

Submission for a Higher Doctorate

The degrees of Doctor of Letters, Music, Science, Science in the Social Sciences and Laws: Guidance

This guidance should be read in conjunction with the [Regulations for the degrees of Doctor of Letters, Music, Science, Science in the Social Sciences and Laws](#). Templates referred to in this guidance are available from the Quality, Standards and Accreditation Team.

1. Eligibility

- 1.1 A higher degree doctorate may be awarded to an individual who has distinguished themselves by their contribution to research, learning or, in the case of DMus, to musical composition.
 - 1.1.1 A graduate of the University of Southampton is eligible to make an application for the degree of Doctor of Letters (DLitt), Doctor of Music (DMus), Doctor of Science (DSc), Doctor of Science in the Social Sciences (DSc (Social Sciences)) or Doctor of Law (LLD) not less than six years after the date of their first graduation.
 - 1.1.2 A member of staff of the University of Southampton (as defined in the [Regulations for Members of Staff in Candidature for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy](#)) who is a graduate of another University is eligible to make an application for DLitt, DMus, DSc, DSc Social Sciences or LLD, provided that a substantial and important part of the work submitted has been carried out after the candidate joined the staff of the University of Southampton.
 - 1.1.3 A Visiting member of University of Southampton staff who has been with the University for more than two years and is a graduate of another University is eligible to make an application for DLitt, DMus, DSc, DSc Social Sciences or LLD, provided that a substantial and important part of the work submitted has been carried out after the candidate entered their period of collaboration (visiting status) with the University of Southampton.

2. Process overview

- 2.1 A two-stage process exists for the consideration of an application for the award of a higher doctorate. An application may only be considered at Stage 2 once Stage 1 has been fully completed and a prima facie case has been established.
- 2.2 Notification of intention to submit an application must be made to the Head of Doctoral College Administration who will advise on application procedures and the fee payable.
- 2.3 The Head of Doctoral College Administration will instruct the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team Leader to liaise with the applicant and co-ordinate the administration of the process within the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team as set down in sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of this Guidance.

3. Stage 1: preliminary review

- 3.1 Stage 1 consists of a preliminary review of the work on which the applicant wishes to base their submission to establish whether a prima facie case exists.
- 3.2 The Doctoral College (Faculty) Team will instruct the applicant to submit the following documentation for consideration at Stage 1:
 - an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae;
 - an overview statement setting out the applicant's grounds for requesting the award;
 - a synopsis of the applicant's key academic and research achievements that support the application;
 - a list of publications or work on which their submission is based.

The applicant is not required to pay a fee at Stage 1.

- 3.3 The Doctoral College (Faculty) Team must notify the Dean of the Faculty that an application for the award of a higher doctorate has been received and that a Prima Facie Assessment Panel to conduct the preliminary review will be convened.
- 3.4 The Prima Facie Assessment Panel should be chaired by the Head of School and include a minimum of one additional member of University of Southampton staff from within the academic discipline(s) in which the applicant's field of study lies. The Panel is required to give a fair and honest assessment of whether a prima facie case exists. Informal advice may be sought from an external examiner appropriate to the discipline should the Panel consider this necessary.
- 3.5 The Chair of the Panel should provide written confirmation of the Panel's decision and supporting rationale. This should be submitted to the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team within one month of receipt of the applicant's documentation.
- 3.6 If a prima facie case exists, the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team will advise the applicant accordingly and instruct them to make a full application for consideration at Stage 2. The applicant must be advised that that the establishment of a prima facie case is no guarantee that a recommendation for award will be the final outcome.
- 3.7 If no case exists, the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team will provide the applicant with feedback based on the Panel's rationale.

4. Stage 2: Full submission and required fee

- 4.1 The applicant is expected to submit a selection of work for detailed assessment. The submission should be made to the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team within three months of the notification to the applicant that a prima facie case exists.
- 4.2 The application must be based wholly (or to a substantial extent) on original work of distinction carried out independently. Should any of the work have been produced jointly with others, the applicant will need to include a written statement clearly indicating the share they have personally taken in the work (further detail can be found in paragraph 4 of the [Regulations for the degrees of Doctor of Letters, Music, Science, Science in the Social Sciences and Laws](#)).
- 4.3 The following information is required as a minimum:
 - a completed application form, showing the summary title of the work to be submitted;
 - an up-to-date curriculum vitae;
 - a synopsis of the applicant's research record, outlining clearly the research interests and achievements through reference to publications by number (generally six to ten pages equivalent to A4 size are expected). The applicant must clearly evidence that the publications have been widely received in the national and international academic community, and noted as making an original, substantial and authoritative contribution to knowledge in the applicant's field of study;
 - a list of the publications which the applicant is submitting. The list must:
 - number the publications in order of listing;
 - group papers by subject area, where appropriate;
 - indicate against each item the date, title and source of publication and be arranged in two sections:
 - works of which the applicant is sole author, and
 - jointly authored work.

A statement indicating the nature and contribution by the applicant in papers involving joint authorship (through reference to each numbered publication) should be included. The University of Southampton reserves the right to independently consult any of the co-authors or collaborators concerning the veracity of the statement.

Publications should normally be listed chronologically but may be arranged in groups if this is more appropriate to their content, in which case chronologically ordered within each group as follows:

- authors' names should be listed in the same order as printed on the publications;
- the first and last page number of each publication should be listed;

- work previously submitted successfully for any other degree should be specified and the name of the degree and the awarding institution identified.
 - an asterisk (*) should reference the ten most significant publications.
- 4.4 The applicant may choose to include other work that is shown to have been accepted for publication but which is as yet unpublished and any such work should be so marked in the numbered list of publications. This work will be considered only as supplementing the main body of printed and published work.
- 4.5 The applicant may choose to include any work which has been included (or which is about to be included) in a submission for another degree or diploma at either the University of Southampton or any other higher education institution or professional or learned body. Any such work should be so marked in the numbered list of publications. This work will not be considered in the assessment of the applicant's submission, but will be regarded as supplementing the remainder of the work.
- 4.6 The applicant will be required to pay a fee in accordance with the sum published in the [Fees, Charges and Expenses Regulations](#) (University Calendar Section IV). The fee must be paid at the point of full submission and the examination process may not commence until it has been received. This fee will be paid to the Faculty.

5. Examination process

- 5.1 Once the full submission has been received and the required fee paid, examiners must be appointed and arrangements made for the examination. The examination process, including the assessment of the submission, should normally be completed within three months of the applicant's submission.
- 5.2 Normally one internal and two external examiners shall be appointed to examine the applicant's submission. The Chair of the Prima Facie Assessment Panel is responsible for nominating the examining team and the examiners' nomination form (available from the Quality, Standards and Accreditation Team), should be used for this purpose. Examiners, both internal and external, should have sufficient experience and appropriate subject expertise to be able to examine effectively. Collectively, the examiners should have acted as examiner for at least three doctoral examinations and be familiar with examination practice and standards in the UK. As an example, if the external examiner possesses subject expertise but limited UK examining experience, this may be compensated for by a suitably UK-experienced internal examiner. The criteria for the appointment of the examiners, as set out in the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](#), applies to the appointment of examiners for a submission for the award of a higher doctorate.
- 5.3 In order to ensure externality and quality assurance of choices made and justifications provided, the nominations must be approved by the Faculty Director of the Graduate School in their capacity as Chair of Faculty Graduate School Committee (or their sole, and named, deputy who must be a member of the Faculty Graduate School directorate). Alternatively, the Faculty Director of the Graduate School may choose to refer the nomination to the Faculty Graduate School Committee for its consideration.
- 5.4 The Doctoral College (Faculty) Team will provide each examiner with a copy of the applicant's full submission. The examiners will conduct their assessment primarily on the applicant's printed and published work submission. This does not, however, preclude the examiners from requiring the applicant to attend an oral examination (*viva voce*), or to undertake any further written or practical assessment that the examiners may consider necessary.
- 5.5 Each examiner will prepare an independent written report on the applicant's submission which will be sent to the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team and made available to all other examiners. The template (available from the Quality, Standards and Accreditation Team) should be used for this purpose.
- 5.6 The internal examiner will act as the Chair of the examining team, and will convene a meeting of the examiners to discuss the independent reports and to make a joint recommendation. A higher doctorate shall be awarded only to an applicant who, in the opinion of the examiners, has fully demonstrated the following criteria:
- a contribution of originality and merit to their field of study;

- a sustained, consistent and substantial contribution to the advancement of knowledge over a number of years;
- authoritative standing in their field of study;
- seminal publications which have led to extensions or development of knowledge by others;
- (For the DMus as composer), the submission must show a comprehensive technique at the highest possible standard and possess distinctive quality, in either powers of invention or methods of treatment.

5.7 On behalf of the examining team, the Chair will complete the Examiners' Joint Report and Recommendation Form using the template (available from the Quality, Standards and Accreditation Team), returning it to the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team. The recommendation should take one of the following forms:

- the higher doctorate should be awarded
- that the degree should not be awarded
- the applicant should be required to attend an oral examination (viva voce) or to undertake a further written or practical assessment.

5.8 In the exceptional situation that the examiners are unable to reach a joint recommendation, the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team will refer the matter to the Dean of the Faculty. The Dean will be given access to the applicant's submission and each examiners' independent report and, in consultation with the Chair of the Prima Facie Assessment Panel, will make a final recommendation.

5.9 The examiners' independent reports and their joint report and recommendation should be scrutinised and approved by the Faculty Director of the Graduate School, in their capacity as Chair of Faculty Graduate School Committee.

5.10 In such cases where the examiners do not recommend the award of a higher doctorate, the applicant may be permitted, at the discretion of the Dean of the Faculty, to make a new application at a later date. All such information should be communicated to the applicant.

6. Award process

6.1 Following the approval of the examiners' recommendation, the approved outcome should be submitted to Faculty Education Committee to recommend to Senate that the higher doctorate is awarded. At this point, the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team may notify the applicant that a recommendation for award has been made.

6.2 Following Senate's approval, the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team will process the award via the student records system.

7. Storage and cataloguing of the applicant's submission

7.1 The Doctoral College (Faculty) Team is responsible for ensuring that a copy of the applicant's full submission is stored in the Library. There is no prescribed format and the submission is not required to be bound.

Document Information	
Author	Quality, Standards and Accreditation Team
Owner (committee)	Postgraduate Research Quality Monitoring and Enhancement Subcommittee
Approved Date	July 2011, March 2013, February 2015, October 2018, March 2019
Last Revision	February 2023
Type of Document	Guidance