



Higher Doctorate Awards in the UK

UK Council for Graduate Education



Stuart Powell and Nicola Crouch

First published in 2008 by the UK Council for Graduate Education

© UK Council for Graduate Education

ISBN 978-0-9543915-6-0

Contents

Foreword	4
Executive Summary.....	6
1 Context.....	8
2 Responses to the survey.....	10
3 Future Awards	13
4 Awards in Question	13
5 Eligibility.....	14
6 Supervision.....	15
7 Submission and Examination	16
8 Fees	24
9 Frequency of Award	25
10 Discussion and Recommendations.....	27
References.....	33
Appendices (1-6).....	34
UKCGE Published Titles.....	55

Higher Doctorate Awards in the UK

The UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) was established in 1994 to promote the interests of graduate education in all disciplines in higher education institutions. It currently has some 126 institutional members. This report on the Higher Doctoral Awards available in member institutions is one of a series of publications investigating key issues in graduate education.

This report was prepared by Professor Stuart Powell (former Honorary Secretary UKCGE) from the University of Hertfordshire and Nicola Crouch, Administrator of UKCGE following a survey of the Council's member institutions. Its main purpose was to map the range of awards that are described as being at higher doctoral level and their incidence across member institutions. As with so many of the other surveys that UKCGE has carried out the picture that has emerged is one in which there is some common ground but also varying interpretations, particularly with regard to nomenclature of awards, and varying practices, particularly with regard to eligibility criteria for the award and examination procedures. The report also addresses issues of the supervision of candidates and the financial cost to candidates.

The report raises a number of key issues that the Council believes are fundamental to the control of the quality of higher doctoral awards. It is hoped that this information will be of use both for those currently offering such awards and for those considering them.

To enable the authors of the report to include up-to-date information about the higher doctoral awards questionnaires were sent to all UK Council member institutions. The Council would like to thank all those who responded to the questionnaires, as their responses have contributed to the compiling of what I believe is a definitive survey of the current position with regard to higher doctoral awards in the UK.

Professor Malcolm McCrae
November 2008
Chair, UK Council for Graduate Education

The UK Council for Graduate Education is an organisation established to promote the interests of graduate education in all disciplines in higher education institutions. The Council was established in 1994 and has over 125 institutional members.

For further information about the UK Council and its activities, please contact:

The Principal Officer
UK Council for Graduate Education
Lichfield Centre
The Friary
Lichfield
Staffordshire
WS13 6QG

T: 01543 308602
F: 01543 308604
E: ukcge@ukcge.ac.uk
www.ukcge.ac.uk

A list of the Council's publications is given at the back of this book.

Executive Summary

1. Of the 70 member institutions who responded to the survey, 70% offered higher doctorate awards.
2. The most common categories of person eligible for registration for a higher doctoral award are 'Alumni' and 'Current Academic Staff'. Respondents noted an array of caveats relating to eligibility within those categories and these relate in large part to issues such as: pre-requisite qualifications, time elapsed from first degree or initial doctorate to point of application for the higher level of award, time in 'qualifying post' and place where research work took place.
3. The only award cited unequivocally as a higher doctorate (by ten institutions), with a single nomenclature attached to it, was the Doctor of Divinity (DD). The other awards available in more than ten institutions were the higher doctorates in Science, Letters, Law and Music (mostly, though not universally, known by the abbreviations DSc, DLitt, LLD and DMus respectively). However, in all of these cases the award is also offered elsewhere at initial doctoral level.
4. A majority of institutions operated a system involving a prima facie stage of some kind.
5. Institutions varied in what they expected to be included in a higher doctorate submission. Variations related to: (i) publications, (ii) commentary, (iii) CV and (iv) a statement regarding collaborators. Of those institutions that required a commentary, the range of maxima was from 500 words to 30,000 words.
6. The special nature of assessment at higher doctoral level is recognised in some institutions by the involvement of senior post holders within the awarding university, by an increased emphasis on judgment making that involves appraisal of contribution to an intellectual field over an extended period of time rather than assessment against distinct academic criteria and by the need for examiners to be, themselves, leading authorities within the field concerned.
7. The majority of respondents (56%) indicated that an oral examination was not required at higher doctoral level within their institution. In only 17% of the sample was such an examination compulsory and in the remainder it was discretionary.
8. Fees ranged from £250 to £4,100 with the majority charging somewhere between £500 and £999. The situation with regard to fees varied within institutions in terms of whether or not the applicant is a member of staff.

9. In the two year period preceding the questionnaire the majority of institutions made either no higher doctorate awards or made just one. In contrast just three institutions made more than 13 such awards each.
10. The Report includes several recommendations and these can be found in Section 10.

Professor Stuart Powell

Research Professor at the University of Hertfordshire

&

Miss Nicola Crouch

UKCGE Administrator (2005 – 2008)

Part One – Context

1. Introduction

1.1 Origins of the Survey

Following questions and expressions of interest from its membership, UKCGE agreed to map out academic awards known as 'higher doctorates' that are currently on offer in member institutions and to examine how the situation with regard to these awards is changing, if at all. To this end a survey of higher doctorates on offer across member institutions was instigated and this report summarises the findings and makes some comment on the situation.

1.2 The Scope of the Survey

In seeking to achieve these aims it was necessary to begin by trying to delineate the nature of this higher doctoral level. The survey therefore included a suggestion as to what this level entailed, and hence the relationship between nomenclature and award, but also sought to elicit other understandings of the nature of higher doctorates by asking for awards that were treated by institutions as higher doctorates but which differed in some respect from the working definition as stated in the survey. All of the above was addressed in part one of the survey and, for convenience, is dealt with correspondingly in this report.

The secondary purposes of the survey related to details of eligibility, supervision, submission and examination as well as cost and 'frequency' of the award and these are dealt with in part two of this report.

1.3 Defining the Higher Doctorate Level

1.3.1 Range of Awards

At a number of UKCGE meetings and workshops over recent years it has been noted that member institutions have quite different notions of, and approaches, to higher doctoral awards.

The two most basic examples are given below.

- (i) Some institutions offer such awards and some do not, yet there is no clear rationale for the separation in this respect (i.e. it does not relate to 'new' or 'old' universities or to any geographic distinction).
- (ii) Instances have been noted where the same nomenclature is employed (by different institutions) for higher doctorates on the one hand and honorary doctorates or initial doctorates on the other; indeed comments within the responses to the survey suggest that some member institutions are quite firm in assuming that their own interpretation of what titles may be awarded for what types of submission is universally accepted, whereas in reality it is not.

1.3.2 Working Definition of 'Higher Doctorate'

As noted above, the preamble to the survey included a working definition of what the authors of this report interpreted a higher doctorate to be, but it was also anticipated that there would be a need to revise that according to responses. The working definition had been derived from a straw poll of the kinds of award available in a small number of institutions and was intentionally broad and inclusive.

It was determined that the working definition should relate only to level and to the kind of submission that enables an institution to make an award at that level. Hence, '*a higher doctorate is an award that is at a level above the initial doctorate (e.g. the PhD) and that is typically gained not through a defined programme of study but rather by submission of a substantial body of research based work.*'

A further explanatory distinction was drawn between the PhD (seen in this context as an award at initial doctoral level) and a higher doctorate, thus: '*Therefore, where a PhD has come to indicate mastery of a narrow field (narrow in the sense of representing possibly three years of research study only) the Higher Doctorate **may** be seen as indicating command over a field of study and a sustained contribution to understanding within that field.*'

1.4 Responses to the Survey

The survey was sent to all 125 members of the UKCGE. There were 70 responses, i.e. a responses rate of 56%. Not all of the respondents responded to all of the questions; in part this was due to acknowledged uncertainty on the part of some in relation to their own institutional procedures regarding higher doctorates. This report takes account of the varying numbers of respondents to the range of questions.

Part Two – Responses to the Survey

2. Specific Higher Doctorate Titles in Use (Questions 1 & 2 refer)

2.1 Range of awards cited in responses

All seven award titles included in the original list, as cited in question 1 of the survey (*‘which of the following awards are available?’*), were employed by three or more institutions. In addition, there were two other awards that were cited by nine or more institutions in their responses to question 2 (*‘Other awards not listed’*): in engineering and in technology. All nine of these ‘most common’ awards are listed in Table 1 in rank order by number of institutions offering the award (clearly this does **not** relate to number of awards actually made or to number of candidates enrolled).

As well as the above there was a large group of awards that were named by only one or two institutions and these are considered in section 2.3.

2.2 The most common award titles

In Table 1 the most common higher doctoral awards (i.e. those with more than two institutions having regulations pertaining to them in place at the time of the survey) are listed. They are presented in descending order from most to least commonly available.

Table 1 – Most Common Award Titles

Award Title	Abbreviated Title	Number of institutions offering the award at higher doctoral level	Number of institutions where the award is made at initial doctoral level (rather than at higher level)
Doctor of Science	DSc ¹	49	1
Doctor of Letters	DLitt	48	1
Doctor of Law(s)	LLD	32	1
Doctor of Music	DMus	14	1
Doctor of Divinity	DD	10	0
Doctor of Technology	DTech	10	N/A
Doctor of Engineering	DEng	9	1
Doctor of Social Science	DSocSc	5	3
Doctor of Medicine	MD	3	27

2.3 Numbers of Institutions Awarding Higher Doctorates

In total 70 institutions responded to the survey. Of this total, 49 institutions (i.e. 70% of the sample) responded that they offered higher doctorate awards. The remaining 21 institutions (i.e. 30% of the

¹ Though see later section for an additional list of DSc awards within specific areas.

sample) did not make such awards. One institution responded that it was looking into developing the award in the future and a further institution, at the time of the survey, was holding its regulations regarding higher doctorates in abeyance and intends to maintain this position until 2011.

Clearly, though we have ordered the awards in Table 1 according to the number of institutions that offer them, this ordering does not take account of the actual number of awards made by institutions. In short, having an award 'available' within institutional regulations bears no necessary relationship to how often that award is made. The survey did not seek to break down individual awards in terms of numbers made, though it did seek information on overall numbers of higher doctorates awarded (Section 9).

2.4 Doctorates in Divinity, Science, Letters and Music

The only award listed in Table 1 that is unequivocally an award made at higher doctoral level, with a single nomenclature attached to it, is the Doctor of Divinity. Yet, it is also the case that only ten member institutions offered that particular award. It is perhaps worth stressing at this point that all the outcomes in this report relate to our sample of 70 institutions only. It may well be, for example, that what is said above about the Doctor of Divinity is denied in the case of some or indeed all of the institutions that did not respond to the survey or are not members of the Council.

The other awards on offer in more than ten institutions were the higher doctorates in Science, Letters, Law and Music (mostly, though not universally, known by the abbreviations DSc, DLitt, LLD and DMus respectively); However, in each of these cases the award was also offered by at least one institution elsewhere at initial doctoral level. Though, in turn, it is also worth pointing out perhaps that such offerings were restricted to just two institutions. In short, the awards of DSc, DLitt, LLD and DMus are mostly – though not universally – restricted in use to Higher Doctorates rather than initial doctorates

It should be noted here that, in the case of Science, there were a number of institutions who responded to question 2 ('other awards not listed in response to question 1') that they offered higher doctorate awards in Science but with specific areas within that domain denoted and these are listed in Table 2.

2.5 Doctorates in Engineering, Technology, Social Science and Medicine

The remaining awards listed in Table 1 are those in Engineering, Technology, Social Science and Medicine. In each of these cases, named awards were offered at initial level elsewhere in our sample and abbreviations used vary between the two separate levels. For example:

- In Engineering, nine institutions offered the DEng as a higher doctorate while one institution offered this award at initial doctoral level. A number of respondents noted that the DEng 'is used' to denote higher doctoral level while the EngD is used to denote initial [often 'professional'] doctoral level.
- In Technology, ten universities used DTech while another (not included in Table 1) used Doctor of Technical Science (DScTech).
- In Social Science, five institutions offered a DSocSc as a higher award while another three offered it at initial doctoral level.
- In Medicine, the three institutions that offered the MD at higher level are outnumbered by the 27 who responded that they offered the MD at initial doctoral level.

2.6 The Relationship Between Name of Award and its Abbreviated Form

What becomes clear from the above is that, with the exception of the Doctor of Divinity (DD), there is no universally agreed practice across our sample when it comes to the relationship between name of award, its level and its abbreviated form. Within this lack of absolute uniformity, it is also clear that the two higher doctorates most widely on offer, and with little variation, were the DSc (Doctor of Science) and the DLitt (Doctor of Letters). Even here, in the case of Science, there were four individual institutions who distinguish an area within science in their named, higher doctoral awards (see section 2.3).

2.7 The Less Common Award Titles

Table 2 lists those higher doctorate awards that were available currently in one or two of our sample institutions only (note that there are two awards within the regulations at one university but which are held in abeyance until 2011 (Doctor of Literature [DLit]; Doctor of Literature (Education) [DLit(Ed)]).

Table 2 – Less Common Award Titles

Award Title	Abbreviated Title	Number of Institutions making award
Doctor of Dental Science	DDSc	2
Doctor of Arts	DArts	1
Doctor of Design	DDes	1
Doctor of Economic and Social Studies	DScEcon	1
Doctor of Medical Science	DMedSc	1
Doctor of Metallurgy	DMet	1
Doctor of Science (Engineering)	D.Sc Eng	1
Doctor of Science in Engineering	DSc in Engineering	1
Doctor of Science in Agriculture & Biological Sciences	DSc in Agriculture and Biological Sciences	1
Doctor of Science in Medicine	DSc in Medicine	1
Doctor of Science in Science	DSc in Science	1
Doctor of Technical Science	DScTech	1

It is perhaps worth noting that the majority of the awards listed in Table 2 (nine out of the twelve) fall within the sciences; indeed the final six awards listed were all 'Doctor of Science' but in a specific scientific area such as engineering or medicine.

However, it is also the case that four of the awards (DSc in Agriculture and Biological Sciences, DSc in Engineering, DSc in Medicine and DSc in Science) were all offered by one member of the sample only and indeed all of the awards in Table 2 were made across just six institutions. Therefore, just 9% of our overall sample is responsible for the twelve awards in Table 2 and all on an individual basis – with the exception of the DDSc, which is offered by two separate institutions.

Summary to Section 2 – Specific Higher Doctorate Titles in Use

- 70% of the sample offered higher doctorate awards.
- The only award cited unequivocally as a higher doctorate (by ten institutions), with a single nomenclature attached to it, was the Doctor of Divinity. The other awards on offer in more than ten institutions were the higher doctorates in Science, Letters, Law and Music (mostly, though not universally, known by the abbreviations DSc, DLitt, LLD and DMus respectively); However, in all of these cases the award is also offered by one or other of just two institutions elsewhere at initial doctoral level.
- The remaining awards were those in Engineering, Technology, Social Science and Medicine. In each of these cases, named awards were offered at initial level elsewhere and abbreviations used vary between the two separate levels.
- With the exception of the Doctor of Divinity (DD), there is no universally agreed practice in terms of the relationship between name of award, its level and its abbreviated form. After the DD, the two higher doctorates most widely on offer, and with little variation, were the DSc (Doctor of Science) and the DLitt (Doctor of Letters).
- Four awards (DSc in Agriculture and Biological Sciences, DSc in Engineering, DSc in Medicine and DSc in Science) were all offered by one institution only.

3. Future Awards (Question 3 refers)

Only one institution reported that it was considering future higher doctoral awards; it does not currently offer such awards.

4. Awards in Question (i.e. Awards about which the respondent was uncertain) (Question 4 refers)

In question 4 we asked respondents to note any awards about which they were uncertain in the terms we had defined in the preamble to the questionnaire, i.e. where their status as a higher doctorate was in doubt in the mind of the respondent at least. Our purpose here was to offer an opportunity for the working definition of a higher doctorate that we set out earlier in this report (and which was in the preamble) to be questioned.

The awards 'in question' were:

- PhD by Publication – *'We see it as of equivalent status to a standard PhD, albeit for mid-career researchers'*
- DSocSci (Doctor of Social Sciences) – *'At [our University], this is a professional doctorate at a level equivalent to a PhD'*
- MD (Doctor of Medicine) – *'This is an initial doctorate'*
- DD, LLD, DMus, DSc, DLitt, DSocSc, MD – *'These are all honorary awards at [our University]'*.

Summary to Section 4 – Awards in Question

Some institutions asserted that the way in which they interpret the use of particular named awards is 'the accepted way' – yet clearly the evidence from our survey suggests that this is hardly ever the case and that there is a minimal number of universally common practices in this respect. In follow up discussions it became apparent that the assertions made in responses were based on assumptions rather than factual information.

5. Eligibility (Questions B1 & B2 refer)

Forty-eight institutions responded to this question. Clearly, individual institutions may make use of more than one category – indeed this is the most common situation – hence Table 3 gives the numbers of institutions where an eligibility category is employed. The percentages quoted relate to the number of institutions employing a particular category as a percentage of the overall sample of those responding.

Table 3 – Eligibility Categories

Eligibility Categories	Number of Institutions where the category applies	Percentage of the overall sample applying the category
A = Current academic staff	41	85%
B = Former academic staff	24	50%
C = Current 'other University Staff'	23	48%
D = Alumni	42	88%
E = Others (please specify)	22	46%

Table 3 shows that the most common eligibility categories across our sample are 'Alumni' (88 % of our sample employed this category) and 'Current Academic Staff' (85% of our sample employed this category).

In contrast, the least common categories (excluding 'other') are 'Former Academic staff' (50% of our sample employed this category) and 'Current other University staff' (48 % of our sample employed this category).

There is then a clear emphasis on alumni and current academic staff as those eligible to submit for the award.

There were, as might be expected, a large number of caveats to the categories mainly in the form of restrictions as to eligibility. For convenience these are summarised in Appendix 5 – where examples of the main kinds of eligibility criteria are listed.

Summary to Section 5 – Eligibility

The most common categories of person eligible for registration for a higher doctoral award are 'Alumni' and 'Current Academic Staff'.

Respondents noted an array of caveats within those categories and these relate in large part to issues such as: pre-requisite qualifications, time elapsed from first degree or initial doctorate to point of application for the higher level of award, time in 'qualifying post' and place where research work took place.

There were a number of instances noted in responses where various higher awards were treated differently, in terms of eligibility criteria, within an institution.

6. Supervision (Questions C1 & C2 refer)

6.1 Supervised Work or Not?

Clearly one significant feature of working towards an academic award is the amount and kind of support given to the candidate. In this sense, whether or not candidates for a higher doctorate are given access to someone who acts in a supervisory or advisory capacity is part of the defining of the award: in short, does it involve some supervised programme of work or not?

6.2 Summary of Main Responses

Of the forty eight institutions that responded to the question, "*Does a candidate for a higher doctorate have a nominated supervisor or advisor?*":

- thirty nine (81% of those responding) replied that no nomination of supervisor or advisor was made;
- eight (17% of those responding) replied that a nomination of supervisor or advisor was made;
- a further one institution did not require supervision/advice but noted that it might be offered if it were deemed to be appropriate.

6.3 Caveats to Responses

Of those who responded in the negative, two noted that though candidates were not offered supervision as such, they were recommended to 'consult informally' with a senior member of the university staff before beginning to prepare a submission.

Of the eight who responded in the affirmative with regard to supervision or advice, two noted that this nominee would be a senior academic member of staff – familiar with the area of the work and with the higher doctoral standard.

The questionnaire did not ask institutions to clarify roles or indeed to distinguish between the roles of ‘supervisor’ and ‘advisor’. Comments overall however did indicate that what was being offered to higher doctoral candidates in general was more akin to the giving of advice on procedures and on the construction of a submission than to ‘supervision’ in the sense of supervising any research activity.

Summary to Section 6 – Supervision

- There is no uniformity of view with regard to supervision of higher doctorates. Yet it is fairly clear that, for the majority of responding institutions, higher doctorates were not supervised academic awards.
- It is also reasonable to suggest that the giving of advice does take place with varying degrees of informality but that it is usually restricted to matters of procedure and the structure of submissions.
- Where clarification was given, it suggested that those nominated to guide or advise candidates were senior members of staff, familiar with the area and the standard of the award.

7. Submission and Examination (Questions D1 to D6 refer)

7.1 Prima Facie Stage (Question D1 refers)

7.1.1 Relationship to the award of PhD by Published Work

During initial consultations prior to the design of the questionnaire it became clear that, for at least some institutions, the higher doctorate bore some resemblance to the award of ‘PhD by Published Work’, in as much as higher doctorate submissions tended to relate to published matter. It seemed reasonable to ask therefore, in the questionnaire itself, about any ‘*prima facie*’ stages that might form part of the process of assessing potential/actual submissions given that such a stage features in many institutional procedures for the PhD by Published work (as was evidenced in Powell, 2004, ‘The Award of PhD by Published Work in the UK’ published by UKCGE – see the UKCGE website for a downloadable copy).

By ‘*prima facie* stage’ we meant a stage wherein a judgement is made that, at first sight, there was a case for progressing to secondary or final assessment.

7.1.2 Responses

Of the forty eight institutions that responded to this question:

- forty-three (90% of those responding) replied in the affirmative, i.e. that they did operate a system for assessing potential candidates that involved a *prima facie* stage;
- two institutions replied that they did not operate a *prima facie* stage;
- three respondents did not know whether they operated such a stage or not.

One institution clarified its response in some detail and it is cited below (this overlaps with material presented in later sections on the content of submissions).

- “Before accepting a formal application, the University wishes to be satisfied that there is a *prima facie* case for proceeding with the application. To establish whether there is a *prima facie* case, candidates are required to submit one copy of the material indicated below:
 - a specimen set of the papers the candidate wishes to submit in support of the application
 - a full list of publications
 - a curriculum vitae
 - a statement which should include:
 - A summary of the work covered in the submission, drawing attention to work considered to be of particular importance and including an assessment of the significance of the work in relation to knowledge at the time the research was done, and, as appropriate, its influence on subsequent research in the field;
 - an indication of the relationship, if any, between the various topics covered by the papers;
 - a clear statement, in the case of work submitted under joint authorship, of the candidate’s own share in the joint publication;
 - an indication of whether, and to what extent, any of the papers submitted have resulted from work for which an earlier degree has been awarded.

If the University accepts that there is a *prima facie* case for proceeding with the application, candidates are asked to make a formal submission by completing an examination entry form and sending 2 further copies of the original submission together with the examination fee.”

None of the general comments at the end of the questionnaire related to this *prima facie* stage.

Summary – Prima Facie Case

- A clear majority of the sample operated a system involving a *prima facie* stage of some kind and in this sense there is a clear similarity between the higher doctorates and the award of PhD by Published Work (where the stage is also common if not universal).

7.2 Guidance on [number of] Publications within Submissions (Question D2 refers)

7.2.1 Introduction

The survey included a question relating to any stipulations with regard to publications expected or required of a higher doctoral submission. This was an attempt to discern whether or not institutions conveyed any expectation to potential candidates regarding the scope of a submission in terms of publications (in the first instance simply of number of publications). Admittedly, this makes reference to a fairly crude ‘measure’ of what a higher doctoral submission might legitimately comprise but the earlier

UKCGE report into the PhD by Published Work had revealed that 'number of publications' was cited in many institutional regulations. In this current survey respondents were able to add comment about quality and/or kind of publication in addition to number.

7.2.2 The Responses

In response to the question "Is any guidance given on the number of publications required within a submission?":

- Forty institutions (83 % of those 48 who answered the question) responded that no such guidance was given;
- Six institutions (13% of the 48 of those who answered the question) did give some guidance

Of the six institutions that did offer some guidance, clarification of guidance given to potential candidates included the following comments.

- 'The work is required to be "*considerable, having regard to the nature of the discipline*". Most of the requirements refer to the quality of the work. For the DMus, between 5 & 7 musical compositions are required.'
- 'For scientific disciplines, 80-100 published works; for humanities disciplines – a number of major publications, for example 2 or 3 books, plus a range of 30 or so publications in respected journals. However, guidance states these are cited as examples only.'
- 'Advice is given on different types of publications deemed acceptable.'
- 'A candidate shall present published work(s) or a collection of published papers which shall be a record, distinguished by its high standard, of important original work by the candidate. The work shall be a major contribution to the subject. The candidate shall also indicate whether or not the work or any part of it has been submitted, successfully or unsuccessfully, for a degree in this or any other University.'

Summary – Guidance on Number of Publications in a Submission

- A majority of institutions (i.e. 83 % of those responding to this question) did not give guidance on number of publications either in broad terms or more specifically.
- Of those that did give guidance, two specified the numbers of publications that they might expect. This compares with 14% of respondents to the earlier survey relating to the PhD by Published Work (see pgs 24-25 of the 2004 UKCGE Report).

7.3 Restrictions on Time (Question D3 refers)

7.3.1 Introduction

A feature of some institutional regulations regarding the award of PhD by Published Work is that time parameters are set out within which the publications to be submitted have to fall (33% of those responding to the 2004 survey about the PhD by Published Work employed some such parameters - see Powell, 2004). In a similar way it seemed reasonable to ask, in this current survey, if such restrictions applied in the case of higher doctorate awards.

7.3.2 Responses

Of the forty-six institutions who answered the question, *'Are there any restrictions regarding the period of time over which the applicant's cited works were published?'*:

- Forty-five institutions (98%) replied that they did not have any restrictions on time;
- One institution (2%) replied that it did have restrictions;

Of the forty-five who responded in the affirmative there were just two caveats noted:

- (i) work must be a 'sustained and consistent contribution over a number of years';
- (ii) work may be disregarded 'if it is considered that it has not been in the public domain or if it is submitted for a degree at too short an interval'.

One other institution noted that the situation with regard to this question was under review.

The institution which responded that it did operate some kind of time restriction clarified that restriction:

- (i) A candidate shall 'submit material of which a substantial and important part has been carried out after the candidate joined the staff of the University' (or one of its partner institutions).

Summary – Restrictions on Time

- A majority of institutions (i.e. 98% of respondents to this question) did not make any restriction on time periods within which cited publications must fall when considering an application for a higher doctorate.
- The institution that did make such restrictions referred to work needing to be carried out in the awarding (home) university.
- Despite this lack of clear guidance on any parameters regarding time within which publications must have been made, there was an implicit expectation that research outputs must be sustained over a substantial period of time.

7.4 Form of Submission (Question D4 refers)

7.4.1 Variation in expectations of what comprises a submission

In order to gain a closer understanding of the way in which institutions interpret the standard of a higher doctorate we asked them to indicate what their expectations were of a higher doctoral submission. In short, just what is a candidate for such a doctorate required to submit to enable the institution to judge whether or not he/she has met the criteria for the award?

All except one of the institutions responding to the questionnaire gave an answer to the question, "what form does the submission take?" (Q.D4) In order to try to make sense of the responses we present them in outline below according to the kinds of content required within institutional regulations. We give the detail of responses within each of these groupings in Appendix 3.

We begin with those institutions that require only the candidate's publications and end with those that require a number of elements within a submission: (i) those publications, (ii) a commentary, (iii) a CV and (iv) a statement regarding collaborators. Clearly this presentation is arbitrary; it is not intended as a precise categorisation in that some institutions overlap and some may have chosen to include only some parts of what they require (the question was open); nevertheless we suggest that the sections below offer some idea of the range of what is required in terms of submissions for higher doctorates. Our suggestion here is that whether or not an institution is requiring these things is indicative, to some extent at least, of their view of what is needed in order to judge whether or not a candidate has achieved the standard of a higher doctorate.

The number of words indicated with regard to any commentary that is required is a variable that cross-cuts our sections and we consider it at the end of this section.

7.4.2 Grouping of responses regarding form of submission

- **Publications only (Six Institutions)**

Six of the forty-seven institutions responding to this question recorded that they require the publications alone (we include here one institution that noted the requirement of an abstract in addition to the publications). These six responses are listed in Appendix 3.

- **Publications and a Commentary/Critical Appraisal (20 Institutions)**

Twenty institutions required of the candidate only the publications accompanied by a commentary. Here we sub-divide these responses into those asking for 1,000 words or less, those asking for 1,000 words or more and finally those with an unspecified word length. By sub-dividing in this way we are not concerned so much with the pragmatics of differing word lengths but rather with the implications of what can be included in less than a 1,000 words in comparison with what can be included in a document of unspecified length. This sub-section does not include those institutions that required a CV in addition to the above.

- **Publications and a Commentary of 1,000 words or less**

Eight institutions required the publications and an accompanying document of 1,000 words or less that served as and abstract or summarizing text or commentary or critical appraisal (all these terms were used). Again, the eight responses are listed in Appendix 3 because they illustrate the kinds of concerns institutions have with regard to the commentary.

- **Publications and a commentary of more than 1,000 words**

Six institutions defined the length of the commentary as more than 1,000 words. The range of word lengths mentioned here was from 5,000 to 30,000. As mentioned in a footnote, we can perhaps safely presume that in all the responses these word lengths refer to maxima – though that information was not always provided by respondents. Again, we list responses in Appendix 3 in as much as they seem indicative of the intention behind word allowance.

- **Publications and a commentary of undefined length**

There were six institutions that did not specify word length in relation to the commentary. The detail of their responses is given in Appendix 3.

- **Publications, Commentary and Curriculum Vitae (CV) (Nine Institutions)**

Nine institutions required a CV as well as the publications and accompanying commentary. Our justification for separating this group out is the notion that requiring a CV is indicative of a wider notion of a higher doctorate award than would be indicated by consideration of publications alone. In the cases in this sub-section the length of the expected commentaries varied or remained unspecified – none of the specified lengths were less than 1,000 words. Examples of these nine responses are given in Appendix 3.

- **Publications, commentary and summary of collaborator statements (and CV) (eleven institutions)**

There were ten institutions that required the publications, a commentary and a summary of collaborator statements and a further one that required these things and a CV. Some examples are given in Appendix 3. In short, these institutions, arguably, made the most demands in terms of requirements within a submission (in relation to breadth of content though not necessarily, of course, in terms of any quality measure). (Note: clearly, some institutions might have required verification of contribution where collaboration has occurred yet might not have entered this into their response to this question (i.e. some institutions may deal with such collaboration in their procedures but not specifically in their requirements of a submission))

7.4.3 Number of words indicated in relation to the commentary

This report has already noted that the responses do not, universally, enable us to understand if the word lengths quoted refer to maxima or minima or indeed to approximations. However, no institution quoted a minimum word length and so we can perhaps safely assume that where word length was noted as simply a number of words (i.e. with no indication of whether this number referred to maximum or minimum or approximate) then the intention was either to refer to maximum or approximate.

Of those institutions that required a commentary and stipulated in their response a word length:

- 10 institutions indicated a maximum or approximation of less than a 1,000 words;
- 3 institutions indicated a maximum or approximation of less than 5,000 words;
- 7 institutions indicated a maximum or approximation of less than 10,000 words;
- 3 institutions indicated a maximum or approximation of more than 10,000 (15,000, 20,000 and 30,000 respectively).

Of those who required a commentary, the range was from 500 to 30,000 words.

7.4.4 Specific Reference to the Award of Doctor of Music (DMus)

There were two responses that made specific reference to the award of DMus. These are noted in Appendix 4. In short, these two references make exceptions for the DMus, notably in one instance allowing 'as an alternative to publication' the inclusion in a submission of: 'unpublished works accompanied by evidence of performance in a fully professional context'.

Summary – Form of Submission

Institutions varied in what they expected to be included in a higher doctorate submission. Variations related to: (i) publications, (ii) commentary, (iii) CV and (iv) statement regarding collaborators.

- 6 institutions: publications only
- 20 institutions: publications and a commentary only
- 9 institutions: publications, commentary and curriculum vitae
- 10 institutions: publications, commentary and summary of collaborator statements
- 1 institution: publications, commentary, CV and summary of collaborator statements

Of those institutions that required a commentary, the range was from 500 words to 30,000 words.

7.5 How is the examination Panel Constituted? (Question D5 refers)

An open question was employed for this issue of how the examination panel is constituted because it was felt unwise to predict outcomes in this particular area by the use of pre-determined categories. Responses, then, reflect the openness of the question but also, we suggest, indicate the variability and range of nuance that exists in how Higher Doctorate submissions are judged. For example, the terminology used by respondents to this question indicates perhaps a distinction between the notion of 'examination against set criteria' at initial doctoral level and a broader notion of assessment that includes reviewing and appraising at this Higher Doctoral level. Similarly, there are a number of instances where it was noted that '*comments would be sought from...*' and again the words: assessors, examiners, reviewers, referees, advisers are all used and sometimes in a way that would imply interchangeability.

In an attempt to identify some of the common themes and differing practices that exist across the sector and the nuances within them with regard to the composition of examination panels at Higher Doctoral level, we summarise below some key features that occurred within the 46 institutional responses to question D5. We have chosen to note below the numbers responding but we do this for the reader's interest only – clearly numbers may mislead here because the question we asked did not require directed responses, for example to any specific qualities or experiences that might be required of examiners.

- All 46 responses make mention of more than one examiner.
- All 46 responses make mention of the need for the involvement of external assessment, though one response does note 'and an external if necessary'.
- A majority of responses refer to three or more examiners being required (36 out of the 46 responses).
- A minority of responses (nine out of the 46 responses) make reference to assessment processes including specific named senior posts within the university (e.g. the Vice Chancellor) and/or to those from within the university at professorial or readership rank.
- Some respondents (nine out of the 46 responses) make mention of specific qualities that assessors should have, for example that they should be '*leading figures in the field*' or have '*recognised eminence in the subject of the submission*' and/or should hold a higher doctorate themselves.
- One institution notes the involvement of an examiner from overseas as being desirable.

- There are occasions noted where committees or specially set-up sub committees or panels (e.g. ‘*scrutiny panel*’) are noted in the sense of referees advising a committee on a submission (five out of the 46 responses).
- There are a few occasions where mention is made of a phased process – with a prima facie stage or something that appears to approximate to that (four out of 46 responses).
- Independence of examiners/reviewers from the university and from the candidate is mentioned throughout responses.

Summary – Constitution of Examination Panel

Many of the distinctive features of the criteria for the proper composition of an assessment panel are carried over from initial doctoral level. For example, the need for review that is external to the university, independence of judgment and specialist experience within the substantive domain.

However, the special nature of this higher level is recognised in some responses by an indication of the involvement of named senior posts within the awarding university, by an increased emphasis on judgment making that involves appraisal of contribution to an intellectual field over an extended period of time rather than assessment against distinct [academic] criteria and by the need for examiners/reviewers to be, themselves, leading authorities within the field concerned.

7.6 Oral Examination (Question D6 refers)

Table 4 summarises the responses to the question, ‘is an oral examination: compulsory, discretionary or not required?’

Table 4 – Responses to ‘is an oral examination: compulsory, discretionary or not required?’

Compulsory	Discretionary	Not required	No response
8 institutions	13 institutions	27 institutions	0 institutions

The majority of institutions that responded (27 out of 48) indicated that they did not require an oral examination (56%). Of the remaining 21 institutions where the possibility of such an examination existed, 13 (27% of the total responses) indicated that it was discretionary and only 8 institutions indicated that it was compulsory (17%).

The questionnaire did not pursue the grounds upon which discretion might be exercised but comments made and follow-up discussions indicated that in circumstances where a reviewer expressed doubt or where judgments varied among a panel of reviewers then the option of an oral might be taken. There were no indications concerning the frequency with which the option of an oral is taken in such contexts.

While it has not been possible to find survey data that would indicate the situation with regard to this question at initial doctoral level, the anecdotal evidence would seem to suggest that if the same question were to be asked at that [lower] level then the responses would be entirely in the opposite direction. That is, at initial doctoral level very few, if any, institutions 'do not require' an oral examination whereas in a majority of institutions such a process is compulsory; where discretion is allowed then typically that would be a matter of illness of the candidate or some other 'special circumstance'. In short, where at initial doctoral level the oral examination is very much an expected part of the overall examination process in the UK this is not the case at higher doctoral level.

Summary – Oral Examination

The majority of respondents (56%) indicated that an oral examination was not required at higher doctoral level within their institution. In only 17% of the sample was such an examination compulsory and in the remaining 27% it was discretionary.

This picture is in marked contrast to what anecdotal evidence indicates to be the case at initial doctoral level where oral examination is more an expected part of the overall examination process.

8. Fees (Question E1 refers)

Table 5 summarises the fees charged by different institutions. It should be noted that, for convenience, where an institution indicated that there was a fee for an initial stage (e.g. a prima facie stage) and a subsequent fee for final examination then we have combined those two fees to give an overall figure for the total cost to an individual of gaining the award. We should also note that some institutions differentiate according to whether or not the applicant is a member of staff – Table 5 does not include any note of remission of fees for staff and merely gives basic costs.

Table 5 – Fees

No response indicating cost	No fee	£0 - £499	£500 - £999	£1000 plus
20 institutions	0 institutions	5 institutions	13 institutions	10 institutions

Table 5 indicates that the majority of institutions (20 out of 48) did not respond to this question by indicating a fee level (we should note here that 3 institutions who responded with a comment to the effect that fee costs varied [e.g. 'as determined at the time'] are included in this 'no response' category). In comments and follow-up discussions it appeared that many respondents were unable to readily ascertain the figure from standard institutional information sources. Fees for higher doctorates were, for some respondents, matters of some mystery that might only be resolved when an application was made.

Of the 28 institutions that responded with a figure (or figures that we could combine to give an overall cost to the applicant) the majority (13) charged a fee between £500 and £999. A smaller number (10)

charged over £1,000 and a minority charged less than £499. For interest we can note that fees charged ranged from £250 to £4,100. There were no institutions that did not charge fees – though concessions for staff might include a waiver of the entire fee.

Summary – Fees

The situation with regard to fees is variable across the sector and varies within institutions in terms of whether or not the applicant is a member of staff.

Fees ranged from £250 to £4,100 with the majority charging somewhere between £500 and £999. Some institutions noted that their fee levels were under review.

9. Frequency of Award (Question E2 refers)

Table 6 summarises the responses to question E2 (‘Approximately how many higher doctoral awards has your institution made over the last two years?’).

Table 6 – Frequency of Awards Made at Higher Doctoral Level

Number of awards made	Nil	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13+	No response
Number of Institutions Responding	20	15	7	1	1	3	1

It can be seen from Table 6 that the majority of respondents (20 out of 47 institutions that responded to this particular question – 43%) noted that no awards were made in the two year period prior to this request for information. Following this clear majority, the number of institutions within a category declines as the number of awards made increases. So: 15 institutions awarded between 1 and 3 higher doctorates each in the two year period, 7 institutions made between 4 and 6 such awards, 1 institution awarded 7, 1 institution awarded 10 and finally 3 institutions awarded more than 13 each.

It is clear from the Table that higher doctorate awards are, for the majority of institutions, rare events relative to other forms of award. Indeed, if the number of institutions making just one award in the two year period (7 institutions) is added to those making none (which seems legitimate given that in a two year period any institution only making one award must have a ‘nil’ year) then we have a grouping of 27 institutions – that is 58% of those responding made either nil or just one higher doctoral award over the two year period.

At the other end of the scale it is perhaps worth noting that 3 institutions awarded more than 13 higher doctorates each over the period respectively: 15, 20 and ‘15 to 20 approximately’.

In most responding institutions, then, higher doctoral awards are rarely made but in a minority of institutions they are more common. Of course, these figures are not mapped against the number of awards made at initial doctoral level by the various responding institutions.

Of course, the questionnaire did not seek information on how many applications were made in relation to the number of higher doctorates eventually awarded. This report does not contain any information therefore on attrition rates at higher doctoral level – it is possible then that many more apply than is reflected in Table 6 – i.e. many may apply but few are ultimately successful.

Summary – Frequency of Award

In the two year period preceding the questionnaire the majority of institutions made either no higher doctorate awards or made just one. In contrast just three institutions made more than 13 such awards each. There is therefore quite a marked difference in how frequently higher doctoral awards are being made across the sector though, again, for the majority number of awards made is small.

Part Three – Discussion

10.1 Definition of Higher Doctorate Awards

It is apparent from the responses to the questionnaire that there is a general lack of consensus across the sector in terms of understanding the nature of Higher Doctorate awards, at least in terms of common nomenclature and their place in relation to other kinds and levels of doctorate. Where institutions claim certainty that their understanding in these respects is the commonly accepted one then evidence from elsewhere in this report indicates that certainty to be ill-founded. However, there are some interpretations that are virtually universal and which relate to these awards - notably perhaps: in the use of the DSc and DLitt awards, the way in which the eligibility categories are broadly cast (i.e. the need for the candidate to have some involvement/connection with the awarding institution) and the need for a successful candidate to need to have made a substantial contribution to an intellectual field over a sustained period.

It is arguable that benefits to candidates or to institutions will not necessarily arise from any defining – at national level - of the higher doctorate more sharply than at present. There is a sense in which responses to the questionnaire indicate that the higher doctorate awards are ‘working’ (in the sense that some universities have regulations pertaining to them which are used to register candidates and make awards) albeit for different institutions in different ways. It is not clear then that it would be desirable to seek conformity of definition (for example with a view to enhancing the quality of the work required to achieve the award).

Having acknowledged that some lack of universality with regard to how universities treat higher doctorate awards may be benign if not wholly acceptable – it seems reasonable to suggest that there is an issue where the same nomenclature is used for different levels of academic award. Of course, this issue may bedevil other areas of academia (e.g. the DBA as a diploma or a doctorate) but at the levels of doctorate and higher doctorate it would seem important to distinguish level by nomenclature with consistency.

Recommendation

There was no evidence in the data to suggest that the working definition and the additional explanatory distinction developed for the questionnaire and repeated in this report needed to be revised in any way – in short, it fits with the clear majority of practices across the sector.

Institutions that are engaged in developing regulations with regard to higher doctorates may wish therefore to use the descriptor below as a starting point in their discussions.

‘A higher doctorate is an award that is at a level above the initial doctorate (e.g. the PhD) and that is typically gained not through a defined programme of study but rather by submission of a substantial body of research based work. It may be seen as indicating command over a field of study and a sustained contribution to understanding within that field.’

10.2 Relationships between Kinds and Levels of Doctorate

10.2.1 Higher and Honorary Doctorates

It seems important here to distinguish between higher and honorary doctorate awards. Clearly, here there may be legitimate ‘double usage’ of named awards yet some respondents clearly viewed ‘higher’

as meaning 'honorary' and yet the way in which the higher awards are used by the vast majority does comply with the working definition that we set out at the outset of this report and had used in the questionnaire itself. According to our definition the higher doctoral awards are quite distinct from honorary awards and the two need not be confused – indeed to do so would damage the credibility of both. We should note here that there is no UKCGE report into Honorary Doctorates (nor indeed, to our knowledge, any report from any other source) and therefore our comments in this paragraph relate to our own understanding of these awards rather than to any body of evidence.

10.2.2 Relationship between Higher Doctorates and the PhD by Published work

One area where there is scope for confusion between awards is in the relationship between Higher Doctorates and the PhD by Published Work; indeed, some respondents commented that they saw no distinction between the two awards. Certainly, both of these awards involve the assessment of research activity based, in part or in whole, on the contribution to a field made by the candidate through the medium of his/her publications. The notion of 'in part or in whole' is perhaps a significant element in an understanding of the distinction between these awards. Higher doctorates may (though not necessarily) involve a judgment about contribution being made on the basis of the whole range of research activities and in this sense are not necessarily restricted to publications alone (note that a number of institutions require a CV as well as publications when assessing for this higher award). A PhD by Published Work on the other hand is usually (see Powell's report for UKCGE on this award in the list of publications at the end of this report and available on the UKCGE website) awarded for publications alone (though usually accompanied by a commentary).

The two awards are also similar in that a 'commentary' (or synopsis or exegesis or other such title) on the contribution made by the publications themselves is often (though again not always) required. Broadly speaking such a commentary is more often required at PhD by Published work level than it is at Higher Doctoral level.

There is also, of course, the matter of level or depth of contribution made. Powell's earlier report into the PhD by Published work indicates that this award is seen by the majority of institutions in the UK that use it as being on a level with the kind of contribution made at [initial] PhD level; indeed, some institutions have begun to merge their regulations with regard to these two awards, at the level of criteria if nothing else. The Higher Doctorate on the other hand is awarded, by definition, for a contribution that can be judged to be 'higher' than that of a PhD.

In short, while a Higher Doctorate may be awarded, at least in part, on the basis of published work it is distinct from the PhD by Published Work in terms of the part played by publications in the overall assessment. The two kinds of award are also distinct in terms of the level of contribution that the publications are judged to have made to a defined intellectual field.

10.2.3 Relationship between Higher and Professional Doctorates

Some respondents indicated in their comments that they were unsure of the difference between higher and professional doctorates and certainly there were issues of inconsistent use of nomenclature between these two kinds of award.

There is some similarity between the awards if one takes the view that the higher doctorates awards are signifiers of sustained achievement within a 'professional' area (using professional in its widest sense).

Yet, the distinction must again be a matter of level. A professional doctorate is described in the 2005 UKCGE report *'Professional Doctorate Awards in the UK'* (see list of UKCGE Reports at the end of this current publication) as *'an award at a doctoral level where the field of study is a professional discipline and which is distinguished from the PhD by a title that refers to that profession'* (Powell and Long, 2005, p.8). In that report, the consensus among respondents was an interpretation of the professional doctorates as being awarded for a level of contribution that has some broad sense of parity with the PhD and indeed this is reflected in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (see QAA website). In contrast, it is clear from this current report that if higher doctorates are to mean anything it is necessarily the case that they must be awarded for work that is 'higher' in level than that required for an [initial] doctorate.

In summary, while both higher and professional doctorates are awarded for research work that seeks to inform and enlighten intellectual fields that may well be described as professional in the broadest sense of the term (e.g. the profession of science) the two kinds of award operate at two distinct levels: the doctoral and the higher doctoral. It may seem that this is self-evident yet, following responses to the questionnaire, it is perhaps worth stating explicitly. The matter of distinguishing these levels is discussed below.

Recommendation

While the Higher Doctorates are related to the other forms of doctorate described here in this report (i.e. Honorary, by Published Work and Professional as well as the PhD) they are also distinct from them by the kind of intellectual effort that is required to attain them, by the level of the outcomes of that effort and by the sustained period over which that effort must necessarily be expended. Institutions that develop doctorates of any of these kinds may wish to retain a notion of the relative qualities of each.

10.3 Matters of Level

The questionnaire did not address directly the matter of level of achievement required for a higher doctorate to be awarded – in part because in its initial conception it was concerned primarily with surveying the sector to gain a snapshot view of the situation with regard to these awards. However, the way in which institutions responded indicated that there was some consensus around the notion of the higher level of achievement that was required. For example, the general consensus was reflected in: the way in which eligibility of candidates was defined, the nature of the submission that was requested of candidates and the scope of the examination process (including here the status of examiners).

Two themes can be extracted from the various responses, though we note that neither of these can claim to be universal - they merely reflect the general direction of responses and comments. (i) Candidates for a higher doctorate need to have been working in the intellectual field(s) for a sustained period of time and may have to have had some substantial connection with the awarding institution during that time. (ii) During their time of working they need to have been actively engaged in researching at a level where outcomes have contributed significantly to the advancement of the field; in so doing they will have demonstrated command over the intellectual discipline(s).

In the sense that one level needs to be understood in relation to another it is perhaps fair to say that where the PhD (and the other initial level doctorates) requires evidence that the candidate can function

as an independent researcher who is able to continue to make a critical contribution to a field, the higher doctorate in contrast requires evidence that this kind of functioning has continued for a sustained period and that the resulting contribution is significant in terms of the advancement of ideas within the discipline. The situation here may be summarised as: a first level where an award is made on the basis of evidence that a programme of study has led to a defined level of achievement being demonstrated by a candidate (e.g. the PhD) compared to a second level where an award is made for a 'lifetime's contribution' (e.g. a DLitt).

The notion of intellectual field is in itself interesting in that the extent to which assessors would require the contribution to have been made to a specified domain of work within a discipline or to a discipline as a whole (that is, crossing areas within a discipline) or to related disciplines was not clear from responses. We can assume perhaps that 'weight of contribution' is the key here and that the issue for an awarding university might well be in the composition of an examining panel that can adequately judge a submission where, for example, there is much crossing of disciplinary boundaries. Clearly, this is an issue that also occurs at initial doctoral level and can perhaps only be resolved by flexibility of regulations.

Recommendation

Much of what is written in this section (10.3) requires some understanding of the level at which an initial doctorate may safely be awarded. Within individual institutional regulations it may well be important to set the criteria for the two levels of doctoral award within a context in which the higher can be judged as building upon and extending those that pertain at the lower (initial) doctoral level.

Criteria for the two levels of award may need to relate to the same kinds of intellectual activities but the standards need to be distinct.

10.4 Matters of Nomenclature

The earlier parts of this report highlight some areas where the nomenclature employed in some institutions for some higher doctoral awards conflicts with uses of the same award title at different levels of academic study in other institutions. Indeed, there is very little absolute uniformity of title usage. While some variation is to be expected, it does seem that the existing situation will be confusing and potentially misleading for those outside of academia who need to interpret the meaning of the various award titles – in particular perhaps those from outside of the UK. In short, the common currency of the UK's higher doctorate awards is endangered because of their lack of consistency.

Recommendation

When developing, or reviewing, the nomenclature it employs in relation to higher doctorates an institution might usefully take note of the range of award titles as set out in Table 1 of this report and make decisions with regard to nomenclature that enhance consistency rather than increase the current range and/or exacerbate current, inherent contradictions and tensions.

10.5 Eligibility

A strong feature of the responses to the question about eligibility requirements for higher doctorates was the need for prospective candidates to have a connection with the awarding university, typically either as graduate or as a member (current or past) of its staff. This requirement casts the awards in a particular light; it makes them more than academic awards that can be gained through advanced research study by any students whatever their background but they are also different from honorary doctoral awards because they do require academic achievement (as has already been noted).

The question that arises therefore is why higher doctoral awards often have eligibility criteria that are restricted to those with existing or prior connections to the institution? The answer must lie in the notion that the awards are made to those who are within the particular academic fold (i.e. the awarding institution) who are deserving of them. The corollary, in such circumstances, is that they would not be given to outsiders even if they do deserve them. Where such restrictive eligibility criteria are applied then we can reasonably assume that the purpose of the awards is to 'honour our own'.

Of course, as can be seen in the main body of the report not all institutions apply the same eligibility criteria and hence we can – again, reasonably - assume that those institutions that do not have those restrictions are operating on the basis of a different underlying purpose with regard to higher doctorates, and one which relates to 'rewarding the academically worthy' regardless of their connectedness or otherwise with the awarding institution.

Recommendation

When considering regulations and practices with regard to higher doctorates, institutions may wish to consider the underlying purposes of those awards that they offer. In particular, whether or not eligibility criteria relate to existing or prior connections with the university might usefully be seen as signifiers of underlying purpose.

In short, are higher doctorates awarded only to honour those with connections to the university or are they awarded to reward any [appropriately qualified] researchers who have met a particular standard of academic achievement? The answer that an institution gives to this question ought to be compatible with its [stated] purpose in offering the higher doctoral award.

10.6 Supervision

The responses noted in the main body of the report suggest that whether or not supervision is offered to potential candidates signifies a difference in the underlying institutional attitude taken to the higher doctoral awards. Supervision is offered where the higher doctorate is seen as an academic award that requires guidance on how to assemble and possibly defend a submission. Clearly, the kind of supervision required at this level is different from that needed at initial doctoral level – in essence the research work at the higher doctoral level will have been completed (over an extended period of time) and in this sense there is no 'programme of study' to supervise. All of this means that 'supervision' is probably not the most appropriate term in relation to the task in hand – the role is really one of advising or mentoring. In any case the qualification of the person chosen for the role needs some consideration – in order to match

to the requirements of the task those qualities would seem to revolve around an understanding of the regulations regarding a submission and some skill in putting together an advance and coherent argument relating to an extended body of work.

Recommendation

Institutions might consider (a) whether or not a mentoring role is appropriate in terms of the demands of the submission process as defined within their regulations and (b) what qualities any such mentor needs to have, or acquire, in order to perform duties satisfactorily. In both of these areas the status of individuals is not really the important issue; it is more a matter of knowledge of the relevant particulars (of submission regulations for example) and the ability to construct an argument from complex and extensive material.

10.7 Submission and Examination

The main body of the report notes wide variation in what is expected of higher doctoral submissions (e.g. with or without an accompanying exegesis), the process of submission (e.g. prima facie stage or not), the kinds of restriction on time periods during which the research must have been undertaken in order for it to 'qualify' as part of a submission (e.g. within a period of so many years or not) and the constitution of the examining panel (e.g. in terms of number of examiners and their status with regard to having a higher doctorate themselves or not). All of these differences may reflect the underlying stance that the particular institution takes towards the higher doctorate award; on the other hand some of them may have developed over time in reaction to particular circumstance and individual preferences on the part of senior academic staff.

Recommendation

If an institution were to review its procedures with regard to the submission of work for a higher doctorate and its subsequent examination then that review might usefully take account of underlying purpose.

For example, if the purpose in these respects is to judge contribution to a field of intellectual enterprise then why should there be restrictions on the time during which that contribution has been made? If it is the contribution itself that is to be judged then, arguably, it does not matter if the period is short or long. If on the other hand it is the achievement of the individual in making the contribution then, arguably, achieving things over a shorter time frame might be seen as being more highly valued than achieving them over a longer period.

Reasoned compatibility between underlying purpose on the one hand and the reality of what is expected in terms of submission and examination on the other, is what needs to be achieved by institutional regulations and by practices and procedures.

References

Powell, S.D. (2004) *The Award of the PhD by Published Work*. Lichfield, UKCGE (available as a downloadable report from the UKCGE website <http://www.ukcge.ac.uk/publications/reports.htm>)

Powell, S.D. and Long, E. (2005) *Professional Doctorate Awards in the UK*. Lichfield, UKCGE (available as a downloadable report from the UKCGE website <http://www.ukcge.ac.uk/publications/reports.htm>)

Appendix 1 – The Questionnaire



UK Council *for* Graduate Education

Higher Doctorate Awards in the UK, June 2007

Introduction

UKCGE is undertaking a brief survey of the range of higher doctorate awards available across the sector and the nomenclature that is used in relation to them. UKCGE will publish this information on its website as a downloadable PDF document.

Clearly, the main purpose of this survey is to ascertain what member institutions understand by 'higher doctorates' and what awards of this kind are on offer across the sector. Therefore please list any awards that are treated within the regulatory structures of your university as 'higher doctorates'.

We give a working definition of 'higher doctorate' in the questionnaire itself but we stress that this is for guidance only and we do not wish to limit responses in any way by predetermining outcomes. We will report the range of ways in which the term is used.

UKCGE would be grateful if institutions could return the questionnaire to Nikki Crouch at N.G.Crouch@ukcge.ac.uk by Friday 8 June 2007.

Notes on electronic completion of the questionnaire

Open & Save

- Double-click on the template – it opens as a word document.
- To save, please include the name of your institution as part of the file name and save to your pc.
- To return the questionnaire, email UKCGE (N.G.Crouch@ukcge.ac.uk) and add the saved document as an attachment.

Navigating the Form

- Use Tab button or the mouse to move around the form.
- You need to click on a box/shaded area in order to enter your answer or activate the drop-down menu.
- Boxes with an arrow on the left have predetermined answers from which to choose an answer.
- Boxes with a border around them are check boxes, click with the mouse to mark with a cross.
- Shaded areas are for free text. The box will expand as you type. You may find that the spell checker will not work in these areas.
- Save your changes.

Part One – Awards Available

Name of institution	
Your own name	
Position in the institution	

Question 1. Please indicate which of the following awards are available in your university

Award Title	Abbreviated Title	Does your Institution make this award as a higher doctorate?	Does your Institution make this award at initial doctoral level (rather than at higher level)?	Comment
		Yes/No/Don't Know	Yes/No/Don't Know	
Doctor of Divinity	DD			
Doctor of Law	LLD			
Doctor of Music	DMus			
Doctor of Science	DSc			
Doctor of Letters	DLitt			
Doctor of Social Sciences	DSocSc			
Doctor of Medicine	MD			

Question 2. Other Awards not listed in Question 1 – please give full and abbreviated titles if possible

Note: As a starting point for this survey we are taking a higher doctorate to be an award that is:
(a) at a level above the initial doctorate (e.g. the PhD),
(b) that is typically gained not through a defined programme of study but rather by submission of a substantial body of research based work

Therefore, where a PhD has come to indicate mastery of a narrow field (narrow in the sense of representing possibly three years of research study only) the Higher Doctorate *may* be seen as indicating command over a field of study and a sustained contribution to understanding within that field.

Any Other Awards (not listed in question 1)

Award Title	Abbreviated Title	Comment

Question 3. Future Awards (not yet available but planned)

Award Title	Abbreviated Title	Comment

Question 4. Awards in Question

If you are in any doubt about whether or not a particular award 'qualifies' in the sense we describe above then please note it in the section below.

Awards in Question

Award Title	Abbreviated Title	Comment

If you have given a nil response to Part One of this questionnaire then please ignore Part Two (unless you wish to comment further in section F) and return the questionnaire as indicated at the end.

Part Two

B. Eligibility

B1.	Which of the following eligibility categories apply to the higher doctorates at your university?	Please tick as appropriate
A =		
B =		
C =		
D =		
E =		
B2.	Are there any particular restrictions on these eligibility categories (e.g. to be eligible candidates must have been in the employment of the university for at least two years?)	Yes/No/ Don't Know
	If yes, please specify:	

C. Supervision

C1.	Does a candidate for a higher doctorate have a nominated supervisor or advisor?	Yes/No/ Don't Know
C2.	If yes (to C1), do the regulations define who that supervisor/advisor shall be (e.g. Head of Faculty)?	
	Please specify (if known):	

D. Submission and Examination

D1.	Is there a prima facie stage (or equivalent)?	Yes/No/ Don't Know
D2.	Is any guidance given on the number of publications required within a submission?	Yes/No/ Don't Know
	If yes, please specify:	
D3.	Are there any restrictions regarding the period of time over which the applicant's cited works were published?	Yes/No/ Don't Know
	If yes, please specify:	
D4.	What form does the submission take (e.g. publications plus 6000 word critical appraisal)?	
D5.	How is the examination panel constituted (e.g. three externals with a least some higher doctorate experience among the panel)?	
D6.	Is an Oral Examination:	Please tick one option only
	1. compulsory?	
	2. discretionary?	
	3. not required?	

E. Cost and Frequency of Award

E1.	What is the fee? (clearly some respondents may wish not to divulge this figure, in which case please ignore)	£
E2.	Approximately how many higher doctorate awards has your institution made over the past two years?	

F. Any Other Comments

We have deliberately kept this questionnaire brief but any comments you wish to make in clarification of anything related to the above please include here

Thank you for your help in completing this questionnaire. Member institutions will be notified when the results are published on the UKCGE website.

Please return to Nikki Crouch (n.crouch@ukcge.ac.uk) by Friday 8 June 2007.

Professor Stuart Powell
University of Hertfordshire
and UKCGE Honorary Secretary

Nikki Crouch
Administrator
UKCGE

Appendix 2 – List of awards against institutions (of those who agreed to be named)

Title of Award	Awarding Institution
Doctor of Divinity (DD)	Birmingham Cambridge Cardiff Durham Exeter Leeds Manchester Nottingham Roehampton St Andrews
Doctor of Law (LLD)	Anglia Ruskin Bedfordshire Birmingham Bradford Brighton Bristol Cambridge Cardiff Exeter Hertfordshire Lancaster Leeds Leeds Metropolitan Leicester Manchester Manchester Metropolitan Nottingham Nottingham Trent Plymouth Roehampton Sheffield Hallam Southampton St Andrews Sussex Swansea
Doctor of Music (DMus)	Birmingham Bristol Cambridge Cardiff Durham

Title of Award	Awarding Institution
Doctor of Music (DMus) continued	Hertfordshire Leeds Manchester Nottingham Southampton St Andrews Sussex York
Doctor of Science (DSc)	Anglia Ruskin Bath Bedfordshire Birmingham Bradford Brighton, Bristol Cambridge Cardiff Central Lancashire Cranfield Durham Exeter Heriot Watt Hertfordshire Huddersfield Lancaster Leeds Leeds Metropolitan Leicester Loughborough Manchester Manchester Metropolitan Nottingham Nottingham Trent Plymouth Roehampton Salford Sheffield Hallam Southampton St Andrews Sussex Swansea York
Doctor of Letters (DLitt)	Anglia Ruskin Bath Bedfordshire Birmingham Bradford Brighton Bristol

Title of Award	Awarding Institution
Doctor of Letters (DLitt) continued	Cambridge Cardiff Central Lancashire Durham Exeter Heriot Watt Hertfordshire Huddersfield Lancaster Leeds Leeds Metropolitan Leicester Loughborough Manchester Manchester Metropolitan Nottingham Nottingham Trent Plymouth Roehampton Salford Sheffield Hallam Southampton St Andrews Sussex Swansea York
Doctor of Social Sciences (DSocSc)	Manchester Manchester Metropolitan Southampton
Doctor of Medicine (MD)	Cambridge St Andrews
Doctor of Engineering (DEng)	Birmingham Bradford Bristol Exeter Heriot Watt Manchester Sheffield Hallam
Doctor of Technology (DTech)	Anglia Ruskin Bradford Brighton Loughborough Manchester Metropolitan Nottingham Trent Plymouth

Appendix 3 – Detail of expected form of submissions for a higher doctorate (see section 7.4.2 of the main text)

Publications only

Six of the forty-seven institutions responding to this question recorded that they require the publications alone (we include here one institution that noted the requirement of an abstract in addition to the publications).

These six responses are quoted below, in part because their phrasing is, perhaps, indicative of their intentions (e.g. in terms of flexibility).

- “Publications only (which must be in English)”
- “Three copies of published work and a list of this work”
- “Copies of published work or thesis presenting the results of original research or scholarship”
- “Publications or a specially composed thesis or a combination of both”
- “For application: three copies of each work on which application is based, where possible, suitably bound”
- “Specially composed or published work, or a series of published papers within a field of work, or any combination of these”

Publications and a Commentary/Critical appraisal of 1000 words or less

Here we note those eight institutions that required the publications and an accompanying document of 1000 words or less that served as an abstract or summarizing text or commentary or critical appraisal (all these terms were used). We list the eight responses because they illustrate the kinds of concerns institutions have with regard to the commentary.

- “Publications plus abstract document”
- “List of publications and a 1000 word statement”
- “Publications plus a statement of 1000 words setting out the applicant’s view of the nature and significance of the work submitted and a full statement of the extent of the applicant’s contribution to any of the work submitted which involves joint authorship”
- “Publications plus 500 word summary of the field of research”
- “Publications plus a statement of not more than 1000 words setting out the applicant’s view of the nature and significance of the work submitted”
- “Publications plus 1000 word statement setting out briefly the case for the award of the higher doctorate, and clearly identifying one or more research ‘themes’ which have been developed over a period of time to assist the Assessors in recognising homogeneity, variety and scope of the candidate’s work”
- “Publications, plus statement (1000 words)”
- “Publications plus a 1000 word case”

Publications and a commentary of a defined length of more than 1000 words

There were six institutions that defined the length of the commentary as more than 1000 words. The range of word lengths mentioned here was from 5000 to 30,000. As mentioned in a footnote, we can perhaps safely presume that in all the responses these word lengths refer to maxima – though that information was not always provided by respondents. Again, we list responses in as much as they seem indicative of the intention behind word allowance.

- “Publications plus statement of between 5000 – 10,000 words setting out the basis for the award”
- “Publications plus 30,000 words”
- “Publications plus a critical commentary of up to 10,000 words”
- “Publications plus 15,000 word maximum critical appraisal”
- “Publications plus a 5-10,000 word critical appraisal”
- “Publications (which may be books, contributions to journals, patent specifications, reports, specifications and design studies and other relevant evidence of original work) plus 6000 word critical commentary”

Publications and a commentary of undefined length

There were six that did not specify word length in relation to the commentary.

- “No word limit is given”
- “Bound thesis containing publications and commentary”
- “Publications and a critical appraisal, no word limit”
- “Publications plus appraisal of publications plus definition of author contribution for shared publications”
- “Published work, complete list of candidate’s academic work and a statement on the nature, extent and importance of the work submitted”
- “Complete list of publications with an indication of those to be submitted, a summary and the publications”

Publications and Curriculum Vitae (CV)

Nine institutions require a CV as well as the publications and accompanying commentary. Our justification for separating this group out is the suggestion that requiring a CV is indicative of a wider notion of a higher doctorate award than would be indicated by consideration of publications alone.

In the cases in this sub-section the length of the expected commentaries varies or is unspecified – none of the specified lengths are less than 1000 words. Examples of these nine responses are given below.

- “Critical appraisal between 1000 – 10,000 words, plus off-prints or photocopies of each published work cited & copies of other published or unpublished works cited in a CV”

- “Letter of application, two copies of a CV which includes a full list of publications (including any work already accepted for publication) and one copy of each publication being submitted for examination. If accepted for examination two further copies of the publications and the required fee are then requested”
- “CV, plus list of all publications, plus list of published works presented for examination (i.e. sub-set of total list), list of any other work to be presented (e.g. unpublished work, additional evidence of practical achievements), exposition up to 10,000 words on value and significance”
- “A CV and list of titles, copies of the published work and a statement of any collaborative input into the work”
- “A general title for the submitted work and a statement briefly outlining the main theme or themes running through the publications and indicating those areas considered to contain a significant and clearly defined contribution to knowledge, plus a brief CV and a written statement indicating the share which he/she personally took in the work”
- “Publication plus a full CV”

Publications, commentary and summary of collaborator statements (and CV)

There were ten institutions that required the publications, a commentary and a summary of collaborator statements and a further one that required these things and a CV. Some examples are given below. In short, this section refers to those institutions making, arguably, the most demands in terms of requirements within a submission.

- “This consists of 2 bound or securely boxed copies of the:
 - supporting summary (4-5pages) which indicates: the field(s) of specialism; the evidence of originality and distinction in the work; the contribution that has been made to the advancement of knowledge in the field(s); how much, if any of the work has been submitted or is being concurrently submitted for any other degree;
 - a full, numbered list of the works being submitted in the order in which they appear in the submission;
 - printed copies of the published works being submitted;
 - a summary of collaborator statements (if appropriate);
 - 3 loose copies of the supporting summary”
- “A letter of application; A synoptic commentary not exceeding 10,000 words setting out the applicant’s view of the nature and significance of the work submitted; A full statement of the extent of the applicant’s contribution to work submitted, involving joint authorship or other types of collaboration”
- “A supporting paper which summarises each publication submitted, outlined their interrelationship, gives a critical review of the current state of knowledge and research in the applicant’s field and indicates how his or her work has contributed to the field”
- “The applicant is required to provide 3 copies of the following:
 - A) Nature and significance of the work
 A statement of not more than 2000 words setting out the applicant’s view as to the nature and significance of the work submitted and highlighting the progression of the work and of any inter-relationships

B) Personal contribution

A full statement of the extent of the applicant's contribution to the work(s) submitted and detailing joint authorship or other types of collaboration"

- "Copies of research outputs plus a completed application form; a statement of not more than 1000 words setting out the applicant's view of the nature and significance of the work submitted; a full statement of the extent of the applicant's contribution to work submitted, involving joint authorship or other types of collaboration"
- "The publications; an application form; a statement of 2000 – 5000 words setting out the applicant's view of the nature and significance of the work; and a full statement of the extent of the applicant's contribution to work submitted, involving joint authorship or other types of collaboration"
- "In addition to the copies of the work on which the application is based, the applicant shall submit one copy of each of the following:
 - i) a statement of not more than 1000 words setting out the applicant's view of the nature and significance of the work submitted;
 - ii) a full statement of the extent of the applicant's contribution to any of the work submitted which involves joint authorship or other types of collaboration"
- "The submission should consist of a body of appropriate work at an appropriate standard – this may take the form of books, contributions to journals, patent specifications, reports, specifications and design studies and may also include other relevant evidence of original work. All material, other than books, should be secure in one hard-back folder, or more if necessary, each containing a title and contents page. Additionally to this, the following should be submitted: a statement of not more than 1000 words setting out the applicant's view of the nature and significance of the work submitted and a full statement of the extent of the applicant's contribution to any of the work submitted which involves joint authorship or other types of collaboration"
- "Publications plus a summary of the work included in the submission, and a written statement justifying contribution to co-authored works included"
- "A statement not exceeding 20,000 words showing the relationship between the various studies and indicating how far and in what respect the contributions appear to advance study of his/her subject
Copies of each publication
A summary statement
A statement indicating the extent to which the work has been carried out by the candidate, along with a clear indication of any parts of collaborative work"

This final sub-section contains reference to the institution requiring all of the above and a CV. It is quoted in full partly because it acts to summarise much of is required in parts by other institutions.

- "A title page setting out the candidate's name, title of the submission and award for which the submission is made
Details of the candidate's qualifications

A signed statement from the candidate and any co-authors advising how far the work submitted is based on the candidate's own independent study, making it clear, for each publication, how far the work was conducted in collaboration with or with the assistance of others and the conditions and circumstances in which the work was carried out

A critical overview (not exceeding 5000 words) comprising a review of the contribution the work makes to the academic field in question

A list of the publications submitted

Copies of all the relevant published material, appropriately ordered

A curriculum vitae

A statement to confirm that the work has not been presented, in part or in full, for the award of another degree

The relevant examination fee"

Specific Reference to the Award of Doctor of Music (DMus)

There were two responses that made specific reference to the award of DMus. In the case of the second cited below the reference is simply to exclude the DMus from some of the expectations that apply to that institution's other higher doctorates.

- "A submission for the degree of DMus based upon original musical compositions may include, as an alternative to publication, unpublished works accompanied by evidence of performance in a fully professional context and recordings on tape or disc may be submitted in addition to the scores of all or any of the works which form the material of the application"
- "For all higher doctorates apart from the DMus, four copies of all of the following:
Published work;
Commentary linking published work and explaining its significance;
signed statement indicating level of contribution to each publication & role of the candidate as sole author, senior author, or co-author;
a CV;
2-3 page synopsis of the candidate's record of research and scholarship;
Any manuscripts already accepted for publication"

Appendix 4 – How is the Examination Panel Constituted?

Exam Panel
2 internal PVCs, Chair of the Research Degrees Committee & 1 senior member of academic staff. Comments sought from 2 independent external examiners who are acknowledged leaders in the field
2 internals & 2 externals
3 external assessors, 2 of which provide a report in writing and a third who participates as a member of the scrutiny panel established by the Research Degrees Committee
Normally 1 internal & 2 external assessors (except when candidate is a member of staff, when all assessors are external)
Three assessors at least 2 of whom are external 'who shall be of recognised eminence in the subject of the submission'
VC, PVC (Academic Affairs), Dean of the relevant Faculty, an external if necessary
1 internal and 2 external examiners
Two independent assessors, at least one external
The submission will be considered initially by a committee consisting of the VC (or a nominee) and 2 other members of the Senate (Prima Facie stage) If the committee is satisfied that there is a case for further detailed consideration of the submission it will: - appoint 3 referees (determined in consultation with a Head of School) - ask 2 of the appointed referees to submit an independent report on the works and recommend whether an award should be made The reports will be considered by the committee and a recommendation made to the Senate. The committee may, at their discretion, ask the applicant to attend an interview
Two external examiners, who have extensive experience in the topic area and hold a higher doctorate or equivalent academic standing
Normally 4 examiners of which at least 2 are external
Three examiners: two external, one internal (three external if a staff candidate)
Internal plus at least 2 externals
Three examiners (only one internal unless a candidate is a member of staff in which case no internal)
One internal and two external assessors
At least 2 external examiners are appointed and in addition, an internal examiner may also be appointed. External examiners shall be of recognised eminence in the subject of the submission

Exam Panel
I think it is 3 externals with experience of higher docs amongst them
3 externals and the Vice Chancellor
2 examiners, at least one external
Normally 2 examiners but sometimes 3. One external and one from within the university
One internal and 2 externals
<p>Consists of 2 stages</p> <p>Assessment panel within the University Preliminary consideration by an Assessment Panel established by the Research sub-committee of Academic Committee to ascertain whether a prima facie case exists for proceeding to a formal examination of the submission The panel will comprise of 4 members including the Chair of the Research sub-committee who will act as the Chair of the Panel</p> <p>External Examination If the Assessment Panel determines that the submission be formally examined, consideration of the submission will be undertaken by 2 external examiners, wholly independent of the University and the applicant The examiners will be appointed by the Research sub-committee of Academic Committee Each examiner is required to make an independent report to the Research sub-committee</p> <p>Action in case of Disagreement In case of a disagreement between the examiners the Research sub-committee may appoint a third examiner</p>
Normal practice is to appoint an Internal examiner and 3 External examiners (with 2 reserves)
3 examiners (usually 2 external and 1 internal but may be 3 externals)
Two external examiners who must be experienced in research in the specific area of the candidate's submission and have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined; normally be holders of a higher doctorate themselves or enjoy similar academic standing and recognition; must be external and wholly independent of the University
Two external examiners. In case of a disagreement a third may be appointed
Three externals, usually expect one to have a higher doctorate
Two external examiners – ideally with a Higher Doctorate and, where possible, one of the examiners should be from an overseas institution
Three external examiners
After prima facie stage with two internals the formal examination consists of two external examiners

Exam Panel
Two external Assessors (with one reserve Assessor)
Three examiners shall be appointed, all of whom will be external and wholly independent of the University and its partner institutions
Three examiners including a Professor or Reader of RGU and 2 externals
Three externals, all from outside the University
Two externals. A third may be appointed in the event of conflicting recommendations regarding the award of the degree
One internal and two externals who have a mix of subject expertise and examining experience (not necessarily at higher doctoral level)
Two externals and one internal
Two or more members of Academic Staff of the University one of whom shall be from among the professorial staff and two more additional Examiners from outside the University
Three examiners, at least two external, none should have published with the candidate any of the works listed by the candidate
At least 2 external examiners and an internal examiner
Three referees (two of which act in the first instance) of sufficient seniority and experience to be able to command authority shall make recommendation to a committee consisting of: The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Administration) Two other senior persons appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Administration)
Two independent Examiners
At least two external examiners. Senate may also appoint an internal examiner, if it so decides
Dean of School as Chair and two external examiners
Two external examiners
At least two examiners, at least one of whom shall be external to the University
Initial panel comprises the Chair of the University Research Committee, a member of the University's Executive, at least two other members of the University whose expertise is relevant and at least one specialist in the field from outside the University This panel then selects two external examiners at least one of whom must hold a Higher Doctorate or equivalent qualification
Three, two of which are external

Appendix 5 – Restrictions on Eligibility of Candidates for Higher Doctorate Awards

This Appendix contains a sample of the kinds of eligibility criteria being operated across the responding institutions. All the main kinds of criteria are represented here.

- Applicants should normally be: holders of at least 7 years standing, of a first degree awarded by an institution of higher education in the UK or of a qualification of equivalent standard; or holders of at least 4 years standing of a higher degree awarded by an institution of higher education in the UK or of a qualification of equivalent standard
- Applicants should normally be holders of a PhD or equivalent, in addition to at least 4 years standing of a higher degree or of a qualification equivalent to a higher degree
- Alumni must have graduated at least 8 years earlier
- Current staff to be full-time members of staff and to have been in employment of the University for not less than 4 years
- Retired staff to have been full-time members of staff for not less than 4 years immediately prior to retirement
- Applicants should normally be: holders of at least 7 years standing, of a first degree awarded by an institution of higher education in the UK or of a qualification of equivalent standard; or holders of at least 4 years standing of a higher degree awarded by an institution of higher education in the UK or of a qualification of equivalent standard
- Candidature for higher doctorates other than the DMus is open to graduate of the University without any further restriction. For the DMus there are restrictions in terms of the number of years that must have elapsed since graduation. For higher doctorates apart from the DMus candidature is additionally open to: subject to Senate's approval, graduates of any other degree-awarding body who have spent at least three years in the University [NB this includes all staff, past or present, as long as they are graduates and have spent 3 years in the University]. For the DMus similar eligibility criteria apply for non-graduates of this University but in addition candidature is open, subject to Senate approval, to: any composer of standing who has made a significant contribution to contemporary compositional thought. The eligibility criteria take into account the fact that these awards are used regularly as honorary awards
- The University wishes to encourage applicants who have a link with the University and accordingly stipulates that normally applicants are expected to be engaged in the University's activities. In addition the University also applies the following criteria:
 - holders of at least 7 years' standing of a first degree awarded by a UK university or of a qualification and/or experience at an equivalent level; OR
 - holders of at least 4 years' standing of a doctoral degree awarded by a UK university or of a qualification and/or experience at an equivalent level

- All those eligible have to have been in the category in question for at least 3 years
- Other staff = those defined as 'professional' in our statutes
- All applicants must have held UK or equivalent degree or some other qualification deemed more generally equivalent for at least 10 years
- Alumni must be of at least 4 year's standing from a Masters degree or PhD, or of at least 7 year's standing from a Bachelor's degree
- Graduates of the University of not less than 7 years' standing
- Graduate of not less than 7 years' standing who hold full-time appointments of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Reader, Professor or Research Fellow (Grade II and above) in the University and have completed 5 years full-time service in the University in one or more of those posts
- Graduates of the University (or graduates of the CNAA who took their degrees as a registered student of the Polytechnic) of not less than 10 years' standing following conferment of an appropriate first degree or not less than 7 years' standing from conferment of the degree of MPhil or PhD; OR Members of the academic staff of the University of not less than 10 years' standing from conferment of an appropriate first degree who have served for not less than 7 years on the academic staff of the University
- Staff have to be in post for 7 years. Graduates must be 9 years beyond their first degree and 6 years beyond a PhD
- The basis of an award of a higher doctorate shall be the submission to the University of a work of high distinction which should constitute an original and significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge or to the application of knowledge or to both, and should establish that the applicant is a leading authority in the field(s) of study concerned
Applicants shall normally be:
 - i) holders, of at least 7 years' standing, of a first degree awarded by the former Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) or by an institution of higher education in the UK or of a qualification of equivalent standard; or
 - ii) holders, of at least 4 years' standing, of a higher degree awarded by the former CNAA or by an institution of higher education in the UK or a qualification of equivalent standard
- Staff shall submit material of which a substantial and important part has been carried out after the candidate joined the staff of the University
- To be admitted for DSc or DLitt – the candidate must either be a graduate of the University provided that no less than 7 years have elapsed from the date of their first graduation in the University; or be a professor, reader or lecturer or holder of any such post or appointment in the University as Senatus Academicus may approve, provided that not less than 4 years have elapsed from the date of appointment

Appendix 6 – List of those institutions contributing to the report

Anglia Ruskin University
University of Bath
Bath Spa University
University of Bedfordshire
University of Birmingham
University of Bolton
University of Bradford
University of Brighton
University of Bristol
University of Cambridge
Cardiff University
University of Central Lancashire
University of Chichester
Cranfield University
University of Cumbria
University of Durham
Edge Hill University
University of Exeter
Glasgow School of Art
University of Gloucestershire
Heriot-Watt University
University of Hertfordshire
University of Huddersfield
University of Hull
Imperial College London
Institute of Cancer Research
Institute of Education
Keele University
King's College London
Lancaster University
University of Leeds
Leeds Metropolitan University
University of Leicester
Liverpool Hope University
London School of Economics and Political Science
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
Loughborough University
The University of Manchester
Manchester Metropolitan University
Napier University
North East Wales Institute of Higher Education
University of Nottingham
Nottingham Trent University
University of Plymouth
Roehampton University
Royal Holloway, University of London
University of Salford
Sheffield Hallam University
University of Southampton
University of St Andrews
University of Sussex
Swansea University
The College of St Mark and St John
University College for the Creative Arts
UHI Millennium Institute
University of Wales, Newport
University of York

UK Council for Graduate Education Published Titles

ISBN	Title
0-9525751-0-8	Graduate Schools (1995)
0-952-5751-1-6	The Award of the Degree of PhD on the Basis of Published Work in the UK (1996)
0-9525751-9-1	Quality and Standards of Postgraduate Research Degrees (1996)
0-9525751-2-4	Practice-Based Doctorates in the Creative and Performing Arts and Design (1997)
0-952-5751-3-2	The status of published work in submissions for doctoral degrees in European Universities (1998)
0-952-5751-4-0	Preparing Postgraduates to Teach in Higher Education (1999)
0-952-5751-5-9	The International Postgraduate: Challenges to British Higher Education (1999)
0-952-5751-6-7	Research Training for Humanities Postgraduate Students (2000)
0-9525751-7-5	Research Training in the Creative and Performing Arts and Design (2001)
0-952-5751-8-3	Professional Doctorates (2002)
0-9543915-0-0	Research Training in the Healthcare Professions (2003)
0-9543915-1-9	A Review of Graduate Schools in the UK (2004)
0-9543915-2-7	The Award of PhD by Published Work in the UK (2004)
0-9543915-3-5	Confidentiality of PhD Theses in the UK (2005)
0-9543915-4-3	Professional Doctorate Awards in the UK (2005)
0-9543915-5-3	Access to Doctoral Examiners' Reports (2007)

UK Council *for* Graduate Education

UK Council for Graduate Education
Lichfield Centre
The Friary
Lichfield
Staffordshire
WS13 6QG

T: 01543 308602
F: 01543 308604
E: ukcge@ukcge.ac.uk
www.ukcge.ac.uk

First published in 2008 by the UK Council for Graduate Education
© UK Council for Graduate Education
ISBN 978-0-9543915-6-0

