

*Handbook*  
*for Candidates*  
**and**  
**Supervisors for**  
**Masters Degrees by Research**  
**and Doctoral Degrees**

This Handbook provides information on the requirements for undertaking Masters by research and doctoral degrees at La Trobe University. The Handbook is accurate as at June 2006. The University reserves the right to vary the information contained herein at any time without notice.

*CONTACT DETAILS*

**The Research and Graduate Studies Office (RGSO)**

Location: level 2 of the David Myers Building, Bundoora

Counter Hours: 9am to 4.45pm Monday to Friday

Telephone: 9479 2464 (Candidature and Scholarships)  
9479 1975 (Grants and Fellowships)  
9479 1058 (Contracts and Intellectual Property)  
9479 1443 (Ethics)

Facsimile: 9479 1464

Email: [RGS@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:RGS@latrobe.edu.au)

The Research and Graduate Studies Office internet site is located at [www.latrobe.edu.au/www/rgso](http://www.latrobe.edu.au/www/rgso)

Candidates from the Albury-Wodonga campus may contact the office of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor in the first instance.

Telephone: 026058 9791

All scholarship enquiries should be directed to the Research and Graduate Studies Office.

**La Trobe University Postgraduate Association (LUPA)**

Location: Upper Level, Union Building, Bundoora

Telephone: 03 9479 2438

Facsimile: 03 9479 5617

Email: [lupaoffice@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:lupaoffice@latrobe.edu.au)

Web site: [www.latrobe.edu.au/lupa](http://www.latrobe.edu.au/lupa)

ii  
PREFACE

Higher education research aims to maintain and strengthen Australia's knowledge base and research capabilities, by developing an effective research and research training system, thereby enhancing Australia's economic development, international competitiveness and attainment of social goals. (Commonwealth Department of Education, Science & Training, 2002)

La Trobe University places great importance on the contributions made by higher degree candidates to research and scholarship. Indeed, the provision of high quality research training is a fundamental component of the University's Mission Statement.

The university recognizes the increasing diversity of those embarking on masters by research, traditional doctoral degrees, and professional doctorates. It is also keenly aware that the prospects, ambitions, needs and pressures faced by full time candidates overlap but also differ from those enrolled as part time candidates.

The contents of this Handbook offer a comprehensive overview of the range of support and facilities available for those enrolled in a higher degree within the university. The responsibilities and expectations for both research candidates and their supervisors are also outlined. Many questions and issues likely to arise during candidature can be answered by consulting the relevant section of the Handbook. Supervisors, Post Graduate Co-ordinators, Heads of Schools, the La Trobe Postgraduate Association and staff from the Research and Graduate Studies Office are further useful sources of information. Readers are reminded that conditions and regulations change from time to time. The most up to date information is available on the Research and Graduate Studies Web page located at the following url. <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/sc/>

On behalf of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research), and of the University community more generally, I wish you a productive and rewarding period as a higher degree candidate, as well as the speedy and successful completion of your studies. Make the most of all the opportunities available during your period of candidature!

Gilah Leder  
Chair, Higher Degrees Committee (Research)  
June, 2006

### **Abbreviations used in this Handbook**

APA	Australian Postgraduate Award
APA(I)	Australian Postgraduate Award (Industry)
AUSAID	Australian Agency for International Development
AVCC	Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee
DEST	Department of Employment, Science and Training
DIMA	Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.
HDC(R)	Higher Degrees Committee (Research)
HECS	Higher Education Contribution Scheme
IPO	International Programs Office
LTUPRS	La Trobe University Postgraduate Research Scholarship
LTUOPRS	La Trobe University Overseas Postgraduate Research Scholarship
LUPA	La Trobe University Postgraduate Association
EIPRS	Endeavour International Postgraduate Research Scheme
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
RGSC	Research and Graduate Studies Committee
RGSO	Research and Graduate Studies Office

## Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1	<b>The Research and Graduate Studies Office and the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)</b> .....	1
1.2	La Trobe University Postgraduate Association .....	2
1.3	Quality assurance .....	2
1.4	Funding Opportunities – grants, fellowships and scholarships .....	2
<b>2.</b>	<b>Higher Degrees Administered by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)</b> .....	3
2.1	Masters by research .....	3
2.2	Professional Doctorates – Coursework .....	4
2.3	Professional Doctorates – Research .....	4
2.4	Doctor of Philosophy .....	5
<b>3.</b>	<b>Responsibilities of Parties Involved with Candidature</b> .....	5
3.1	Responsibilities of the University .....	5
3.2	Responsibilities of the Head of School .....	6
3.3	Responsibilities of the supervisor(s) .....	7
3.4	Responsibilities of the candidate .....	9
3.5	Responsibilities of the examiners .....	9
<b>4.</b>	<b>Resources and Facilities</b> .....	10
4.1	Resources and facilities for the candidate .....	10
<b>5.</b>	<b>Candidature</b> .....	11
5.1	Applying for candidature.....	11
5.2	Duration of candidature.....	12
5.3	Expectations for contact within candidature .....	13
5.4	Full-time candidature .....	13
5.5	Part-time candidature .....	13
5.6	Employment during candidature .....	14
5.7	Variations to candidature.....	14
5.7.1	Change in course load .....	15
5.7.2	Absence from the University .....	15
5.7.3	Sick leave .....	15
5.7.4	Suspension or extension of candidature .....	15
5.7.5	Overseas research .....	15
5.7.6	Upgrading candidature from Masters to PhD.....	15
5.7.7	Concurrent enrolment.....	16
<b>6.</b>	<b>Scholarships</b> .....	16
6.1	Duration of scholarships.....	17
6.2	Suspensions to scholarships .....	17
6.3	Extensions to scholarships.....	17

<b>7.</b>	<b>Full Fee Paying Students and Visa Matters</b> .....	18
7.1	Payment of fees .....	18
7.2	Student visas.....	18
<b>8.</b>	<b>Supervision</b> .....	18
8.1	The process of supervision .....	18
8.2	Contact between candidate and supervisor(s) .....	19
8.3	Supervisors .....	20
8.4	Review of written work .....	20
8.5	Periods when a supervisor is absent from the University.....	20
8.6	Dealing with problems in supervision .....	21
<b>9.</b>	<b>The Thesis Topic</b> .....	20
<b>10.</b>	<b>Ethics Approval For Research Projects</b> .....	21
<b>11.</b>	<b>Academic Progress</b> .....	22
11.1	Requirements.....	22
11.2	Annual review .....	22
11.3	Lapse of candidature .....	23
11.4	Reinstatement of expired candidature .....	23
<b>12.</b>	<b>Difficulties During Candidature, Grievance Procedures and Appeals</b> .....	24
12.1	Difficulties and grievances other than with supervision .....	24
12.2	Difficulties and grievances relating to supervision .....	24
12.3	Grievances relating to transfer or confirmation of candidature.....	24
12.4	Grievances (Regulations) .....	24
<b>13.</b>	<b>Confidential Research</b> .....	25
13.1	Patents and inventions .....	25
13.2	Research contracts and agreements .....	26
<b>14.</b>	<b>Publishing Research</b> .....	26
<b>15.</b>	<b>Research in Other Institutions</b> .....	27
<b>16.</b>	<b>Preparation and Submission of the Thesis</b> .....	27
16.1	Formal requirement 'Notice of intention to submit the thesis for examination' .....	28
16.2	Content .....	28
16.3	Format .....	28
16.4	Final review .....	29
16.4.1	After submission.....	29
16.5	After the examination .....	29
<b>17.</b>	<b>Examination of the Theses</b> .....	30
17.1	Appointment of examiners .....	30
17.2	Examiners' reports .....	30
17.3	Consideration of reports by the HDC(R).....	30
17.4	Resubmission.....	32
<b>18.</b>	<b>The Award of the Degree</b> .....	33

<b>APPENDIX A</b>	
Guidelines for the Appointment of Examiners and Requirements for Degrees.....	34
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	
AVCC Code of Practice for Maintaining and Monitoring Quality and Standards in Higher Degrees.....	62
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	
Guide to Forms to Vary Enrolment Details and Submit Thesis.....	73
<b>APPENDIX D</b>	
Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis for Examination.....	74
<b>APPENDIX E</b>	
Support Services Offered by La Trobe University.....	86
<b>APPENDIX F</b>	
Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel Procedures.....	89

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is essential that all candidates for higher degrees are aware of the numerous issues that affect their candidature. The information included in this Handbook has been compiled by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research), the HDC(R), with the view to providing candidates enrolled in degrees for which the Committee is responsible with information that will assist with most facets of candidature. These degrees are all Masters by research, all professional doctorates (both coursework and research) and the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). Other postgraduate degrees, including Masters by coursework degrees, are the responsibility of the Faculty offering the degree and details concerning these degrees and candidature can be obtained from the relevant School or Faculty Office.

It is also essential that supervisors are fully familiar with all of the information contained in this handbook. Supervisors have a responsibility to guide their students in all aspects of their research and candidature. As a result supervisors should be aware of the expectations and requirements for candidature. However, both candidates and supervisors should be aware of the importance of seeking formal advice when issues arise concerning candidature.

With respect to this point, it must be stressed that the information contained herein is intended only as a guide. Inevitably, it is not possible to provide details, which will cover all aspects of candidature. Candidates are encouraged to seek specific information by contacting their supervisor(s), Postgraduate Co-ordinators or Heads of Schools, their peers through the La Trobe University Postgraduate Association (LUPA), and the staff in the Research and Graduate Studies Office (RGSO) of the University. International candidates should approach the International Programs Office on matters relating specifically to their requirements, (e.g., visa requirements).

All degrees are governed by University regulations and candidates and supervisors should familiarize themselves with all of the relevant regulations. The regulations for the degrees for which the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) administer are available for perusal at the following web address <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/legalservices/regulations.html>. Conditions of candidature for Doctor of Philosophy are set out in Regulation 21.2, for professional doctorate degrees in Regulation 21.3, and for Masters degrees by research in Regulation 21.5. The procedures relating to the examination process are defined in Regulation 21.12. All candidates and supervisors should be thoroughly familiar with the degree regulations and, when necessary, supervisors should advise candidates of the regulations. However, the primary responsibility for observing regulations rests with the student. Consequently, for matters regarding regulations and conditions of candidature, when unsure about interpreting the regulations, or when in receipt of conflicting information, candidates are strongly advised to check they have accurate information with staff in the RGSO.

Many Schools now produce their own handbooks. These provide valuable information for candidates and should also be read carefully. However, if at any time information contained in these handbooks appears to conflict with University Regulations or with information in this University Handbook, then the regulations and this Handbook take precedence over School handbooks.

*This Handbook is also available on the web at the following location:*

*<http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/information/forms/INFOSUPC.rtf>. As sections of the Handbook are updated from time to time it is important that you check the web to make sure you have the current version of the Handbook.*

### **1.1 The Research and Graduate Studies Office and the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)**

The University Research and Graduate Studies Office (RGSO) handles all aspects of doctoral and Masters by research candidature and scholarships with the exception of any coursework component which is handled in the Faculty of enrolment. Full contact details for the RGSO are provided inside the front cover of this Handbook. The RGSO is under the direction of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research), Professor Erich Weigold, who is Chair of the Research and Graduate Studies Committee (RGSC), one of the important policy committees of the Academic Board of the University.

The Higher Degrees Committee (Research) is a subcommittee of the RGSC and is authorised by the RGSC to deal with all matters related to candidature for Masters degrees by research, all professional doctorate degrees and all PhD degrees. Thus the HDC(R) approves applications for admission to candidature, receives and considers requests for variations to the conditions of candidature, monitors

academic progress, oversees the examination process and reviews the reports of examiners prior to recommending the award of degrees to the Academic Board. The HDC(R) meets each month, except January, so that delays on all matters related to candidature are minimised.

It is important for candidates to appreciate that the HDC(R) interacts with Schools through Faculties and Heads of School. Often a Head of School will delegate the authority to interact with the HDC(R) to a "Postgraduate Co-ordinator". Candidates will be able to gain valuable advice or assistance from this person. However, it should be noted that the person from the School does not have any authority delegated by the HDC(R). Thus this person cannot make any decisions regarding candidature or related matters. The School representative can only give advice or assistance, or make recommendations to the HDC(R).

Each Faculty of the University is represented on the HDC(R) by a member, and an alternate member. There is also a member of LUPA on the HDC(R). These persons are appointed to the HDC(R) by the RGSC and an independent Chair of the HDC(R) is appointed by Academic Board. This broad cross-section of the University provides the HDC(R) with a balance which enables the Committee to reach fair and representative decisions.

### **1.2 La Trobe University Postgraduate Association**

The La Trobe University Postgraduate Association Inc. (LUPA) is governed by a committee of management which represents the interests of postgraduate students. A team comprising of the committee, staff and friends of LUPA work together to provide services and support for postgraduates. LUPA provides a range of service including academic seminars, advocacy, representation, a fortnightly e-Newsletter and social events.

Our academic seminar program is one of our most recognised and utilised services, providing essential information to help postgraduates complete their degrees. Seminars are presented by La Trobe academics and other experts that are fully conversant with their particular topic. Topics include writing a literature review, quantitative and qualitative research methodologies and thesis examination. Special seminars are also held specifically for postgraduate coursework students.

LUPA offers an advocacy service to all postgraduate students who need advice or support with regards to their academic degree. The service provides an avenue for student to address concerns when they arise such as thesis writing, supervision, submission requirements and examination. LUPA advocates can direct you to suitable officers within the University who can assist you or they can liaise with people for you.

Representation on University committees is one of the ways that the postgraduate voice can be heard. LUPA has a number of postgraduate representatives that sit on key University committees, including Academic Board and the RGSO Higher Degrees Committee (Research). These forums enable LUPA to present postgraduate views to the decision-making bodies of the University.

The team at LUPA knows the importance of having some fun to balance all that academic activity! LUPA holds a number of social activities throughout the year just for this express purpose. Events such as the annual cultural night and the wine tasting and cheese evening allow students to unwind with people that share common goals and experiences and to talk to other people that understand the postgraduate experience.

LUPA is increasingly utilising electronic means of communication to both distance and local students. The website contains useful resources such as articles as well as online membership application (see [www.latrobe.edu.au/lupa](http://www.latrobe.edu.au/lupa)). LUPA members can choose to receive a fortnightly e-Newsletter that contains information about postgraduate issues, upcoming seminars and events and a feature article aimed at assisting postgraduates in some part of their studies.

Like all community organisations, the success of LUPA is dependent on the input from the postgraduate community. If you are interested in becoming a member of the committee, feel that you have the skills or enthusiasm to assist LUPA, or just wish to put forward an idea, please contact LUPA at [lupaoffice@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:lupaoffice@latrobe.edu.au) or on 9479 2438.

### **1.3 Quality assurance**

In keeping with the need to meet expectations for quality assurance, this Handbook sets out requirements of the key parties involved in higher degrees (see Section 3), as well as procedures and requirements such as progress reports, for ensuring that a quality research training is provided.

#### **1.4 Funding opportunities - grants, fellowships and scholarships**

Current information on research grants, fellowships, scholarships, awards and medals is available from the RGSO Web Site by using the following address: <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/www/rgso>. This home page provides valuable information on research in the University in addition to providing information on various funding schemes open for applications. Information on scholarships available from sources external to the University is available from the Grants and Fellowships Officer whereas further information on postgraduate scholarships awarded by the University may be obtained from the Co-ordinator Scholarships and Candidature.

Advice on current schemes open for funding is also forwarded to academic staff and postgraduate candidates by email. The Grants Administration Section maintains an email directory of all academic staff and postgraduate candidates interested in receiving information on new funding opportunities for their specific research discipline. Postgraduate candidates who wish to be included on the email directory, should contact the Administrative Assistant (Research) on 9479 1975.

Candidates should also read Section 6 on the Australian Postgraduate Awards, the La Trobe University Postgraduate Research Scholarship, Endeavour International Postgraduate Research Scholarship and the La Trobe University Overseas Postgraduate Scholarship.

## **2. HIGHER DEGREES ADMINISTERED BY THE HIGHER DEGREES COMMITTEE (RESEARCH)**

As mentioned in Section 1, the HDC(R) is responsible for Masters by research degrees, all professional doctorates regardless of whether these are classified as research or coursework degrees, and the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Higher degrees are classified as coursework or research based on a DEST guideline, which requires that research degrees comprise a minimum of 67% research. All postgraduate degrees with less than 67% research are classified as coursework degrees. Whereas the HDC(R) has responsibility for doctoral coursework degrees, all other coursework degrees are the responsibility of the Faculties.

The award of Masters by research, professional doctorate or PhD is recommended to the Academic Board by the HDC(R) once the candidate has completed all the requirements for the degree. The distinction between a Masters thesis and one for a doctoral degree is substantial and it is important that candidates are aware of the different expectations for degrees. Further details are given in Sections 2.1 to 2.4 below and in Appendix A.

Formal coursework may be prescribed for candidates studying for higher degrees by research; such coursework should not hinder progress towards completion of the degree. Each candidate has a principal supervisor, with whom should be arranged a program of supervised research designed to suit the individual requirements and interests of the candidate within the formal requirements of the degree. A candidate may be required, by the HDC(R) on the recommendation of the supervisor, to supplement the research program by attending lectures, seminars, or practical classes, if these are considered a necessary adjunct to the research program.

The particular degree program in which a candidate is enrolled will depend on a range of factors including the previous experience and qualifications of the candidate, the nature of the training required, the relevance of the degree to the candidate's current employment or to the planned future career of the candidate. Candidates enrolled in a Masters by research may apply to upgrade to a PhD and details of this process are provided in Section 5. Applications to transfer between other degrees, for example from a Masters by coursework to a PhD, or from a professional doctorate to a PhD, are considered as individual cases by the HDC(R). Candidates wishing to consider such transfers should consult staff in the Candidature and Scholarships Section of the RGSO in the first instance.

### **2.1 Masters by research**

The requirements for the degree of Masters by research are the completion of all coursework components (should any be specified for the degree) at a satisfactory level and submission of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) competence in the design and conduct of a research project that incorporates methodological skills appropriate to the discipline and makes a contribution to knowledge;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline. It must not exceed 60,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 40,000 words in science subjects or 50,000 in non-science subjects. These word lengths do not include footnotes, bibliographies and appendices.

## **2.2 Professional doctorates - coursework**

A Professional Doctorate (Coursework) degree shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis once the candidate has met all coursework requirements of the degree at a satisfactory level. The requirements for the degree shall be satisfactory completion of all coursework components and completion of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) at least either an original or a substantial contribution to knowledge of direct relevance to the profession;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge with particular reference to the profession in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline. It must not exceed 50,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 40,000 words. These word lengths do not include footnotes, bibliographies and appendices.

## **2.3 Professional doctorates - research**

A Professional Doctorate (Research) degree shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis once the candidate has met all coursework requirements of the degree at a satisfactory level. The requirements for the degree shall be satisfactory completion of all coursework components and completion of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) a substantial and original contribution to knowledge of direct relevance to the profession;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge with particular

reference to the profession in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;

- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline. It must not exceed 75,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 60,000 words. These word lengths include do not include footnotes, bibliographies and appendices.

## **2.4 Doctor of Philosophy**

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is based on a program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff. It is expected the scope of the project be such that it can be completed in 3 years of full-time study or equivalent part-time study.

The degree of PhD shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis. The requirements for the degree shall be completed by submission of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) a substantial and original contribution to knowledge;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline. It must not exceed 100,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 50,000 words in science subjects or 75,000 in non-science subjects. These word lengths do not include footnotes, bibliographies and appendices.

## **3. RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES INVOLVED WITH CANDIDATURE**

The University endorses the "Code of Practice for Maintaining and Monitoring Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Degrees" produced by the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee (AVCC) and undertakes to adhere to it. The Code is presented in Appendix B and the responsibilities set out below have been developed within the broader context of the Code.

### **3.1 Responsibilities of the University**

The University through the HDC(R) and RGSC has the responsibility to ensure that:

- 3.1.1. there are clearly specified entry standards and requirements which, taking due regard to discipline, apply, are adhered to, and are set for, each degree to ensure that enrolling candidates are likely to have the capacity to succeed given adequate commitment;
- 3.1.2. there is access to the facilities required by the candidate to pursue candidature, which, while varying between different areas within the University, should always be made clear to the candidate at the outset;

- 3.1.3 the candidate, through the School or Faculty, has access to persons who can provide guidance in the English language, computing, word processing skills and statistical advice, noting that access to these services may be on a fee paying basis;
- 3.1.4 there is a clear policy and set of procedures for obtaining relevant ethics clearances including coverage of informed consent, deception and debriefing, and that the policy and procedures are made available to candidates;
- 3.1.5 there is protection of the intellectual property rights of all parties by appropriate consultation with the Contracts and Intellectual Property Officer in the RGSO;
- 3.1.6 there is adherence to the standards set by the Occupational Health and Safety Committee of the University and requirements for safe practices are adhered to;
- 3.1.7 there is adequate monitoring of progress through reports made at least annually;
- 3.1.8 there are grievance procedures by which either the candidate or the supervisor may make appropriate representations should significant difficulties arise;
- 3.1.9 there are clear guidelines for examiners and adjudicators outlining in particular the University's expectations for each higher degree; and
- 3.1.10 there are procedures of appeal which set out the grounds and the means whereby candidates may appeal against the conduct and outcome of the examination and evaluation of candidature.

### **3.2 Responsibilities of the Head of School**

It is the responsibility of the Head of School, either directly, or indirectly through delegated responsibility to a Postgraduate Co-ordinator or Chair of a relevant School Committee, to assure the HDC(R) that before an offer of candidacy is made:

- 3.2.1 the candidate is appropriately qualified for admission to candidature;
- 3.2.2 the candidate appears to have the capacity, background knowledge and skills required to undertake the proposed higher degree successfully;
- 3.2.3 the research project proposed is appropriate for the degree;
- 3.2.4 the project is feasible in terms of time, facilities, equipment, source material, and funding for the expected duration of the research (see Section 4 on Resources and Facilities);
- 3.2.5 an appropriate supervisor and co supervisor are nominated and that the supervisors have appropriate qualifications and experience and are sufficiently expert in the area of research to offer proper supervision. Before making this recommendation, the Head of School should, wherever possible, consult the proposed supervisor(s) and other academic staff, as may be appropriate, and the candidate.
- 3.2.6 the workload of the supervisor(s) is such as to allow sufficient time to give proper supervision to the candidate;
- 3.2.7 high quality supervision can be provided and maintained throughout the research period and that alternative supervision is available and will be arranged should the principal supervisor leave the University;
- 3.2.8 each new candidate is informed, where appropriate, of the facilities and resources available to graduate candidates within the School, Faculty and the University (e.g., library, computing and technical facilities);
- 3.2.9 each new candidate is made aware of the University's standards and the requirements for safe practice and ethics approval;

- 3.2.10 each new candidate is informed of the procedures by which representation may be made to the Head of School (or nominated representative) or the Dean of the Faculty, if the candidate believes that the work is not proceeding satisfactorily for reasons outside the control of the candidate, and these problems cannot be resolved by discussion with the appointed supervisor(s);
- 3.2.11 there are appropriate procedures in place to deal with conflicts between a candidate and any supervisor and that candidates are made aware of these procedures at the time of enrolment;
- 3.2.12 candidates are informed of any requirements to present seminars or attend courses which are part of their studies; and
- 3.2.13 appropriate opportunities are provided, by way of seminars or research colloquia, for candidates to develop their skills at presenting their work as well as facilitating their integration into a cohesive group and that appropriate opportunities exist for candidates to interact with one another and with staff to develop profitable intellectual relationships.

During candidature, the Head of School, either directly, or indirectly through delegated responsibility to a Postgraduate Co-ordinator or Chair of a relevant School Committee, is responsible for ensuring that:

- 3.2.14 if a proposed supervisor is to be unavailable for more than 2 months (Masters), or 3 months (doctoral) then alternative arrangements for supervision are made and officially communicated to RGSO;
- 3.2.15 difficulties raised by the student or supervisor, or both, are addressed without delay, when appropriate within the School and that student and supervisor are made fully aware of their rights and whom they may consult outside of the School;
- 3.2.16 the candidate has ongoing access to the resources and facilities that the School undertook to provide at the time of enrolment or at the time of any change of topic;
- 3.2.17 the thesis is checked carefully prior to submission and certified that it is of a standard appropriate for submission for examination for the degree in which the candidate is enrolled, including but not restricted to format and typographical considerations; and
- 3.2.18 the University procedures are followed for the appointment of examiners, that appropriate consultation has taken place in the process of nominating examiners and that the examiners are appropriately qualified, in each case taking account of formal qualifications, research and professional experience, and area(s) of expertise.

When the supervisor is the Head of School, another senior academic member of the School is required to countersign any recommendations on matters of candidature.

### **3.3 Responsibilities of the supervisor(s)**

A candidate generally has a principal supervisor and a co-supervisor (additional supervisors may be appointed). The principal supervisor's responsibilities include:

- 3.3.1 knowing the candidature and scholarship regulations and conditions that apply to the degree in which the student is enrolled;
- 3.3.2 being sensitive to the need for the candidate to use time productively;
- 3.3.3 providing guidance about the nature of research and the standards expected, the choice of a research topic, development of a proposal and organisation for its presentation, the planning of the research program, assistance with the literature and sources, attendance at taught classes where appropriate, and assistance with relevant research techniques (including arranging for instruction where necessary);

- 3.3.4 maintaining regular contact with the candidate, normally fortnightly and not less than once a month;
- 3.3.5 being accessible in person to the candidate at appropriate times, when advice may be needed;
- 3.3.6 ensuring compliance with ethics and safety requirements;
- 3.3.7 advising the candidate on planning and estimating the time and effort involved in various stages of the research work, including the literature survey, the research proposal, data collection and thesis preparation;
- 3.3.8 ensuring that an appropriate timetable has been set to allow the candidate to complete the degree within an acceptable period of time. When this period is likely to extend beyond the period for which scholarships are provided (e.g., 3 years full-time for a PhD or research professional doctorate and 2 years full-time for a Masters degree), informing the candidate in writing at the beginning of the candidature that the project will take more than the specified period to complete, regardless of whether the candidate is currently in receipt of a scholarship or plans to apply for one;
- 3.3.9 requesting written work and returning such work with constructive criticism and in reasonable time, normally within 30 days;
- 3.3.10 arranging, where appropriate and possible, for the candidate to meet with other researchers in the field or related disciplines, and to attend meetings or conferences;
- 3.3.11 encouraging the candidate to publish aspects of the research where this does not violate a confidentiality agreement or infringe the Regulations of the University on confidential research (see Section 13) and ensuring that guidelines for order of authorship within the relevant discipline are followed;
- 3.3.12 ensuring that all matters to do with confidentiality of research, patents and inventions and research contracts with external bodies (see Section 13) are attended to and that any agreements reached do not in any way prevent the candidate from meeting all the requirements of the higher degree enrolments in force at the time;
- 3.3.13 ensuring that the candidate is made aware immediately of inadequate progress or of standards of work below those generally expected, specifying the problems and suggesting ways of addressing them;
- 3.3.14 ensuring that whenever a supervisor believes termination of candidature should be recommended because of unsatisfactory progress, the candidate is given preliminary written advice to that effect, and that copies of the advice note are sent to the Head of School (or nominated representative), and to the Chair of the HDC(R);
- 3.3.15 recommending to the HDC(R) if it is appropriate for the candidate to upgrade candidature from Masters to PhD. Normally the candidate would be expected to have completed a substantial part of the work at a standard that indicates a capacity to fulfil the requirements for the PhD degree;
- 3.3.16 reporting in writing, when required, on the candidate's progress to the HDC(R);
- 3.3.17 as with other written work, providing critical comment on drafts of the thesis within a reasonable time (normally within 30 days) and, at the time of submission, certifying that the thesis conforms with the regulations and is therefore, *prima facie*, worthy of examination;
- 3.3.18 advising, after taking advice from the candidate and consulting with the Head of School or appointed representative, of the names of possible examiners (*the nomination of examiners is confidential to the HDC(R) and the appointment of possible examiners may not be disclosed to candidates - candidates should have the opportunity however to identify names of individuals who might not be suitable as examiners*);

- 3.3.19 ensuring that candidates submit a "Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis" 3 months before the expected submission date;
- 3.3.20 arranging for alternative supervision during periods of leave;
- 3.3.21 making the candidate aware of the various forms available from RGSO that cover changes or interruptions to candidature (see Appendix C); and
- 3.3.22 taking an interest in the pastoral care of the candidate through being sympathetic and supportive with regard to non-academic aspects of supervision and, if it is considered necessary, encouraging use of the University Counselling Service or other services.

### **3.4 Responsibilities of the candidate**

The responsibilities of candidates include:

- 3.4.1 becoming familiar with and complying with the appropriate Degree Regulations and the relevant sections of the Examinations Regulation and the University's appeal procedures relating to any of these matters;
- 3.4.2 abiding by the Guidelines for the Conduct of Research available for perusal at the following web address [http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/information/1998\\_Guidelines\\_COR.pdf](http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/information/1998_Guidelines_COR.pdf);
- 3.4.3 discussing with the supervisor(s) the type of guidance and comment that the candidate finds most helpful, and agreeing to a schedule of meetings which will ensure regular contact with the supervisor(s);
- 3.4.4 ensuring that research is not undertaken without appropriate ethics and safety approvals;
- 3.4.5 presenting orally and/or in writing thesis proposals during the first full-time year of candidature or equivalent part-time period
- 3.4.6 taking the initiative in raising problems or difficulties, no matter how elementary they may seem;
- 3.4.7 maintaining the progress and standards of the work in accordance with those agreed with the supervisor(s), including the presentation of written material as required in sufficient time to allow for comments and discussions before proceeding to the next stage;
- 3.4.8 providing a formal progress report to the HDC(R) as and when requested;
- 3.4.9 becoming familiar with the facilities and resources available;
- 3.4.10 attending School or Centre staff and postgraduate seminars and other types of meetings where this is a requirement;
- 3.4.11 accepting responsibility for the academic content of the thesis and publishing any parts thereof which do not infringe any confidentiality agreements or infringe the Regulations of the University on confidential research (see Section 13 and 14);
- 3.4.12 preparing the thesis for examination, including arrangement for its typing, proof-reading, binding and consulting the supervisor(s) regarding matters of style and presentation;
- 3.4.13 applying at the appropriate time to the HDC(R) for variations to the conditions of candidature (e.g. change in course load, suspensions or extensions and upgrades) after consulting with the supervisor(s); and
- 3.4.14 complying with the requirement to provide 'Notice of Intention to Submit a Thesis' 3 months before the estimated date of submission.

### **3.5 Responsibilities of the examiners**

Examiners of a thesis should be chosen because they have specific expertise in the field or have a breadth of knowledge of the discipline that includes the area and are the most appropriate persons to act as examiners. Details of the responsibilities of examiners are given in Appendix A. In summary, in accepting an invitation to examine a thesis, an examiner undertakes to:

- 3.5.1 abide by the examination procedures set down by the University;
- 3.5.2 maintain confidentiality on all aspects of the thesis;
- 3.5.3 examine the thesis independently;
- 3.5.4 become sufficiently familiar with the thesis to enable assessment, without bias, on whether or not the thesis meets the requirements for the degree;
- 3.5.5 examine the thesis within the bounds of any stated research paradigm and/or methodological approach;
- 3.5.6 write a detailed report which provides evidence of where the thesis succeeds or fails in meeting the requirements of the degree; and
- 3.5.7 complete the examination within the period of time (normally 2 months) which was agreed upon when the invitation to examine the thesis was accepted.

## **4 RESOURCES AND FACILITIES**

When making an offer to a candidate, it is the responsibility of the Head of School, either directly, or indirectly through delegated responsibility to a Postgraduate Co-ordinator or Chair of a relevant School Committee, to determine what resources and facilities will be required to undertake the proposed research. This is essential in order to ensure that the candidate has selected a topic for which such resources and facilities can be provided so that an undertaking can be given that these resources and facilities along with others detailed below in Section 4.1 will be available to the student. Should it not be possible to give such an undertaking then a change of topic should be discussed with the potential candidate. Moreover any variations to the proposed research during candidature including changes to the topic should only be approved by the School if it can provide the resources that will be required for the new topic. If for any reason the School is not able to provide all resources required including the costs involved in undertaking research away from the University, the candidate must be made aware of this at the time he or she is made an offer, and make a decision whether to accept candidature in the light of this information.

### **4.1 Resources and facilities for the candidate**

Once a topic has been selected for which the Head of School can provide an undertaking that the resources and facilities will be available, all candidates for higher degrees for which HDC(R) is responsible should be provided with:

- 4.1.1 the resources required to undertake the research including access to equipment and funding for the materials, for equipment that is not currently available, and for other costs, unless some other agreement has been reached between the candidate and the School prior to acceptance of candidature;
- 4.1.2 office workspace, usually on a shared basis, with a desk, chair, and lockable filing cabinet for all *full-time* candidates and for those part-time candidates who can present a case for having access to these facilities;
- 4.1.3 a mailbox within the School;
- 4.1.4 access to a telephone for work purposes during working hours and at all times for emergencies;

- 4.1.5 access to laboratory and other space required for conducting the research;
- 4.1.6 access to School photocopying facilities at a level to be determined within each School;
- 4.1.7 access to essential equipment and resources including access to computers with word processing packages and other software packages of relevance to the discipline (e.g., bibliography/reference, statistics, and spreadsheet packages);
- 4.1.8 access to library resources including funding support to cover costs of obtaining library materials not available in the University Library and not covered by Library funding;
- 4.1.9 written information, preferably in the form of a booklet, that includes a clear statement on the resources to which postgraduates are entitled and which the School is able to provide;
- 4.1.10 an undertaking from the candidate's School that it will endeavour to subsidise conference travel and ensure that the postgraduate work undertaken by the candidate will not be disrupted by interruptions to funding sources for at least the minimum period of candidature; and
- 4.1.11 information about access to counselling services, and to persons who can provide guidance and tuition in English language, computing and word processing skills and statistical advice, noting that these may be on a fee basis.

## 5. CANDIDATURE

### 5.1 Applying for candidature

Academic qualifications of the applicant, availability of adequate supervision and resources are important considerations which are taken into account when determining whether or not an applicant will be admitted to candidature.

Although there is no formal probationary period for candidature for Masters or PhD degrees, the period between admission to candidature and the submission of the first annual report can be regarded in this light since a formal report of progress is made.

Whether or not an individual decides to apply for candidature in a higher degree is determined by many factors and the decision should be made with great care. A potential higher degree candidate should ask at least:

- am I capable of studying for a higher degree by research?
- \*      how keen am I?
- \*      what does it involve?
- \*      where is the best place to study?
- \*      who will be my supervisors?
- \*      will my potential supervisors and I interact well?
- \*      can the School support my research?
- \*      what scholarships are available and is the level of support adequate?
- \*      what demonstrating or tutoring opportunities might be available?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

In seeking to answer the above questions, potential candidates should consult as widely as possible including with academic advisors, potential supervisors, postgraduate candidates studying in the potential School and LUPA.

At the same time, the potential supervisors should be asking questions such as:

- is the potential candidate capable of completing a higher degree?
- does the potential candidate have the required theoretical background and training in research methods?

\* which degree is appropriate to this potential candidate at the moment?

\* is the potential candidate sufficiently committed?

\* will I interact well with the potential candidate?

\* will the potential candidate interact well with my group and the School?

\* do I have the necessary expertise and interest to supervise this potential candidate adequately in the proposed area of research?

\* is it necessary to appoint a co-supervisor or an associate supervisor from outside the University?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

If the answers to the above questions are satisfactory then the individual should be encouraged to apply for candidature. However, it should be noted that even if the answers to all or most of these questions are satisfactory at the time of initial consideration there is no guarantee by either the candidate or the supervisors that circumstances will not change and it may be necessary at some subsequent time to reconsider candidature.

Application forms for candidature are available from RGSO or from the School or from the International Programs Office (international students). Candidates should take special care to ensure that they complete all required sections of the form and supply the additional information requested. They should also check that their referees do provide references.

The following are taken into account in assessing applications for admission to candidature.

\* the academic background, any other qualifications and research and professional experience of the applicant, where relevant to the proposed course of study and research;

\* academic referees' reports;

\* professional referees' reports when required;

\* the practicability and quality of the proposed research project;

\* the relevance of the proposed research project to the current research interests and goals of the School;

\* the availability of supervision, research facilities and any other resources that may be required;

\* performance at a selection interview, when required by the Head of School responsible for making a recommendation of admission to the HDC(R);

\* for a professional doctoral program, the personal suitability of the applicant, and

\* any other matters which the HDC(R), in consultation with the Head of School and such other persons as appropriate, deems to be relevant.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Applicants wishing to transfer candidature from other institutions may be given recognition for the work completed if they are continuing with the same research topic.

## 5.2 Duration of candidature

The normal period of candidature for a Masters degree by research discipline is typically 1-2 years full-time or 2-4 years part-time, but it varies between degrees.

It is expected that the normal period of candidature for the PhD degree will be between 3 and 4 years for a full-time candidate, and between 4 and 8 years for a part-time candidate. Candidates for the PhD degree should plan their research with the aim of submitting their thesis within 3 to 3.5 years of commencing full-time enrolment.

Holders of APA or LTUPRS, when planning their research, should note that scholarships are provided for a period of 2 years for Masters degrees and 3 years for doctoral degrees. No extensions are given for Masters degrees and a maximum extension of 6 months may be possible at doctoral level (see Section 6 for further details). Extensions are not granted on the grounds that the research as planned initially would take more than 3 years.

In special circumstances the HDC(R) may reduce the minimum period of candidature to not less than one year.

### **5.3 Expectations for contact within candidature**

It is required that all candidates regardless of full or part-time status maintain adequate and regular contact with their supervisor(s) and the School throughout the candidature. Thus, any application which appears to be essentially for external candidature, with minimal and incidental contact with the University, will not be approved. In contrast, an application in which it is proposed to have reasonable periods at the University and other forms of regular contact for supervision will be received favourably. It will be necessary therefore, for each applicant, prospective supervisors and School to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the HDC(R) how a proposed candidature will satisfy the philosophy outlined above.

If there is to be meaningful academic discussion of research progress and interchange of ideas, and both supervisor and candidate are fulfilling their research commitments, it is desirable that regular contact should be maintained between candidate and supervisor. This should occur once per fortnight, and certainly not less than once a month. Ideally this contact should involve face-to-face meetings, but it is recognised that with developments in communications including email and interactive video links, face-to-face meetings may be held less regularly.

In addition, adequate contact with a School should involve attendance at relevant courses and seminars. It should be noted that a School or a supervisor may impose more stringent requirements for contact than those outlined above.

Scholarship holders are expected to pursue their studies on campus and within the appropriate Schools of the University except where approval has been given by the HDC(R) to continue research away from the University.

### **5.4 Full-time candidature**

Full-time candidates are expected to be working on their research during normal working hours from Monday to Friday each week, other than official periods of leave and for up to eight hours employment per week as permitted by the regulations. Full-time candidates would normally be expected to be based at one of the University's campuses, other than when on approved field work related to their research. Candidates should note that any proposal for longer absence from personal contact with the University, such as for field work, requires the prior approval of the HDC(R). Candidates holding student visas must be enrolled on a full-time basis.

### **5.5 Part-time candidature**

Part-time candidature is possible for candidates whose essential research facilities are located away from the University or who, for employment or other reasons, are not able to attend the University to work on a research project full-time. Staff of the University may enrol as part-time candidates. As far as possible, a part-time candidate should have the same personal contact and relationship with the supervisor(s) and the University as would be expected of a full-time candidate.

An application for part-time candidature will require a sufficiently detailed program involving the candidate, the supervisors, the School and, where appropriate, the employer, which will satisfy the HDC(R) that adequate and regular contact will be maintained.

For a candidate admitted to part-time status, it is expected that annual progress reports should provide evidence which will confirm adherence to the original program.

Additional information will be required of candidates who are employed. Where the duties of the employee are not related to the higher degree, it will be necessary to obtain from the employer a commitment to allow the candidate sufficient time to pursue the research proposed. Where the duties of the employee are related to the higher degree program, or where an employer's or other external facilities are used, additional information is sought by the HDC(R).

It is imperative that the research be carried out independently by the candidate concerned and in a manner appropriate to postgraduate research, and that the University, through the supervisors, has control over the direction of the research project. It may be appropriate in some circumstances to appoint an associate supervisor, or an external co-supervisor from within the organisation where the applicant works (see Section 8). The role of the associate supervisor or external co-supervisor will be determined in each case by the University.

Part-time candidates who resume after a period of suspension resulting from increased work load in their employment will need to provide a new statement as to the amount of time available for the research and how they will satisfy the requirement for 'adequate and regular contact'.

International students are not permitted to enrol part-time, as a condition of their student visa.

### **5.6 Employment during candidature**

During normal working hours, full-time candidates may undertake paid employment up to a maximum of 8 hours per week (or up to 240 hours a year). Schools are encouraged to provide candidates, especially those considering an academic career, with opportunities to engage in teaching within the allowed maximum of 8 hours per week. Payment for such teaching should be at the standard recognised rates and it is the responsibility of the Head of School to ensure that candidates receive appropriate support and training to undertake these teaching duties and that they do not interfere with the candidate's overall progress. Other employment that makes significant demands on a candidate's research time is not allowed unless approval is given by the HDC(R) on the advice of the supervisors.

Where a full-time candidate chooses to undertake employment in his or her own time, the candidate cannot later claim special consideration if progress has been impeded by this employment. If a candidate considers, at the start of such employment, that progress is likely to be impeded, it would be prudent to seek part-time enrolment.

Part-time candidates who have other employment are expected to be able to make a significant time commitment to their research (see Section 5.5).

International students should note that student visas are issued without work rights (condition 8101), however once their course has started an international student can apply for Permission to Work (condition 8105) to be added to their visa. The application form is available at the International Programs Office. The completed form is lodged at DIMA (Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs), together with a \$60 fee. You can also apply online at [www.immi.gov.au](http://www.immi.gov.au) if you have a credit card. A student visa with work rights permits students up to 20 hours employment per week (includes volunteer work), and unlimited hours during the annual four week break.

### **5.7 Variations to candidature**

All variations to the conditions of candidature or variations to the conditions of scholarships such as the La Trobe University Postgraduate Research Scholarship, the Australian Postgraduate Awards with stipend, the Endeavour International Postgraduate Research Scholarship and the La Trobe University Overseas Postgraduate Research Scholarship, are subject to prior application to and approval from the HDC(R). Holders of other scholarships, studentships or awards should consult the conditions of award to determine procedures which should be followed when seeking to vary the conditions of candidature and/or the award.

Variations to the conditions of candidature include extensions to candidature, change in course load (conversion from full-time to part-time candidature or vice-versa), resumption of candidature

following any period of leave, suspension of candidature for any reason, overseas research or fieldwork in Australia, and concurrent enrolment in another subject.

Candidates are requested to make applications for variations on the appropriate form obtainable from the RGSO or from the web address <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/information/>. It is expected that any application form will have been lodged through the supervisor and Head of School. An application for variation of candidature may be supplemented as appropriate with an attached statement, and should be made well in advance of the date the change is requested to take effect. Decisions on applications are made on the basis of individual merit and circumstances within the framework of the degree regulations and established policies.

Applications for variation include the following:

#### 5.7.1 *Change in course load*

The change may be from full-time to part-time or *vice-versa*, for the rest or part of candidature. After approval, *pro rata* adjustments to the expiry date of candidature and the due date for submission of the thesis are made.

#### 5.7.2 *Absence from the University.*

Candidates may apply to the HDC(R) for permission to proceed with the course away from the University (e.g., to collect essential data not available at the University).

#### 5.7.3 *Sick leave*

Candidates may apply for periods of sick leave. Note it is essential if progress is likely to be delayed as a result of illness, that a formal application is made for sick leave. Following approval of periods of sick leave, adjustments will be made to the expiry date of candidature and the due date for submission of the thesis. Candidates who are scholarship holders are entitled to up to 3 months of sick leave while still in receipt of their scholarship. However, this must be formally approved and recorded at the time. Periods of illness are not considered as acceptable grounds for an extension to a scholarship as it would be expected that such periods would have been recorded as sick leave and the scholarship termination date adjusted accordingly (see Section 6).

#### 5.7.4 *Suspension or extension of candidature*

The responsibility of making application to the HDC(R) for suspension or extension of candidature lies with the candidate. An application for extension should be referred to the Head of School or Postgraduate Co-ordinator; it requires a supporting justification from the supervisor(s) referring to such matters as work already completed on the thesis, what remains incomplete and special circumstances that have caused delay. Except in special circumstances, total extensions recommended by the Head of School should not exceed 12 months. The total time for suspensions normally should not exceed 2 years. A suspension within the first 12 months of candidature normally will not be given; a candidate should withdraw and reapply at a later time to revive the candidature. International students must seek advice from International Student Support Services, in the IPO or the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA) regarding suspension of candidature and are reminded that the University is obliged to inform DIMA once you suspend your candidature. Any suspension granted for longer than 6 months will normally result in the cancellation of your student visa. After suspending your candidature you have 28 days to leave the country or apply for another visa. International candidates should note that other variations to candidature may have implications for visa status and candidates should consult staff in the International Programs Office prior to lodging the application at the RGSO.

#### 5.7.5 *Overseas research.*

Permission may be granted for a specified period overseas provided it is demonstrably a necessary and integral part of the program for the degree and that arrangements have been made for maintaining adequate and regular contact with the supervisor. Candidates planning a period of overseas research or field study should first discuss their proposal thoroughly with their supervisor(s) including the

appropriateness or otherwise of finding a suitable 'local' associate supervisor or external co-supervisor for appointment.

#### 5.7.6 *Upgrading candidature from Masters to PhD*

At times candidates enrolled in a Masters degree by research consider upgrading to a PhD. Circumstances vary between candidates and in some cases the School may have required a candidate to enrol in a Masters degree initially whereas in other cases a candidate may have enrolled initially with the intention of completing the Masters degree but subsequently decided to upgrade. In all cases the procedure is the same. Candidates planning to upgrade should note that the requirements for a PhD degree are greater than those for a Masters degree and therefore as a result it is expected that it will take a longer time to complete a PhD. When requesting upgrading, candidates must provide evidence of their potential to complete a PhD within the prescribed time. The supervisors must also be satisfied that the candidate is likely to be successful and that the project is suitable for upgrading to a PhD. The supervisors in supporting an application to upgrade is making a judgement on the best information available at the time and is not in any way providing a guarantee that the candidate will definitely be able to complete a PhD. It is the uncertainty of success at the PhD level that makes some supervisors and Schools recommend that candidates should enrol initially for a Masters degree. Such provision is a safeguard to protect the interests of both parties (the candidate and the supervisor) because it gives both the opportunity to contemplate the possibility of the candidate upgrading to PhD candidature.

A Masters candidate who wishes to upgrade candidature to the PhD level must complete the necessary form available from RGSO or at the web address <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/information/> and provide the supervisor(s) with evidence of work of PhD standard before a case can be made to the HDC(R) in support of the application. Such an application must be supported by an independent assessment by a person who is qualified to make the assessment, is familiar with the area, has read the candidate's written work and is willing to provide a formal evaluation of it for the HDC(R).

Masters candidates are eligible to apply to upgrade after being enrolled for a period of not less than 8 months full time, or 12 months part time, and before eighteen months (full-time equivalent) of candidature has elapsed. All requirements made by a School and supervisor prior to recommending to the HDC(R) that transfer from Masters to PhD candidature be permitted must be stated in writing, received and noted by the HDC(R). The candidate should be given a written copy of information forwarded to the HDC(R).

If your upgrade is approved, and you hold a student visa, you will need to request a new electronic Confirmation of Enrolment from the IPO. This will state that you are now studying a PhD and that you have a new course end date. We recommend that you go into DIMA to inform them of this. You will also need to renew your student visa before it expires. We recommend that you begin planning for this eight weeks before the expiry date.

Candidates in receipt of an APA or an LTUPRS should be aware it is essential that an application to upgrade is lodged to allow sufficient time for it to be processed prior to the termination of the scholarship. Scholarships that are terminated at the end of the 2 year period for a Masters degree cannot be reinstated, even if an upgrade is subsequently approved. Consequently, candidates planning to upgrade should begin this process at least 6 months before the termination date, and ensure that the completed "*Application to Upgrade from Masters to PhD Candidature*" form is lodged with RGSO a minimum of 2 months prior to the expiry date.

International students in receipt of a scholarship other than the LTUPRS or EIPRS should consult the Sponsored Program Co-ordinator in the IPO before making an application for an upgrade.

#### 5.7.7 *Concurrent enrolment.*

Candidates need to apply for approval to enrol concurrently for other courses or subjects, and state both the relevance to their research project and the additional workload involved. It is important to stress that enrolment as a candidate for more than one degree will be permitted only under exceptional circumstances.

## 6. SCHOLARSHIPS

There are two main categories of scholarships available at the University, the Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA) funded by DEST, open to Australian citizens or Permanent Residents who have resided in Australia continuously for the 12 months prior to the closing date for applications, and the La Trobe University Postgraduate Research Scholarships (LTUPRS) funded by the University and open to Australian and international candidates. Candidates with a first class honours or equivalent degree or with research experience deemed to be equivalent to such a degree are eligible to apply for these scholarships. The application deadline is the 31st of October each year for the following year. Scholarships are generally only available to full-time candidates, although individual cases will be considered for part-time APA and LTUPRS in cases of heavy care commitments or a medical condition precluding full-time study. Periods of study already undertaken towards the degree prior to commencement of the award will be deducted from the maximum period of tenure of the award. The value of scholarships is announced each year by RGSO. Full-time scholarships provide an allowance which is currently tax exempt. Further information on eligibility criteria is available through the RGSO or in the application kit available through Heads of Schools or Postgraduate Co-ordinators in the School of enrolment.

International candidates may be eligible to apply for a DEST funded Endeavour International Postgraduate Research Scholarship (EIPRS) which provides for tuition fees to suitably qualified candidates from all overseas countries excluding New Zealand. Applicants who are currently studying on a scholarship sponsored by the Australian Agency for International Development (AUSAID) or have just completed study on such a scholarship are not eligible to apply for the EIPRS. The La Trobe University Overseas Postgraduate Scholarship (LTUOPRS) is a partial tuition fees scholarship funded by the University to international candidates. The LTUOPRS provides for partial tuition fees, candidates are required to pay \$5000 for tuition each year for the tenure of the award which is 3 years for research doctoral candidature and 2 years for Masters by research candidature, the LTUOPRS provides the remaining cost of the tuition fee. Currently enrolled candidates are permitted to apply for the LTUOPRS. Possible extensions of 2 semesters are available for recipients of the EIPRS and the LTUOPRS. The University has determined that successful applicants who have not previously held an LTUPRS for more than 3 months will be allocated a LTUPRS to provide for a living allowance whilst a holder of the EIPRS or LTUOPRS.

### **6.1 Duration of scholarships**

The APA and LTUPRS are provided for a period of up to 2 years for Masters degrees and up to 3 years for doctoral degrees. No extensions are given for scholarships for Masters degrees and a maximum extension of 6 months may be possible for a scholarship at doctoral level. EIPRS and LTUOPRS are provided for a period of up to 2 years for Masters by research and up to 3 years for a PhD or research professional doctorates with the possibility of an extension of an extra year for each.

### **6.2 Suspensions to scholarships**

Candidates wishing to suspend either an APA or an LTUPRS should discuss their applications with the Head of School or the Postgraduate Co-ordinator. Candidates are also strongly advised to consult the Assistant Co-ordinator (Scholarships and Candidature) RGSO before taking any action. An application for the suspension of an award should be lodged with the RGSO at least 4 weeks prior to the commencement of the suspension date. As conditions regarding suspensions may vary for other scholarships or awards, candidates should definitely consult the Assistant Co-ordinator (Scholarships and Candidature) RGSO before taking any action.

### **6.3 Extensions to scholarships**

The current DEST guideline governing extensions to APAs, which for reasons of equity the University also applies to LTUPRSs, states that:

*“A provider may also approve an extension to the duration of an APA for a Research Doctoral student of up to six months provided the student is making satisfactory progress and the grounds for the extension relate to the study and, are beyond the control of the student....”*

Consequently HDC(R) will only be willing to consider approving an extension if the circumstances are of an academic nature and clearly beyond the control of a candidate. Should a situation arise when an extension may be required, candidates are strongly encouraged to discuss the matter with their supervisor and Postgraduate Co-ordinator or Head of School, as well as consulting the Assistant Co-ordinator (Scholarships and Candidature) RGSO. An application for an extension should be made on the form available from RGSO and should have attached a justification which clearly states the reason(s) the research has been delayed and the length of the delay that resulted (which should be at least as long as the period of extension being requested).

Acceptable grounds for an extension, if clearly documented, include but are not restricted to, an unforeseen delay in obtaining a critical piece of equipment, an unavoidable delay in gaining access to manuscripts or other important documents from libraries, a delay in obtaining a visa to travel to undertake fieldwork, and problems in obtaining ethics clearance from an external institution that was beyond the control of the researcher.

Financial hardship or other personal difficulties, or initially embarking on a research program that was known to take longer than the 3 year scholarship period are not grounds for extension. Similarly periods of illness do not constitute grounds for an extension as the candidate should have requested a period of sick leave at the time. The absence of a supervisor is also not considered as grounds for an extension as it is the responsibility of the School to ensure that acceptable alternative arrangements for supervision are provided.

Candidates should note that the HDC(R) checks previous progress reports and is unlikely to look favourably on any request for an extension if the delay occurred earlier in candidacy but was not documented in the progress report at the end of the year in which it occurred. It is also helpful to HDC(R) if, when making a request for an extension which has resulted from a delay earlier in candidacy, the candidate makes specific reference to the progress report in which the delay was documented.

An application for the extension of an award should be lodged with the RGSO at least 8 weeks prior to the current expiry date of the scholarship.

As conditions regarding extensions may vary for other scholarships or awards, candidates should definitely consult the Assistant Co-ordinator (Scholarships and Candidature) RGSO before taking any action. International students should consult the Sponsored Programs Co-ordinator in the IPO regarding extensions. They will also advise on the ramifications for your student visa.

## **7. FULL FEE PAYING CANDIDATES AND VISA MATTERS**

### **7.1 Payment of fees:**

International students are charged tuition fees based on the study load they are undertaking as part of their course (ie the number of credit points or the EFTSU). If an international student fails to complete the thesis on time and must extend the thesis candidature, they will be charged additional tuition fees based on the credit points undertaken. Candidates funded through a scholarship may need to consult the Sponsored Programs Co-ordinator in the IPO, their scholarship body, or representative, for permission to extend their candidature.

International students experiencing financial difficulties that affect their ability to pay their tuition fees on time, must apply for an extension to payment at the International Programs Office before the fees are due. International students who fail to pay tuition fees by the due date (without an extension) may have their enrolment terminated. If termination does occur, the University is obliged to inform DIMA, who may cancel the student visa.

### **7.2 Student visas**

Student visas are issued by the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA) with a number of conditions attached, including:

- 8202- satisfy course requirements (you must be enrolled full time and maintain academic

- progress);
- 8206- study with the education provider where you initially enrol for the first year of the course;
  - 8533- advise the University within seven days of any change of address;
  - 8501- maintain acceptable health insurance cover during your entire stay in Australia;
  - 8101- you and your family members must not work without permission.

The University is obliged to notify DIMA if students breach visa conditions, change course, or intermit (defer) or discontinue their studies. When this occurs, a letter from DIMA is sent to a student's last known address, advising them to go to a DIMA office within 28 days or their visa will be cancelled. This means that it is important to keep your address up-to-date with the University.

Work rights on student visas: See 5.6 above.

General visa information as above can be provided both to candidates and supervisors by the IPO. For more detailed information, visit a branch office of DIMA, phone the DIMA inquiry line on 131 881 (ring from anywhere within Australia for the cost of a local call), or see the website at: [www.immi.gov.au/study/overview/index.htm](http://www.immi.gov.au/study/overview/index.htm)

## **8. SUPERVISION**

### **8.1 The process of supervision**

During the period of candidature, it is expected that the supervision process will result in the candidate receiving training in all aspects of the planning and execution of research. This training will normally begin with the candidate in the role of an apprentice or junior partner and end, especially for doctoral degrees, with the candidate being trained to a level where he or she can engage in research independently or work as a member of a research team. However, although the candidate should be able to undertake research independently by the end of a degree, it is still expected that at all stages of the degree, the supervisors' input will be of importance.

Quality supervision will not only provide training in the planning and execution of research, but will provide support and training in other activities involved in research, including the presentation of papers at conferences, the preparation of manuscripts for publication and the preparation of grant applications or other requests for funding.

During the course of the degree, the candidate has the primary responsibility for the conduct of study and research, and the planning, writing and presentation of the thesis. Notwithstanding this responsibility, a close working relationship with the supervisors should be of direct benefit to the candidate at all stages of candidature. Supervisors should also benefit from having new and enthusiastic input into a topic in which they have a direct interest. Thus, candidature for a higher degree should be a mutually rewarding partnership between candidate and supervisor.

### **8.2 Contact between candidate and supervisor(s)**

The supervisors should be accessible in person to the candidate at mutually agreed times, when academic advice may be sought. Supervisors should also be sympathetic and supportive to candidates with regard to non-academic aspects of supervision and, if it is considered necessary, encourage them to utilise the support services offered by the University. (A summary list is attached as Appendix E and more detailed information is available in LUPA's postgraduate handbook.)

Both the candidate and the supervisor(s) have an obligation to ensure that they confer on the progress of the research at mutually agreed intervals. The supervisors should be in close contact with the work at all times to know, and be able to report on how the candidate is progressing and to judge when some direction may be desirable. The contact may vary between disciplines but, as a minimum in normal circumstances, supervisor(s) and candidate should be in contact on average once per fortnight, and certainly not less than once a month. When the candidate has not maintained appropriate contact, it is the principal supervisor's responsibility to contact the candidate to arrange a meeting. The importance of regular and frequent contact cannot be over-emphasised. Research into successful higher degree

completions shows that the frequency of meetings is linked to success rates. That said, it is also recognised that the frequency and duration of meetings may vary depending on the stage of the research. It would be expected that in the early planning stages, there would be frequent meetings of considerable duration, whereas once the candidate embarks on data collection for example, the frequency and duration of meetings may both decrease while still ensuring that there is regular contact.

Overall, the candidate has a responsibility to maintain progress of the work including, in particular, the presentation of written material as agreed in sufficient time to allow for comments and discussions before proceeding to the next stage. The supervisor(s) must ensure that the candidate is made aware of inadequate progress or of standards of work below those generally expected, specifying the problems and suggesting ways of addressing them.

### **8.3 Supervisors**

All candidates must have a *principal supervisor* who is a member of the academic staff of La Trobe University and who has the appropriate level of qualifications to supervise, or demonstrated research experience of equivalent standing. That is, the principal supervisor must be a member of the University at the level of lecturer or above and should have at least a qualification at the equivalent level (i.e., PhD for PhD candidate, professional doctorate or PhD for other doctoral candidates, and Masters by research for Masters candidates). If the supervisor does not have at least the equivalent qualification then, in order to supervise, it must be demonstrated to the HDC(R) that he or she has a strong track record of research and publications judged to be at least equivalent to the degree. The principal supervisor must also have sufficient expertise in the area of research to provide informed comment and direction for the student. When candidates work with more than one supervisor (see below), the principal supervisor holds final responsibility for all supervision matters including those as set out in Section 3.3.

Candidates must also have one or more *co-supervisors* and may have one or more *associate supervisors* or *external co-supervisors* who provide additional input and direction to the research. Co-supervisors are members of staff of the University and associate supervisors and external co-supervisors are not members of staff of the University but may be employed at another University or other institution (e.g., hospital, CSIRO). Co-supervisors and associate supervisors can play an important role by bringing additional expertise to the process.

The HDC(R) expects candidates to work with more than one supervisor. This assists in the development of ideas and in learning to work as part of a research team. It also is of importance should one of the supervisors have to withdraw from supervision at any stage, even for a relatively short period of time, as shared supervision can reduce any discontinuities that may be experienced. Schools are encouraged to consider making use of a panel system for supervision. It is essential that the roles and expectations of each supervisor are discussed and agreed to by the student and the supervisors. This includes identifying one of the supervisors as the principal supervisor. In addition, whereas the student may meet more frequently with one of the supervisors, regular meetings should be held with all supervisors to review progress and discuss future directions.

The HDC(R) approves the appointment of all supervisors.

### **8.4 Review of written work.**

A supervisor should advise a candidate on the presentation of the thesis, review all sections of it as it is being written and comment critically on each draft before the final version is made ready for submission. It is important that work submitted by the candidate to the supervisor(s) be dealt with promptly and that the supervisor(s) inform the candidate when the work will be returned. It is also incumbent on a candidate to take account of a supervisor's other commitments and not to place unreasonable demands with respect to time for reading a draft section.

### **8.5 Periods when a supervisor is absent from the University**

If a supervisor plans to take leave (for more than 2 months for Masters candidates or 3 months for doctoral candidates) during the period of candidature, arrangement for alternative supervision must be

made to the satisfaction of the Head of School or HDC(R) and to the candidate. RGSO must receive formal notification of the arrangements signed by the Postgraduate Co-ordinator or Head of School. A condition of candidature is that if the principal supervisor is not available there is at least one other person in the School, elsewhere in the University, or an external co-supervisor outside of the University who can supervise. However, if in the judgement of the candidate and supervisor, for some reason adequate alternative supervision cannot be arranged during a supervisor's absence the candidate should consider making arrangements to suspend candidature. If the thesis is at a crucial stage and other satisfactory arrangements cannot be made, the supervisor should postpone leave.

### 8.6 Dealing with problems in supervision

Since the intellectual challenge and stimulus that should characterise a research degree depend to an important extent on the relationship between the candidate and the supervisor(s), careful thought should be given by the candidate and the proposed supervisor(s) to the question of personal compatibility as well as common academic interest. It is essential that the project is of direct interest to the supervisor(s) and the candidate, and within each supervisor's area of expertise.

On occasions personality clashes or other interpersonal difficulties may develop which prevent fruitful co-operation between candidate and supervisor. It is important that any such difficulties are dealt with early and the candidate should seek advice from the Postgraduate Co-ordinator or Head of School. Candidates should also read Section 12 for further guidance on difficulties during candidature.

## 9. THE THESIS TOPIC

With the exception of some professional doctorate degrees when the topic is developed during candidature, the research topic should be identified by the candidate in consultation with the nominated principal supervisor prior to enrolment. Again, with the exception of some professional doctorate degrees in which there is an emphasis on coursework during the early period of enrolment, the topic should be fully developed as a research proposal during the early months of candidature. For the professional doctorates where this is not expected, clear guidelines are provided by the School offering the doctorate, regarding when the topic should be identified and when a proposal should be developed.

During candidature, the research may change direction or emphasis. Possible reasons for changing the topic of a thesis could include safety or security issues in countries where fieldwork is necessary. Such a change may necessitate a change in the title. Applications for change of title for the thesis should be made promptly on the appropriate form available from the RGSO or on the Web <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/www/rgso>. Candidates should note that a School can only support a change of topic if there is expertise available to supervise the new topic along with the other resources and facilities that will be required

## 10. ETHICS APPROVAL FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS

It is the responsibility of the principal supervisor to ensure that a candidate who conducts research involving human or animal subjects, ionising radiation or recombinant DNA has approval from the relevant University or Faculty Ethics Committees or the University Occupational Health and Safety Office before any data collection commences. However, the candidate should also be aware of his or her responsibilities in obtaining appropriate approvals before commencing their research. Application forms are available by following the links on the internet site [www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/ethics/](http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/ethics/) or at the following telephone numbers:

*	Animal: Research and Graduate Studies Office	9479 1976	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
*	Human: Research and Graduate Studies Office	9479 1443	
*	Ionising radiation or recombinant DNA	9479 2043	
Faculty Human Ethics Committees:			
*	Education	5444 7983	Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
*	Health Sciences	9479 3573	
*	Humanities and Social Sciences	9479 3505	

*	Law and Management	9479 1603
*	Faculty of Science, Technology & Engineering	9479 3698

All research projects involving human participants or animal experimentation require ethics approval. Staff and candidates involved in collaborative research with external institutions, contract research projects and postgraduate research projects are all included in this requirement. It is also likely when collaborative research is being conducted with external institutions, ethics approval from the institutions concerned will also be required.

Ethics approval is required for the following reasons:

- to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects from any physical and mental discomfort, harm and danger from research procedures;
- to protect the candidate's and supervisor's rights as researchers to carry out legitimate investigation, as well as the reputation of the University for research conducted and sponsored by it;
- to minimise the potential for claims of negligence made against the candidate, the supervisor, and the University.

**Remember it is a requirement prior to the commencement of any data collection that:**

**All research projects involving humans require approval by a Faculty or the University Human Ethics Committee. If the project is funded by a research grant, other than internal School of Faculty funding, or by contract funds then approval must be sought from the University Human Ethics Committee.**

**All research projects involving animals require approval by the University Animal Ethics Committee.**

**All research projects using ionising radiation require approval by the University Radiation Safety Officer.**

**All research projects using recombinant DNA require approval by the University Genetic Manipulation Supervisory Committee.**

## 11. ACADEMIC PROGRESS

### 11.1 Requirements

Continuation of candidature is conditional on maintenance of satisfactory progress. A supervisor may draw the attention of the HDC(R) to problems with progress of a candidate at any time. Indeed, a supervisor is required to report immediately to the HDC(R) any failure by a candidate to make satisfactory progress or to abide by other requirements in the regulations governing the degree. Note too, that the regulation provides for a candidate to be required at any time during the course of candidature to take an oral or written examination (or both) in the branch of knowledge appropriate to the subject of the thesis.

Any requirement made by a School which is in addition to those contained in the regulations must be set out in writing by the School and Faculty concerned, and copies given to the candidate and the HDC(R).

For continuing candidates, special requirements which a School, Faculty and supervisor may specify when a candidate is not making satisfactory progress or not maintaining adequate and regular contact must be made in writing, and received and noted by the HDC(R). The candidate should be given a written copy of the requirements.

International students should note that student visa condition 8202 requires that international students maintain satisfactory academic progress.

## 11.2 Annual review

There is a formal annual review of progress of all candidates, which normally takes place in the latter part of the year. The RGSO distributes an Annual Progress Report Form to each candidate.

It is essential that the completion of the annual progress report is taken seriously by the candidates and their supervisors. When requests for extensions to candidature or scholarships are made, annual progress reports are consulted to determine whether delays were noted and discussed at the time, and what action was taken. If annual progress reports fail to note delays and report progress as satisfactory or better, then it is unlikely extensions will be granted. Hence it is in the student's interests to make sure that information is accurately recorded. If for any reason there have been delays in progress these should be noted in the report and discussed with the principal supervisor and where appropriate the Postgraduate Co-ordinator or Head of School. While not all delays will form grounds for scholarship extensions all details should still be recorded. Such delays, some of which may constitute grounds for extensions, include adverse personal circumstances, difficulty in obtaining access to equipment or research participants, and problems in meeting with a supervisor. It is also important that supervisors provide accurate reports including any concerns they may have about the progress of a student. By noting these it provides the opportunity for discussion and for setting clearer objectives.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to complete the appropriate section and pass the form on to the supervisor by the due date. Normally the principal supervisor and student should meet to discuss progress and the completion of the candidate's and supervisor's sections. In the unusual event that a candidate feels threatened by this procedure then the candidate should immediately notify either the Head of School or Postgraduate Co-ordinator of any concerns. Once the candidate has completed the relevant section, it is then the responsibility of the principal supervisor, or in the case of an external co-supervisor, to complete the supervisor's section, discuss the report with the candidate, and pass on the form to the Postgraduate Co-ordinator or the Head of School, one of whom completes the report. If at this stage unsatisfactory progress is recorded, the Co-ordinator or Head of School is required to discuss the matter with the candidate, set out requirements that should be met for continued enrolment and ask the candidate to sign to indicate that he or she is aware of the unsatisfactory progress assessment and of the expectations for continuation of candidature.

The Head of School or Postgraduate Co-ordinator should then forward all reports to the Faculty Higher Degrees Research Committee (or equivalent) who should follow-up any problems identified with progress. Remedial action can be instigated at this stage in most cases. Each Faculty Committee reports to the HDC(R) on the progress of all candidates.

***Note that failure to provide a progress report when required will be taken automatically to constitute unsatisfactory progress.***

If the Faculty Committee decides, after investigation, that progress appears to be unsatisfactory, the candidate will be asked to 'show cause' why candidature should not be terminated. The candidate has the opportunity to write to the Faculty Committee and to appear before it. After considering all the evidence, the Faculty Committee may decide that progress is unsatisfactory and recommend to the Academic Board via the HDC(R) that candidature should be terminated.

Where an international student's candidature has been terminated, they will be reported to DIMA as breaching condition 8202 after the time to appeal has elapsed. Any student who appeals will not be reported until a decision is made by the Higher Degrees Appeals Committee of the Academic Board on the appeal.

## 11.3 Lapse of candidature

It is a candidate's responsibility to:

- re-enrol by the required date each year; and
- resume candidature after a period of suspension by the required date.

If these commitments are not met, and no satisfactory reason is provided to the HDC(R) within 30 days, then candidature will lapse as reinstatement is not automatic.

#### **11.4 Reinstatement of expired candidature**

A candidature which has expired may be reinstated by the HDC(R) *for examination purposes only* on the recommendation of the Head of School.

Applications for reinstatement must be submitted at least 3 months before the expected date of submission and the thesis must be submitted within six months of reinstatement of candidature. A candidate must lodge a Notice of Intention to Submit form (see Section 16.1).

## **12. DIFFICULTIES DURING CANDIDATURE, GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES AND APPEALS**

From time to time difficulties may arise during candidature. These may be a result of personal or financial problems, difficulties making progress with research or other difficulties of an academic nature, difficulties in obtaining the support required or access to facilities, or interpersonal or other difficulties with a supervisor. Problems that arise during the course of undertaking a higher degree can be dealt with most effectively with minimum disruption if they are identified and addressed early. It is important therefore that, if difficulties arise, candidates for higher degrees are willing to recognise these and take action to deal with them. The action taken and the individual who is consulted will depend on the nature of the problem.

### **12.1 Difficulties and grievances other than with supervision**

Grievances or difficulties should be taken up initially with a candidate's supervisor who will be able to provide advice and assistance. If a candidate is of the opinion that he or she cannot talk to the supervisor then the matter may be taken up with the Postgraduate Co-ordinator or Head of School. When the matter is confidential candidates should make this clear to the person they are talking to and seek that person's assurance that it will be treated confidentially.

Candidates can also seek advice from LUPA at any time during their candidature. This may be sought on an informal level and will be treated confidentially. Representatives of LUPA can also act formally as an advocate for the candidate and attend meetings to represent the candidate.

Candidates may also take grievances and complaints to the University Ombudsman who can assist a candidate with the resolution of difficulties. Such approaches by candidates are treated confidentially.

Even if you are not sure if particular circumstances will develop into difficulties it is far better to consult someone in the School or a LUPA representative to discuss the matter than to ignore the situation. In addition, whereas friends and other candidates can often be supportive they may not have the relevant knowledge and experience of academic staff and LUPA representatives to provide appropriate advice.

### **12.2 Difficulties and grievances relating to supervision**

If grievances or difficulties between a candidate and a supervisor cannot be resolved the matter should be referred to the Postgraduate Co-ordinator then to the Head of School, then to the Dean of the Faculty. If this fails to resolve the matter the Chair of HDC (R) shall assist in formulating a solution. Advice, support and assistance may be sought from LUPA, the University Ombudsman, or from International Student Support Services.

### **12.3 Grievances relating to transfer or confirmation of candidature**

Candidates with a grievance concerning transfer of candidature, confirmation of candidature or other matters which are not concerned with the termination of candidature or examination of a thesis shall put their case to the Head of School in the first instance. If this fails to resolve the matter then they may put their grievance to the Dean of the Faculty and if this fails, to the Chair of HDC (R) who shall assist in formulating a solution.

## 12.4 Grievances (Regulations)

Regulation 21.2 Doctor of Philosophy, Regulation 21.3 Professional Doctorates and Regulation 21.5 Masters by research cover matters pertaining to candidature for these degrees. Under these regulations candidates may request that the HDC(R) review a decision on any matter affecting research candidature or the examination of a thesis. Grounds for asking for a review of a decision not to award a higher degree or not to allow resubmission could include:

- procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination,
- documented evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of one or more of the examiners.

A request for review must be made in writing within 30 days of the decision setting out reasons in full to the HDC(R).

In the event that the HDC(R) upholds the decision, candidates may appeal to the Higher Degrees Appeals Committee of Academic Board in the following instances:

- termination of candidature;
- failure of theses; or
- revision or resubmission of theses.

Such appeals are to be forwarded to the Secretary of the Higher Degrees Appeals Committee of Academic Board and should be made within 2 months of the date of posting of such a decision to the candidate. A candidate can seek assistance from the Secretary of the Higher Degrees Appeals Committee regarding such appeals.

International Students should seek advice from International Student Support Services in the IPO regarding the ramifications of the above on their student visa.

## 13. CONFIDENTIAL RESEARCH

If, at the time of selection of a research project, a candidate is offered the opportunity to develop or work on a project that has the potential to produce outcomes that could lead to claims on intellectual property or is funded under a contractual arrangement, the candidate must be fully informed by the supervisor(s), in writing, of any conditions or contracts which might restrict disclosure of information and the extent to which communication with University colleagues is possible during the course of the work and on its completion. Any company involved in such a project should be clearly informed of the University's policy regarding involvement by candidates.

Normally, it would be expected that any delay in publication (e.g., while patentability is investigated and patent specifications are drawn up and lodged), should not exceed 12 months. If the candidate agrees to take part in such a project, a written agreement on the conditions of disclosure must be concluded over the signatures of the candidate, principal supervisor, Head of School concerned, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).

Where such a situation was unforeseen but arises in the course of the research work, a meeting of the candidate, supervisor(s) and Head of School must be held forthwith and a *written* understanding of the conditions of disclosure of information agreed by all parties. Prior to any understanding, legal advice from the University solicitors should be sought on the form that the agreement should take.

Notwithstanding any of the above, no arrangements should be proposed, and certainly not agreed to by a candidate, which in any way prevents the candidate from meeting all the requirements of the higher degree regulations in force at the time of enrolment for the degree.

### 13.1 Patents and inventions

Under University legislation, the University is the owner of any 'invention' produced by a member of staff in the course of employment. The University has no claim to ownership of inventions invented by students in the course of studies except by virtue of the contributions of staff members, or in order to give effect to a third party right (e.g., under a contract sponsoring the student's project) or otherwise under a contractual agreement with the student.

An 'invention' is defined as a 'potentially patentable invention process or discovery' (Statute 32). Inventors, whether staff or students, have an obligation to disclose inventions to the University. Note that this applies to students even though the University may have no claim to ownership. This is necessary in order to enable the University to examine the circumstances of the invention and to confirm that no other members of the University or any third parties have an interest in the invention.

.An inventor of an invention in which the University has an interest is obliged under University regulation to ensure that the details of any invention are not prematurely disclosed (refer Regulation 32.1, section 6.2).

Premature disclosure in this context means disclosure which might preclude the taking out of a patent. An invention might be disclosed at a seminar, in a thesis or other publication, on a computer disk or in a casual conversation.

Candidates are warned, therefore, of the need to balance and reconcile the requirements of their postgraduate course or project and their obligations under regulations of the University. Publication of results, for example in research papers, may be delayed.

### **13.2 Research contracts and agreements**

Increasingly, candidates are involved in applications for funding from corporate sponsors to support their research. The University wishes to encourage and assist such initiatives. At the same time the University wishes to ensure that the terms and conditions of funding are not inconsistent with a candidate's degree requirements.

Caution is particularly important to avoid restrictions prohibiting the disclosure of research results or requiring any delays in the examination of a thesis.

Applications for externally funded scholarships, studentships or research grants generally should be lodged through the RGSO ten working days before the deadline for lodgement with the grantor. Proposals for research contracts must be submitted to the RGSO for prior approval. Mostly, funding bodies will inform applicants of the results of applications via this Office. Occasionally, however, applicants will be informed directly. If this should happen candidates should **NOT** sign any agreement or contract or accept funds on behalf of the University. Candidates should seek the advice of their supervisors, the Head of School, and, depending on the nature of the funding agreement, either the Contracts and Intellectual Property Officer (Telephone: 9479 1973) or the Grants Coordinator (Telephone: 9479 2049). Copies of any agreement should be referred to these officers, who may seek advice from the Director, Legal Services. The University wishes to assure candidates that it will do its utmost to secure funding while also protecting their rights and privileges. However, in order to ensure this the cooperation of candidates is needed at all stages of the process and certainly *before* any documents are signed.

**In summary, it is essential that all applications for funding are submitted through the RGSO and any offers of funding are checked by this Office prior to acceptance.**

Candidates who are concerned in any way about these matters should discuss them with their supervisors and with their Head of School. As far as possible discussion should take place prior to the commencement of a project and clear agreement reached and recorded at this time.

Supervisors and candidates may find it useful to consult the Policy on Intellectual Property which is provided to candidates at the time of enrolment. A copy of the current Policy is available at the RGSO web page of the University's web site.

## **14. PUBLISHING RESEARCH**

Candidates are encouraged to write up work for publication as they undertake their research leading to a higher degree. It is noted that in some cases the nature of the research will not lend itself to preparation for publication until close to completion of the thesis. However in all other cases, unless restricted by considerations discussed in Section 13, candidates should be encouraged to prepare and submit work for publication during the course of their studies. The process of publishing can assist candidates develop appropriate writing skills which will be of value when writing the thesis, can provide valuable feedback on the research which can be incorporated into the thesis, and can lead to international recognition of the work prior to submitting the thesis.

Whether research is written up for publication or presented at a conference before or after completion of the degree, it is essential that the University's guidelines for the authorship and publication and other relevant guidelines for the conduct of research are followed (guidelines available at the following web address) <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rgso/information/forms/CRC%202003.doc> One issue that is of particular importance is authorship on the paper or conference presentation. It is difficult to provide definitive guidelines about order of authorship as there are some variations across disciplines. However, most disciplines have professional associations whose guidelines can be consulted. In the case of doctoral research which requires that the student makes an original and/or substantial contribution to learning, it would be expected that the order of authors of papers stemming from the doctoral research would reflect that contribution. It is also essential that anyone [including supervisor(s)] who has made a substantial contribution to the research is an author. Candidates should always consult their supervisors before writing up material for publication or preparing it for a conference. Equally candidates have a right to expect that supervisors will consult them before making use of any of their research for a conference paper or publication. Should any concerns arise about authorship, candidates should consult the Head of School or Postgraduate Co-ordinator for guidance.

In summary, whereas it is noted above that there are some variations to the order of authorship across disciplines it would normally be expected that a candidate's work for a higher degree would be in order of authorship that assigns recognition to the candidate as the main contributor to this research. Moreover it would normally be expected, according to usual convention, that this would result in the candidate being the first named author. If in preparing a paper with a supervisor or other contributor to the research, this appears not to be the case, then it is important that the candidate discusses the issue, in the first instance with the supervisor, Head of School or Postgraduate Co-ordinator.

## **15. RESEARCH IN OTHER INSTITUTIONS**

At times in this Handbook reference has been made to conducting research in other institutions. This may vary from research in schools or hospitals to research in private companies. In addition, the nature of the research may vary from gaining access to a particular population (e.g., school children) solely to conduct one's own research, to participation in a major research program being undertaken for example in a hospital. Regardless of the nature of the research it is essential that all required approvals, including ethics approvals, are obtained from the relevant authority or authorities.

In cases where a student becomes part of major research program being conducted externally, there can often be benefits for all parties concerned. The student may gain access to a particular population which otherwise would not be accessible, may gain expert advice from members of the research team and may have access to other resources that could not be provided by the University. In return the research team will benefit from the student's participation in the project including the intellectual contribution made and the work undertaken for the thesis, which otherwise may not have been part of the program. It is often advisable that a member of the research team becomes an associate supervisor, or an external co-supervisor.

In all instances when a student participates in research that is external to the institution, it is essential that the student and the principal supervisor make sure that the student's project and hence contribution to a larger research program can be clearly identified. Matters to do with confidentiality of the data, ownership of the data, and intellectual property rights must also be addressed. Agreement should be reached in writing about these matters *prior* to the start of the project and such agreement must ensure the rights of the student are protected such that the requirements of the higher degree regulations can be met by the student. The discussion and agreement in writing not only should take account of ownership and access to data, but should also address issues of planned future publication and authorship. It is essential that in protecting the candidate's interests, any use of the data by any of the

supervisors or other staff working in a research team, for reports, conference presentations or in publications, occurs only after full consultation with and approval from the student and principal supervisor.

## **16. PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS**

All forms and other printed material referred to below are obtainable from the RGSO counter or the RGSO internet site located at [www.latrobe.edu.au/www/rgso](http://www.latrobe.edu.au/www/rgso).

### **16.1 Formal requirement: 'Notice of intention to submit a higher degree thesis for examination'**

A candidate is required to give (on a prescribed form, see Appendix D) at least 3 *months* notice of intention to submit the thesis for examination, to allow time for the appointment of examiners. The typewritten thesis *summary* (of not more than 300 words) required with the notice of intention to submit is essential information for prospective examiners; it is forwarded to them when they are sent a formal invitation to accept appointment by the HDC(R). Doctoral candidates are also required to provide, with their notice of intention to submit a thesis, a special typewritten summary of a maximum of three sentences in 'non-specialist terminology'. When a recommendation is made to the Academic Board and Council for the award of the degree, this summary is available for the benefit of persons interested in the thesis but not familiar with the field of research. The summary may also be used in University publications, such as the Annual Research Report, 'The Bulletin' at a graduation ceremony and on the RGSO internet site.

### **16.2 Content**

The thesis should contain the candidate's own work, carried out under supervision during the period of candidature. The regulations (Regulation 21.2 for Doctor of Philosophy, Regulation 21.3 for Professional Doctorates and Regulation 21.5 for Masters by Research) should be studied closely with respect to the status of work published prior to candidature. The intention is that the degree is not awarded in recognition of work, however commendable, completed and published prior to any period of candidature at the University. Thus, for example, a report commissioned by an employer cannot be rebound and submitted for examination or award of the degree.

### **16.3 Format**

It is not possible to lay down general rules on the preparation, form and content which apply to all disciplines. Candidates should acquaint themselves with the appropriate scholarly conventions in their discipline for the presentation of references, accuracy of quotation and construction of bibliographies. The relation of research to writing is likely to vary according to the nature of the subject and should be established in consultation with the supervisor(s). In some cases comparatively early preparation of part of the thesis in draft form may be appropriate; in others any substantial preparation may be impracticable until the major part of the study is complete. Candidates should also consult School or Department handbooks for higher degree candidates where guidance should be offered about appropriate format and presentation for the discipline.

Candidates may find it of value to read recent examples of successfully completed theses in their discipline area as a guide to format. Supervisors should be able to guide candidates to read quality theses.

For a candidate whose first language is not English, help with grammar and expression may be given with the approval of the supervisor(s). Editorial guidance should in any case be left to the discretion of the supervisor(s). Overseas candidates may receive assistance from the Language Centre's English for Academic Purpose Program or similar unit (e.g., Language and Academic Skills Units).

If a candidate considers that too much data presentation is required or if the supervisor feels that the thesis will be too long or the candidature unreasonably protracted, this should be discussed and, if necessary, brought to the attention of the Head of School or the HDC(R). Supervisors and candidates should note that it is recommended in the Examinations Regulation that Masters by research thesis must not exceed 60,000 words and it is recommended that normally they should not exceed 40,000 words in science-based disciplines or 50,000 words in non-science disciplines. It should be noted that

word length expectations for the Masters by Research may vary somewhat by Department. Professional doctorates by research theses must not exceed 75,000 words and it is recommended that normally they should not exceed 60,000 words. Professional doctorates by coursework theses must not exceed 50,000 words and it is recommended that normally they should not exceed 40,000 words. PhD theses must not exceed 100,000 and it is recommended that normally they should not exceed 50,000 words in the science-based disciplines or 75,000 in non-science disciplines. Footnotes are not included in the word limit. Footnotes should follow the conventions of the discipline and should not be used as a substitute for content that belongs in the body of text. Candidates should note that these word limits do not include appendices or bibliographies and reference lists.

It may be appropriate to include some material in the form of appendices. Material presented in an appendix can be examined in the same manner as the main text, but it should not be necessary for an examiner to read the appendix to understand the content of the thesis or to determine the validity of an argument presented in the body of the thesis. Appendices need not be included in the word count, but they should not increase the size of the work substantially. If a submitted thesis is overlong it may be returned to the candidate for editing, or the appointed examiners may decline to act. A candidate should not set out to write a thesis to the maximum permissible length, nor regard the maximum period of candidature as time which must be spent before submitting the thesis. Increasingly, examiners are looking for theses that express ideas concisely, and it is not uncommon to read comments in examiners' reports that refer to a thesis being too long.

#### **16.4 Final review**

The form in which the thesis is finally presented must conform with the requirements of Schedule B to Regulation 21.12 Examination and Assessment. Candidates are urged to study this Schedule carefully, well in advance of production of the final manuscript, consult with the supervisor(s), and ensure before proceeding to photocopying and binding that the thesis when submitted will conform to the requirements; otherwise it may be rejected as unsuitable for examination.

It is an important requirement of Schedule B that a candidate prefaces the thesis with a signed statement in the prescribed format to the effect that, except where acknowledged in the text, the thesis is *entirely the work of the candidate*. If a candidate has received special assistance of any kind in preparing the thesis (e.g., processing of statistical data, translation of texts, assistance with English expression, building and operation of equipment), this should be acknowledged fully. In addition a statement of compliance with ethics and safety requirements should be made.

The thesis in its final form, before copying and binding, must be seen by the supervisor(s). If the thesis contains typographical, spelling, grammatical or punctuation errors, or a standard of expression not worthy of a thesis, then these shortcomings should be made known to the candidate who must bring the thesis to a state required in Schedule B, Section 3.

The principal supervisor and the Head of School must then certify that the form of presentation complies with the provisions laid down in the regulations for the presentation of theses and that the thesis is, in the opinion of the supervisor, the candidate's own work. The supervisor is not responsible for the quality of the argument presented, except in a very general sense. In providing the final certification, the supervisor and Head of School are not making any assessment of the thesis or its prospects of success, and may in fact still feel that the thesis does not reach a desirable standard. Subject only to the minimum period of candidature, a candidate has a right to submit the thesis whenever it is desired to do so, though of course normally this only occurs after close consultation with and the support of the supervisor(s).

The specified number of copies of a thesis bound in approved, temporary form should be submitted, and it is the responsibility of the candidate to deliver these, accompanied by the necessary certificate from the supervisor(s) and Head of School, to the RGSO. One copy of the thesis is held by the RGSO until the examination is completed.

##### **16.4.1 After submission**

Once a candidate who holds a student visa has submitted their thesis for examination, they are no longer an enrolled student of the University. This means they have 28 days after this date in which to leave Australia, or apply to DIMA for a different visa. It is possible the candidate can remain in Australia on a student visa for a maximum of two periods of three months each, for the purpose of

carrying out corrections on their thesis in the process of it being marked. Candidates wishing to remain in Australia during the examination process should contact International Student Support Services at the International Programs Office as soon as possible to discuss their options.

### **16.5 After the examination**

In all cases of a successful examination, the HDC(R) recommends award of the degree subject to two final copies of the thesis being received by the RGSO; one is then deposited in the Borchardt Library and one is held in the University Records Services Unit. These two copies must incorporate all corrections required as an outcome of the examination process and, depending on the original classification, will require either confirmation by the supervisor and Head of School that corrections have been made, or a statement by the candidate, endorsed by the supervisor, outlining the way in which points raised by the examiners have been addressed. This statement then requires final approval from HDC(R). The final two copies of the thesis shall be bound in hard covers and cloth.

The recommendation for the award of the degree will not go forward to the Academic Board until the two final copies incorporating any required amendments have been lodged at RGSO and HDC(R) has confirmed that any amendments as required have been attended to. The remaining examined soft bound copies are returned to the candidate. It should be noted that the candidate does not receive back all copies of the original thesis at once; the RGSO retains one 'soft-bound' copy until the two final copies of the corrected thesis are received.

In the case of an unsuccessful examination the University shall retain one copy of the thesis.

## **17. EXAMINATION OF THE THESIS**

Full details regarding the appointment of examiners and the examination process are contained in Appendix A

### **17.1 Appointment of examiners**

The identity of examiners remains confidential to the HDC(R) but possible examiners may be discussed with candidates prior to the recommendation of potential examiners to the HDC(R). The candidate should certainly be offered the opportunity to provide information on examiners, especially to identify an individual or individuals who may not be suitable. However, whereas it would normally be expected such advice would be taken into account, it has the status of advice and those recommending examiners are not in any way bound by it.

As detailed in Appendix A normally the HDC(R) appoints two external examiners for a Masters thesis and 3 external examiners for a doctoral thesis, on the recommendation of the supervisor(s) and the Head of School. For a Masters thesis normally at least one examiner should be based in Australia, and for a doctoral thesis at least one examiner should be based in Australia and one based overseas. Internal examiners are only appointed in exceptional circumstances as outlined in Appendix A.

### **17.2 Examiners' reports**

Each examiner of a doctoral or Masters thesis provides an independent report on the thesis for consideration by the HDC(R).

The examination process normally takes up to 3 months including the 2 months normally allowed for examiners to assess the thesis and provide reports. However, it may take longer as receipt of examiners' reports may be delayed for various reasons. Candidates may themselves contribute to delay, if they have given insufficient notice of intention to submit or do not submit the thesis when expected. Candidates and supervisors should be assured that the HDC(R) keeps the situation of every submitted thesis under close review and seeks to expedite the examination process.

The names of the examiners remain confidential until a final decision is reached by the HDC(R) after which copies of the reports are sent to the supervisor(s), and Head of School; successful candidates normally are supplied with copies of the examiners' comments through their supervisor(s).

Any communication between the examiners and the supervisor or other member of a School about a thesis under examination must be approved by the HDC(R) and arranged through the RGSO.

The recommendations that examiners may make for Masters by research and doctoral degrees are shown on the forms sent to examiners and contained in Appendix A. As also documented in the Appendix, examiners are required to provide a full justification of their recommendation.

### **17.3 Consideration of reports by the HDC(R)**

Regulation 21.12 Examinations and Assessment covers the assessment of examiners' reports by the HDC(R). In the event of disagreement between examiners, the decision is not made simply on a number count. The contents of the examiners' reports are considered in detail and a final recommendation is made taking account of the content of all reports. The following gives details of possible combinations of examiners' recommendations and the outcomes that may result.

#### ***All examiners recommend a PASS (with or without amendments)***

Normally, when both examiners for a Masters thesis or the three examiners for a doctoral thesis recommend the thesis be passed then HDC(R) makes a decision about the thesis. This decision will take account of whether any of the examiners require changes to be made and whether these are viewed by the Committee as being minor in nature or requiring more substantial amendments. Thus the decision reached by the HDC(R) will normally be one of the following:

*(i) The thesis be classified as **passed** and the degree awarded subject to the candidate returning two copies of the amended thesis, as required by Schedule B of the Examinations and Assessment Regulation, to the Research and Graduate Studies Office for deposit in the Borchardt Library and the University Records Services Unit. The Committee will then be able to proceed with a recommendation to the Academic Board that the thesis has met the requirements for the award of the degree and that the degree should now be awarded.*

*(ii) The thesis be classified as **passed** and the candidate awarded the degree on the understanding that the supervisor(s) will ensure that minor amendments addressing points specified in the examiners' reports are made and typographical errors are corrected. Written confirmation of amendments made to be provided by the supervisor and Head of School.*

*(iii) The thesis should be classified as **passed** and the candidate awarded the degree without further examination but subject to the amendments being made that address points raised in the examiners' reports to the satisfaction of the Committee. Once these amendments as required in the examiners' reports have been made the candidate is to provide a **detailed written statement**, endorsed by the supervisor, that addresses the major issues identified in the examiners' reports and includes a general statement confirming that all minor amendments have been made and typographical errors have been corrected.*

#### ***At least one examiner recommends the thesis be DEFERRED OR FAILED***

If at least one examiner recommends the thesis be deferred or failed and at least one that it be passed, or if all examiners recommend that the thesis be deferred, then the matter is referred to a Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel with the request that the Panel make a recommendation to HDC(R). The procedures followed by this Panel are given in full in Appendix F. Candidates should note that when reports are referred to a Panel they will be provided with the opportunity to comment on the reports with respect to their thesis.

The Panel may either recommend to HDC(R) that the thesis be passed and classified as one of categories (i) to (iii) above or that it be classified as (iv) or (v):

*(iv) **DEFERRED** and the candidate be given up to 12 months to revise the thesis according to approved revision guidelines and resubmit the thesis for examination.*

or

(v) ***FAILED*** and the candidate not awarded the degree.

If the deliberations of the Panel and its recommendations fail to satisfy the HDC(R), it may appoint further examiner(s), or an expert assessor to consider the thesis and all reports, before making the final decision.

If HDC(R) accepts the classification of DEFERRED then the candidate is given the opportunity to revise and resubmit the thesis (see Section 17.4).

If HDC(R) accepts the category FAILED, then a recommendation is made to Academic Board that the thesis be classified as FAILED and the candidate not be admitted to the degree.

***All examiners recommend the thesis be FAILED***

Should the unlikely circumstance arise that all examiners recommend the thesis be failed then HDC(R) will give careful consideration to the justifications for this recommendation in the reports before making a final determination on the outcome. HDC(R) may also choose to seek advice from the supervisor, Head of School, or Professor of the discipline before reaching a decision. If following full consideration the HDC(R) accepts the thesis should be failed then a recommendation is made to Academic Board that the thesis be classified as FAILED and the candidate not be admitted to the degree.

Candidates should note that only in exceptional circumstances has a thesis been failed and such an occurrence is extremely rare.

**17.4 Resubmission**

Where a thesis is classified as deferred, a candidate will be invited to revise and resubmit it for examination. To enable preparation of the resubmitted thesis, a candidate normally will have the candidature extended for a period not exceeding 12 months and be required to re-enrol for the duration. Note: International students would be required to pay tuition fees during this period, and could need to renew their student visa also. The complete thesis (both revised and unrevised portions of the resubmitted thesis) will be examined during the second examination.

The Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel is expected to prepare appropriate guidelines based on the examiners' reports to guide the candidate during the revision of the thesis. Unless permission has been granted by the HDC(R), the identity of examiners' should not be revealed to the candidate. The prospective examiners are asked to approve the guidelines as suitable bases for revision prior to the candidate being advised of the guidelines and receiving the anonymous reports of the examiners.

Any communication between the original examiners and the supervisor or candidate or other members of a School must be approved by the HDC(R) and arranged through the RGSO.

The HDC(R) acts in the context of the following policy, approved by the Academic Board:

- (i) A resubmitted thesis should be evaluated on the same academic criteria as a thesis submitted for the first time;
- (ii) A resubmitted thesis normally should be referred to the initial examiners of the thesis (Note that, in practice, it is usual for a revised thesis to be re-examined only by the examiner(s) who did not recommend the original thesis be passed.);
- (iii) The examiners, either original or new, to whom a resubmitted thesis is referred, shall be advised that it is a resubmitted thesis and advised that it is not usual for a resubmitted thesis to undergo further revision. The examiner(s) are provided with any revision guidelines that were drawn up for the candidate. At the discretion of the HDC(R) an examiner may request and be provided with the thesis in its original form, and/or reports from the original examination;
- (iv) The period allowed for resubmission of a thesis should be at the discretion of the HDC(R) and each case should be decided on its merits. However, the normal maximum period for a thesis for a higher degree by research is 12 months;

- (v) Normally a candidate should be permitted to resubmit a thesis only once, but the HDC(R) may exercise its discretion in special cases to allow some amendments to a resubmitted thesis; and
- (vi) In considering its recommendation to the Academic Board, the HDC(R) may, at its discretion, refer back to the reports on the original submission of the thesis to help resolve any conflict of examiners' opinions about the resubmitted thesis. Where necessary an assessor who has not previously been involved in the examination may be appointed.

#### **18. THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE**

Once the two final hard bound copies have been lodged at the RGSO, along with any required confirmation of amendments (see Section 16), the HDC(R) makes a recommendation to Academic Board that the candidate has met the requirements for the degree and that the degree be awarded. The Academic Board then makes a recommendation to the University Council.

Once the University Council approves the recommendation from Academic Board candidates are notified officially from RGSO that they have satisfied the requirements for the degree and that the degree will be awarded and will be requested to complete a Consent to Release a Thesis for Perusal, Loan and Photocopying form to enable the University to make available the thesis copy for these purposes. It is after this that candidates are contacted and invited to attend a graduation ceremony or have their degree awarded *in absentia*.

***Guidelines for the Appointment of Examiners and Requirements for Degrees***

*Doctor of Philosophy*

**Award**

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy is based on a program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff. It is expected the scope of the project be such that it can be completed in three years of full-time study or equivalent part-time study.

The degree of PhD shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis. The requirements for the degree shall be completed by submission of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) a substantial and original contribution to knowledge;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

**Thesis**

- (a) The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline.
- (b) The thesis must not exceed 100,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 50,000 words in science subjects or 75,000 in non-science subjects. These word lengths include footnotes but do not include bibliographies and appendices.
- (c) The thesis may be presented as a series of publications and/or essays based on work completed during candidature with a general introduction that provides the context and clearly links the separate pieces of work and a general discussion and conclusion that draws together the key findings. If any essays or publications included in the thesis are joint, the candidate's contribution must be clearly stated at the front of the thesis.

**Examiners**

- (a) No fewer than three examiners shall be appointed by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) upon the recommendations made by the supervisor in consultation with the professor of the discipline concerned (or when not available another senior academic) through the Head of School.
- (b) Examiners should be selected to include at least two specialists who have extensive expertise in the field or research and consideration should also be given to appointing one generalist who would be expected to have broader expertise that encompasses the area of research.
- (c) No two examiners shall be persons belonging to the same department or equivalent thereof of another university or institution.
- (d) No-one who has been a supervisor or an associate supervisor of the candidate shall be appointed as an examiner.

- (e) Unless the HDC(R) otherwise determines in exceptional circumstances, all three examiners appointed under this regulation shall be persons who are not members of the staff of this University.
- (f) Other than in exceptional circumstances, at least one examiner should be resident in Australia, and at least one should be resident in another country.
- (g) It is expected that each examiner will have a PhD (or an equivalent qualification), or if an examiner does not have such a degree, he or she must have a substantial record of research.

#### **Notes on selection of examiners**

##### *An examiner from La Trobe*

An internal examiner, regardless of campus, should only be recommended if there is genuine difficulty in recruiting three external examiners who meet the requirements set out above and the internal examiner has only recently taken up an appointment. The Committee holds the view that other than in the case of recent appointments, generally if a staff member from La Trobe University has expertise in the area of the thesis that staff member would have been expected to have had significant input to the research either as a supervisor or through providing advice to the student.

##### *All examiners based in Australia*

The Committee is unlikely to approve three examiners who are based in Australia, unless it can be demonstrated convincingly that no-one with sufficient expertise can be identified anywhere other than Australia. It should be noted that the Committee endorses the appointment of one examiner who may not have specialist expertise in the field but would be viewed as a generalist having broader expertise.

##### *No examiner based in Australia*

The Committee is unlikely to approve three examiners all of whom are based outside Australia, unless it can be demonstrated convincingly that no-one with appropriate expertise can be identified in Australia. Again, the Committee's view about the appointment of a generalist examiner should be noted.

**RECOMMENDATION FORM**

**Please read sections 3 and 4 carefully before completing this form.**

For reasons stated in my accompanying report, I recommend that:

- (a) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without amendment or further examination
  
- (b) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to the minor amendments specified in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School
  
- (c) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to the substantial amendments recommended in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)
  
- (d) the thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination
  
- (e) the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, but it is recognised that the research reported in the thesis could form the basis for the preparation of a thesis to be submitted for a Masters by research degree
  
- (f) the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and it is NOT recommended that the thesis be amended and submitted for the degree of Masters by research degree

Signature of Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

It would be appreciated if you would fax this page and accompanying detailed report to the confidential facsimile number below to reduce delays mail deliveries may cause to the thesis examination process.

Research and Graduate Studies Office  
Facsimile: 61 3 9479 1464

**GUIDELINES FOR EXAMINERS**

## **1 Requirements of the degree and thesis**

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is based on a program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff. It is expected the scope of the project be such that it can be completed in three years of full-time study or equivalent part-time study.

The degree of PhD shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis. The requirements for the degree shall be completed by submission of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) a substantial and original contribution to knowledge;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline. It must not exceed 100,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 50,000 words in science subjects or 75,000 in non-science subjects. These word lengths include footnotes but do not include bibliographies and appendices.

## **2 Details of the examination process**

The following outlines the main points according to the University policy for the examination process. If for any reason an examiner cannot accept any part of this policy, the invitation to examine the thesis should be declined and the thesis should be returned to the Research and Graduate Studies Office.

- 2.1 Three examiners are appointed by the University Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.2 Examiners are required to examine the thesis with respect to the topic as defined by the candidate and within the research paradigm and/or methodological approach taken by the candidate. If this is not possible, either because an examiner lacks expertise with regard to the particular paradigm and methodological approach or does not consider the topic, the paradigm or the methodological approach as acceptable, then the individual should decline to act as an examiner.
- 2.3 Examiners are required to submit independent reports and should not consult other examiners, other than in exceptional circumstances either following the approval of or at the request of the Chair of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.4 During the examination process, there should not be any direct contact between an examiner and supervisor or candidate about the thesis. If for some reason an examiner wishes to contact the supervisor or the candidate, approval must be sought from the Chair of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research). If approval is given, all communication must be directed through the Research and Graduate Studies Office.
- 2.5 Each examiner should return the report and the thesis by the date set by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.6 All unpublished parts of the PhD thesis and the examination process are confidential. It is understood that in agreeing to examine a thesis, examiners are agreeing to this confidentiality. Under the Examinations Regulation of this University a candidate may

place an embargo on the public availability of the thesis for a period of up to three years (in exceptional circumstances the Committee might recommend it be up to thirty years). Following conclusion of the examination process an examiner should only make reference to the candidate's unpublished work if written approval from the candidate has been obtained.

- 2.7 Once all three reports have been received, the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) considers these and makes a recommendation regarding the award of the degree. If the classifications of the examiners differ to the extent that at least one examiner suggests the thesis be DEFERRED or FAILED and at least one recommends it be PASSED (with or without amendment), or if all three recommend it be DEFERRED OR FAILED, the Committee will refer the matter to a Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel. The Panel consists of the Faculty representative on Higher Degrees Committee (Research) or nominee, the Chair of the Faculty Research and Graduate Studies Committee or nominee, and at least one other senior academic who has expertise in the area of the thesis. The supervisor is not a member of the Panel but is invited to comment on the reports. The candidate also has the opportunity to comment on the reports with the examiners' names removed. The Panel is requested to bring forward a recommendation to the Committee regarding the classification of the thesis and recommended amendments.
- 2.8 Oral examinations are not a standard part of the University examination process. However, in exceptional circumstances the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) may require that the candidate attend an oral examination on the substance of the thesis and any publications appended to it and his or her knowledge of the subject background.
- 2.9 When the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has concluded its consideration of the examiners' reports and the candidate has made any required amendments to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School, or the Committee, it shall either
- (a) recommend to the Academic Board that the candidate
    - (i) be admitted to the degree of PhD; or
    - (ii) not be admitted to the degree but be allowed to apply to be permitted to revise the thesis and to resubmit it for examination at Masters level: or
    - (iii) be not admitted to the degree; OR
  - (b) be invited to resubmit a revised thesis according to the guidelines provided by the Committee within a maximum period of 12 months
- 2.10 Upon the conclusion of the examination process, once the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has reached a final decision, each report with the examiner's name (unless the examiner has specifically requested his or her name be withheld) is normally made available to the supervisor and candidate.
- 2.11 Upon the conclusion of the examination process, once the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has reached a final decision, each examiner will be notified formally of the outcome of the examination.

### **3 Details on the classifications**

- (a) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without amendment or further examination**

This category should be selected if, in the opinion of the examiner, no changes need to be made in order for the thesis to meet the requirements of the degree. The examiner may have identified

minor points that could be addressed but is making it clear that it is not necessary to do so. In such cases the candidate would have the option of addressing these points.

- (b) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to the minor amendments specified in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School**

This category should be selected if the amendments including typographical errors are minor in nature and can be clearly described such that the candidate can follow these without difficulty. Such amendments would not be expected in any way to change the substance of the thesis but may include such things as some minor inaccuracies in referencing, minor errors in the description of a statistical test, a failure to have observed a particular convention in reporting results, in referencing material or in using footnotes, and clarification of the selection of participants for experimental research.

- (c) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to the substantial amendments recommended in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)**

This category should be selected if the amendments required are more substantial in nature. Addressing these amendments will result in larger changes to the thesis than those in (b) above, but should be able to be undertaken under the guidance of the supervisor to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) resulting in a thesis that meets the requirements of the degree.

- (d) **the thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination**

This category should be selected if in the opinion of the examiner, the thesis currently does not meet one or more of the requirements of the degree but has the potential to do so if the recommended changes are made. In contrast to option (c) the thesis clearly does not meet the requirements at present AND it cannot be assumed with confidence that the recommended changes can be addressed by the candidate or if they are addressed will definitely lead to the thesis meeting the requirements. Thus for example, a re-analysis of data may be required and it is not clear whether the data are in a form that will allow the analysis to be conducted, or if they are, whether the re-analysis will lead to outcomes that reflect sufficiently original and/or substantial findings.

**Note it is expected that in making a recommendation for re-examination, the examiner would be prepared to re-examine the thesis if it is revised and resubmitted. If for some reason this is not possible, the examiner is asked to inform the Committee of this at the time of making the report.**

- (e) **the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, but it is recognised that the research reported in the thesis could form the basis for the preparation of a thesis to be submitted for a Masters by research degree**

- (f) **the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and it is NOT recommended that the thesis be amended and submitted for the degree of Masters by research**

These options should only be selected when the examiner can clearly show that the thesis does not meet at least one of the requirements 1 (i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) of the degree and that it would not be possible for the candidate to address the problems inherent in the thesis such that all requirements would be met. Furthermore, in choosing between classification (e) and (f) a judgement should be made as to whether there is sufficient material in the thesis to provide a basis for revising it for a Masters by research degree. If option (e) is selected the examiner is asked to provide guidelines for the revision of the thesis for submission as a Masters by research thesis.

#### **4 Guidelines for preparing a report.**

The Higher Degrees Committee (Research) recognises that examiners may adopt different styles in preparing a report. However, the Committee expects that examiners take note of the following:

4.1 Depending on the need for detail with regard to possible amendments and the justification of the recommendation, reports generally need not be longer than two to three pages.

4.2 Examiners' reports should consist of one, two or three sections:

- (a) Justification of classification (all reports)
- (b) Recommendations for amendments (all reports except PASS no amendments, or FAIL)
- (c) General points for consideration (optional)

4.3 In preparing the report it is not necessary to provide a detailed account of the contribution of each chapter. If an examiner chooses to provide such detail, it is important that the report still contains separate sections, one justifying why the thesis does or does not meet the requirements of the degree and one if required specifying amendments.

4.4 The report should begin with a clearly identified section *Justification of classification* that provides an overview and justifies the general basis for the recommendation, with regard to the requirements of the degree:

The requirements for the degree shall be completed by submission of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) a substantial and original contribution to knowledge;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

Thus, if it is recommended that the thesis be PASSED (with or without amendments), the section must justify the way in which the thesis meets requirements (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). If it is recommended that it be DEFERRED or FAILED, then in the case of DEFERRED it must clearly justify why the thesis currently does not meet at least one of the requirements (i), (ii), (iii) or (iv). In the case of FAILED, the section must clearly justify why the thesis does not meet at least one of the requirements (i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) of the degree and why it would not be possible for the candidate to address the problems inherent in the thesis such that all requirements would be met.

4.5 The section on *Recommendations for amendments* should provide a clear set of recommendations about what should be changed in the thesis prior to it being PASSED, or in the case of a DEFERRED thesis, resubmitted for examination. When appropriate, the section, may be divided into major changes, minor changes and typographical errors.

4.6 The section *General points for consideration* is optional. This section may contain points that an examiner would like the candidate to consider if making revisions to the thesis (but ones that are not required) or is recommending the candidate consider if preparing material for publication. It is very helpful to candidates if examiners can comment on the suitability of the research for publication. Note it is important that recommendations which the examiner believes should be addressed are clearly distinguished from those being suggested for consideration only. The former should all appear in the section *Recommendations for amendments*.

## ***Masters by Research***

### **Award**

A Masters by research degree requires a minimum of one year of full-time enrolment or equivalent. Normally the research component is the entire degree (100%) and it must constitute at least 67% of the degree. The program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff, must be equivalent to one year of full-time study or equivalent.

A Masters by research degree shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis once the candidate has met any coursework (i.e., non-research) requirements of the degree at a satisfactory level. The requirements for the degree shall be satisfactory completion of all coursework components and completion of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) competence in the design and conduct of a research project that incorporates methodological skills appropriate to the discipline and makes a contribution to knowledge;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

### **Thesis**

- (a) The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline.
- (b) The thesis must not exceed 60,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 40,000 words in science subjects or 50,000 words in non-science subjects. These word lengths include footnotes but do not include bibliographies and appendices.

### **Examiners**

- (a) No fewer than two examiners shall be appointed by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) upon the recommendations made by the supervisor in consultation with the professor of the discipline concerned (or when not available another senior academic) through the Head of School.
- (b) The two examiners should have specialist expertise in the field or research.
- (c) The two examiners shall not be persons belonging to the same department or equivalent thereof of another university or institution.
- (d) No-one who has been a supervisor or an associate supervisor of the candidate shall be appointed as an examiner.
- (e) Unless the HDC(R) otherwise determines in exceptional circumstances the two examiners appointed under this regulation shall be persons who are not members of the staff of this University.
- (f) Other than in exceptional circumstances, at least one examiner should be resident in Australia. Note both examiners may be based in Australia.

- (g) It is expected that each examiner will have a Masters by research (or an equivalent qualification), a doctoral level degree, or if an examiner does not have a Masters by research degree or a doctoral degree, he or she must have a demonstrated substantial record of research.

#### **Notes on examiners for Masters**

##### *An examiner from La Trobe*

An internal examiner should only be recommended if there is genuine difficulty in identifying two external examiners who are experts in the field and the internal examiner has only recently taken up an appointment. The Committee holds the view that other than in the case of recent appointments, generally if a staff member from La Trobe University has expertise in the area of the thesis that staff member would have been expected to have had significant input to the research either as a supervisor or through providing advice to the student.

##### *No examiner based in Australia*

The Committee is unlikely to approve two examiners both of whom are based outside Australia, unless it can be demonstrated convincingly that no-one with appropriate expertise can be identified in Australia.

*Masters by Research*

**RECOMMENDATION FORM**

**Please read sections 3 and 4 carefully before completing this form.**

For reasons stated in my accompanying report, I recommend that:

- (a) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Masters without amendment or further examination
  
- (b) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Masters subject to the minor amendments specified in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School
  
- (c) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Masters subject to the substantial amendments recommended in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)
  
- (d) the thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination
  
- (e) the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Masters

Signature of Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

It would be appreciated if you would fax this page and accompanying detailed report to the confidential facsimile number below to reduce delays mail deliveries may cause to the thesis examination process.

Research and Graduate Studies Office  
Facsimile: 61 3 9479 1464

## GUIDELINES FOR EXAMINERS

### **Masters by Research**

#### **1 Requirements of the degree and thesis**

The degree of Masters by research is based on a program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff. It is expected the scope of the project be such that it can be completed in a minimum of one year of full-time study or equivalent part-time study.

The degree of Masters by research shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis. The requirements for the degree shall be satisfactory completion of all coursework components and completion of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) competence in the design and conduct of a research project that incorporates methodological skills appropriate to the discipline and makes a contribution to knowledge;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline. It must not exceed 60,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 40,000 words in science subjects or 50,000 in non-science subjects. These word lengths include footnotes but do not include bibliographies and appendices.

#### **2 Details of the examination process**

The following outlines the main points according to the University policy for the examination process. If for any reason an examiner cannot accept any part of this policy, the invitation to examine the thesis should be declined and the thesis should be returned to the Research and Graduate Studies Office.

- 2.1 Two examiners are appointed by the University Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.2 Examiners are required to examine the thesis with respect to the topic as defined by the candidate and within the research paradigm and/or methodological approach taken by the candidate. If this is not possible, either because an examiner lacks expertise with regard to the particular paradigm and methodological approach or does not recognise the paradigm and methodological approach as acceptable, then the individual should decline to act as an examiner.
- 2.3 Examiners are required to submit independent reports and should not consult other examiners, other than in exceptional circumstances either following the approval of or at the request of the Chair of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.4 During the examination process, there should not be any direct contact between an examiner and supervisor or candidate about the thesis. If for some reason an examiner wishes to contact the supervisor or the candidate, approval must be sought from the Chair of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research). If approval is given, all communication must be directed through the Research and Graduate Studies Office.
- 2.5 Each examiner should return the report and the thesis by the date set by the Higher Degrees

Committee (Research).

- 2.6 All unpublished parts of the Masters thesis and the examination process are confidential. It is understood that in agreeing to examine a thesis, examiners are agreeing to this confidentiality. Under the Examinations Regulation of this University a candidate may place an embargo on the public availability of the thesis for a period of up to three years (in exceptional circumstances the Committee might recommend it be up to thirty years). Following conclusion of the examination process an examiner should only make reference to the candidate's unpublished work if written approval from the candidate has been obtained.
- 2.7 Once the two reports have been received, the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) considers these and makes a recommendation regarding the award of the degree. If the classifications of the examiners differ to the extent that one examiner suggests the thesis be DEFERRED or FAILED and one recommends it be PASSED (with or without amendment), or if both examiners recommend it be DEFERRED OR FAILED, the Committee will refer the matter to a Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel. The Panel consists of the Faculty representative on Higher Degrees Committee (Research) or nominee, the Chair of the Faculty Research and Graduate Studies Committee or nominee, and at least one other senior academic who has expertise in the area of the thesis. The supervisor is not a member of the Panel but is invited to comment on the reports. The candidate also has the opportunity to comment on the reports with the examiners' names removed. The Panel is requested to bring forward a recommendation to the Committee regarding the classification of the thesis and recommended amendments.
- 2.8 Oral examinations are not a standard part of the University examination process. However, in exceptional circumstances the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) may require that the candidate attend an oral examination on the substance of the thesis and any publications appended to it and his or her knowledge of the subject background.
- 2.9 When the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has concluded its consideration of the examiners' reports and the candidate has made any required amendments to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School, or the Committee, it shall either
  - (a) recommend to the Academic Board that the candidate
    - (i) be admitted to the degree of Masters, or
    - (ii) not be admitted to the degree; OR
  - (b) be invited to resubmit a revised thesis according to the guidelines provided by the Committee within a maximum period of 12 months
- 2.10 Upon the conclusion of the examination process, once the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has reached a final decision, each report with the examiner's name (unless the examiner has specifically requested his or her name be withheld) is normally made available to the supervisor and candidate.
- 2.11 Upon the conclusion of the examination process, once the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has reached a final decision, each examiner will be notified formally of the outcome of the examination.

### 3 Details on the classifications

- (a) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Masters without amendment or further examination**

This category should be selected if, in the opinion of the examiner, no changes need to be made in order for the thesis to meet the requirements of the degree. The examiner may have identified minor points that could be addressed but is making it clear that it is not necessary to do so. In such cases the candidate would have the option of addressing these points.

- (b) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Masters subject to the minor amendments specified in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School**

This category should be selected if the amendments including typographical errors are minor in nature and can be clearly described such that the candidate can follow these without difficulty. Such amendments would not be expected in any way to change the substance of the thesis but may include such things as some minor inaccuracies in referencing, minor errors in the description of a statistical test, a failure to have observed a particular convention in reporting results, in referencing material or in using footnotes, and clarification of the selection of participants for experimental research.

- (c) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Masters subject to the substantial amendments recommended in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)**

This category should be selected if the amendments required are more substantial in nature. Addressing these amendments will result in larger changes to the thesis than those in (b) above, but should be able to be undertaken under the guidance of the supervisor to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) resulting in a thesis that meets the requirements of the degree.

- (d) **the thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination**

This category should be selected if in the opinion of the examiner, the thesis currently does not meet one or more of the requirements of the degree but has the potential to do so if the recommended changes are made. In contrast to option (c) the thesis clearly does not meet the requirements at present AND it cannot be assumed with confidence that the recommended changes can be addressed by the candidate or if they are addressed will definitely lead to the thesis meeting the requirements. Thus for example, a re-analysis of data may be required and it is not clear whether the data are in a form that will allow the analysis to be conducted, or if they are, whether the re-analysis will lead to outcomes that reflect sufficiently original and/or substantial findings.

**Note it is expected that in making a recommendation for re-examination, the examiner would be prepared to re-examine the thesis if it is revised and resubmitted. If for some reason this is not possible, the examiner is asked to inform the Committee of this at the time of making the report.**

- (e) **the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Masters**

These options should only be selected when the examiner can clearly show that the thesis does not meet at least one of the requirements 1 (i), (ii) or (iii) of the degree and why it would not be possible for the candidate to address the problems inherent in the thesis such that all requirements would be met.

### 4 Guidelines for preparing a report.

The Higher Degrees Committee (Research) recognises that examiners may adopt different styles in preparing a report. However, the Committee expects that examiners take note of the following:

4.1 Depending on the need for detail with regard to possible amendments and the justification of the recommendation, reports generally need not be longer than two to three pages.

4.2 Examiners' reports should consist of one, two or three sections:

- (a) Justification of classification (all reports)
- (b) Recommendations for amendments (all reports except PASS no amendments, or FAIL)
- (c) General points for consideration (optional)

4.3 In preparing the report it is not necessary to provide a detailed account of the contribution of each chapter. If an examiner chooses to provide such detail, it is important that the report still contains separate sections, one justifying why the thesis does or does not meet the requirements of the degree and one if required specifying amendments.

4.4 The report should begin with a clearly identified section *Justification of classification* that provides an overview and justifies the general basis for the recommendation, with regard to the requirements of the degree:

The requirements for the degree shall include the submission of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) competence in the design and conduct of a research project that incorporates methodological skills appropriate to the discipline and makes a contribution to knowledge;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

Thus, if it is recommended that the thesis be PASSED (with or without amendments), the section must justify the way in which the thesis meets requirements (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). If it is recommended that it be DEFERRED or FAILED, then in the case of DEFERRED it must clearly justify why it currently fails to meet at least one of (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). In the case of FAILED, the section must clearly justify why it would not be possible to meet at least one of (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) even with amendments.

4.5 The section on *Recommendations for amendments* should provide a clear set of recommendations about what should be changed in the thesis prior to it being PASSED, or in the case of a DEFERRED thesis, resubmitted for examination. When appropriate, the section, may be divided into major changes, minor changes and typographical errors.

4.6 The section *General points for consideration* is optional. This section may contain points that an examiner would like the candidate to consider if making revisions to the thesis (but ones that are not required) or is recommending the candidate consider if preparing material for publication. It is very helpful to candidates if examiners can comment on the suitability of the research for publication. Note it is important that recommendations which the examiner believes should be addressed are clearly distinguished from those being suggested for consideration only. The former should all appear in the section *Recommendations for amendments*.

### ***Professional Doctorate (Research)***

### **Award**

A Professional Doctorate (Research) degree requires three years of full-time study or equivalent and is based on coursework and a program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff. The research component that is written up and submitted as a thesis must constitute at least 67% of the degree and consequently, it is expected that the scope of the project reported be such that it can be completed in the equivalent of two years of full-time study. In some Professional Doctorates (Research), the equivalent of two years devoted to the research component is spread through the three years of full-time enrolment, or equivalent. Consequently the research is not quite as extensive in scope as the PhD degree which involves three years of full-time research. However, it must still constitute a substantial and original contribution to knowledge.

A Professional Doctorate (Research) degree shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis once the candidate has met all coursework requirements of the degree at a satisfactory level. The requirements for the degree shall be satisfactory completion of all coursework components and completion of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) a substantial and original contribution to knowledge of direct relevance to the profession;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge with particular reference to the profession in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

### **Thesis**

- (a) The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline.
- (b) The thesis must not exceed 75,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 60,000 words. These word lengths include footnotes but do not include bibliographies and appendices.

### **Examiners**

- (a) No fewer than three examiners shall be appointed by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) upon the recommendations made by the supervisor in consultation with the professor of the discipline concerned (or when not available another senior academic) through the Head of School.
- (b) Examiners should be selected to include at least two specialists who have extensive expertise in the field or research and consideration should also be given to appointing one generalist who would be expected to have broader expertise that encompasses the area of research.
- (c) No two examiners shall be persons belonging to the same department or equivalent thereof of another university or institution.
- (d) No-one who has been a supervisor or an associate supervisor of the candidate shall be appointed as an examiner.

- (e) Unless the HDC(R) otherwise determines in exceptional circumstances, all three examiners appointed under this regulation shall be persons who are not members of the staff of this University.
- (f) Other than in exceptional circumstances, at least one examiner should be resident in Australia, and at least one should be resident in another country.
- (g) It is expected that all examiners will have a PhD or, a professional doctorate by research (or an equivalent qualification). If an examiner does not have such a degree, he or she must have a substantial record of research.



**RECOMMENDATION FORM**

**Please read sections 3 and 4 carefully before completing this form**

For reasons stated in my accompanying report, I recommend that:

- (a) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of XXXXXX without amendment or further examination
- (b) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of XXXXXX subject to the minor amendments specified in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School
- (c) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of XXXXXX subject to the substantial amendments recommended in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)
- (d) the thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination
- (e) the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Doctor of XXXXXXXX.

Signature of Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

It would be appreciated if you would fax this page and accompanying detailed report to the confidential facsimile number below to reduce delays mail deliveries may cause to the thesis examination process.

Research and Graduate Studies Office  
Facsimile: 61 3 9479 1464

## **Guidelines for Examiners of a Professional Doctorate (Research) Thesis**

### **Requirements of the degree and thesis**

A Professional Doctorate (Research) degree requires three years of full-time study or equivalent and is based on coursework and a program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff. The research component that is written up and submitted as a thesis must constitute at least 67% of the degree and consequently, it is expected that the scope of the project reported be such that it can be completed in the equivalent of two years of full-time study. In some Professional Doctorates (Research), the equivalent of two years devoted to the research component is spread through the three years of full-time enrolment, or equivalent. Consequently the research is not quite as extensive in scope as the PhD degree which involves three years of full-time research. However, it must still constitute a substantial and original contribution to knowledge.

A Professional Doctorate (Research) degree shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis once the candidate has met all coursework requirements of the degree at a satisfactory level. The requirements for the degree shall be satisfactory completion of all coursework components and completion of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) a substantial and original contribution to knowledge of direct relevance to the profession;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge with particular reference to the profession in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline. It must not exceed 75,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 60,000 words. These word lengths include footnotes but do not include bibliographies and appendices.

### **2 *Details of the examination process***

The following outlines the main points according to the University policy for the examination process. If for any reason an examiner cannot accept any part of this policy, the invitation to examine the thesis should be declined and the thesis should be returned to the Research and Graduate Studies Office.

- 2.1 Three examiners are appointed by the University Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.2 Examiners are required to examine the thesis with respect to the topic as defined by the candidate and within the research paradigm and/or methodological approach taken by the candidate. If this is not possible, either because an examiner lacks expertise with regard to the particular paradigm and methodological approach or does not recognise the paradigm and methodological approach as acceptable, then the individual should decline to act as an examiner.
- 2.3 Examiners are required to submit independent reports and should not consult other examiners, other than in exceptional circumstances either following the approval of or at the request of the Chair of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research).

- 2.4 During the examination process, there should not be any direct contact between an examiner and supervisor or candidate about the thesis. If for some reason an examiner wishes to contact the supervisor or the candidate, approval must be sought from the Chair of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research). If approval is given, all communication must be directed through the Research and Graduate Studies Office.
- 2.5 Each examiner should return the report and the thesis by the date set by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.6 All unpublished parts of the Professional Doctorate thesis and the examination process are confidential. It is understood that in agreeing to examine a thesis, examiners are agreeing to this confidentiality. Under the Examinations Regulation of this University a candidate may place an embargo on the public availability of the thesis for a period of up to three years (in exceptional circumstances the Committee might recommend it be up to thirty years). Following conclusion of the examination process an examiner should only make reference to the candidate's unpublished work if written approval from the candidate has been obtained.
- 2.7 Once the three reports have been received, the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) considers these and makes a recommendation regarding the award of the degree. If the classifications of the examiners differ to the extent that one examiner suggests the thesis be DEFERRED or FAILED and one recommends it be PASSED (with or without amendment), or if all three recommend it be DEFERRED OR FAILED, the Committee will refer the matter to a Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel. The Panel consists of the Faculty representative on Higher Degrees Committee (Research) or nominee, the Chair of the Faculty Research and Graduate Studies Committee or nominee, and at least one other senior academic who has expertise in the area of the thesis. The supervisor is not a member of the Panel but is invited to comment on the reports. The candidate also has the opportunity to comment on the reports with the examiners' names removed. The Panel is requested to bring forward a recommendation to the Committee regarding the classification of the thesis and recommended amendments.
- 2.8 Oral examinations are not a standard part of the University examination process. However, in exceptional circumstances the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) may require that the candidate attend an oral examination on the substance of the thesis and any publications appended to it and his or her knowledge of the subject background.
- 2.9 When the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has concluded its consideration of the examiners' reports and the candidate has made any required amendments to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School, or the Committee, it shall either
- (a) recommend to the Academic Board that the candidate
    - (i) be admitted to the Professional Doctorate degree , or
    - (ii) not be admitted to the degree; OR
  - (b) be invited to resubmit a revised thesis according to the guidelines provided by the Committee within a maximum period of 12 months
- 2.10 Upon the conclusion of the examination process, once the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has reached a final decision, each report with the examiner's name (unless the examiner has specifically requested his or her name be withheld) is normally made available to the supervisor and candidate
- 2.11 Upon the conclusion of the examination process, once the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has reached a final decision, each examiner will be notified formally of the outcome of the examination.

### **3 Details on the classifications**

- (a) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded a Professional Doctorate degree without amendment or further examination**

This category should be selected if, in the opinion of the examiner, no changes need to be made in order for the thesis to meet the requirements of the degree. The examiner may have identified minor points that could be addressed but is making it clear that it is not necessary to do so. In such cases the candidate would have the option of addressing these points.

- (b) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded a Professional Doctorate degree subject to the minor amendments specified in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School**

This category should be selected if the amendments including typographical errors are minor in nature and can be clearly described such that the candidate can follow these without difficulty. Such amendments would not be expected in any way to change the substance of the thesis but may include such things as some minor inaccuracies in referencing, minor errors in the description of a statistical test, a failure to have observed a particular convention in reporting results, in referencing material or in using footnotes, and clarification of the selection of participants for experimental research.

- (c) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded a Professional Doctorate degree subject to the substantial amendments recommended in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)**

This category should be selected if the amendments required are more substantial in nature. Addressing these amendments will result in larger changes to the thesis than those in (b) above, but should be able to be undertaken under the guidance of the supervisor to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) resulting in a thesis that meets the requirements of the degree.

- (d) **the thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination**

This category should be selected if in the opinion of the examiner, the thesis currently does not meet one or more of the requirements of the degree but has the potential to do so if the recommended changes are made. In contrast to option (c) the thesis clearly does not meet the requirements at present AND it cannot be assumed with confidence that the recommended changes can be addressed by the candidate, or if they are addressed will definitely lead to the thesis meeting the requirements. Thus for example, a re-analysis of data may be required and it is not clear whether the data are in a form that will allow the analysis to be conducted, or if they are, whether the re-analysis will lead to outcomes that reflect sufficiently original and/or substantial findings.

**Note it is expected that in making a recommendation for re-examination, the examiner would be prepared to re-examine the thesis if it is revised and resubmitted. If for some reason this is not possible, the examiner is asked to inform the Committee of this at the time of making the report.**

- (e) **the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded a Professional Doctorate degree**

These options should only be selected when the examiner can clearly show that the thesis does not meet at least one of the requirements 1 (i), (ii) or (iii) of the degree and why it would not be possible for the candidate to address the problems inherent in the thesis such that all requirements would be met.

#### **4 Guidelines for preparing a report**

The Higher Degrees Committee (Research) recognises that examiners may adopt different styles in preparing a report. However, the Committee expects that examiners take note of the following:

4.1 Depending on the need for detail with regard to possible amendments and the justification of the recommendation, reports generally need not be longer than two to three pages.

4.2 Examiners' reports should consist of one, two or three sections:

- (a) Justification of classification (all reports)
- (b) Recommendations for amendments (all reports except PASS no amendments, or FAIL)
- (c) General points for consideration (optional)

4.3 In preparing the report it is not necessary to provide a detailed account of the contribution of each chapter. If an examiner chooses to provide such detail, it is important that the report still contains separate sections, one justifying why the thesis does or does not meet the requirements of the degree and one if required specifying amendments.

4.4 The report should begin with a clearly identified section *Justification of classification* that provides an overview and justifies the general basis for the recommendation, with regard to the requirements of the degree:

- (i) a substantial and original contribution to knowledge of direct relevance to the profession;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge with particular reference to the profession in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

Thus, if it is recommended that the thesis be PASSED (with or without amendments), the section must justify the way in which the thesis meets requirements (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). If it is recommended that it be DEFERRED or FAILED, then in the case of DEFERRED it must clearly justify why it currently fails to meet at least one of (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). In the case of FAILED, the section must clearly justify why it would not be possible to meet at least one of (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) even with amendments.

4.5 The section on *Recommendations for amendments* should provide a clear set of recommendations about what should be changed in the thesis prior to it being PASSED, or in the case of a DEFERRED thesis, resubmitted for examination. When appropriate, the section, may be divided into major changes, minor changes and typographical errors.

4.6 The section *General points for consideration* is optional. This section may contain points that an examiner would like the candidate to consider if making revisions to the thesis (but ones that are not required) or is recommending the candidate consider if preparing material for publication. It is very helpful to candidates if examiners can comment on the suitability of the research for publication. Note it is important that recommendations which the examiner believes should be addressed are clearly distinguished from those being suggested for consideration only. The former should all appear in the section *Recommendations for amendments*.

## ***Professional Doctorate (Coursework)***

### **Award**

A Professional Doctorate (Coursework) degree requires three years of full-time study or equivalent and is based on coursework and a program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff. The research component that is written up and submitted as a thesis must constitute between 30% and 50% of the degree and consequently, it is expected that the scope of the project reported be such that it can be completed in the equivalent of one to one and a half years of full-time study. In some Professional Doctorates (Coursework) the equivalent of one to one and a half years devoted to the research component is spread through the three years of full-time enrolment, or equivalent. Consequently the research is not as extensive in scope as the PhD degree which involves three years of full-time research and hence the candidate is not required to demonstrate both a substantial and original contribution to knowledge.

A Professional Doctorate (Coursework) degree shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis once the candidate has met all coursework requirements of the degree at a satisfactory level. The requirements for the degree shall be satisfactory completion of all coursework components and completion of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) at least either an original or a substantial contribution to knowledge of direct relevance to the profession;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge with particular reference to the profession in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

### **Thesis**

- (a) The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline.
- (b) The thesis must not exceed 50,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 40,000 words. These word lengths include footnotes but do not include bibliographies and appendices.

### **Examiners**

- (a) No fewer than three examiners shall be appointed by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) upon the recommendations made by the supervisor in consultation with the professor of the discipline concerned (or when not available another senior academic) through the Head of School.
- (b) Examiners should be selected to include at least two specialists who have extensive expertise in the field or research and consideration should also be given to appointing one generalist who would be expected to have broader expertise that encompasses the area of research.
- (c) No two examiners shall be persons belonging to the same department or equivalent thereof of another university or institution.

- (d) No-one who has been a supervisor or an associate supervisor of the candidate shall be appointed as an examiner.
- (e) Unless the HDC(R) otherwise determines in exceptional circumstances, all three examiners appointed under this regulation shall be persons who are not members of the staff of this University.
- (f) Other than in exceptional circumstances, at least one examiner should be resident in Australia, and at least one should be resident in another country.
- (g) It is expected that all examiners will have a PhD or, a professional doctorate (or an equivalent qualification). If an examiner does not have such a degree, he or she must have a substantial record of research.

*Professional Doctorate (Coursework)*

**RECOMMENDATION FORM**

**Please read sections 3 and 4 carefully before completing this form**

For reasons stated in my accompanying report, I recommend that:

- (a) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of XXXXXX without amendment or further examination
  
- (b) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of XXXXXX subject to the minor amendments specified in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School
  
- (c) the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of XXXXXX subject to the substantial amendments recommended in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)
  
- (d) the thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination
  
- (e) the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Doctor of XXXXXXXX.

Signature of Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

It would be appreciated if you would fax this page and accompanying detailed report to the confidential facsimile number below to reduce delays mail deliveries may cause to the thesis examination process.

Research and Graduate Studies Office  
Facsimile: 61 3 9479 1464

## **Guidelines for Examiners of a Professional Doctorate (Coursework) Thesis**

### **1 Requirements of the degree and thesis**

A Professional Doctorate (Coursework) degree requires three years of full-time study or equivalent and is based on coursework and a program of research undertaken by the candidate, under the supervision of a member of the academic staff. The research component that is written up and submitted as a thesis must constitute between 30% and 50% of the degree and consequently, it is expected that the scope of the project reported be such that it can be completed in the equivalent of one to one and a half years of full-time study. In some Professional Doctorates (Coursework) the equivalent of one to one and a half years devoted to the research component is spread through the three years of full-time enrolment, or equivalent. Consequently the research is not as extensive in scope as the PhD degree which involves three years of full-time research and hence the candidate is not required to demonstrate both a substantial and original contribution to knowledge.

A Professional Doctorate (Coursework) degree shall be awarded without classification on the basis of examination of a thesis once the candidate has met all coursework requirements of the degree at a satisfactory level. The requirements for the degree shall be satisfactory completion of all coursework components and completion of a thesis which demonstrates:

- (i) at least either an original or a substantial contribution to knowledge of direct relevance to the profession;
- (ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge with particular reference to the profession in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;
- (iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;
- (iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

The thesis should be written as concisely as possible, free from typographical errors and in a format appropriate to the discipline. It must not exceed 50,000 words and it is recommended that it not exceed 40,000 words. These word lengths include footnotes but do not include bibliographies and appendices.

### **2 Details of the examination process**

The following outlines the main points according to the University policy for the examination process. If for any reason an examiner cannot accept any part of this policy, the invitation to examine the thesis should be declined and the thesis should be returned to the Research and Graduate Studies Office.

- 2.1 Three examiners are appointed by the University Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.2 Examiners are required to examine the thesis with respect to the topic as defined by the candidate and within the research paradigm and/or methodological approach taken by the candidate. If this is not possible, either because an examiner lacks expertise with regard to the particular paradigm and methodological approach or does not recognise the paradigm and methodological approach as acceptable, then the individual should decline to act as an examiner.
- 2.3 Examiners are required to submit independent reports and should not consult other examiners, other than in exceptional circumstances either following the approval of or at the request of the Chair of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research).

- 2.4 During the examination process, there should not be any direct contact between an examiner and supervisor or candidate about the thesis. If for some reason an examiner wishes to contact the supervisor or the candidate, approval must be sought from the Chair of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research). If approval is given, all communication must be directed through the Research and Graduate Studies Office.
- 2.5 Each examiner should return the report and the thesis by the date set by the Higher Degrees Committee (Research).
- 2.6 All unpublished parts of the Professional Doctorate thesis and the examination process are confidential. It is understood that in agreeing to examine a thesis, examiners are agreeing to this confidentiality. Under the Examinations Regulation of this University a candidate may place an embargo on the public availability of the thesis for a period of up to three years (in exceptional circumstances the Committee might recommend it be up to thirty years). Following conclusion of the examination process an examiner should only make reference to the candidate's unpublished work if written approval from the candidate has been obtained.
- 2.7 Once the three reports have been received, the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) considers these and makes a recommendation regarding the award of the degree. If the classifications of the examiners differ to the extent that one examiner suggests the thesis be DEFERRED or FAILED and one recommends it be PASSED (with or without amendment), or if all three recommend it be DEFERRED OR FAILED, the Committee will refer the matter to a Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel. The Panel consists of the Faculty representative on Higher Degrees Committee (Research) or nominee, the Chair of the Faculty Research and Graduate Studies Committee or nominee, and at least one other senior academic who has expertise in the area of the thesis. The supervisor is not a member of the Panel but is invited to comment on the reports. The candidate also has the opportunity to comment on the reports with the examiners' names removed. The Panel is requested to bring forward a recommendation to the Committee regarding the classification of the thesis and recommended amendments.
- 2.8 Oral examinations are not a standard part of the University examination process. However, in exceptional circumstances the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) may require that the candidate attend an oral examination on the substance of the thesis and any publications appended to it and his or her knowledge of the subject background.
- 2.9 When the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has concluded its consideration of the examiners' reports and the candidate has made any required amendments to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School, or the Committee, it shall either
- (a) recommend to the Academic Board that the candidate
    - (i) be admitted to the Professional Doctorate degree , or
    - (ii) not be admitted to the degree; OR
  - (b) be invited to resubmit a revised thesis according to the guidelines provided by the Committee within a maximum period of 12 months
- 2.10 Upon the conclusion of the examination process, once the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has reached a final decision, each report with the examiner's name (unless the examiner has specifically requested his or her name be withheld) is normally made available to the supervisor and candidate.
- 2.11 Upon the conclusion of the examination process, once the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) has reached a final decision, each examiner will be notified formally of the outcome of the examination.

### **3 Details on the classifications**

- (a) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded a Professional Doctorate degree without amendment or further examination**

This category should be selected if, in the opinion of the examiner, no changes need to be made in order for the thesis to meet the requirements of the degree. The examiner may have identified minor points that could be addressed but is making it clear that it is not necessary to do so. In such cases the candidate would have the option of addressing these points.

- (b) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded a Professional Doctorate degree subject to the minor amendments specified in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the supervisor and Head of School**

This category should be selected if the amendments including typographical errors are minor in nature and can be clearly described such that the candidate can follow these without difficulty. Such amendments would not be expected in any way to change the substance of the thesis but may include such things as some minor inaccuracies in referencing, minor errors in the description of a statistical test, a failure to have observed a particular convention in reporting results, in referencing material or in using footnotes, and clarification of the selection of participants for experimental research.

- (c) **the thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded a Professional Doctorate degree subject to the substantial amendments recommended in my report and the correction of any typographical errors being made to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research)**

This category should be selected if the amendments required are more substantial in nature. Addressing these amendments will result in larger changes to the thesis than those in (b) above, but should be able to be undertaken under the guidance of the supervisor to the satisfaction of the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) resulting in a thesis that meets the requirements of the degree.

- (d) **the thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination**

This category should be selected if in the opinion of the examiner, the thesis currently does not meet one or more of the requirements of the degree but has the potential to do so if the recommended changes are made. In contrast to option (c) the thesis clearly does not meet the requirements at present AND it cannot be assumed with confidence that the recommended changes can be addressed by the candidate, or if they are addressed will definitely lead to the thesis meeting the requirements. Thus for example, a re-analysis of data may be required and it is not clear whether the data are in a form that will allow the analysis to be conducted, or if they are, whether the re-analysis will lead to outcomes that reflect sufficiently original and/or substantial findings.

Note it is expected that in making a recommendation for re-examination, the examiner would be prepared to re-examine the thesis if it is revised and resubmitted. If for some reason this is not possible, the examiner is asked to inform the Committee of this at the time of making the report.

- (e) **the thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded a Professional Doctorate degree**

These options should only be selected when the examiner can clearly show that the thesis does not meet at least one of the requirements (i), (ii) or (iii) of the degree and why it would not be possible for the candidate to address the problems inherent in the thesis such that all requirements would be met.

#### **4 Guidelines for preparing a report.**

The Higher Degrees Committee (Research) recognises that examiners may adopt different styles in preparing a report. However, the Committee expects that examiners take note of the following:

4.1 Depending on the need for detail with regard to possible amendments and the justification of the recommendation, reports generally need not be longer than two to three pages.

4.2 Examiners' reports should consist of one, two or three sections:

- (a) Justification of classification (all reports)
- (b) Recommendations for amendments (all reports except PASS no amendments, or FAIL)
- (c) General points for consideration (optional)

4.3 In preparing the report it is not necessary to provide a detailed account of the contribution of each chapter. If an examiner chooses to provide such detail, it is important that the report still contains separate sections, one justifying why the thesis does or does not meet the requirements of the degree and one if required specifying amendments.

4.4 The report should begin with a clearly identified section *Justification of classification* that provides an overview and justifies the general basis for the recommendation, with regard to the requirements of the degree:

(i) at least either an original or a substantial contribution to knowledge of direct relevance to the profession;

(ii) the candidate's ability to provide a critical appraisal of relevant literature and available research, to appreciate and understand the relationship of the investigations undertaken by the candidate to the wider field of knowledge with particular reference to the profession in which these investigations are located, and to draw out the contribution to knowledge made by these investigations;

(iii) the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the methodological techniques used in the research and any shortcomings associated with these techniques;

(iv) a satisfactory level of literary presentation reflecting an ability to communicate in a clear, concise and authoritative manner appropriate to the discipline and to the professional arena to which it is addressed.

Thus, if it is recommended that the thesis be PASSED (with or without amendments), the section must justify the way in which the thesis meets requirements (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). If it is recommended that it be DEFERRED or FAILED, then in the case of DEFERRED it must clearly justify why it currently fails to meet at least one of (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). In the case of FAILED, the section must clearly justify why it would not be possible to meet at least one of (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), even with amendments.

4.5 The section on *Recommendations for amendments* should provide a clear set of recommendations about what should be changed in the thesis prior to it being PASSED, or in the case of a DEFERRED thesis, resubmitted for examination. When appropriate, the section, may be divided into major changes, minor changes and typographical errors.

4.6 The section *General points for consideration* is optional. This section may contain points that an examiner would like the candidate to consider if making revisions to the thesis (but ones that are not required) or is recommending the candidate consider if preparing material for publication. It is very helpful to candidates if examiners can comment on the suitability of the research for publication. Note it is important that recommendations which the examiner believes should be addressed are clearly distinguished from those being suggested for consideration only. The former should all appear in the section *Recommendations for amendments*.

## **APPENDIX B**

### ***Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee*** **AVCC CODE OF PRACTICE FOR MAINTAINING AND MONITORING** **ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS IN HIGHER DEGREES**

**Contents**

**Publishing Information**

**Foreword**

**1 Higher Degrees**

1.1 Definitions

**2 Responsibilities**

2.1 Responsibilities of the institution

2.2 Responsibility of the academic unit(s) (e.g. Department)

2.3 Responsibilities of the Supervisor

2.4 Responsibilities of the Candidate

**3 Admission**

**4 Supervision**

**5 The Topic**

**6 Reports**

**7 Grievance Procedures**

**8 Examination**

**9 Appeals**

**10 Intellectual Property**

**11 Moral Rights**

**12 Professional Doctorates**

**Other AVCC Publications**

## **PUBLISHING INFORMATION**

© Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (ACN 008 502 930)

ISBN: 0 7266 0352 X

This work is copyright-free to universities and other relevant bodies provided that attribution of authorship is made to the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (AVCC). Apart from such use all rights in copyright are reserved.

Further Enquiries may be directed to:  
The Executive Director  
Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee  
GPO Box 1142  
Canberra ACT 2601

Phone: (02) 6285 8200  
Facsimile: (02) 6285 8211  
E-mail: [publications@avcc.edu.au](mailto:publications@avcc.edu.au)  
Internet: <http://www.avcc.edu.au/avcc/pubs/cophd.htm>

## **FOREWORD**

In 1987, the AVCC published a booklet *Code of Practice for Maintaining and Monitoring Academic Quality and Standards*. It was emphasised in that booklet that it was the responsibility of each institution to develop effective internal procedures for monitoring standards and quality, and suggested that the Code could be used as a guide to help universities formulate procedures appropriate to their own situation.

The Code was revised in 1990 in recognition of the dramatic changes in the higher education system in Australia which had occurred since the document was first released, and of the way policies were being developed externally which affected both research and the research degrees of universities. The continual impact of the increasing demand for accountability, externally and to students themselves cannot be ignored.

Given the ready acceptance by institutions of the Code, and its widely perceived usefulness as cited in *Learning for Life*, the final report of the Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy, April 1998, the AVCC has thought it timely to amend and revise the Code in the light of the current environment in which research is conducted. The intent remains the same: to build upon the experience of institutions and to establish general guidelines from the relevant parts of existing protocols to assist in the revision or development of institution-specific procedures. These guidelines consequently draw heavily in various parts on those already in place in Australian universities.

Elements of the guidelines will be applicable to all postgraduate degrees (and some at undergraduate level) containing a significant research component, for example, professional doctorates and coursework degrees with a significant research project. Some aspects of the guidelines also apply to the coursework component of these degrees.

Professor John Niland, AO  
President

July, 1998

## **1. HIGHER DEGREES**

### **1.1 Definitions**

#### 1.1.1 Masters by research

Masters by Research degrees generally have the objective of training students in research methodology and techniques and in their critical evaluation, appropriate to their field of study, and in the application of such methodology by conducting a specified program of research under appropriate supervision. In addition, such degrees require training in analysing the literature and debate in the substantive area of the thesis topic at an advanced level.

Examiners of a Masters degree should satisfy themselves that the student: has a thorough understanding of the relevant techniques in the field demonstrated both by their application and a thorough review of the literature; has managed to demonstrate competence in the chosen field through judicious selection and application of methods to yield fruitful results has the capacity critically to evaluate these results; and has the capacity to present well written work.

#### 1.1.2 PhD degrees

PhD degrees provide training and education with the objective of producing graduates with the capacity to conduct research independently at a high level of originality and quality. The student ought to be capable by the end of his/her candidature of conceiving, designing and carrying to completion a research program without supervision. The PhD candidate should uncover new knowledge either by the discovery of new facts, the formulation of theories or the innovative re-interpretation of known data and established ideas.

Examiners will expect a thesis to be well written and to reveal an independence of thought and approach, a deep knowledge of the field of study and to have made a significant original contribution to knowledge consistent with 3-4 years of supervised research training.

#### 1.1.3 Professional Doctorates

The Professional Doctorate is specific to a discipline, aimed primarily at practitioners in the field. The program of study would be expected to include advanced coursework, project activity and a research component.

## **2. RESPONSIBILITIES**

Research training at a tertiary institution involves the active participation of both staff and students. The responsibility to ensure that it is conducted in the most efficient and effective manner is shared by all parties: the institution, its academic units and staff, and the students, all have obligations to each other. These should be clearly set out in documentation given to the student at the time of admission.

The documentation should include: a copy of the information to be given to the student by the academic unit, the policy on student progression and reports, the Regulations governing the appropriate degree, library rules, grievance procedures, the policy relating to intellectual property as it affects students, information relating to students rights and obligations, the guidelines for supervisors - all best provided as extracts from appropriate policies and regulations.

### 2.1 Responsibilities of the institution

The institution has the responsibility to establish a policy framework within which academic unit-specific policies can be developed. The institution is responsible for general policies related to:

2.1.1 clearly specified entry standards which apply with due regard to discipline, and which are set to ensure that enrolling students are likely to have the capacity to succeed given adequate commitment;

2.1.2 access to physical facilities and resources (including library resources and support) which, while

varying between different parts of the institution, should be made clear to students at the outset;

2.1.3 ethics clearances procedures concerning matters such as informed consent, deception and debriefing;

2.1.4 the status of intellectual property arising from the work of students as part of their studies;

2.1.5 minimum reporting requirements;

2.1.6 procedures by which either the student or the supervisor may make representations as appropriate should significant difficulties arise (grievance procedures, appeals);

2.1.7 a procedure which, while enabling inexperienced staff to assist with supervision, makes clear a process by which assistance may be sought (either by the supervisor or the student) should it be required. In general, inexperienced staff should begin as joint supervisors only [cross ref. 4.5];

2.1.8 explicit procedures relating to all aspects of the examination process, including clear guidelines for examiners (and for candidates) outlining the institution's expectations for the particular degree; and

2.1.9 in the case of students whose research is conducted in collaboration with other entities such as Cooperative Research Centres or industrial partners, any specific variations in the status of intellectual property or other rules relating to the candidacy should be clearly explained in writing.

2.2 Responsibility of the academic unit(s) (e.g. Department)

It is the responsibility of the academic unit(s) to ensure that:

2.2.1 the student meets the requirements set down by the institution for admission to candidature;

2.2.2 the proposed research project is appropriate for the degree;

2.2.3 the unit is appropriate for the research to be undertaken, and has the space, facilities and resources the work may need;

2.2.4 the proposed supervisor(s) is/are sufficiently expert in the area of research, and has/have the time and commitment, to be able to offer the student quality supervision;

2.2.5 high quality supervision can be provided and maintained throughout the research period;

2.2.6 appropriate opportunities are provided, by way of seminars and the like, for students to develop their skills at presenting their work as well as facilitating their integration into a cohesive group;

2.2.7 appropriate opportunities are provided for students to interact with and develop profitable intellectual relationships with one another;

2.2.8 all new candidates are provided with a statement which sets out the procedures by which students may make representation to the Head of the unit or other designated officer if they believe that their work is not proceeding satisfactorily for reasons outside their control;

2.2.9 an appropriate procedure is established for dealing with unresolved conflicts between supervisor(s) and students, in line with institutional policy;

2.2.10 each candidate has written guidelines concerning ethical and safety procedures appropriate to the discipline;

2.2.11 alternative supervisory expertise is provided should the principal supervisor for any reason cease to be an employee of the university; and

2.2.12 appropriate supervisory arrangements and access to resources are established for part-time and external students (onshore and offshore) [cross ref. 3.2].

### 2.3 Responsibilities of the Supervisor

The supervisor has responsibilities which include:

- 2.3.1 providing appropriate academic support throughout the candidature to enable the candidate to achieve the highest standard of research s/he is capable of;
- 2.3.2 suggesting ways that the candidate can make the most effective use of time. This will involve discussing the nature of research with the student and the standard expected for particular degrees, the choice of the research topic, the planning of the research program, and the availability of library resources in the field and bibliographical and technical assistance;
- 2.3.3 maintaining close and regular contact with the student and establishing at the beginning the basis on which contact will be made. This will facilitate the supervisor's role in advising the student on the pace of progress, and ensuring that a reasonable timetable is set to permit the degree to be completed in the appropriate time;
- 2.3.4 requiring written work from the student on a pre-arranged and agreed schedule so that their progress can be assessed at regular intervals;
- 2.3.5 monitoring carefully the performance of the student relative to the standard required for the degree, and ensuring that inadequate progress or work below the standard generally expected is brought to the student's attention. The supervisor should help with developing solutions to problems as they are identified;
- 2.3.6 using the regular reporting procedures established by the institution as the minimum means by which any difficulties and problems discussed with the student during the year are noted; and supervisors should indicate the action taken or advice given. If the problem is not resolved, the Head of the academic unit, in the first instance should be involved; and the Head and the relevant institutional committee should be notified in writing of continuing problems between reporting periods;
- 2.3.7 comment on the content and the drafts of the thesis and, at the time of submission, certify that the thesis is properly presented, conforms to the Regulations and is therefore, prima facie, worthy of examination;
- 2.3.8 advise the relevant institutional committee of the names and credentials of suitable examiners;
- 2.3.9 fulfilling other institution-specific obligations regarding supervision; and
- 2.3.10 providing career advice and assistance as appropriate.

### 2.4 Responsibilities of the Candidate

The responsibilities of the candidate include:

- 2.4.1 diligently and intelligently proceeding with the research as agreed between the candidate and the supervisor;
- 2.4.2 becoming familiar with, and abiding by, the institution's Regulations governing the degree;
- 2.4.3 discussing with the supervisor the type of help considered most useful, and keeping to an agreed schedule of meetings which will ensure regular contact;
- 2.4.4 taking the initiative in raising problems or difficulties and sharing responsibility for seeking solutions;
- 2.4.5 maintaining the progress of the work in accordance with the stages agreed with the supervisor, including in particular the presentation of any required written material in sufficient time to allow for comments and discussions before proceeding to the next stage;
- 2.4.6 discuss the progress towards, and impediments to, maintaining the agreed timetable with the

supervisor at regular intervals;

2.4.7 providing a formal report to the appropriate committee, through the supervisor, at periods specified by the institution;

2.4.8 adopting at all times, safe working practices relevant to the field of research and adhering to the ethical practices appropriate to the discipline and the institution; and

2.4.9 accepting the responsibility for producing the final copies of the thesis, its content, and ensuring that it is in accord with the relevant requirements, including the standard of presentation.

### **3. ADMISSION**

Criteria for admission to a degree program should include not only academic qualifications and, where appropriate, professional experience but also the feasibility of the proposed course of study in the department, the availability of supervision, adequate infrastructure and other resources, and where candidates are in employment, the capacity to meet the time and other requirements of candidature.

3.1 The institution should avoid mis-matches between students and supervisors. Emphasis should be placed, therefore, on investigating students' interests and background and their match with resources and available expertise, preferably in advance. Student enquiries should be responded to in a timely manner.

3.2 Since part-time students and external students (onshore and offshore) often have other obligations, the criteria for admission could include availability for study and interaction with the supervisor, level of motivation and capacity to cope [cross ref. 2.2.12].

3.3 Where there is doubt about the candidate's academic preparedness for the proposed degree, they should first be admitted to probationary candidature lasting no more than 12 months. Institutions may, in the case of doctoral degrees, require admission initially into a masters program. In cases where probationary enrolment strikes problems, the institution should provide clear paths for conversion of enrolment to an appropriate alternative academic program.

### **4. SUPERVISION**

4.1 Supervisors should ensure that research students have accurate information about any planned, long period of leave (or retirement) during the candidature and the arrangements made to provide for supervision during absences.

4.2 Co-supervisors should be appointed at the outset of the program, particularly if any lengthy absences of the principal supervisor are planned or if expertise additional to that provided by the supervisor(s) is required. This could be a staff member from the same institution, from another institution or from industry.

Any co-supervisor should be involved as soon as practicable in the development of the candidate's research plan and should maintain a level of communication with the candidate and the supervisor to allow adequate supervision whenever necessary.

4.3 If a co-supervisor(s) is appointed, the place of primary responsibility must be clear. The principal supervisor, normally a member of the academic staff of the institution, carries the responsibility of co-ordinating communication between the supervisors and the student.

4.4 In some cases, e.g. where the topic is multi-disciplinary or staff are inexperienced, an advisory committee could be formed to advise the student and any possible advantages of team supervision could also be explored. Whatever supervisory arrangement, however, the place of primary responsibility must be made clear.

4.5 Staff with proven and current research records and experience in supervision should normally be preferred for sole supervision of a candidate, and then only if absences and the like can be adequately

covered. Less experienced members of staff should be co-supervisors in the first instance and supported by appropriate mentoring and/or training [cross ref. 2.1.6].

## **5. THE TOPIC**

5.1 If the topic is not defined prior to enrolment, it should be specified no later than six months, preferably three, into the candidature; scholarship regulations will influence how much lead-time is available.

5.2 Provision should be made in the regulations for changes to the title at the time of drafting the final version of the thesis to reflect accurately the research.

## **6. REPORTS**

Written reports from the student and the supervisor are an important and formal means by which any problems concerning the candidature can be identified. They also serve to keep the appropriate officers of the institution informed.

Supervisors and candidates should be aware that, in the eventuality of disputations during the course of candidature, written reports will be of prime importance; and therefore these reports must be frank appraisals by both the supervisor and the student of the student's progress. The report is the means by which the institution assesses whether the candidature should continue. They should be prepared at least annually.

6.1 Report forms should be circulated to students in time to allow the supervisor and the Head of the academic unit to view and comment on the report prior to re-enrolment for the following year.

6.2 Reports should be monitored by an institutional committee with responsibility for postgraduate teaching and research on behalf of the institution.

6.3 Each Faculty and/or academic unit should establish particular requirements tailored to their disciplines; the institutional policy should include the need for the reports to be seen by the student after the supervisor and the Head have added their comments to the report. Openness at this stage could obviate problems later.

6.4 The policy relating to student reports should make clear what happens to the reports, and how they may be used.

## **7. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES**

Institutions should have established grievance procedures for dealing with problems arising from a candidature which permit the student access to the most appropriate person (e.g. a Head of unit, Dean, a Chair of a Postgraduate Studies or Higher Degrees Committee or a Deputy/Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), or an institutional committee charged with the overall responsibility for postgraduate students.

The grievance procedures should be designed to permit the investigation of problems arising during the candidature, and assist in formulating acceptable solutions.

## 8. EXAMINATION

Because of the special nature of research degrees, where the students could have uniquely expert understanding of the field, they will also have a special relationship with their examiners. The students are not examined only to establish the extent of their understanding of a body of existing knowledge. They are examined by individuals who must judge their approach to research, their construction of hypotheses, their arguments and their analyses and who will be their peers if the degree is awarded. The selection of examiners is therefore of critical importance.

8.1 Steps should be taken to ensure that examiners are free from bias, in relation to the student or the supervisor; this could be assessed by a general discussion of possible examiners with the student and any co-supervisors although care must be taken not to jeopardise the integrity and independence of the examination process.

8.2 Examiners should normally still be active in research/scholarship thus ensuring that their knowledge of the field is current.

8.3 They should have empathy with the theoretical framework used by the student.

8.4 They should be made familiar with the requirements of the institution and the essential parts of the Regulations governing the particular research degree.

8.5 Possible examiners and their credentials should be submitted to the relevant institutional committee by the supervisor or Head of department (who will normally have consulted with the student to guard against bias and other problems) and appointed by the University.

8.6 The institution should have procedures developed to guard against inordinate delays in the examination process. Institutions should require that examiners undertake to complete the examination of the thesis within, for example, three months of receipt. Examiners should be required to provide a statement of agreement to examine within a stated period of time.

8.7 The institution may need to ensure that examiners are aware of any Commercial-in-Confidence work incorporated into the thesis.

8.8 The institution should have a clear set of procedures for dealing with conflicting judgement by examiners.

## 9. APPEALS

The complex and special role of examiners of research degrees indicates that institutions should establish procedures which give a student, in certain circumstances, the right of appeal against the examination process and/or evaluation of their candidature. Appeals should be permitted on procedural grounds only: appeals by candidates simply rejecting the assessment of the merit of their work should not be permitted. Nor should the procedures permit an appeal on grounds of complaint about the inadequacy of supervisory or other arrangements during the period of study; the grievance procedures should be used at the appropriate time.

Procedures and machinery for implementing appeals should be established on a permanent not ad hoc basis. Each institution should develop procedures and ensure that each student is fully aware of the institutional practices.

The grounds for appeal against a decision not to award a postgraduate research degree or not to allow re-submission, could include:

- i. procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination;
- ii. circumstances affecting the student's performance of which the examiners were not aware; and
- iii. documentable evidence of prejudice or of bias on the part of one or more of the examiners.

In general, the candidate would need to make a case to the relevant Dean, Deputy/Pro-Vice-Chancellor or equivalent who will decide whether a case exists, prima facie, and will take action as specified in the procedures.

The possible outcomes of an appeal, ranging from rejection to permission to re-submit the thesis, should be made clear to the student. Where an appeal is upheld, any required additional work by the student in the nature of amendments or revision should be clearly specified.

## **10. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**

It is important that the candidates be made aware of the institution's policy relating to intellectual property before embarking on the research. The policy should be made available to the candidate at the time of enrolment.

10.1 Each institution should have a policy on the ownership of intellectual property particularly any generated by students in the course of their work (study) within the institution. Any understandings that are written must be consistent with this policy.

10.2 If a candidate is to be involved in work which could result in the generation of intellectual property and/or is funded by a contractual arrangement, the candidate should be fully informed by the supervisor, in writing, of any particular conditions or contracts which could either restrict disclosure or affect the extent to which communication with colleagues is possible during the course of the work and on its completion. For example, students working in Cooperative Research Centres or funded by Australian Postgraduate Awards (Industry) or industry scholarships need to be clearly informed at the beginning of their candidature about the arrangements concerning intellectual property which may conflict with or override the University's policy in this area.

If the candidate agrees to take part in such a project, a written agreement on the conditions of disclosure and related matters, should be concluded over the signatures of the candidate, principal supervisor(s) and Head of the unit(s) concerned.

Any company involved in such a project should be clearly informed of the institution policy regarding student involvement. The institution should ensure that the research program is not unreasonably influenced by commercial or industrial factors.

10.3 Any delay in publication, e.g. while patentability is investigated and patent specifications are drawn up and lodged, should be as limited as possible. The normal maximum delay in publication is 12 months.

10.4 The policy should require that the candidate, the supervisor and the Head must meet and produce a written understanding should patentable intellectual property be generated unexpectedly and hence in the absence of an initial agreement.

10.5 The policy should be sensitive to the legal consequences of publication of "intellectual property" in theses which may vary between the States and Territories.

10.6 The policy should be clear on access to theses and any confidentiality requirements of the examination process, including provision for confidentiality agreements with examiners should that be deemed necessary.

Restricted access to theses should only be considered by an institution when a case is made and only agreed to in compelling circumstances. Such circumstances could include commercial confidences, but not simply the denial of access by other scholars to what purports, after all, to be an advance in knowledge. When granted, restricted access should be for a limited time, and as short a period as possible.

10.7 Agreement should be reached between the student and supervisor concerning authorship of publications and acknowledgement of contributions during and after the candidature. There should be open and mutual recognition of the candidate's and supervisor's contribution on all published work arising from the project.

10.8 No policy should be developed which prevents candidates from meeting all the requirements of the higher degree regulations.

## **11. MORAL RIGHTS**

11.1 Academic endeavour is centred on the generation, exploration and expansion of new and original ideas. The intellectual work undertaken by higher degree students is the foundation of their future careers. Supervisors and institutions have a key responsibility to assist students in publishing their work both during the course of candidature and immediately following submission of their theses.

11.2 Joint publication is one significant way in which a supervisor can assist a student in these terms. However, care needs to be taken, in the context of what is a power imbalance between supervisor and student, to ensure supervisors do not usurp credit for a student's work. To ensure that this does not happen and that possibilities of misunderstanding are minimised, supervisors and students should negotiate the basis for acknowledgement of joint authorship, particularly the order in which authorship is listed, in the early stages of a student's candidature, and preferably before the research is conducted. Supervisors should adhere to existing AVCC guidelines relating to publication and authorship, treating their students as colleagues in this regard; and respect the ethical guidelines that might be laid down by the profession associated with their discipline.

## **12. PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATES**

12.1 The major means of education and training at the doctoral level in Australia has been the PhD undertaken by research and thesis. Recently, however, there has been a significant increase in professional doctorates. The objectives of a doctoral degree in a specified professional field are:

- to provide postgraduate opportunities in professional fields for students whose background and experience are appropriate to pursue leadership in the professions;
- to provide extended and advanced training in professional fields where projects and investigations are more applied in nature and more obviously oriented to professional practice; and
- to enhance relationships between the higher education sector and the professions

12.2 Professional Doctorates differ from PhDs in at least the following respects:

- whereas the PhD program is designed to equip candidates to be researchers, the professional doctorate is designed to equip candidates to be critical consumers of research;
- the nature of professional doctorates makes them especially amenable to supervision by a larger number of persons. Moreover, the focus of professional doctorates is compatible with supervision being provided in part from the relevant professional area. Where teams of supervisors are used, the inclusion of an associate supervisor or external co-supervisor who is a practitioner in the relevant professional area is considered desirable;
- the process of re-defining a thesis topic as outlined under Section 5.1 above is not necessarily relevant to professional doctorates; and
- panels of experts may be used to examine a professional doctorate thesis.

## OTHER AVCC PUBLICATIONS

Institutions should be familiar with the following AVCC documents in as far as they relate to higher degree candidature issues:

1. University Research: Some Issues, February 1996, (Part II) Conditions of Acceptance of Research Funds  
Available Online: <http://www.avcc.edu.au/avcc/pubs/urissues.htm>
2. **Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice, May 1997**  
Available Online: <http://www.avcc.edu.au/avcc/pubs/glrespra.htm>
3. **Ownership of Intellectual Property in Universities: A Discussion Paper, December 1995**  
Available Online: <http://www.avcc.edu.au/avcc/pubs/ooipiu.htm>
4. **Universities and their Students: Expectations and Responsibilities, November 1994;**  
Available Online: <http://www.avcc.edu.au/avcc/pubs/gluaths.htm>
5. **Guidelines on Postgraduate Fee Courses for Australian Students, February 1997**  
Available Online: <http://www.avcc.edu.au/avcc/pubs/glpostg.htm>
6. **Guidelines Relating to Students with Disabilities, December 1996**  
Available Online: <http://www.avcc.edu.au/avcc/pubs/gldisab.htm>
7. **Code of Ethical Practice in the Provision of Education to International Students by Australian Universities, August 1998;**  
Available Online: <http://www.avcc.edu.au/avcc/pubs/code.htm>

**Guide to Forms to Vary Enrolment Details and Submit Thesis**

**Application to amend personal details** – *To change name or address.*

**Application for a higher degree candidate for concurrent enrolment** – *Seek admission to enrol in subjects while undertaking a research degree.*

**Notice of Intention to Submit a Higher Degree Thesis for Examination** – *Notice to the University of the anticipated submission date of the thesis and information on format and binding requirements. (See Appendix D)*

- C** **Application to change courseload for higher degree research candidature and suspend a postgraduate scholarship (where applicable)** - *To change from a full-time to part-time courseload or vice-versa.*
- E** **Application to extend higher degree research candidature and/or postgraduate research scholarship** - *To extend candidature and/or duration of scholarship.*
- L** **Application for sick leave or maternity leave. Higher degree research candidature and a post graduate research scholarship(where applicable)** - *To suspend (take leave of absence) research candidature due to sickness or to apply for maternity leave. If on scholarship, to apply for paid or unpaid leave due to sickness or to apply for maternity leave.*
- N** **Notification of commencement or resumption of a postgraduate scholarship and/or higher degree research candidature** - *To recommence candidature, scholarship or both after a period of suspension of studies (leave of absence) or to commence a scholarship as a newly enrolled student.*
- O** **Application for outside research or off-campus status for higher degree research candidature** - *To study off campus, within Australia or overseas for a period of time during candidature.*
- R** **Application to revive higher degree research candidature** - *To revive candidature after termination of candidature.*
- S** **Application to suspend higher degree research candidature and/or postgraduate scholarship** - *To suspend (take leave of absence) studies for a period of time and/or scholarship.*
- SV** **Application to vary supervision details** - *To change or add a principal supervisor and/or co-supervisor. To appoint an associate supervisor or external co-supervisor from another institution.*
- T** **Application to change research topic** - *To amend the research topic.*
- U** **Application to upgrade from Masters to PhD candidature** - *To transfer Masters candidature to Doctor of Philosophy candidature.*
- W** **Total withdrawal from higher degree research candidature** - *To cease higher degree studies by withdrawing from the course.*

FORM A

**NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT A HIGHER DEGREE  
THESIS FOR EXAMINATION**

Family name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other names: \_\_\_\_\_ Mr/Ms/Mrs/Miss: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_ School: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Degree undertaken: \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor(s): \_\_\_\_\_

I hereby give notice of my intention to submit for examination my thesis to be entitled :

\_\_\_\_\_

Anticipated submission date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

*I acknowledge that if my thesis is not lodged with the RGSO in accordance with Schedule B of the Examinations and Assessment Regulation (copy attached) within 6 months of the NOI being submitted to the RGSO, this current NOI will lapse and a new NOI will be required a minimum of 3 months before the new submission date. Please indicate if this is a renewed NOI.*

Candidate's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

I confirm that the anticipated submission date as detailed above is a realistic date for completion of the thesis

Supervisor (s)	Head of School or Postgraduate Co-ordinator
Please print names	Please print name
Date:	Date:

**Please Note:** Candidates need to have a *current enrolment* (and have been enrolled in the previous semester) to be able to submit their thesis. International students wishing to extend their visa, once they have submitted their thesis, should contact an International Student Advisor in the International Programs Office for advice.

- 1. NOTICE OF INTENTION (FORM A)**  
Candidates are required to give at least three months notice of intention to submit a thesis for examination using this form. This time is necessary to enable suitable examiners to be recommended, appointed and their availability established. Insufficient notice may cause delay in securing examiners and therefore in sending a thesis for examination.
- 2. SUMMARY OF THESIS - FOR THE INFORMATION OF PROSPECTIVE EXAMINERS (FORM B)**  
A typed summary, using not more than 300 words, is required with the notice of intention because it is information essential to inviting prospective examiners to accept appointment. Be sure that you return the summary with your notice so that it is ready to send to prospective examiners, and delay in appointment is not incurred. Your summary may not be glued or taped to Form B.

.../2

**3. CHECK LIST TO BE SUBMITTED WHEN LODGING A HIGHER DEGREE THESIS FOR EXAMINATION (FORM C)**

A check list is attached as Form C and is designed to ensure that your thesis will conform with Schedule B of the Examinations and Assessment Regulation (R.21.12). Please complete, date and sign the form and submit it with the **four** copies (**three** for Masters) of your thesis for examination.

**4. CERTIFICATE FROM YOUR SUPERVISOR(S) (FORM D)**

A certificate, completed by your supervisor(s), must accompany your thesis when submitted for examination. Please keep in mind that :

- the thesis cannot be sent for examination until the completed certificate has been provided;
- it is the candidate's responsibility to arrange for completion of the certificate, by referring it to his or her supervisor(s) with a copy of the final typed thesis (before being bound) and a copy (attached) of Schedule B to Regulation 21.12 – Examinations and Assessment (Presentation of a Thesis);
- if a candidate has more than one supervisor, a certificate completed and signed by each (either jointly or separately) is required, and
- **FOUR COPIES OF A DOCTORAL AND THREE COPIES OF A MASTERS THESIS MUST BE SUBMITTED.**

**5. PRESENTATION OF YOUR THESIS**

Attached is a copy of Schedule B (Presentation of a Thesis) for your information and referral to your supervisor(s). This schedule sets out all the technical requirements and you are urged to study it carefully, well in advance of the final manuscript, observe the stipulations on maximum permissible word length, consult your supervisor(s) and ensure before you proceed to photocopying and binding that your thesis, when submitted, will meet the requirements.

The Higher Degrees Committee (Research) calls your attention especially to the requirement that you proof read your thesis and that all spelling, grammatical and punctuation errors be corrected before lodging the thesis for examination. Your examiners may recommend that a thesis be deferred for re-examination or failed (if necessary) if the number of errors is thought to indicate the thesis does not reach an acceptable standard for a higher degree.

**6. CLAIM FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS IN PRESENTING A THESIS**

Candidates who hold or have held an Australian Postgraduate Award or a La Trobe University Postgraduate Scholarship within the past twenty-four months should contact the Research and Graduate Studies Office, to obtain the appropriate claim form or further information. Please note that signed and dated original receipts must accompany a claim form. Reimbursement covers University requirements only.

**7. NATIONAL LIBRARY OF AUSTRALIA**

This Library is interested to know about successful theses; if it wishes to have a copy, it will make payment and guarantee to honour any restrictions as to access. If you wish to pursue an enquiry, please write directly to :

Chief Librarian, National Library of Australia  
Parkes Place  
Canberra, ACT 2600

(ref: SC2685A/9707-NOL.FORM.A

FORM B

**SUMMARY OF THESIS FOR THE INFORMATION OF PROSPECTIVE EXAMINERS**

(Required with your Notice of Intention - Form A)

Please type on this form a summary of your thesis using not more than 300 words. This summary need not be identical with the summary to be included in your thesis. It is required with your notice so that it is ready for sending to prospective examiners when they are formally invited to accept appointment. **Your summary may not be glued or taped on this form.**

Candidate's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Signatures: \_\_\_\_\_ (Candidate) \_\_\_\_\_ (Supervisor)

Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ (Supervisor)

(ref.: SC2685B/9609-NOI.FORM.B)

FORM C

**Check List (to be submitted when lodging a higher degree thesis for examination)**

Please check that your thesis complies with Schedule B of the Examinations Regulation (R21.12), date and sign as requested below. (Tick each area as appropriate.)

- (...) 1. The Title page contains all required information as per attached sample.
- (...) 2. I have proof read my thesis carefully and have corrected all typing, spelling, grammatical and punctuation errors. (See note 6 on Form A.)
- 3. The various sections in the thesis are in the order as set out in Schedule C, that is :
  - (...) i. Title page
  - (...) ii. Table of contents and, where applicable, a list of plates, tables, illustrations, symbols or other abbreviations, and details of any other material of a type as designated under ix below.
  - (...) iii. A summary of not more than 300 words.
  - (...) iv. A **signed and dated** 'Statement of Authorship' (date of first soft-bound submission or soft-bound resubmission after deferral):
    - (a) as follows (**verbatim**):

"Except where reference is made in the text of the thesis, this thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis for any other degree or diploma.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis.

This thesis has not been submitted for the award of any degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution."
    - (b) **Further paragraphs shall be included in the statement if applicable, specifying:**
      - (aa) the extent of collaboration with another person or persons,
      - (bb) the extent and the nature of any other assistance received in the pursuit of the research and preparation of the thesis, and
      - (cc) that all research procedures reported in the thesis were approved by the relevant Ethics or Safety Committee or authorised officer as appropriate.
  - (...) v. The main text of the thesis.
  - (...) vi. Appendices, if any.
  - (...) vii. Bibliography or list of references, unless lists of works consulted are appended at the end of each chapter.
  - (...) viii. Index if any.
  - (...) ix. Supplementary material separate from the bound thesis and submitted as part, or in support, of the thesis such as computer printouts, films, models, musical scores, tape recordings or other.

Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ Candidate's signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
(ref.:SC2685C/0106)

(SAMPLE TITLE PAGE)

**(TITLE OF THE THESIS)**

Submitted by  
(Name of candidate and previous degrees held)

A thesis submitted in total fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
(Master of ..... or Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of .....

School of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
Faculty of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

La Trobe University  
Bundoora, Victoria 3086  
Australia

month and year  
(date of **first soft-bound** submission or **soft-bound resubmission** after deferral and 12  
months revision period)

FORM D

## CERTIFICATE FROM THE SUPERVISOR(S) OF A HIGHER DEGREE THESIS

### **Section 1 - for completion by the candidate**

Family name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Other names: \_\_\_\_\_ Mr/Ms/Mrs/Miss: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Degree undertaken (full title): \_\_\_\_\_

Exact title of the thesis (reproduced from the title page):

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### **IMPORTANT NOTES FOR SUPERVISORS:**

1. Supervisors are required under the Examination and Assessment Regulation to sign a statement stating that they have seen a copy of a candidate's final typed thesis and that in their opinion the presentation of the thesis complies with the provisions of that regulation including Schedule B and its requirement that all typographical errors have been corrected, that the spelling, grammar and punctuation are correct and that the expression is worthy of a candidate for a higher degree. Supervisors are reminded that examiners may recommend that a thesis be deferred for re-examination or failed (if necessary) if the number of errors is thought to indicate that the thesis does not reach an acceptable standard for a higher degree. The Higher Degrees Committee (Research) expects that supervisors will inform candidates whenever typing, spelling, grammatical and punctuation errors need to be corrected. However, it is noted that the final responsibility for making the necessary corrections rests with the candidate prior to the lodging of the thesis for examination.
2. **If the form of presentation does not comply with Schedule B and its requirements, supervisors should indicate that the thesis 'does not comply' and inform the candidate in writing as to the reasons.**
3. This certificate must be completed and accompany the thesis (four copies for doctoral theses, three copies for Masters) when submitted for examination. The thesis cannot be sent for examination until the completed certificate has been provided.
4. It is the candidate's responsibility to arrange for completion of the certificate, by referring it to his/her supervisor(s) and the Head of School with a final typed copy of the thesis and a copy (attached) of Schedule B of Regulation 21.12 – Examinations and Assessment.
5. If a candidate has more than one supervisor, a certificate completed and signed by each (either jointly or separately) is required.

**Section 2 - for completion by the supervisor(s) (Please tick as appropriate.)**

In compliance with the requirements of Regulation 21.12 – Examinations and Assessment I hereby state that I have seen a copy of the final typed thesis, and that:

(a) the presentation of the thesis:

- complies with the provision of that Regulation, including Schedule B and its requirement that the candidate correct any typing, spelling, grammatical and punctuation errors prior to submitting the thesis for examination.
- does not comply (see footnote below)

(b) the candidate's declaration of authorship:

- is correct and complies with the verbatim requirement of Schedule B;
- is not correct.

Signature(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

**FOOTNOTE:** A supervisor who makes comments to the committee is requested to forward these in writing to the Research and Graduate Studies Office and include a statement as to whether he or she has advised the candidate of them.

**Section 3 - for completion by the Head of School**

I confirm that I have seen a final copy of the thesis, that the standard of presentation is acceptable, that it meets the requirements for submission and is submitted with the approval of the School.

Head of School \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Please print name \_\_\_\_\_

**REQUIREMENT OF THE THESIS FROM REGULATION 21.12 – EXAMINATIONS AND ASSESSMENT**

Paragraph 27 -

- (1) The thesis submitted for the degree shall be in the English language unless the HDC(R) determines otherwise.
- (2) The thesis shall comply with the requirements detailed in the regulation governing the degree.
- (3) The thesis shall comply with the requirements for the preparation and presentation of a thesis detailed in Schedule B.
- (4) The thesis shall include a statement of authorship and be accompanied upon presentation by a supervisor's certificate both in the form specified in Schedule B.

SC2685D/0106

**SCHEDULE B**

## **PRESENTATION OF A THESIS**

(Examinations and Assessment Regulation [R 21.12])

Candidates for higher degrees shall present **four copies** for doctoral and three copies for Masters of their thesis in conformity with the requirements set out in this Schedule. A thesis may be rejected as unsuitable for examination if it does not conform to these requirements.

### 1. **General requirements**

- (a) Every thesis shall be written as concisely as possible.
- (b) Professional doctorates by research theses must not exceed 75,000 words and it is recommended that normally they should not exceed 60,000
- (c) Professional doctorates by coursework theses must not exceed 50,000 words and it is recommended that normally they should not exceed 40,000 words.
- (d) A thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy must not exceed 100,000 words; it is recommended that normally it not exceed 50,000 words in Science Subjects or 75,000 words in non-Science Subjects.
- (e) A thesis for the degree of Master must not exceed 60,000 words; it is recommended that normally it not exceed 50,000 words or 200 pages in Science Subjects or 50,000 words in non-Science Subjects.
- (f) Footnotes are not included in the word limit. Footnotes should follow the conventions of the discipline and should not be used as a substitute for content that belongs in the body of the text
- (g) Word limits do not include appendices or bibliographies and reference lists.

### 2. **Typing and copy**

- (a) The thesis shall be typed on good quality paper, international size A4 (297mm x 210mm), using at least one and a half line spacing.
- (b) The text may be typed on both sides of the sheet with margins of not less than 38mm and 19mm in width on the left-hand and right-hand side respectively of the obverse side and 19mm and 38mm in width on the left-hand side and right side respectively of the reverse side. The top and bottom margins for each sheet shall be not less than 19mm.
- (c) Footnotes may be typed on single line spacing and shall be clearly separated from the text.
- (d) Each copy of the thesis shall be clearly legible.

### 3. **Checking**

**Before submitting the thesis for examination the candidate must check the typescript to ensure to the best of his or her ability that all typographical errors have been corrected, that the spelling, grammar and punctuation are correct and that the standard of expression is worthy of a candidate for a higher degree.**

### 4. **Arrangement**

The thesis shall incorporate, in the following order -

- (a) A title page setting out in the following order:
  - (i) the full title of the thesis,
  - (ii) the names and degrees of the candidate,
  - (iii) the degree for which the thesis is submitted and a statement that the thesis is submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements for that degree,
  - (iv) the name of the Faculty and its School or Area associated with the work,  
and
  - (v) the name of the University and its address as follows:

La Trobe University  
Bundoora, Victoria, 3086  
Australia

- (vi) the month and year when the thesis was submitted for the degree.
- (b) A table of contents and, where applicable, a list of plates, tables, illustrations, symbols or other abbreviations, and details of any other material of a type as designated under 4(j) below.
- (c) A summary of not more than 300 words.
- (d) (i) A statement in the following words signed and dated by the candidate:

Statement of Authorship:

"Except where reference is made in the text of the thesis, this thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis or any other degree or diploma.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis.

This thesis has not been submitted for the award of any degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution."

- (ii) Further paragraphs shall be included in the statement if applicable, specifying:
  - (aa) the extent of collaboration with another person or persons, and
  - (bb) the extent and the nature of any other assistance received in the  
pursuit of the research and preparation of the thesis.
  - (cc) that all research procedures reported in the thesis were approved by the relevant Safety/Ethics Committee or authorised officer as appropriate

- (e) The main text.
- (f) Appendices, if any.
- (g) Bibliography or list of references, unless lists of works consulted are appended at the end of each chapter.
- (h) Index, if any.
- (j) Supplementary material separate from the bound thesis and submitted as part, or in support, of the thesis such as computer printouts, films, models, musical scores, tape recordings, etc.

5. **Illustrative material and bibliographical references**

The presentation in a thesis of tables, diagrams, maps, plates or other illustrative material, and of bibliographic citations, shall follow consistently an accepted standard.

6. **Binding**

- (a) Each copy of the thesis submitted for examination shall be bound in a stitched soft cover. Copies for deposit in the Library under paragraph 7(a) shall be submitted in stiff covers and cloth. Lettering on the spine of the cloth cover shall show the candidate's name, the title of the thesis and year of submission. No lettering is required on the soft cover binding.
- (b) Published papers submitted as additional evidence shall be bound in the thesis as an appendix.
- (c) If the thesis is too bulky to be bound in a single volume, each volume forming part of the thesis shall be bound and marked as described in sub-paragraph (a) above and shall carry the volume number on the spine.
- (d) Any material submitted under paragraph 4(a) above shall be clearly labelled:  
  
`Submitted by.... (full name of candidate) in support of a Masters/PhD degree thesis entitled.... Date of submission....'.

7. **Availability of copies of theses**

- (a) If a thesis is accepted for the award of the degree the University shall deposit two hard-bound copies with the Library; any remaining soft-bound copies are returned to the candidate. If the thesis is not accepted for the award of the degree one copy of the thesis shall be retained by the University and the remaining copies of such thesis are returned to the candidate.
- (b) After the award of the degree the author shall be asked by the University to consent in writing on forms provided for the thesis to become available for perusal, loan or photocopying. As soon as that consent is received the Library shall make the thesis available for these purposes.
- (c) If the author declines to consent the thesis shall in any case become available for perusal, loan or photocopying in the Library three years after the award of the degree.

- (d) Notwithstanding the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) and (c) above the Higher Degrees Committee (Research) may, in exceptional circumstances, recommend that a thesis be withheld for a period not exceeding 30 years after the award of the degree. In such a case the thesis or any of its parts as the case may be shall only be made available with the permission of the Chief Librarian or on conditions specified by the Chief Librarian after consultation with the Vice-Chancellor.

(SCHEDULE B)  
(ref:SC2685S/0106)

**SPECIAL SHORT SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL/MASTERS BY RESEARCH  
THESIS**

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT DETAILS		
	Student	Number
Family Name _____	Given Name _____	
School of Enrolment _____		
Title of Thesis _____		
Previous degrees awarded _____		

Please type below a summary of a maximum of three sentences in non-specialist terminology, about the general nature of the research undertaken and (where appropriate) give some indication of its relevance and usefulness. If you prefer you may email the summary including the information requested above to rgs@latrobe.edu.au

If you attend a graduation ceremony, doctoral summaries will be read by the Dean; therefore, it should be written in a manner that will be easily understood by the general public. The summary may also be used for University publications such as the *Bulletin*, *Research Report* and the *University's World Wide Web Page*.

THESIS SUMMARY:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED FORM TO THE RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES  
OFFICE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.**

**APPENDIX E**

***Support Services Offered by La Trobe University***

Name	Location	Telephone No
<b>Accommodation Services</b>	Glenn College	03 9479 5100
	Menzies College	03 9479 1071
	Chisholm College	03 9479 2875/2899
	Graduate House	03 9467 1979
	Housing Company	03 9479 2053
	Student Accom Service	03 9479 2112
	Bendigo Residents Serv.	03 5444 7425
	Wodonga	02 6055 6389
<b>Bookshop</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7516
	Bundoora	03 9479 1234
	Wodonga	02 6024 9899
<b>Careers &amp; Employment Service</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7223
	Bundoora	03 9479 2459
	Mildura	03 5022 3704
	Mt Buller	03 5733 7000
	Shepparton	03 5833 2517
	Wodonga	02 6055 6683
<b>Children's Centre</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7215
	Bundoora	03 9479 2122/
	Union Parents & Children's	03 94792526
	Child Care Centre Cooperative	
	Wodonga	02 6055 6653
Beechworth	03 5720 8028	
<b>Computing Services (ITS Helpdesk)</b>	Bundoora	03 9479 1500
<b>Convocation</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7466
	Bundoora	03 9479 2011
	Wodonga	02 6058 3850
<b>Counselling Service</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7223
	Bundoora	03 9479 2956
	Wodonga	02 6055 6631
<b>Credit Union</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7956
	Bundoora	03 9478 8222
	Wodonga	02 6058 3702
<b>Disability Liaison Officer</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7410
	Bundoora	03 9479 1510
	Mildura	03 5022 3629
	Wodonga	02 6055 6662
<b>Employment Service (Union)</b>	Bundoora	03 9479 1373

<b>Equity and Access</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7410
	Bundoora	03 9479 2900
<b>Financial Aid Offices</b> <b>(Student Loans)</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7223
	Bundoora	03 9479 2112/2053
	Mildura	03 5022 3725
	Wodonga	02 6055 6389
<b>Medical Centre</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7770
	Bundoora	03 9473 8888
	Mildura	03 5022 3778
<i>Higher Education Contribution</i> <b>Scheme (HECS)</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7223
	Bundoora	03 9479 1060
	Wodonga	02 6055 6683
<b>International Candidates</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7969
	Bundoora	03 9479 1199
	Wodonga	02 6024 9774

#### Visa renewals

International candidates must renew their student visa before their current visa expires. We recommend that students commence preparation for this at least six weeks before the expiry date. For the most up to date DIMA forms and checklists, candidates should contact the International Programs Office or consult the DIMA website at [www.immi.gov.au](http://www.immi.gov.au).

Language Centre <b>EFS)</b> & <b>Language and Academic Skills Unit</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7844
	Bundoora	03 9479 2417/2788

<b>Libraries</b>	Bendigo – Loans	03 5444 7453
	Reference	03 5444 7451
	Bundoora – Loans	03 9479 2937
	Reference	03 9479 2922
	Wodonga – Loans	02 6058 3760
	Reference	02 6058 3746

<b>La Trobe University</b> <b>Postgraduate Association</b> <b>(LUPA)</b>	Bundoora	039479 2438
	Fax	03 9479 5617
	Carlton	03 9285 5235/5100

<b>Lost Property</b>	Bendigo	03 5444 7514
	Bundoora	03 9479 2314
	Carlton	03 9285 5100
	Wodonga	02 6058 3791
	(Switchboard)	

<b>Occupational Health and</b> <b>Safety Advisor</b>	Bundoora	03 9479 1186
	Bendigo	03 5444 7901

#### Public Transport

For information on the quickest and cheapest way of travelling to and from campus by public transport, contact the MET Information Centre, telephone 131638.

**Research and Graduate Studies Office**

Candidature & Scholarships	9479 2464
Research Grants	9479 1975

**Statutory Declarations** (available at various times of the week, by appointment only)

Bendigo –	Mr Gary Buchanan	03 5444 7505
	Mr. Kevin Brown	03 5444 7472
Bundoora -	Mr Jon Cox	9479 2349
Wodonga -	Mr David Buckle	02 6024 9775

<b>University Ombudsman</b>	Mr Cliff Picton	9479 1897
-----------------------------	-----------------	-----------

**Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel: Procedures**

1 Examiners' reports are referred to a Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel when there is a difference of opinion with at least one examiner recommending the thesis be deferred or failed and one or more other examiners recommending it be passed (with or without amendments) OR when all examiners recommend that the thesis be deferred. The Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel is expected to make a recommendation to the Higher Degrees Committee (Research), HDC(R) regarding the classification of the thesis and amendments that should be made.

2 At the time of making the decision to refer the reports to a Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel, the supervisor will be contacted by the Coordinator, Scholarships and Candidature, to inform him or her that the examiners' reports are to be referred to an Advisory Panel and to request that the supervisor be prepared to counsel the candidate should this be required. A letter will then be sent to the candidate, with a copy to the supervisor, officially informing the candidate of the decision to convene a Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel and enclosing a copy of each of the reports. To ensure that the names of examiners are not released to candidates, the examiners' names will be removed and the reports will be labelled A, B, and C (A and B for Masters).

3 The Faculty representative on the HDC(R) is responsible for convening the Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel which should, if possible, meet within four weeks of the representative receiving the reports.

4 Membership of the Panel should consist of a minimum of three, where possible taking account of appropriate gender representation. The constitution of the Committee should be the Faculty representative as Chair, the Chair or nominee of the Faculty Research and Graduate Studies Committee or Faculty Higher Degrees Committee (Research) and a senior academic with expertise in the discipline area of the thesis, or closely related area. The supervisor is not a member of the Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel. If the Faculty representative is the supervisor or has been directly involved in the supervision at any point during candidature, then the alternate member of HDC(R) for that Faculty should chair the Panel.

5 Prior to the meeting, a written statement should be sought from the supervisor(s) and from the candidate. A joint statement from supervisor and student may be submitted. The supervisor's statement (or the joint statement) should include suggestions regarding what changes should be made if the final decision is to pass the thesis subject to changes being made or to resubmit the thesis for re-examination. The statement of suggested changes should include detailed reference to the examiners' reports.

6 The supervisor, although not a member of the Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel, should be given the opportunity to attend at least part of the meeting by invitation. It is the responsibility of the Chair to determine when the supervisor attends.

7 With regard to steps 5 and 6 above, if for any reason, the student does not wish to be represented by his or her supervisor, this should be discussed with the School postgraduate coordinator or Head of School. In the event that the Head of School is the postgraduate coordinator and is also the student's supervisor advice should be sought from the Faculty representative on the HDC(R) or the Chair of the Faculty Research and Graduate Studies Committee. The student may also choose to seek advice from the La Trobe University Postgraduate Association. Following any such advice the student may nominate another person, who would be expected to have expertise in the area, as his or her representative. This person may also produce a statement including recommended changes and will be invited to attend at least part of the Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel Meeting. However the

supervisor will still be involved in the process.

8 In reaching a decision, the Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel should not automatically give more weight to reports making more negative recommendations. The Panel, taking account of written input from the supervisor and student (and when nominated the student's representative) should consider the reports carefully with a view to determining the most positive outcome for the student that can be defended on academic grounds.

9 In cases where it is decided to recommend that amendments should be made or that the thesis should be revised and resubmitted for examination, the Faculty Higher Degree Advisory Panel, again taking account of the supervisor's input, (and when nominated the student's representative) must provide clear guidelines recommending the points to be addressed when amending the thesis or preparing it for re-examination. The guidelines for revision of a deferred thesis must not refer to any examiner by name, but should refer to report A, B or C as appropriate.

10 The Chair of the Panel should submit a written report to the Chair of HDC(R) that includes a final recommendation, the justification for this recommendation, and where appropriate the points that should be addressed. The final recommendation should be one of the following options:

- a) The thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree without further examination but subject to the recommended amendments being made and the candidate submitting a detailed list of the amendments, signed by the Supervisor and Head of School, to the satisfaction of the HDC(R)
- b) The thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to 12 months to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination.
- c) The thesis should be classified as FAILED. (If this is recommended the Panel should indicate whether the content of the PhD thesis could be used in the preparation of a Masters thesis.)

In exceptional circumstances the Panel may recommend to HDC(R) that the thesis and examiners' reports be referred to an independent assessor who should be asked to make a recommendation on the thesis to HDC(R). The name of an assessor is to be provided by the Head of the School and/or the Professor of the discipline. Also in exceptional circumstances, the Panel may recommend to the HDC(R) that the examiners be asked to confer with a view to reconciling differences in their reports and assessment of the thesis.

11 In cases where it is recommended that the thesis be deferred, then prior to releasing guidelines for revision to the candidate, the points to be addressed will be sent to the deferring examiner or examiners who will be re-examining the thesis. Their agreement should be sought that the guidelines constitute an acceptable approach to the revision of the thesis, or if not, what modifications they would require before accepting the guidelines. Should an examiner not accept the revision guidelines, then the matter will be referred back to the Panel for further consideration.

12 In the event of the Panel and the examiner(s) not being able to agree on the revision guidelines the matter will be referred to the Chair of HDC(R).