



QAA



QAA Collaborative Enhancement Project

**Contributors**

Sarah Patrick – Coventry University  
Glyn Howatson – Northumbria University  
Mary Beth Kneafsey – University of Glasgow  
Susan Grey – University of Hertfordshire  
Rhiannon Martyn – University of Warwick  
Juliet James – University of York

EXPLORING CURRENT  
PRACTICE IN THE UK IN THE  
**DEVELOPMENT OF  
COLLABORATIVE  
DOCTORAL DEGREES**

# QAA Collaborative Enhancement Project

## EXPLORING CURRENT PRACTICE IN THE UK IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF COLLABORATIVE DOCTORAL DEGREES

---

Collaborative degrees at doctoral level are becoming increasingly popular with universities around the globe as a means of developing international research collaborations. Bringing together two sets of doctoral requirements, often in very different academic cultures, regulatory environments and research contexts, whilst ensuring a positive experience for the postgraduate researchers (PGRs) involved, can, however, present significant challenges.

This QAA-funded collaborative enhancement project was developed at the end of 2021 as in a response to a growing interest in collaborative doctoral degrees, at a time when there is relatively little by way of a standard approach across UK universities towards developing this type of provision.

This project has brought together practitioners from a representative group of UK universities – including Russell Group and post-92 universities - to share their experience and identify good practice.

The guidance and points for reflection should be relevant to a wide range of stakeholders including;

- professional support staff who have been tasked with developing, or supporting, collaborative doctoral provision, particularly those new to this area of work
- senior university staff who are involved in establishing international institutional partnerships
- academics who are interested in collaborative doctoral provision

We hope that this document will equip colleagues with the knowledge and awareness to develop successful collaborative doctoral programmes.

**Project lead:** Sarah Patrick, Collaborative Doctoral Programmes Manager, **Coventry University**

**Project participants:**

Professor Glyn Howatson, Dean of the Graduate School, **Northumbria University**

Mary Beth Kneafsey, Postgraduate Research Strategy and Policy Manager, **University of Glasgow**

Dr Susan Grey, Director of the Doctoral College and Director of Research Degrees, **University of Hertfordshire**

Rhiannon Martyn, Head of the Doctoral College, **University of Warwick**

Dr Juliet James, PGR Quality Support Officer, **University of York**

# Contents

<b>Chapter</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>The benefits of Collaborative Doctoral Awards</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Definitions: The Challenge of Terminology and Alternatives to Collaborative Doctoral Awards</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Regional Variations</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Programme Development</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Legal Considerations</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Funding Models</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Agreeing the Collaborative Doctoral Award Examination Process</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Delivering the Collaborative Doctoral Award</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusion and Guiding Principles</b>	<b>33</b>
	○ Reflective Questions	
	○ Operational Checklists	
	○ Useful Resources and Further Reading	

# Chapter One

## The Benefits of Collaborative Doctoral Awards

---

***You get double of everything! You get double of supervisory support; you have two PGR networks you can access, you have two research locations, two student email accounts, two laptops one from each institution, two access cards, two development programmes offered by the institutions, you are closely engaged not only with your PGR fellows, but also with academics and administrative staff of both universities etc. You can also have a double headache at times! You have such a unique double student experience which enriches your cultural awareness, broadens your world outlook, and multiplies your networks! Being a Collaborative PGR not only exposes you to two educational systems but also shapes you to become a truly global citizen.***

Year 2 Collaborative PGR UK-Denmark

In this section, we consider why this guide is needed and the benefits that collaborative doctoral awards can bring to individuals and institutions.

### Collaborative Doctoral Awards: Why is this Guide Needed?

The collaborative doctoral award has been a small-scale activity at most UK universities, and this is perhaps why it has not received the attention that would have led to the development of more 'standard' ways of working. Many institutions are, however, increasing (or planning to increase) the number of collaborative doctorates and/or the number of PGRs on such programmes.

The increase in interest in collaborative doctoral awards, combined with the fact that their development can be complex, particularly for those new to this sphere of activity, means that this guide is timely. The project team hope that it will enable others to benefit from their experience, and knowledge of good practice, in this area.

### Benefits of Collaborative Doctoral Awards

As a practitioner-led project it is perhaps inevitable that the emphasis of this guide is on addressing some of the more challenging aspects of developing collaborative doctoral awards. Before doing so, it is helpful to focus on the considerable potential rewards for participating institutions, supervisors, and PGRs.

The benefits of establishing a collaborative doctoral award for institutions and academic staff will vary depending on the partnership but may include some or all of the following:

- raising an institution's international profile and reputation
- developing and strengthening international research collaborations, leading to additional research activity
- increasing PGR numbers and diversity that enhances research culture, the potential for high quality research outputs and the wider socio-economic impact of the research
- recruiting high achieving and highly motivated PGRs (who are attracted by the prospect of a collaborative doctoral award; may also apply where partnering with an aspirational research partner)
- increasing the pool of funded studentships and/or increasing the return on investment in PGRs (for example, if each PGR is co-funded, rather than sole-funded).

**SCENARIO:** A collaborative doctorate programme developed between a UK university and an Australian university started with an agreement to each fully-fund a PGR simultaneously in two research areas. In six years, that programme has increased to a cohort of 30 PGR, with each institution funding 15 of the PGRs, and has developed into several new research areas. Collaborating on the development of joint doctorate projects has enabled supervisors to really get to know the partner's research strengths.

For a PGR, undertaking a collaborative doctoral award can bring many rewards including:

- benefitting from the expertise of a wider international supervisory team and the alternative academic perspectives that this may bring as a result
- experiencing life as a researcher in two different research cultures
- being able to make use of the standard and specialist facilities, training and support offered by both the host and partner universities
- a better understanding of the global nature of research and increased opportunities to make international links, with potential career benefits
- gaining official recognition of having undertaken a research project in an international environment (being a visiting PGR or being jointly supervised does not provide this).

**SCENARIO:** A Joint doctorate programme between a UK university and a Danish university recruited a UK-based PGR who had previously had no experience of working or studying outside the UK. The PGR had to undertake a year's mobility at the Danish university and this experience contributed to their decision to apply (successfully) for a post-doc position at a key European research facility.

Whilst there is an established literature on developments within doctoral education, there is still much to learn about the collaborative doctoral award and the opportunities and challenges this type of doctoral experience presents. The 'useful resources and further reading' section contains some key texts which help to place the development of collaborative doctoral awards in context.

# Chapter Two

## Definitions: The Challenge of Terminology and Alternatives to Collaborative Doctoral Awards

---

***We can develop the collaborative doctoral award but we must call it a Joint doctorate as dual awards are not permitted by our Higher Education Ministry.***

HE Practitioner, South Africa

In this section, we explore some of the variations in both terminology and approach to the collaborative doctoral award as well as considering some alternative options, as in some instances, a collaborative doctoral award is not what is required.

### The Challenge of Terminology

The focus of this project is collaborative doctoral degree programmes that lead to a collaborative award (henceforward *collaborative doctoral award*). Such programmes are joint enterprises and each will be underpinned by a written agreement, which provides clarity regarding the fulfilment of institutional programme requirements and the application of national and institutional rules and regulations.

A postgraduate researcher on such a programme will be jointly supervised and expected to engage in mobility between institutions. They will produce a single thesis which is subject to a single or combined examination process, leading to either 1) a single degree certificate endorsed by both institutions - (in the UK typically referred to as a joint Doctorate, or 2) two separate degree certificates, one from each institution, with mutual recognition: (in the UK, this is typically referred to as a double or dual Doctorate).

It is important to stress, however, that there is no agreed set of definitions for collaborative doctoral provision. Indeed, the usage and meaning of common terms, that include cotutelle, joint doctorate, double doctorate and dual award varies considerably, within the UK, within Europe and beyond. This is neatly illustrated by two recent European projects exploring this topic (YERUN 2021, and EUA-CDE 2022, see Useful Resources and Further Reading section), which defined cotutelle and joint doctorate in diametrically opposed ways.

**SCENARIO:** One institution in the project group uses the term 'joint' award for a collaborative PGR programme leading to a single degree certificate endorsed by both partners, and 'double' award for a collaborative PGR programme leading to two degree certificates, issued separately by the partners (also referred to as 'dual award'). During the programme development phase, however it became clear that the same terminology was not being used by the partner which impacted on the arrangements for the award and the subsequent agreement.

This variation in the usage and meaning of terms can cause significant confusion when communicating both internally and with prospective partners. For example, if a partner proposes a 'cotutelle' they could be suggesting a collaborative doctoral programme with joint supervision only or one leading to a collaborative (joint/double/dual) award.

Given the lack of consensus, and the complex web of existing arrangements, all with established nomenclature, it will not be helpful to propose a further set of definitions, still less to suggest that we attempt to standardise the terminology. Instead, we simply recommend that institutions that offer collaborative doctoral programmes which lead to a collaborative award should:

- have agreed institutional definitions for collaborative doctoral provision, which have been developed in the context of existing UK (see QAA references in the resources section) and international reference points and which provide clarity on the key aspects of collaborative doctoral programmes
- ensure that institutional staff (including senior leadership) who are likely to have contact with prospective partners:
  - understand the agreed institutional definitions and the practical implications (timeline and process) for taking forward each type of arrangement (for example, some UK institutions have more exacting requirements for the establishment of joint versus double/dual awards, but this is by no means universal).
  - appreciate that definitions vary – across institutions and nations - and care is needed to avoid misunderstandings
  - ask new partners to share their definitions of collaborative doctoral provision to identify any discrepancies and ensure clarity of expectations from the outset. If the definitions seem incompatible, you may be able to find a pragmatic solution (for example, ensuring the legal agreement explains both definitions and how differences will be managed)

## Alternatives to Collaborative Doctoral Awards

As collaborative doctoral awards can be challenging to develop, it is important to explore whether an alternative approach might achieve the desired aims of partnership, e.g. building a strong research link, but at a lower cost (direct or opportunity cost). Alternatives to collaborative doctoral awards (**Table 1**) may also provide a valuable means of exploring links with prospective partners and building trust before developing a collaborative doctoral award.

**Table 1: Overview of options for partnership development at doctoral level**

Option	Benefits	Issues
Visiting PGRs or PGR exchange programme	Good for one-off, short visits for targeted activity	Fees for visiting PGRs may be an issue (it is recommended that low or no fees for short visits, e.g. under 3 months, may be beneficial). Exchanges that rely on reciprocity may be challenging where there is an imbalance of demand between the partners
Joint supervision ( <i>not</i> leading to a collaborative award – the PGR is registered with only one university)	Can be done at low cost (no transfer of resources) and often happens with limited administrative involvement (often based on an informal ‘good faith’ agreement between the academics involved)	It can be difficult to record and monitor joint supervision arrangements  If joint supervision is set up on an informal basis there is little in the way of mechanisms for ensuring the quality of the supervision offered by the partner and limited recourse if issues arise  Some partners may want to be paid for the input of their supervisors
Shared training and/or personal development programme (not leading to a collaborative award – each PGR is registered with only one university)	Can be a good way to share academic expertise and facilities, while developing an inter-institutional cohort of PGRs	Significant workload and partners will need to agree how the costs will be met
Off-site or split-site doctorate (the name may vary) where a PGR is eligible for an award from one university but hosted (fully or partly) and co-supervised by the partner university	As the PGR is only eligible for one award, there are no issues around whose rules and regulations apply (it is always those of the awarding institution). This can be a good way to build PGR capacity at a less-experienced partner	The non-awarding partner can be perceived as the ‘junior’ partner which may not fulfill requirements for reciprocity  It requires a formal written agreement  There needs to be agreement on how the fees will be divided  It can be difficult to monitor supervision arrangements at the partner university

## Reflective Questions

**Are both you and your partner referring to the same sort of collaborative programme?**

**Is a collaborative doctoral award the most appropriate mechanism to develop the partnership or is there an alternative, such as a visiting PGR arrangement?**



# Chapter Three

## Regional Variations

*How can we possibly work on a collaborative doctoral programme when something as fundamental as the exam process is so different?*

Senior Academic at a UK university

In this section, we look at variations within key elements of the doctoral awards between the UK and other countries and identify how these variations might impact the development of a collaborative doctoral award programme. Universities, both in the UK and elsewhere, can be highly bureaucratic environments, for institutions seeking to work co-operatively in doctoral awards it is critically important to consider the need to be sufficiently agile and pragmatic to make a collaborative programme a success.

UK doctoral norms cannot be taken for granted when engaging with universities overseas. In some parts of the world, programme elements may be determined by federal or national authorities and not within the remit of the partner to change. Regional variations can either support or hinder the development of collaborative doctoral programmes, but the first step is to identify the areas of commonality and divergence. **Table 2** highlights some of the common variations that arise between UK and international partners and provides an overview of the key considerations when exploring a collaborative doctoral award. Most of these variations are not insurmountable, but might rely on a level of plasticity by each partner.

**Table 2: Variations of key elements of the doctoral programme**

Programme Element	UK Standard	International Variations
Entry requirements	Usually, entry after Bachelors, is permitted English Language Requirement	In many countries doctoral entry is only permitted after a Masters  Some regions only recognise a two-year Masters  It is important that the requisite entry requirements are agreed between institutions
Recruitment & selection process	Application, research proposal, academic references, and interview  Clear expectations around equality and diversity in recruitment and selection processes	Some universities require an 'expression of interest' prior to a full application, while some partners do not require a research proposal at application stage  Both institutions should actively be involved in the recruitment and selection process
Enrolment	Annual enrolment for the duration of the doctorate  Initial enrolment may be on an MPhil with progression to doctorate subject to satisfactory progress  Enrolment could be at different times in the academic year	Annual enrolment not always required  Some countries have less flexibility on enrolment times (once or twice per year)  If specific entry points/times are required, they might not readily align with UK partner

<b>Programme Element</b>	<b>UK Standard</b>	<b>International Variations</b>
Funding (fees and stipend) and duration of study	<p>PGR typically has 'Student' status, and so if funded this is typically through a stipend</p> <p>PGRs can be funded solely by the institution (often with a fee waiver), through industry partnerships, UKRI doctoral training partnerships, sponsored by external agencies or self-funded</p> <p>Some funding bodies (UKRI) might fund doctoral students for up to 4 years (FT), whereas others might only be funded for up to 3 years, but with a continuation period of up to year</p>	<p>Some universities consider PGRs as staff members and are required to remunerate accordingly (Netherlands, for example), which can be prohibitive for joint funding models</p> <p>Some doctoral programmes have a standard duration greater than 3 years, so funding to support the candidate for the agreed duration is important to consider</p> <p>Stipend values can vary enormously and need to be considered in periods of mobility to allow for differences in the cost of living</p>
Researcher development	<p>Normally there is a compulsory researcher development training programme, but it is not usually credit bearing</p> <p>Many UK universities offer a series of elective training and CPD opportunities to support doctoral students</p> <p>UKRI-funded doctorates have a healthy training budget, whereas others do not, so the experience can be very different between PGRs</p>	<p>Some countries (e.g., parts of Asia, Europe and USA) have a significant taught element in years one and two, often including compulsory, credit bearing courses. In some cases, there is a threshold grade that must be attained before entering the research element of the programme</p>
Supervisor arrangements	<p>Led by a Principal Supervisor, and often supported by a supervisory 'team' of one or more additional supervisors</p> <p>Maximum supervisory loads are sometimes in place</p> <p>Variable levels of contact, depending on the requirements of the PGR and the research question(s)</p> <p>Minimum frequency of contact usually stipulated</p>	<p>In some parts of the world, it is usual to have only one supervisor</p> <p>The frequency of contact with the supervisor may not be stipulated in the doctoral regulations</p> <p>Good synergy between supervisory teams from the collaborating institutions is important to ensure adequate support of the PGR journey</p>
Ethics and integrity	<p>The principles of research integrity should be adhered to according to the Universities UK (see Useful Resources and Further Reading section)</p> <p>Ethical approval from the university Research Ethics Committee is critical to conducting research</p> <p>Where necessary, adhere to UK standards such as the Human Tissue Act</p>	<p>The principles of research ethics and integrity are often very robust in international universities that have well established and rigorous policy and procedures. In such cases, a single application (rather than from both institutions) for ethical approval might be sufficient</p> <p>Where ethics and integrity are less clear, approval is required from both institutions</p>

<p>Mobility</p>	<p>A, period of negotiated mobility is required in the UK to the partner university for a collaborative doctoral award</p> <p>The mobility requirement could be set at institutional level depending on whether or not the programme is to be included in the universities HESA return (in which case the PGR would have to spend at least 8 weeks in the UK during one single academic year of the doctorate programme)</p>	<p>Practice is varied where overseas partners might not require a mobility period, or conversely insist on a minimum mobility period</p>
<p>Progression</p>	<p>Usually requires a project approval in the first few months of study, which is often reviewed by internal panel experts/subject specialist</p> <p>Annual review is commonly comprised of a review panel to ensure the doctoral journey is of sufficient quality, and the PGR is making sufficient progress and can make a timely completion</p> <p>It is considered usual to have regular interactions with the Principal Supervisor (often documented and summarised monthly) and the wider supervising team throughout the academic year</p>	<p>Practice in assessing progression can be extremely varied</p> <p>It will be important to ensure the supervisory teams from the UK and international partner are adequately connected to ensure sufficient support and progress of the PGR</p>
<p>Intellectual Property</p>	<p>IP could belong either to the university or the PGR or, in more limited cases a third party such as a funder or a combination of these aforementioned, where IP might be shared. These will be established from the outset of the doctoral journey</p> <p>PGR retains copyright of the thesis Thesis embargo can be requested, e.g. where matters relating to IP might compromise a competitive advantage</p>	<p>Clarity on IP is important for UK institutions, but international partners might be less interested in this aspect</p> <p>Agreement on arising IP between institutions will be important to establish</p>
<p>Publication requirement</p>	<p>No publications required in order to be awarded a doctorate, although there is an expectation that the work will make a contribution to new knowledge (as judged by the examination team)</p>	<p>In some places across the globe, in Asia and Scandinavian countries, a minimum number of articles accepted for publication are a pre-requisite for submission of the thesis, which can extend the duration of thesis submission</p>

Programme Element	UK Standard	International Variations
Thesis	<p>There is a great deal of free-reign in how the thesis could be formatted</p> <p>Maximum word count guide (either including or excluding appendices)</p> <p>Written in English</p>	<p>International partners might have a different maximum word count for the thesis</p> <p>There might be an expectation for the thesis to be translated into the national language</p> <p>In some cases, there is a possibility to submit the thesis in English with an additional abstract in the home country language (e.g., Finland)</p>
Examination	<p>'Closed door' examination by <i>viva voce</i></p> <p>A small examination jury (typically one internal and one external examiner, plus a Chair). The external examiner is often an acknowledged expert in the field, and whose input into the process is crucial</p> <p>Typically, an independent, non-examining Chair will preside over the examination to ensure the event is conducted in line with regulations of the degree</p> <p>There is no supervisor participation in assessment – the Principal Supervisor, might be allowed to attend the <i>viva voce</i> (in silent support), although this is usually at the discretion of the candidate</p>	<p>In many parts of the world – particularly in continental Europe - a public defence of the thesis is required (but can vary with respect to the degree of jeopardy versus a more ceremonial role), while a few countries (e.g. Australia and South Africa) have traditionally only had a written assessment with external (often international) peer review/ examination that are similar to receiving reviewers' comments on a research manuscript. However, there is an increasing use of <i>viva voce</i> examinations using online platforms for collaborative doctorates with a UK partner</p> <p>Countries vary considerably in terms of the size and composition of examination juries and the balance and role of internal versus external examiners</p>

**SCENARIO:** A joint doctorate between a Danish and UK university. Both countries have a good shared understanding about what a doctoral thesis should entail but there are a number of areas where practice differs between the UK and Denmark; in particular:

- Entry to a doctorate is typically after a two-year Masters programme
- PGRs are expected to complete a set number of ECTS during their programme
- The supervisor must give permission for the PGR to submit their thesis for examination
- A public defence is required as the final step in the examination process
- All these areas required negotiation and resolution before the joint doctorate could be approved and it was necessary, in a number of cases, to opt for the Danish approach because the doctorate in Denmark is governed by a ministerial order whilst there is more flexibility with respect to the UK doctorate. In the case of the final examination, a UK-style closed viva took place before the public defence.

**SCENARIO:** A cotutelle doctorate between a South African and a UK institution. As part of South Africa's contribution to the growth of the global knowledge, there has been increased investment in research, innovation and doctoral study. However, there are some key considerations when developing a collaborative award including;

- Entry requirements for a doctorate in South Africa require completion of an MSc (a South African MSc is research-based and not taught)
- Funding disparity between doctoral students in the UK and South Africa make institutional mobility challenging, particularly for South African based candidates
- Thesis examination is done by external examination via review and report (similar to peer review for a journal) and not by formal examination
- Potential challenges relating to the affirmative action programme that is implemented in South Africa to address issues relating to historical discrimination

In the most-part, a doctorate in South Africa is very well aligned to the UK. The standard duration is similar, the supervision and progression arrangements are also very similar. The examination can be negotiated with relative ease because the submission of the thesis to two examiners remains consistent with South Africa, and the inclusion of a viva voce can appease UK requirements. The biggest challenge is student mobility; but this can be overcome if the UK partner can contribute to the UK stipend for South African candidates visiting the UK.

**SCENARIO:** A dual award doctorate between USA and UK university. Both partners have an overarching shared understanding of the principles surrounding the doctorate. However, there are significant disparities in the doctoral journey that need resolution; specifically: in the USA:

- Coursework carried out over a period of up to three years (the average duration of a Doctorate is 5 to 7 years and can be longer for social sciences and humanities)
- A series of exams to progress on the doctorate programme
- A public defence of the thesis
- An expectation for candidates to contribute to undergraduate teaching that can be as high as 20 hours per week

There is a great deal of disparity in the USA and UK systems. Funding of these collaborations is very complex to negotiate given the very long duration that is influenced by the coursework and series of exams. This is further magnified by the high levels of teaching that could be required by doctorate candidates. There are very few examples where UK-USA doctoral collaborations have been possible.

## Reflective Questions

**How do your partner's doctoral programmes differ from those that you offer?**

**Where there are differences, and how important are these to maintaining the quality of your doctoral award?**

**How much flexibility do you have within your university's regulations to accommodate the core elements of the partner's doctoral programme?**

**Is it possible to reduce duplication in delivery and assessment while maintaining the quality of the award / PGR experience (for example, ethical approval, annual reporting, examination methods) as a result of bringing together the two sets of regulations?**

# Chapter Four

## Programme Development

---

***Moving between countries created its own challenges in both a professional level (compliance, ethics management, managing stakeholder expectations and working within different teams, project management) and on a personal level (moving home, finding new friends, fitting in, and settling in a new country). It's not easy, as any of my colleagues will tell you!***

Year 3 Collaborative PGR UK-Australia

In this section, we consider the different ways in which collaborative doctoral awards are instigated and reflect on how this might affect their success or otherwise. Developing a collaborative doctoral award, usually with an international partner, can be a complex endeavor requiring input from multiple teams across the university and often a long period of negotiation.

It's helpful to remember that at the heart of the programme will be an individual who must carry out a doctorate project across two institutions, usually with a significant period of mobility included, which is no small undertaking. With this in mind, we outline some of the key principles to consider when developing the programme structure underpinning the collaborative doctorate.

### Approaches to Collaborative Doctoral Awards

There are many ways that CDAs are instigated. Proposals could be presented from current or prospective PGRs looking to set up an individual programme ('PGR-led'), or from a supervisor seeking to work with a particular partner or PGR ('Academic-led'), or as a part of a larger proposal for cooperation or collaboration between institutions ('strategic'). All of these approaches bring different challenges for those tasked with taking a proposal forward beyond initial discussions, as outlined in Table 3.

### Clarifying Assumptions

One of the tasks at the outset of a new partnership is clarifying some of the assumptions or promises that may have been embedded in the initial discussions. Some of these assumptions might include:

- It's easy to do (a collaborative doctoral programme) and is therefore an obvious way to link to a partner
- As the collaboration has been requested it must be pursued
- Collaborative awards should only sit within an established research collaboration
- Adding collaborative awards into an existing partnership or collaboration negotiation is an easy way to extend the partnership / deepen the collaborative relationship
- A collaborative programme should always offer full studentships
- Fee waivers must always be made to collaborative award partners

The reality is that different institutions have different strategic aims, financial processes, and appetites for and approaches to risk, all of which are considered when developing partnerships. Many institutions will simply not entertain the idea of setting up an award for a single PGR (due to the costs outweighing the benefits) or outside of an established partnership, preferring instead to set up a partnership where an agreed number of PGRs will participate in a programme across a number of years.

The effort required and the bureaucracy involved in setting up CDAs means, for many institutions, that a clear return on the investment of time and institutional resource needs to be demonstrated. Alternatively, it needs to be considered what level of risk is acceptable if the return on investment is not achieved.

## Partnership Development Models

The manner in which the collaborative award is proposed, conceived and developed can affect the support it is given from the institution, both practically and financially. The following table provides an overview of some of the possible challenges and opportunities typically presented by each type of partnership development model.

**Table 3: An overview of the pros and cons of each partnership development model**

	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Comments</b>
'Strategic'	<p>High-level support can speed the process and make resources available</p> <p>Can build 'cohorts' of PGRs who can support each other</p>	<p>Over commitment by institution is possible if operational realities are not fully considered</p> <p>It may be considered as a 'top down' approach and may not be embraced by those needed to make the programme a success, e.g. individual supervisors</p> <p>A 'cohort' might not work in practice in a large institution</p>	<p>Strategic models for collaborative programme development should form part of a larger research collaboration between the two institutions. These are usually long-term investments, with significant commitment at a senior level both in terms of funding and human resource to support the development of the collaborative programme and the cohort of PGRs recruited to the programme</p>
'Academic- led'	<p>Academic buy-in Research collaboration already established and may provide a rich PGR experience as a consequence</p>	<p>Fragile – based on individuals who may move institutions or otherwise become unavailable</p> <p>The perceived ability to work with a colleague is not an indicator of a successful partnership as administrative links are also required</p> <p>Can be resource-intensive for a single or limited number of PGRs</p>	<p>Some UK universities will not entertain single student agreements</p> <p>The proposal must form part of a business case for a larger partnership</p> <p>Sometimes a formal legal partnership or collaborative programme is not needed to sustain a productive academic partnership, which can be done through other forms of collaboration such as visiting PGR schemes and co-supervision</p>
'PGR-led'	<p>Prospective PGRs find this idea attractive.</p>	<p>Can be resource intensive for a single PGR</p> <p>PGR experience can be poor as no-one 'owns' the programme, PGR does not form part of a cohort</p> <p>Fragile – based on individuals who may not be able to see the programme through to the end</p>	<p>Many UK universities do not allow single-PGR agreements</p> <p>Generally seen as less desirable as the burden is on the PGR to build and maintain the partnership</p> <p>There may be better options for facilitating PGR mobility than a CDA</p>
Expansion of existing collaborative programme	<p>Should in theory be simple and build on existing work</p>	<p>Assumption that it is possible to just add PGRs/disciplines without any bureaucratic consequences or that any agreed models are portable to other disciplines or contexts</p>	<p>While the initial partnership may be well established, with working links between the two institutions, significant negotiations may still be required if regulations, funding arrangements, financial contributions or administrative support vary by Faculty</p>



## Programme Development for Collaborative Doctoral Awards

Bringing together two distinct doctoral programmes, often with an overseas partner, into a single journey that is achievable and coherent for the PGR can be a complex undertaking. The doctoral journey in the UK has evolved with increasing training and development needs, requirements for data management and impact plans, pushes for PGRs to engage the public with their research and/or undertake placements or internships, increasing expectations around open access publications and rules around compliance issues such as export controls. Other countries will have their own requirements and it is therefore not as simple as bringing two sets of academic regulations into line when the regulatory environment extends beyond the academic institution to government or other extra-institutional requirements. Increasingly, universities also need to be aware of government guidance and restrictions related to the 'trusted research' agenda. Universities must undertake due diligence to ensure that partnerships, partner countries, and even the research itself is not subject to sanction, liable to be used in ways not intended but which are regulated, or subject to regulation under relevant legislation,

It is sometimes helpful to break the activities down into several key stages, some of which can overlap, and ensure that institutional experts from each area are involved at an early stage:

- The proposal and business case
- Review of regulations / programme development
- Developing and negotiating the legal agreement
- Setting up the financial and operational processes

The first two points are covered in this chapter and the second two points covered in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.

### The Proposal and Business Case – the 'Strategic Fit'

The proposal or business case for developing a CDA is likely to look very different at each institution. Considerations for assessing the 'strategic fit' of the proposed partnership might include:

- **PARTNER PROFILE:** The partner's reputation at an institution level and/or within specific disciplines, and the perceived ability for the partner to meet its commitments to the partnership.
- **COUNTRY:** The country of the partner institution and the implications of any legislation in either country that might affect the establishment of a partnership, e.g., export controls, immigration requirements, national HE legislation in the partner country. Some countries are subject to sanction, export control or other regulations by government bodies and due diligence must be undertaken to ensure that any risks are acceptable.
- **STRATEGY:** The strategic aims that the proposed partnership would support and how they align with institutional strategic goals.
- **RESEARCH:** The potential for developing or enhancing valuable research partnerships and collaborations that strengthen the institutional research profile or contribute to strategically important strands of research. Any relevant risks related to the type of research being undertaken should also be considered.
- **RECRUITMENT:** Market analysis to understand the potential for PGR recruitment in both countries.
- **FUNDING:** What each partner is willing to commit in terms of funding for PGRs. What the impact might be where PGRs would be expected to fund themselves. Whether the programme can support itself financially or turn a profit or whether strategically the financial aspects are less important (for example where brand or reputation is enhanced by the partnership, or research outputs outweigh direct income from the partnership). Any relevant infrastructure or equipment that might be required.
- **SUPPORT:** How the programme has been instigated may impact on the support it is given, for example if there is senior-level endorsement, it may be better resourced in terms of funding and staffing. It is important to identify who will be involved in the programme development and delivery, and that commitment is made for the duration of the programme.

A thorough business case, articulating a position on the above considerations which sets out the risks, costs and benefits of the proposal and makes a positive argument for the partnership can aid the approval process as it moves through various internal stages.

Approval processes will vary widely from institution to institution and could encompass several layers of approval of different aspects of the partnership, separately or in sequence. A concern for institutions could be the agility of their institution and/or of their proposed partner(s) in approving the programme in a timely manner. Approval processes can be lengthy and bureaucratic and the time it takes can easily be underestimated. For example, strategic approval of the partnership may be required before any financial approval is undertaken or approval may move back and forth through approving bodies or processes as different aspects of the partnership are accepted or rejected.

Equally, institutions may take a much simpler approach to approve proposals and rely on aspects, such as academic compatibility with the partner, or may prefer to pursue smaller-scale partnerships where the considerations may be mainly financial or strategic.

## **Review of Regulations / Programme Development**

The programme may or may not be set out in detail as part of the proposal or business case. If it wasn't part of the process, an articulation of the programme alongside a review of each institution's relevant regulations is a logical next step.

What the programme entails (as outlined in Table 2), as well as what each institution's requirements are, need to be assessed and aligned. Programme development discussions can be an involved and lengthy process as many institutions do not have significant flexibility with their regulations. Where requirements differ, a middle ground needs to be agreed upon. Where any regulation changes are required, this can cause significant delays as such changes work their way through institutional governance processes. Some partners may also be governed by national level legal constraints that may dictate the form of the programme, e.g. such as whether the partnership can only result in a particular kind of award, or if publications must form a compulsory part of the award.

Presenting your institution's required regulations without coming across as being too rigid is a skill that must be developed. To aid the programme development negotiations, it is recommended that institutions develop an approach to articulating what is important to them in terms of their regulations and what is or isn't a 'deal breaker'.

There are often staff in institutions, typically in graduate schools / doctoral colleges who have the policy and regulatory expertise to negotiate this process effectively, and linking colleagues with similar expertise in each institution is a useful approach. Academic colleagues make a key contribution to the development of the programme but are not always as well informed on the regulatory aspects, making them important partners in these processes but often leaving them feeling frustrated at the level of detailed negotiation required over the regulatory aspects.

**SCENARIO:** One institution developed a short 'key principles' document that outlined its non-negotiable regulatory requirements for doctoral awards, such as how a supervisor participated in assessment processes or approaches to intellectual property. Staff who were talking to colleagues about partnerships even in a fairly casual sense could share this document to see if there were any obvious issues from the very start.

**SCENARIO:** A UK institution developed a consortium of European universities of which collaborative doctorates were the first deliverable. There was agreement to fund (fees and stipend) reciprocal numbers of PGRs. At this point the potential benefits of operating at scale disappear. Each pair of universities have to negotiate CDAs which fit their local requirements including differences in funding models (and values), training requirements, and the final assessment. If the partners participate each year then the respective agreement can be recycled. But each time a new partner joins, the negotiations start again. An unintended consequence of such a high profile scheme is that academic staff and prospective PGRs think that participation in the scheme is an automatic entitlement to admission (e.g. language entry conditions do not apply), or that PGRs can just arrive without any process being followed.

## Developing and Negotiating the Legal Agreement

Once a partnership is approved, or ideally in parallel to the programme approval process, the institutions will need to establish the legal partnership. This is generally done through a detailed legal agreement between the institutions that sets out the full range of matters to be agreed upon for the partnership. The PGR is generally not a party to the main agreement between institutions unless the partnership focuses solely on a programme for a single PGR. One way to handle this flexibly is for there to be a main agreement and then sub-agreements or appendices that refer to individual PGRs and requiring their signature. The next chapter covers the legal agreement considerations in more detail.

### Reflective Questions:

**What are the strategic drivers for engaging in developing a CDA – e.g. international profile, building a larger or more diverse PGR community, publications - and does the proposed partnership align with these?**

**What strategic decisions or plans has your institution made about what kinds of programmes it is willing to participate in and what kinds of partners it wants to work with, e.g. are you willing to consider a variety of programme structures, how will you assess the suitability of partners?**

**What processes are in place for agreeing a business case and for taking forward negotiations around a legal agreement?**

**What are your key considerations and limits as an institution, e.g. what are your 'red lines' or non-negotiable points that could doom the formalisation of a CDA from the start?**

**What financial or staff resources are you prepared to commit as an institution and is this enough for the programme to succeed?**

**Who would be responsible for managing the programme on the ground? Has there been consideration of the PGRs on CDAs as a cohort to promote a positive PGR experience?**

# Chapter Five

## Legal Considerations

---

***I didn't realise that I had to consider the jurisdiction of the partner university while I wasn't based there...but now I realise that I'm enrolled as a researcher at both institutions and therefore have to abide by the regulations of both at all times'***

Year 2 Collaborative PGR UK-Australia

Most partnership discussions do not start with the legal teams of the partner universities, and many of the lead instigators of prospective collaborative doctoral programmes will not have any legal background. This section is therefore designed as a guide to identifying the key legal requirements of a collaborative doctoral award agreement.

When setting out to work with a prospective partner on a collaborative doctoral award, it is essential that a programme is developed that complies with the requirements of both institutions (many of which are outlined in chapter 4).

It is important to note that this chapter is provided as guidance only and professional legal advice should be sought when developing legally-binding documents. In this section we look at some of the key elements of the collaborative doctoral programme that address the non-academic legal requirements.

### A 'Team' Approach

The legal agreement underpinning a CDA will encompass a range of different aspects of the collaboration, from the overall partnership and management of the relationship, to programme level information, as well as key legal clauses addressing jurisdiction, data protection, liability, review and termination of the legal partnership.

It's unlikely that a single person in any institution would have the knowledge and remit to negotiate and finalise a legal agreement that covers all the necessary requirements. It is therefore important to develop the right team from the outset. This includes ensuring that the appropriate colleagues are in place, not only at your own institution, but also at the partner institution. Not having the right team in place at the right stage of the process can result in lengthy negotiations.

Partnership discussions might be located with the university's Senior Management Team or with the Research Leads. Programme discussions might be supported by colleagues in the Registry function of the Graduate School or Doctoral College. Standard legal clauses can be provided by the legal team.

### Developing the Legal Agreement

Most partnership approvals start with undertaking due diligence investigation and assessment on the proposed partner. This should flag any potential risks in engaging with the partner which may need to be addressed in the legal agreement or planned for in terms of risk mitigation.

Once the partnership has been approved for progression to a formal legal agreement, discussions then must take place between institutions to establish the type and content of the legal agreement. The legal teams in each of the partner institutions may not communicate directly with each other, working instead through other non-legal colleagues in partnership development teams, research offices, graduate schools or doctoral colleges. The internal priorities and pressures within each institution can complicate the process and lengthen time it takes to develop an agreement if project staff or legal teams are relatively far removed from the collaborators and therefore place less urgency on the work. The length of time it takes to develop a legal agreement that can be mutually agreed should not be underestimated and can take anything from six months to two years.

The first stage in developing the legal agreement usually involves deciding which institution's partnership agreement will provide the starting point. Some universities might take a very light touch legal approach, typically if they view collaborative doctorates as a relatively low risk undertaking, whilst others might have a very rigorous approach to implementing legal partnership agreements. The approach to the legal agreement may depend on how each partner views the partnership whether, for example, the partner is perceived as higher or lower status, and the degree of financial or reputational risk involved.

Overseas partners may be less concerned with legal aspects considered quite important in the UK, such as data protection/GDPR, open access to research, data management, research impact, and vice versa. The extent to which the partners involved are willing to agree to some of these strictures or to which UK institutions may waive them will depend on the nature of the partnership.

There are times when discussions must end as partners cannot find a way to develop a programme that makes sense to both institutions, for example when there are divergent approaches to funding, research ethics, intellectual property ownership, or legal jurisdiction of the agreement. It is therefore essential that legal considerations are explored as much as possible from the outset.

## Different Elements of the Legal Arrangements

It may be helpful to think of the legal agreement as encompassing three broad areas of activity;

- i. partnership development between the two participating institutions;
- ii. programme development – ensuring that it is possible for the PGR to progress through the doctorate at both institutions simultaneously whilst remaining compliant with both sets of regulations;
- iii. standard legal clauses which address or acknowledge the national requirements for compliance.

A summary of the key considerations for each element of the legal agreement is outlined in Table 4

**Table 4: Key areas to be addressed in the Collaborative Doctoral Programme Legal Agreement**

Partnership	Programme	Legal
Over-arching description of the partnership	Admissions processes	Publicity and marketing (including any national compliance requirements)
Identify the Senior Leads (at each institution)	Progression arrangements (including consideration of national requirements eg publications)	Intellectual Property
Identify which office are the coordinators (the partnership may be managed by different offices at each institution)	Exam arrangements	Liabilities and Insurance
Agreed duration of legal agreement	Research ethics requirements	Confidentiality (including national compliance in areas such as Freedom of Information, and Data Protection)
Periodic review of the partnership	Visa / Immigration arrangements	Review arrangements for the legal agreement
Financial arrangements	Periodic review of the programme	Termination arrangements (including Force Majeur)
Legal contact		Law and jurisdiction

## Partnership Requirements

The legal agreement should include a description of the overall programme as well as a 'glossary' of key terms of reference, related to the programme, that are to be used in the agreement. For example, the standard reference for a Postgraduate Researcher (PGR in the UK) may vary from country to country, and so should be clarified in the agreement, the UK partner may want to refer to the programme as 'dual award' but the overseas partner may want to refer to the programme as a 'joint doctorate' and a clarification should be provided.

As well as identifying the legal contact, the agreement should identify the Senior Lead at each institution. This is typically the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor or Pro Vice-Chancellor (in the UK) and their equivalent at the partner university.

It may also be helpful to identify which office is responsible for the coordination of the programme, as this may be managed by different offices at each institution (eg Doctoral College, Central Graduate School, Faculty-based Graduate Office, International Programmes Office).

The legal agreement should be implemented for a fixed period with a plan for periodic review of the partnership, typically every 5 years.

## Programme Level Requirements

As outlined in Chapter 4, presenting your institution's required regulations without coming across as being too rigid is an essential skill when developing the collaborative doctoral award. Understanding what regulations are fixed and where there is some flexibility is key and requires the right team to be in place as the programme-specific clauses within the legal agreement are discussed.

Whilst the detail of the CDA may be captured in a separate document, such as a Programme Handbook, it is helpful to refer to some of the key programme requirements in the legal agreement. The legal agreement may therefore include a clause which outlines the agreed entry criteria and admissions process, what key progression assessment will be used (including consideration of national requirements eg publications), any obligations for fulfilling research ethics requirements, and how the final exam is to be conducted (even if it's just an outline of the process in principle).

The legal agreement might also acknowledge how each partner will proceed in the event that the candidate does not meet the necessary progression requirements for each institution. A standard approach is for each party to allow the other to progress the candidate on a single award only (rather than the collaborative award) in the event that the requirements for progression or award have not been met (though this may not be possible in some countries).

Given that mobility typically forms part of the CDA, the legal agreement should acknowledge who takes responsibility for visa, immigration and travel arrangements (this is typically the responsibility of the PGR).

Most UK universities also have a requirement to periodically review the programme, and so a review schedule that is acceptable to both the partners should be included as a clause in the agreement.

## National Regulatory Requirements

Given that PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards are enrolled simultaneously at both institutions, the UK and the partner's regulatory environment must be addressed, throughout the duration of the doctorate.

There are some areas of legal requirements that will be non-negotiable due to the national regulations of both partners such as status of the postgraduate researcher (staff or student), ethics clearance requirements, data protection, minimum or maximum length of study and type of award granted. Taking some time out at the start to talk broadly about doctoral education in both national settings is a helpful way to identify any potential obstacles before discussions get too detailed.

Some examples of UK regulatory frameworks which must be respected include; Competition and Markets Authority (Marketing and Admissions), Visa requirements and Academic Technology Approval Scheme (ATAS) clearance (Immigration) Office for Students (Regulations, Student Welfare and Rights), Quality Assurance Agency (Quality Assurance).

## PGR Learning Agreement

The main legal agreement is typically between the two partner institutions and does not reference individual PGRs. However, given that no two doctoral projects are the same, once PGR are recruited into the CDA, it is helpful to have a separate, legally binding contract, which outlines the specific arrangement between all three parties. Differences to the main agreement might occur in areas such as funding, mobility, or supervisory arrangements and should be captured in the PGR Learning Agreement.

A template for the PGR Learning Agreement can be included as an example in the appendix of the main agreement, and this ensures that both parties are familiar with the broad requirements of the PGR Learning Agreement from the outset.

**SCENARIO:** An academic department negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding with a Chinese university to offer a dual degree programme. This involved the legal team and partnerships office among others, but not the Doctoral College. The MoU did not include any detail. When the Doctoral College was approached to work up a Student Learning Agreement, it became clear that key information such as funding, had not been clearly communicated to candidates.

## Reflective Questions

**What does the legal agreement mean for the partner? Is it a significant event that will lead to a formal signing, or is it an activity that can happen in the background whilst the programme development activity takes place?**

**What level of risk does the partnership present? Are those risks addressed in the legal agreement?**

**Does the legal agreement enable you to make the final decision on whether to make the award from your institution if the candidate can't progress to the award?**

**Are the right people involved, at both institutions, to determine what is included in the legal agreement?**



# Chapter Six

## Funding Models

---

***If a proposed collaborative doctoral award is to be a success, it is vital that there is a sustainable funding model, in particular the provision of a stipend.***

UK HE Practitioner

Part of the appeal of the collaborative doctoral award to prospective PGRs is that they often come with funding. However, there is more than one model for funding a CDA. In this chapter we explore the different funding models and the implications for the PGR and partner institutions of each model.

### Funding Models

As outlined in Chapter 4, CDAs may develop from a range of strategic interests; either from an individual PGR, from a single academic, or as a result of an initiative at an institutional level. As a result, the funding model underpinning CDAs can take more than one form.

At one end of the spectrum, is the single PGR-led initiative which might not attract institutional studentship funding. At the other end of the spectrum are CDAs that present an opportunity at an institutional level to build an international research profile and, as such, could come with full studentships attached, with funding provided by both the partner institutions.

Whilst PGRs on CDAs are typically enrolled at both institutions throughout the doctorate, there is usually a different role played by each institution in terms of the funding model. The terminology used to describe the role of each partner should be clarified from the outset. For example, 'Home' institution is usually the institution where the PGR starts their doctorate and may also be referred to as the 'lead' institution. 'Host' institution is the institution where the PGR is based at a particular point in their doctorate and may also be referred to as the 'partner institution'.

### Main Costs

The main costs in a CDA include fees, stipend and travel expenses. Depending on how the studentships are funded and the research area, additional items such as bench fees and consumables might be treated separately. All costs should be considered and allocated at the outset of the partnership.

### Fees

Often fees are waived by both institutions when entering into a CDA, especially if the programme has been developed as a strategic institutional initiative. However, other models do exist whereby fees are only paid to the 'host' institution, or a reduced fee is applied to the programme. Self-funded CDAs, where the PGR pays the full fee at both institutions, are rare.

While 'fees' are often assumed to mean 'tuition fees', care should be taken in any legal agreement to specify what is meant by fees as many universities may have other categories of fees such as registration fees or bench fees.

### Stipend

A stipend is the funding allocated directly to the PGR, usually on a monthly basis, to cover their living expenses. The stipend should cover an acceptable living allowance, which in the UK context usually reflects the recommended stipend level as advised by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI).

Given that CDAs usually take place across transnational settings, it should be clear what is the 'benchmark' for an acceptable living allowance in the partner country. Consideration should be given to the variation in the cost of living between international partners and the stipend arrangements agreed accordingly.

What is a generous allowance in one location might be insufficient in another.



## Travel Expenses

Collaborative doctoral awards between transnational partners usually involve a period of mobility. Where this is included in the agreement underpinning the programme, acknowledgement should be made regarding who will cover the costs of travel. Staff travel may also be considered.

The following table summarises possible funding models and how they might link to the strategic importance of the CDA.

**Table 5: An Overview of Possible Funding Models**

<b>Funding model</b>	<b>Outline</b>	<b>Implications</b>
Self-funded	<p>Fee waiver – none (alternatively fees may be charged only whilst at the ‘host’ university)</p> <p>Stipend – none</p> <p>Travel expenses – none</p>	<p>This model is typically used for self-funded collaborative doctoral awards. It is important to determine the PGR has sufficient resource to meet the expected costs relating to the programme or there might be issues arising from financial insecurity and ultimately failure to successfully complete the doctorate</p>
Shared costs	<p>Fee waiver – Yes. Usually waived at both institutions for the duration of the doctorate</p> <p>Stipend – Yes. Paid to the PGR depending on location of the PGR</p> <p>Travel expenses – Yes. For example, one return journey covered by the ‘home’ institution</p>	<p>This funding model might be used in a collaboration which is academic-led, but perhaps not institution-wide</p> <p>Attaching the funding model to the mobility pattern may be a good way to share the costs between the partner institutions. However, consideration should be given to the impact on the research of the mobility pattern</p> <p>For example, mobility should take place when it is most beneficial to the research, however there may not be the flexibility to be responsive to the research needs if the funding model requires that the PGR re-locate and switch stipend-provider part way through the doctorate</p>
Home institution covers costs <u>for the duration of the doctorate</u> , recruitment is matched by each institution	<p>Fee waiver – Yes. Usually waived at both institutions for the duration of the doctorate</p> <p>Stipend – Yes. Usually covered in full by the ‘Home’ institution for the duration of the doctorate. However, for partnerships where there is considerable difference in the cost of living this needs to be taken into account</p> <p>Travel expenses – Yes. One return journey covered by the ‘home’ institution</p>	<p>This funding model is typically used where there is significant, strategic, often institution-wide, commitment to the partnership</p> <p>This model requires that partners are in a position to fully-fund the stipend even when the PGR is overseas. This includes meeting the UKRI stipend requirements (or the UK partner’s minimum stipend requirement) when the PGR is in the UK</p> <p>The benefit of one partner funding for the duration of the doctorate, in particular the stipend, is that it allows greater flexibility with regard to when the mobility takes place.</p>

## Link Between Funding and Mobility

Where stipend payments are linked to mobility, such as in the 'shared costs' model highlighted in the table above, it is essential that the mobility pattern is agreed in advance, so that the mobility period makes sense with regard to the research project and also so that both institutions can make the necessary arrangements to put in place stipend payments for the period that they are 'hosting' the PGR.

The model whereby the 'home' or 'lead' institution covers the stipend for the full duration of the doctorate is the most straightforward model from an administrative perspective, and it also allows for greater flexibility within the research project. However, the success of this model depends on two key elements i) parity in the living costs at both home and host institution, and ii) balanced recruitment by both institutions.

Partnerships with institutions based in regions where there is a significant difference in living costs might not be able to benefit from this model, unless the UK institution is willing to provide a 'top up' to the stipend provided by the partner for the period of time the PGR spends in the UK.

**SCENARIO:** A UK university wanted to develop a collaborative doctoral partnership with university in South Africa. The funding model developed was 'shared costs'. As the partner in South Africa couldn't cover the UK stipend rate, a model was developed that enabled the PGR to complete the doctorate by spending the majority of the time in South Africa, coming to the UK for two months on an enhanced stipend, covered by the UK university to match the UKRI rate. Fee waivers were offered throughout by both institutions.

**SCENARIO:** An Indonesian university wanted to develop a partnership with a UK university which involved at least 12 months in the UK. A funding model was developed which enables the Indonesian 'host' to cover living costs at the local rate, while the UK partner will cover the period in the UK at the UKRI rate.

**SCENARIO:** A collaborative doctoral programme was established between a UK and Singaporean Institution based on the 'shared costs' model. In theory, this funding model provided for a 4-year studentship, equally divided between the partners, with each funding 2 years. In practice most research projects did not require 2 years in Singapore. As a result, this programme became more costly to the UK partner as PGRs spent more time in the UK than in Singapore.

## Funding Models and Recruitment of PGR

The funding models outlined above are usually offered for a specified duration, typically 3.5-4 years. Within this time frame the PGR will be required to complete their doctorate, as well as undertake a period of international mobility and meet any training expectations agreed between the partners. Given the additional demands on the PGR of a CDA, it may be helpful to consider enhanced entry requirements, such as a compulsory Masters degree (where this would not usually be needed) or higher English language scores. Consideration should also be given to the design of the research project, to ensure that it is achievable within the specified duration.

### Reflective Questions:

**Does the funding model meet the requirements of your institution?**

**Is the funding model reciprocal/balanced?**

**What changes (eg to the PGR mobility) could impact on the funding model you have chosen?**

**Has consideration been given to differences in living costs between the two partner locations?**

**Is the collaborative doctoral award achievable within the funding model?**

# Chapter Seven

## Agreeing the Collaborative Doctoral Award Examination Process

---

***If an oral defence is required by one of the parties, the organising party must assume responsibility for the location, costs, and committee membership arrangement.***

Extract from a collaborative doctoral award agreement between UK and Australian partners

In this section, we consider the principles and practice of agreeing the examination process for a collaborative doctoral award.

The quote above starts with the phrase 'if an oral defence is required' which might seem absurd to UK higher education practitioners, where the final examination by oral examination or 'viva voce' is considered sacrosanct. However, the statement is taken from an agreement between a UK and Australian institution and illustrates how UK doctoral examination norms cannot be taken for granted when engaging with universities overseas (in Australia a viva is not standard). Internationally, a UK-style closed door oral examination is fairly uncommon.

### To Viva or not to Viva...

In the UK, the oral examination is usually a 'closed' examination, where only the candidate, examiners, and any independent observer or chair is present. Many providers permit the supervisor to be present to observe the examination, with the candidate's and examiners' permission, but they do not play an active role in the final decision-making process. This differs from some non-UK European oral examination models involving a public defence, where the candidate may invite family and friends to join the audience in what is considered a celebration as well as a defence of the thesis, and where the outcome of the award is usually already known.

Where UK universities are offering a CDA with European partners the public defence is sometimes used rather than the 'closed' UK model. Where the UK institution is not the lead university, it might be appropriate to compromise on the need for a viva, although we would consider this to be exceptional. (See QAA Characteristics Statement in Useful Resources and Further Reading section)

The over-riding principle in agreeing an examination process that works for any given partnership is that it is not unduly onerous for the PGR. Ideally, a single examination process is agreed even if this includes additional examiners, beyond what we would consider the norm in the UK, or additional ceremonial or public aspects.

As much detail as possible should be agreed from the start and set out in the legal agreement, not least because examinations take place years after the agreement is negotiated and often involve different personnel. Both institutions will need to have their core (non-negotiable) requirements met to ensure that the assessment process is robust. Starting points include deciding:

- which institution's regulations take precedence and when?;
- can a single approach be agreed that meets all parties' criteria for assessment?;
- what aspects of your institutional process are non-negotiable and which could you compromise on?;
- who is able to make these decisions, and in what timescale?;

Not all of the examination process requirements will need stipulating in the agreement, it may be sufficient to make reference to the relevant institutional regulations (and later include a more detailed overview of the final agreed exam process as a variation or appendix to the agreement).

Those elements of the examination process which typically present key points of difference and therefore need to be addressed in the agreement are highlighted in Table 6 below in *italics*.

**Table 6: Key elements of the examination process**

Thesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Format, including the use of published material within the thesis ('journal format'), supplementary material or material in other formats</li> <li>• <i>Language(s)</i></li> <li>• Word limits and appendices</li> <li>• Submission process – including number of copies and requirement for hard copies</li> <li>• Other requirements, e.g. publications, embargoes</li> </ul>
Examiners/jurors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How many and their roles, e.g. is there a panel convenor in addition to the examiners</i></li> <li>• Eligibility to act as an examiner</li> <li>• Report requirements</li> <li>• <i>Role of supervisors (if any)</i></li> </ul>
Viva voce and/or public defence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Viva requirements</i></li> <li>• <i>Public and/or private</i></li> <li>• <i>How/where - are panel members or the PGR able to participate online</i></li> <li>• <i>Who leads on arrangements and what are the appropriate timescales</i></li> <li>• <i>Expenses (if travel involved)</i></li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Agreeing the range of possible outcomes and the consequences or timescales for corrections or re-examination</i></li> <li>• Do the results need to be reported to or ratified by a university committee or other body</li> <li>• Graduation entitlement and arrangements</li> <li>• <i>Certificate(s)/testamur/diploma</i></li> <li>• Deposit of final thesis and embargo considerations</li> </ul>

**SCENARIO:** From an agreement with a Belgian university:

"The defence consists of two stages: a private defence between the student and the defence committee, and the public defence. The private defence will follow the regulations of the student's home institution. On conclusion of the private defence stage a \*public defence will take place at one of the partner institutions (in principle this is the home institution) and will be recognised by all institutions involved. In the present case the public defence will take place at [insert name institution]. To note: \*The UK institution has agreed to this variation on its standard way of examining a thesis."

## Reflective Questions

**Are you able to accommodate variations to your examination regulations where a partner's assessment process is different from a standard UK viva?**

**Are you able to accommodate a public defence?**

**Is your partner willing to include a closed viva?**

**Are the grounds for appeal the same as in the standard UK examination process?**

# Chapter Eight

## Delivering the Collaborative Doctoral Award

---

***I have been very lucky as my supervisors are highly experienced and they do their utmost to guide, develop, and support me as they understand that in order for me to be on track, I have to comply with the requirements of two universities.***

Year 2 Collaborative PGR UK-Denmark

Reaching agreement with a partner about a collaborative doctoral award, is not the end of the process, but rather the beginning of a, hopefully, successful delivery stage. This section includes guidance on navigating some of the key operational issues throughout the collaborative research degree lifecycle.

At the core of a CDA should be the provision of a rich and varied student experience which seeks to add value for the PGRs, their supervisors and their institutions.

Whilst the potential rewards might be self-evident, they do not come without challenges. This is particularly the case not just in terms of governance requirements, but also in respect of the day-to-day management of the PGR experience and the provision of an excellent research environment. These aspects are typically not covered by legal agreements where the focus is likely to be on other aspects of the programme, such as legal and regulatory requirements.

### Attracting PGRs to a collaborative doctoral programme

Marketing and recruitment activities for a collaborative doctoral programme can present some additional complicating factors. Sometimes even quite operational matters can become sticking points when working in collaboration with a partner, such as how a logo is used or how a programme is marketed.

How students apply for the collaborative programme is an important consideration. Both partners will already have a standard application and admission process which will need to be considered, and a logical admissions process outlined for prospective applicants. Collaborative programmes may vary in terms of whether an application is made to a specific funded project, or whether a research proposal needs to be developed, and if so whether the proposal is developed with a supervisor who is associated with the programme or entirely by the applicant.

Common questions to explore with the partner regarding marketing and recruitment to the collaborative programme may include:

- Do marketing materials (including use of logos) need to be signed off by both parties?
- Will both institutions take responsibility for recruitment, or will one take the lead? How should any differences in the recruitment process (e.g. in the role of supervisors) be managed?
- Do PGRs have to apply formally to one institution or both, and if the latter are there any ways in which the process can be streamlined to avoid duplication of effort for the PGRs?
- How will both institutions ensure that they are satisfied that an individual is suitable to be admitted to the CDA programme? Will there be a joint admissions panel, or will one institution forward suitable applicants to the other for their, secondary, approval? How will equality, diversity and inclusion considerations be met?
- How will information about PGRs be transferred between parties in line with the data protection requirements?
- How will student records be set up to ensure PGRs on CDAs can be easily identified and reported upon (including compliance reporting such as UK's HESA)?
- Have both institutions considered how stipends and other payments to PGRs will be managed?
- How will PGRs be helped to navigate any visa issues?

## PGR experience and wellbeing on collaborative doctoral award programmes

There are challenges common to all PGR and the UK Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), provides a useful framework for identifying the key areas (supervision, resources, research community, wellbeing, progress and assessment and skills and professional development), but the pursuit of a collaborative doctoral award presents additional challenges for PGRs such as:

- Mastering two different academic cultures and managing co-supervisors
- Negotiating the practicalities of moving to and living in another jurisdiction e.g., visas, tax, social security and health care
- Meeting the governance and programme requirements of two institutions
- Navigating what is likely to be a bespoke examination process.

Smith McGloin (2022) encapsulates some of additional challenges for CDAs in the following observation:

*“Overcoming time zones and communication lags both across supervisory teams such as in co-tutelle arrangements and with family and friends at home was noted as barrier to accessing timely support. Difficulties in cross-cultural supervision were also noted by a number of respondents as aptly summarised by the following quotation: ‘Cultural shock in general and, in special, difficulty of understanding the feedback from my British supervisors. In Brazil, supervisors are more clear and assertive about their feedbacks, whereas UK supervisors tend to be more polite but also share less and give less support when giving feedback.’ Finally, loneliness is reported as a major barrier to mobility with respondents expressing the challenges posed by the loss of social networks and the burden of ‘building up everything from scratch’.”*

There are, however, various ways to support PGRs to successfully navigate the challenges of a CDA. Institutions should seek to provide the following:

- Clear information about the CDA during the recruitment and selection process, including honesty about the challenges involved, as well as the opportunities
- A Programme Handbook which outlines the programme that has been developed for the specific collaborative doctoral award
- An induction process that involves representatives of both institutions so that there is no danger of one institution (or its requirements) being mis-represented, and which sets out key programme milestones including training, progression and the final examination process
- Careful choice of supervisors (who ideally should have experience of international co-supervision and supervising at a distance)
- Training and support for supervisors to understand expectations of PGRs on the CDA with regard to training, progression and examination – this should include tailored support for collaborative arrangements
- Documentation for examiners which is specific to the CDA
- Where possible, an early opportunity for each PGR to meet supervisors in person to facilitate relationship building, especially where some relationships will be online for significant periods of time
- A supervision agreement that is negotiated between the PGR, and their supervisors and sets out clear expectations for the timing and nature of supervisory meetings (including any practical considerations e. g. overcoming time zone differences, communication platforms) and the provision of feedback on the PGR’s work
- Expectations on professional development should also be clearly set out as part of any researcher development programme
- A named administrative first point of contact at each institution who can support or signpost to relevant practical support for issues such as visas, tax, accommodation, access to health care

- Peer support, for example through recruitment to a cohort (rather than single-PGR model which can leave a PGR very isolated) or alternatively buddying/mentoring schemes
- A named contact for PGR wellbeing at both institutions, together with access to supporting material such as The Wellbeing Thesis and The Dragonfly Cafe (see Useful Resources and Further Reading section)

The UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) provide a summary of key pinch points for PGR wellbeing and offer suggested good practice solutions for each stage of the doctoral lifecycle which can usefully be adopted by collaborative teams (see Useful Resources and Further Reading section).

With partners generally geographically distant, contact with at least one of the supervisory teams will inevitably be online where the PGR is by definition based at different universities at different stages of the programme. This creates unique challenges in terms of connecting, communicating, building the relationship, understanding expectations and giving feedback. It is important that supervisors are versed in strategies to cope with these and are open to the potential challenges of building their own relationships with co-supervisors. A helpful guide to managing these challenges may be found in the UKCGE Guide to Online Supervision (see Useful Resources and Further Reading section).

Indeed, one of the positive consequences of the difficulties endured as a result of Covid-19 was a growth in understanding of the online experience, whether this be as a vehicle for supervision, more general researcher development, or for data collection and presentation. To an extent this created more parity around the Student experience between CDAs and non-CDAs with more PGRs likely to be online or at a distance from some part of their supervisory team or programme support. However, it is noteworthy that a less positive impact of Covid-19 was the need in some cases to compromise on the duration of the mobility period as well as making exceptional arrangements on funding when PGRs spent more time than envisaged away from their home institution. These unintended scenarios are worth bearing in mind for future planning.

### **Monitoring the collaborative doctoral award - the individual and the partnership**

As with all doctoral programmes, CDAs require monitoring not just in terms of standards and the quality of the PGR experience in each phase, but also in terms of the success of the partnership in meeting its desired objectives. Monitoring is therefore twofold, and partners should agree in advance how they will undertake both these aspects and how this will be communicated.

Depending on the scale of the partnership, it may be valuable to set up a joint governance body with representation from both partners. This body may meet every six to twelve months and take the lead on overseeing the operation and review of the CDA, providing a forum for addressing any identified challenges and opportunities.

In the UK context, universities generally have clear processes in place for the monitoring of the PGR experience on non-collaborative programmes, including supervision, health and safety requirements, ethics protocols, research integrity and progress towards programme goals. This monitoring typically takes place annually, regardless of whether the PGR is on a full-time or part-time programme.



Questions to discuss with a collaborative partner may include:

- If monitoring is to be undertaken primarily via each institution's standard internal processes, how and when will relevant information be shared between the parties?
- What metrics or indicators relating to the standard and quality of the PGR experience are key and how will these be compared with PGRs who are on equivalent (but not collaborative) programmes to check that those on the CDA are not at a disadvantage?
- Does any additional or bespoke monitoring need to take place e.g., a CDA-specific survey or focus groups, potentially covering both PGRs and their supervisors, and if so, who will be responsible for this?
- Are PGR able to participate in a joint governance body?

More generally, what is clear is that the monitoring processes for collaborative doctoral awards should be underpinned by a fundamental tenet that all partners' responsibilities and requirements are both specified and met.

## **Reflective Questions**

**Have you and your partner considered the practicalities of marketing, recruitment and admission of PGRs on your collaborative doctoral award? Where do EDI considerations fit in?**

**Does your institution and the partner institution have the appropriate services in place to support PGRs on the collaborative doctoral awards?**

**What additional support might PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards need? How do they access PGRs on representation?**

**How will you monitor your collaborative doctoral award and the success of the programme more generally??**

**Are the governance arrangements proportional to the size of the provision?**



# Chapter Nine

## Conclusions and Guiding Principles

---

***I would recommend this program to all new students who seek to broaden their horizons not only in science but in cultural experience also. Although it might be challenging, I believe that the outcome is really worthwhile and memorable.***

Year 2 Collaborative PGR UK-Belgium

At the time of writing, the management of collaborative doctoral awards remains relatively under-regulated, and therefore there are a wide range of institutional approaches to the development and management of these programmes.

There is still much research and practice-sharing to be done, however we hope that this practitioner guide will prove helpful and a useful resource to guide thinking in this area.

There is a significant amount of detail within this document, but we believe it is possible to identify some guiding principles, to be considered when developing any CDA. Universities should ensure that:

- They are clear about their reasons for, and commitment to, any partnership.
- The standard of the doctoral award is protected, and regulatory requirements carefully considered.
- There is an excellent experience for the PGRs concerned, to conduct research in the best possible environment, where they are supported to learn and develop.
- There is clarity for all parties on their respective roles and responsibilities
- Both partners can evidence all the above.

Partnership working can be challenging, and the management of the detail of collaborative doctoral awards can be time-consuming, but these programmes, when well-managed, can provide benefits to all parties - institutions, supervisors and of course PGRs.

### Reflective Questions

The reflective questions throughout the document are repeated below in an edited form to help colleagues with different roles in developing CDAs to work through potential challenges and key considerations. In developing these, the following assumptions were made about staff roles. Each institution may differ from these assumptions and individuals may occupy more than one role or roles that cut across these descriptors.

- Senior leaders (Deans or VCs) are largely focused on strategic rather than programmatic or operational matters.
- Academic / Programme leads are largely focused on building and nurturing academic partners/partnerships, developing programmes that suit the partnerships, acting as academic programme leads, and supporting PGRs to successful completion.
- Professional leads need to keep the strategic in mind while focusing on the regulatory and operational matters. The funding model needs to work, regulations must be coherent, and PGRs provided with the best possible experience. Professional staff may have roles in strategy delivery, policy management, registry management, collaborative partnership development, graduate school management, or operational delivery.
- PGRs want the best possible experience to undertake their research and develop their careers. They need appropriate information to make informed decisions about their choice of programme.

### SENIOR LEADERS:

- What are the strategic drivers and/or institutional goals for engaging in developing a CDA? Are your objectives strategic, financial, related to prestige or reputation, building specific partnerships or research strengths, growing the size of your PGR community or other goals? Does the proposed partnership align with these goals?
- What strategic decisions or plans has your institution made about what kinds of programmes it is willing to participate in and what kinds of partners it wants to work with, e. g. are you willing to consider a variety of programme structures, how will you assess the suitability of partners?
- What processes are in place for developing/agreeing a business case or for taking forward negotiations around a legal agreement?
- What are your key considerations and limits as an institution, e. g. what are the non-negotiable points or unacceptable risks?
- What financial or staff resources are you prepared to commit as an institution, and is this enough for the programme to succeed?
- What level of risk does the partnership present? Are those risks addressed in the legal agreement?
- Does the funding model meet the requirements of your institution and is it reciprocal/balanced?

### ACADEMIC LEADS:

- Does the proposed programme meet your institutional goals for wanting to build a partnership for a CDA? What institutional objectives are met if the partnership is successful?
- Are both you and your proposed partner referring to the same sort of collaborative programme?
- How does your partner's doctoral programme differ from those that you offer? Where there are differences, how important are these to maintaining the quality of your doctoral award?
- Is a collaborative programme the most appropriate mechanism to develop the partnership or is there an alternative, such as a visiting PGR arrangement?
- What processes are in place for developing/agreeing a business case or for taking forward negotiations around a legal agreement?
- What financial or staff resources are you able to commit and is this enough for the programme to succeed?
- Who would be responsible for managing the programme on the ground?
- Are the governance arrangements proportional to the size of the provision?
- Have you and your partner considered the practicalities of marketing, recruitment and admission of PGRs on your collaborative doctoral award? Where do EDI considerations fit in?
- Has there been consideration of the potential to recruit students on CDAs as a cohort to promote a positive PGR experience?
- Has consideration been given to differences in living costs between the two partner locations?
- Are you able to accommodate variations to your examination regulations where a partner's assessment process is different from a standard UK viva, for example including an element of public defence, or setting aside an oral defence?
- Are the grounds for appeal the same as in the standard UK examination process?
- Does your institution/the partner institution have the appropriate services in place to support PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards?
- How well do the supervisors of PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards understand the different programme requirements?
- How will you monitor your collaborative doctoral award?

## PROFESSIONAL LEADS/MANAGERS

- What strategic decisions or plans has your institution made about what kinds of programmes it is willing to participate in and what kinds of partners it wants to work with, e.g. are you willing to consider a variety of programme structures, how will you assess the suitability of partners? Does the proposed programme meet your institutional goals for wanting to build a partnership for a CDA? What institutional objectives are met if the partnership is successful?
- Are both you and your proposed partner referring to the same sort of collaborative programme?
- Is a collaborative doctoral award the most appropriate mechanism to develop the partnership or is there an alternative, such as a visiting PGR arrangement?
- How does your partner's doctoral programme differ from those that you offer? Where there are differences, how important are these to maintaining the quality of your doctoral award?
- How much flexibility do you have within your university's regulations to accommodate the core elements of the partner's doctoral programme?
- Is it possible to reduce duplication in delivery and assessment while maintaining the quality of the award / PGR experience (for example, ethical approval, annual reporting, examination methods) as a result of bringing together the two sets of regulations?
- What kind of approval processes are in place for agreeing support for a business case or for taking forward negotiations around a legal agreement?
- What are your key considerations and limits as an institution, e. g. what are the non-negotiable points or unacceptable risks?
- What financial or staff resources are being committed and is this enough for the programme to succeed?
- Who would be responsible for managing the programme on the ground? How are key contacts at each institution communicated to the student(s)?
- Are the governance arrangements proportional to the size of the provision?
- Have you and your partner considered the practicalities of marketing, recruitment and admission of PGRs on your collaborative doctoral award? Where do EDI considerations fit in?
- Has there been consideration of the students on CDAs as a cohort or cohorts to promote a positive PGR experience?
- What does the legal agreement mean for the partner? Is it a significant event that will lead to a formal signing, or is it an activity that can happen in the background whilst the programme development activity takes place?
- What level of risk does the partnership present? Are those risks addressed in the legal agreement?
- Does the funding model meet the requirements of your institution and is it reciprocal/balanced?
- What changes (e.g. to the PGR's mobility) could impact on the funding model you have chosen?
- Has consideration been given to differences in living costs between the two partner locations?
- Is the collaborative doctoral award achievable within the funding model?
- Are you able to accommodate variations to your examination regulations where a partner's assessment process is different from a standard UK viva, for example including an element of public defence, or setting aside an oral defence?
- Are the grounds for appeal the same as in the standard UK examination process?
- Does your institution/the partner institution have the appropriate services in place to support PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards?
- What additional support might PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards need? How do they access representation?
- How well do the supervisors of PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards understand the different programme requirements?
- How will you monitor your collaborative doctoral award?

### PROSPECTIVE PGRs:

- Who is responsible for managing the programme on the ground and how is this communicated to the PGR?
- Has consideration been given to differences in living costs between the two partner locations?
- Does your institution/the partner institution have the appropriate services in place to support PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards?
- What additional support might benefit PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards?
- How well do the supervisors of PGRs on collaborative doctoral awards understand the different programme requirements?
- What size is the cohort of PGRs on the programme?

## Operational Checklist

There are a number of areas where there might be differences between any two institutions which may be of greater or lesser priority depending on the nature of the proposed partner or partnership. It might be useful to review the list below to highlight any areas that may require negotiation in order to establish the partnership.

### PROGRAMME STRUCTURE

- Award Title
- Duration of study
- Curriculum structure or required coursework or assessment (as applicable)
- Tuition fees and financial arrangements
- Bench fees and other fees
- Regulatory flexibility
- Over-arching legal environments which dictate certain types of awards

### RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS

- Information provided for prospective PGRs
- Candidate entry qualifications
- English Language requirements
- Admissions processes
- Registration processes

### SUPERVISION

- Appointment of Supervisors
- Supervisory team arrangements for the PGRs
- Frequency and recording of Supervisory meetings
- Training for supervisors and internal examiners

## ON-PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

- Monitoring progression (key milestones)
- Transfer process (timing and procedure)
- Requirements for a training or development plan
- Required training (e. g. methods training, health and safety, research integrity, data management)
- Ethical Approval
- Student Academic Appeals
- Changes to mode of study – Full time/Part time/ Thesis Pending
- Procedures for and regulations covering Suspensions / Extensions

## RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

- Study spaces / office spaces
- Access to libraries or specialist resources/equipment/laboratories
- Access to development opportunities
- Digital environment and resources
- Good practice in research / Research Misconduct Policy
- Health and safety

## STUDENT SUPPORT

- Induction and training, including research methods and personal and professional development
- Access to wellbeing support, services and/or resources
- Leave policies (parental leave, sickness or other absence, holiday entitlement, unauthorised absences)
- Student complaints procedures
- Withdrawal procedures
- Policy environment (non-academic conduct, disability support, wellbeing, equality and diversity)

## RESEARCH EXAMINATION REQUIREMENTS

- Format, language and word count requirements
- Criteria for examination of the award and examination outcomes
- Composition of the examination panel
- Nature and format of the examination
- Examination outcomes and corrections procedures
- Exit awards
- Electronic submission of thesis, examination copy or final copy
- Open access and thesis deposit requirements

## GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

- Degree parchments
- Attendance at ceremonies

## Useful Resources and Further Reading

### Resources for those involved in establishing CDAs

Resource	Contents	Comments
QAA	<a href="#">Research Degree – Advice &amp; Guidance</a>	Provides advice for providers on the research environment and the supervisory process, which are distinct requirements of research degrees
QAA	<a href="#">Doctoral Degrees – Characteristics Statement</a>	Describes the distinctive features of the doctorate in the UK
QAA	<a href="#">Qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body</a>	Provides an outline of the the distinctive features of qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body. Whilst not specific to doctoral programmes there are some reference points for the development of CDAs.
The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities Altbach, P & Knight, J (2007)	Journal Article from the Journal of Studies in International Education (volume 11, issue 3-4, 2007) <a href="#">The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities (2007)</a>	Reflections from a leading education researcher on motivations and realities of internationalisation in higher education.
Doctoral Education for the Knowledge Society: Convergence or Divergence in National Approaches? Kehm, BM; Freeman, RPJ; Locke, W; (2018)	<a href="#">Book Chapter on Growth and Diversification of Doctoral Education in the United Kingdom</a>	The chapter analyses the growth in numbers of doctoral students and doctoral degrees awarded in the UK in recent years and develops two arguments related to this growth.
Toward a global doctorate?: Forces and forms in doctoral education worldwide. Nerad, M., & Heggelund, M. (Eds.). (2008)	<a href="#">Forces and forms in doctoral education</a>	A seminal text from the academic literature on the development of the modern-day doctorate
Hannover Recommendations (2019)	<a href="#">Hannover Recommendations - website</a>	A set of recommendations developed in 2019 following a gathering in Hannover of a group of leading education experts from around the world
Learning and Teaching: The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences Zgaga, P (2018)	Journal article from Learning and Teaching: The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences (volume 11, issue 2, 2018) <a href="#">How has mobility become central to the EU's idea of doctoral education? A brief overview of the history of a policy idea</a>	A journal article which addresses why and how mobility has become central to the EU's idea of doctoral education

Young European Research Universities (YERUN) Report (2021)	<a href="#"><u>Analysing National and Institutional Doctoral Regulations The Road to Successful Cross-border Cooperation on Joint Doctoral Programmes</u></a>	A comparative analysis of the national and institutional regulations of 17 universities located across 12 EU Member States
Erasmus+ Key Action 2 project funded by the European Commission The project, led by European network of research universities (YERUN)	The Link EDU-RES project focuses on the internationalisation of doctoral education and the establishment of collaborative and interactive frameworks for its operation  <a href="https://www.jointphdprogrammes.com/"><u>https://www.jointphdprogrammes.com/</u></a>	The project website includes some useful references including a 'toolkit' for prospective applicants to a joint doctorate
European Universities Association Council for Doctoral Education (2022)	<a href="#"><u>Co-tutelles in European universities: concept, aims and implementation EUA-CDE Thematic Peer Group Report</u></a>	The report focuses in particular on the practical dimension of the introduction of co-tutelles but also relates to the potential of co-tutelles as a strategic tool. It serves as a source of inspiration and reflection for everybody who is tasked with introducing such schemes within their own institution
Universities UK Concordat	<a href="#"><u>Universities UK Concordat</u></a>	The Concordat aims to provide a national framework for good research conduct and its governance
CPNI	Trusted Research <a href="https://www.cpni.gov.uk/trusted-research"><u>https://www.cpni.gov.uk/trusted-research</u></a>	Trusted Research aims to secure the integrity of the system of international research collaboration, which is vital to the continued success of the UK's research and innovation sector.
UKRI	Trusted Research and Innovation <a href="https://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-standards-and-data/good-research-resource-hub/trusted-research-and-innovation/"><u>https://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-standards-and-data/good-research-resource-hub/trusted-research-and-innovation/</u></a>	Trusted research and innovation is UKRI's work programme designed to support cross-sector campaigns which protect all those working in our thriving and collaborative international research and innovation sector.



## Resources for those involved in supervising or supporting CDAs

Resource	Contents	Comments
A Guide to Online Supervision  Kumar, Kumar & Taylor (2020) for UKCGE	Developed by the UK Council for Graduate Education this is a  <a href="#">A Guide to Online Supervision (2020)</a>	A helpful guide to managing the challenges of supervising at a distance
The Thesis Whisperer	<a href="#">Doing a Cotutelle what the...?</a>	A case study reflecting on the Student and Supervisor experience of a collaborative doctoral award
The implications of doctoral mobility for doctoral programme design and supervision  Rebekah Smith McGloin, Nottingham Trent University	<a href="#">The implications of doctoral mobility for doctoral programme design and supervision</a>	Article which takes the findings of a 2018 survey of UK doctoral researchers to examine the enablers and constraints to doctoral mobility, exploring the value of mobility to the respondents in terms of career development and knowledge development
The Wellbeing Thesis	A national, open access web-resource, hosted by Student Minds charity for postgraduate research students, to support wellbeing, learning and research.  <a href="#">The Wellbeing Thesis (website)</a>	The University of Derby, King's College London, and Student Minds co-created the website with PGRs to provide information on mental health and wellbeing during postgraduate research studies
Dragonfly Mental Health	As part of the Dragonfly Mental Health service, the Dragonfly Café facilitates academics of all disciplines from around the world to support each other in cultivating mental health in both live events and through an online platform.  <a href="#">The Dragonfly Café</a>	This online service is offered by the US-based volunteer group Global Consortium for Academic Mental Health



QAA