a date specified, for that award in accordance with one of the following:
- (i) that the degree of Master of Philosophy is awarded (as per (a) above);
  - (ii) that the degree of Master of Philosophy is awarded subject to minor amendments to the accompanying commentary being made (as per (b) above);
  - (iii) that the degree of Master of Philosophy is awarded subject to modest amendments to the thesis being made (as per (c) above);

In such circumstances, the work must meet the criteria for the award of MPhil.

- g) That the degree for which the candidate has submitted is not awarded, resubmission is not permitted, and the research degree is terminated.

It should be noted that where the recommendation of the examiners is for re-examination at a later date as set out in Section A paragraph 19 (e) of these Regulations, options d) and e), are not available as outcomes at the later re-examination.

20. The candidate must satisfy the examiners in both the submitted work and the *viva voce*. A candidate may fail the examination because of the submitted work, the *viva voce* or both. The examiners may therefore recommend re-examination only in that part in which the candidate has failed.
21. A candidate who fails to submit corrections or revisions to the accompanying commentary by the date set by the examiners shall normally be regarded as having failed the examination and paragraph 60 of the [Regulations for Research Degrees](#) (*Outcomes of the Examination*) shall apply.

## Section B: Submission by Thesis

### Admission

22. A member of staff wishing to submit a thesis in candidature for PhD – Standard Route must apply to the Faculty Graduate School directorate for candidature under the [Regulations for Admission to Degree Programmes, the Admissions Policy](#), and paragraphs 10 to 23 of the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#) (*Selection and Admission of Research Students*)
23. Prior to making a formal application, the member of staff should have a preliminary discussion with their Head of School or Professional Service to discuss their capacity to undertake a PhD – Standard Route as a staff candidate.
24. The formal application should include:
  - a) a letter of support from the Head of School or Professional Service providing explicit confirmation that the member of staff's workload has been discussed and that the staff member has (or will be) given capacity to undertake a PhD – Standard Route as a staff candidate.
25. The application should be submitted to the Faculty Graduate School office for consideration by the Faculty Graduate School directorate.

### Candidature

26. The minimum and maximum length of candidature applicable to a member of staff in candidature for a PhD – Standard Route is set down in the [Regulations for Research Degrees](#).
27. A member of staff in candidature for a PhD – Standard Route will be liable for standard part-time UK supervision fees.
28. A member of staff in candidature for a PhD – Standard Route shall undertake their candidature in accordance with the [Regulations for Research Degrees](#) and the expectations of the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#). This includes the requirement to undertake Progression Reviews at fixed points during the course of their candidature and a requirement to satisfactorily complete the required confirmation process to the satisfaction of the Faculty Graduate School directorate.

### Examination

29. For the award of Doctor of Philosophy, the candidature must have demonstrated the criteria as set down in paragraph 5 of the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#) (*The Difference between PhD and MPhil – The PhD*).
30. The examination will follow the same procedure as set down in paragraphs 89 to 102 of the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#) (*Examination*).

## Examiners

31. Two external examiners and one internal examiner shall be appointed to examine a staff candidate will be examined by two external examiners and an internal examiner.

## Recommendations of the Examiners

32. The examiners shall recommend one of the courses of action as specified in paragraph 58 of the [Regulations for Research Degrees](#) (*Outcomes of the Examination*):
33. The candidate must satisfy the examiners in both the submitted work and the *viva voce*. A candidate may fail the examination because of the submitted work, the *viva voce* or both. The examiners may therefore recommend re-examination only in that part in which the candidate has failed.
34. A candidate who fails to submit corrections or revisions to the accompanying commentary by the date set by the examiners shall normally be regarded as having failed the examination and paragraph 60 of the [Regulations for Research Degrees](#) (*Outcomes of the Examination*) shall apply.

## Appeals and Complaints

35. The [Regulations Governing Academic Appeals by Students](#) sets out the procedure to be followed should a member of staff in candidature for the award of Doctor of Philosophy consider they have grounds to appeal against any academic decision made by the University. A staff candidate cannot appeal against poor teaching or supervision (see the [Regulations Governing Student Complaints](#)).

### **Revision History**

*No revisions for 2005/06*

*Minor revisions for 2006/07*

*No revisions for 2007/08*

*No revisions for 2008/9*

*No revisions for 2009/10*

*Revisions approved by UPC in July 2011*

*Reviewed in July 2012; no changes made*

*Amendments approved by UPC in May 2013 and by Senate in June 2013*

*Reviewed and revised in 2013/14 – amendments approved by AQSC 19 February 2014 and Senate 18 June 2014*

*Reviewed in July 2015; no changes made*

*Amendments approved by AQSC in May 2016 and by Senate in July 2016*

*Amendments approved by AQSC in May 2017 and by Senate in June 2017*

*Amendments approved by AQSC in May 2018 and by Senate in June 2018*

*Amendments approved by AQSC in May 2019 and by Senate in June 2019*

*Amendments approved by AQSC in July 2020 and by Senate in July 2020*

*Amendments approved by AQSC in May 2021 and by Senate in June 2021*

*Amendments approved by AQSC in May 2022 and by Senate in June 2022*