

The Library
University of East Anglia
Norwich Research Park
Norwich NR4 7TJ
United Kingdom

Email: foi@uea.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0) 1603 592 431
Fax: +44 (0) 1603 591 010
Web: <http://www.uea.ac.uk>

[REDACTED]

03 March 2015

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information Act 2000 – Information request (ref: FOI_15-032)

We have now considered your request of 10 February 2015 for information on requirements and regulations relating to the degree of Doctor of Science.

Our response is on page 2 of this letter, together with a copy of your request, and we hope this will meet your requirements.

Please note that any material over which UEA has copyright is released on the understanding that you will comply with all relevant copyright rules regarding reproduction and/or transmission of the information provided.

You have the right of appeal against this response. If you wish to appeal, please set out in writing your reasons for appealing and send to the above address. You must appeal within 60 calendar days of the date of this letter. Any appeal received after that date will not be considered nor acknowledged. This policy has been reviewed and approved by the Information Commissioner's Office.

You also have a subsequent right of appeal to the Information Commissioner's Office. Further information is available on their website:

https://ico.org.uk/Global/contact_us, or by telephone on 0303 123 1113.

Please quote our reference given at the head of this letter in all correspondence.

Yours sincerely

Ellen Paterson
Information Policy and Compliance Manager
University of East Anglia

Response to Freedom of Information Act 2000 request (FOI_15-032)

Your request:

'...the minutes and rationale relating to the change of regulation [relating to the degree of Doctor of Science] in 2005.'

Our response:

The changes made in the 2005-6 University Academic Calendar to the Regulations for the Doctor of Letters, Doctor of Laws and Doctor of Science were intended to bring the degrees more in line with the PhD by Publication. We have therefore included information relevant to that degree in the following extracts.

The changes were discussed during two separate meetings of the Graduate Studies Executive. They were approved, as part of the annual review of the University Calendar, by the Director of Graduate Studies on behalf of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (LTQC) and Senate.

The relevant extracts from the minutes and agenda from these meetings are as follows:

Graduate Studies Executive, 22 June 2005

Extract from Agenda:

- '5. PhD by Publication
To consider

Amendments to the Regulations for PhD by Publication (Document B)'

Please note that the discussion was opened up wider than the PhD by Publication (see excerpt from Minutes below). 'Document B' is no longer held by the University but would have related only to the PhD by Publication.

Graduate Studies Executive, 22 June 2005

Extract from Minutes

- '6. Regulations for Postgraduate Awards
Reported

'That as part of the annual review of the Calendar and in the light of restructuring and other issues which had been raised during the year, the Director of Graduate Studies proposed the following amendments to the Regulations governing postgraduate awards. The proposed amendments tended to elaborate or clarify the original intention of the Regulations and did not constitute amendments in policy. The proposed amendments could therefore be approved by the Director on behalf of LTQC and Senate.

6.1 PhD by Publication

Recent experience had highlighted the need to strengthen and clarify the admissions requirements for this degree.

- 1) When the degree was originally conceived it had been intended to offer a route to a higher degree for colleagues with a distinguished academic record (demonstrated through publications) who had not previously attempted or completed a research degree. However, the boundaries of the Regulations had been tested by the suggestion that candidates for a standard PhD could transfer to the PhD by Publication at the end of their programme of study and submit work in the form of published papers in place of the thesis.

It was agreed that it was not within the spirit of the Regulations for the PhD by Publication for it to be used by students at the beginning of their academic careers as an alternative route to a PhD.

2) The proposal was to include a phrase in Regulation 1(2) to clarify expectations in terms of the length of time a candidate should have been engaged in active research contributing to the publications being submitted for the degree and potentially the volume and nature of the published work.

It was recognised that different disciplines had different expectations in respect of published work (e.g. Humanities subjects tended to look to monographs, whereas the majority of scientific research would be published through papers).

There was also scope for elaboration of expectations in Regulation 8(1).

It was agreed that reference to work of an extent characteristic of more than seven years active research effort in the candidate's field should be inserted. (Seven years was chosen as representing more than the normal period of registration for a part-time PhD.)

3) The current wording of the Regulations was inconsistent with the expectations set out in the wording for the standard PhD. It was proposed that wording from the PhD Regulations should be inserted where appropriate.

Agreed

6.2 Doctor of Letters, Doctor of Laws and Doctor of Science

GSE's attention was drawn to the need to consider policy issues in respect of these awards at a future date.

1) Subject matter

A recent enquiry had raised the issue of whether the University should consider making an award in a subject area in which it did not have expertise. The general consensus was that this would not be appropriate. It was therefore proposed to insert a requirement similar to that included in Regulation 1(4) of the PhD by Publication indicating that such awards would only be made in subject areas where the University would be able to offer supervision. This would be consistent with the requirements of other research degrees.

Agreed

2) The wording of the Regulations – “sustained, original and distinguished contribution to learning” and the requirements set out in Regulation 2 – was felt to be sufficiently robust in setting out the nature of the award to avoid the need for clarification required for the PhD by Publication.’

Graduate Studies Executive, 20 July 2005

Extract from Agenda:

‘4. Regulations

To consider

(i) Proposals for amendments to regulations governing postgraduate awards (Document B)’

Extracts from Document B:

Extract 1: Background

'As part of the annual review of the Calendar, and specifically of the regulations governing postgraduate awards, the Director of Graduate Studies, the Assistant Registrar (Joanne Ashman) and the Senior Assistant Registrar (Alison Rhodes) have considered where amendments to the regulations are required. The proposed amendments take account of the need to clarify levels of authority in the light of restructuring, the need to ensure consistency across degrees, and the need to add clarity and eliminate ambiguity in other areas of the regulations. These amendments do not represent a change in policy and therefore do not require approval by Senate. Any proposed amendments fall within existing policy and approved principles.'

Extract 2: Word length

'A review of the regulations for the MPhil and PhD, including specific paragraphs relating to the awards in Creative Writing and Music Composition highlighted a disparity in the length of the critical thesis and/or the requirements set out in the regulations. It is proposed to introduce clarity and consistency. These proposals have also been carried through to the PhD by Publication.

- MPhil in Creative Writing – 15 – 30,000 word critical thesis
- MPhil in Music Composition – 15-30,000 word critical thesis
- PhD in Music Composition – 20-50,000 word commentary
- PhD by Publication – minimum of 20,000 word critical analysis'

Extract 3: Miscellaneous

'• Doctor of Laws, Doctor of Letters, Doctor of Science: to be reformatted to more closely mirror the PhD by Publication and other research degree regulations. Addition of an admission regulation mirroring those in other regulations that the School must be able to offer supervision or have expertise in the area of the degree.'

Graduate Studies Executive, 20 July 2005

Extracts from Minutes:

Extract 1: '5. Regulations

Considered

1) Proposals for amendments to regulations governing postgraduate awards.'

Extract 2: 'Discussed (under 1)

Word Length:- Amendments designed to create greater consistency and, in the case of the PhD by publication, to demand greater scope of explanatory text, accompanying the seven years of research activity required.

Miscellaneous:- Amendments to LLD, Lit. D and Sc.D and others so as to reflect parity with arrangements for the PhD by publication, including a regulation to necessitate suitable supervision and expertise in the home School.

Extract 3: Resolved (under 1 and 2)

1) In respect of word lengths, further checks, locally, with regard to the M Phils in Creative Writing and Music Composition, were to be undertaken.

Additionally, the word length for the PhD by publication would be clarified as a part of the check on the regulations for the MD, which was shortly to be undertaken.

Your request:

'...information as to what is expected in the critical analysis.' [As mentioned in 2(1) of the Regulations relating to the Doctor of Laws, of Letters and of Science¹]

Our response:

Regulation 2(1) states that the following are required: Three copies of a critical analysis of the work submitted (a minimum of 30,000 words in length) covering the development of the candidate's submitted work and its sustained, original and distinguished contribution to knowledge.

There is no written guidance beyond this on what is expected in the critical analysis as this will vary by candidate and by discipline - there is no single definition that can adequately define the structure and content of a good critical analysis. Guidance on how to prepare the critical analysis would come from the supervisor. It should be noted however that it is the examiners who need to be persuaded of the merit of the work, including the critical analysis, in order to recommend that the award is made. Examiners receive a copy of the following:

'Memorandum to Examiners

1. This memorandum is to be read in conjunction with the Regulations for the Degree of Doctor of Laws, Doctor of Letters and Doctor of Science.
2. Before recommending the award of the Degree, the examiners shall satisfy themselves that the candidate has made a sustained, original and distinguished contribution to knowledge.
3. Each examiner should report separately using the appropriate report form which will be supplied by the Postgraduate Research Office. The report shall consist of two sections:
 - 1) a specific recommendation that the candidate be approved for the award of the degree, or that he/she be not approved;
 - 2) a general report on the work submitted by the candidate giving reasons for the examiner's recommendation.
4. The examiners' reports should be sent to the Postgraduate Research Office, who will submit them to the Learning and Teaching Committee of the Senate. If the examiners recommend that the degree be awarded the Learning and Teaching Committee shall so recommend to the Senate.'

¹ [http://www.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs\(awards\)/doctor-of-laws,-of-letters-and-of-science](http://www.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs(awards)/doctor-of-laws,-of-letters-and-of-science)