

DOCTORATE COURSE RULES
Rules for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Document Type:	Rules
Administering Entity:	Research Services
TRIM Number:	D05/242
Date Endorsed by Academic Board:	25 June 2007
Date Approved:	13 August 2007
Approved by:	UNE Council
Indicative time for Review:	2 years from approval date
Responsibility for Review:	Academic Board Higher Degree Research Committee
Related Policies or Other Documents	Conferring Awards Posthumously: Coursework Policy

1. INTERPRETATION

- (i) In these Rules “the Committee” shall mean “the Higher Degree Research Committee”.
- (ii) “Three-year PhD program” refers to the full-time equivalent variant of the PhD program that comprises a 100% thesis research program with no preparatory year. The part-time equivalent of the three-year PhD program is six years.

2. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Admission to candidature in either the three-year or the four-year PhD program may be approved by the Committee only when the relevant Head of School has:

- (a) certified that the necessary facilities and appropriate support for the applicant undertaking his or her proposed PhD training and/or research are available; *and*
- (b) nominated an appropriate principal supervisor and co-supervisor(s) in accordance with Rule 3.

2.1 The Three Year Program

- (i) Any applicant for admission to candidature for the three-year PhD program shall be a graduate, or shall have fulfilled all the requirements for admission to a degree of the University of New England or of any other institution recognised by the Committee for this purpose, and shall satisfy the requirements of Rule 2.1(ii) and Rule 2.1(iii).
- (ii) The Committee may on the recommendation of the Head of School concerned admit to candidature for the three-year PhD program an applicant who holds or has fulfilled all the requirements for:
 - (a) the degree of Master, provided that the applicant has shown potential for research demonstrated by a research project or resulting dissertation/thesis comprising typically 25% or more of the Masters program, *or*
 - (b) the degree of Bachelor with first class Honours or second class Honours in the First Division, or equivalent.

In special circumstances with the approval of the Committee, upon provision of a strong, clear and substantiated case from the Head of School, an applicant who does not satisfy the requirements of 2.1(ii)(a) or 2.1(ii)(b) may be admitted to candidature in the three-year PhD program if evidence of acceptable research experience, exhibited in concrete research outputs, is produced.¹ Such a candidate will be required to complete a probationary period of candidature as described in Rule 2.2(a).

- (iii) Every applicant for admission to candidature for the three-year PhD program shall:
 - (a) produce documented evidence of capacity to undertake work at the PhD level. The Committee may require as evidence the passing of a special examination; *and*

¹ “concrete research outputs” covers published journal articles and/or books or substantive research reports, where the applicant has clearly specified his or her contribution to any jointly authored product, and which have been sighted by the Head of School and principal supervisor.

- (b) submit to the Committee a proposed program of research to be undertaken in a nominated School of the University and approved by the Head of that School.
- (iv) On admission to candidature the candidate shall pursue a course of advanced study and research on the approved topic for a period of three years. In the case of a full-time student the normal maximum period of candidature shall be three years, (six years for part-time candidates).

2.2. Probationary Period

- (a) The Committee will normally accept a candidate directly into the three-year PhD program on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding 12 months full-time equivalent. Before completion of the probationary period, the Committee shall seek a Confirmation of Candidature report from the Confirmation of Candidature Panel as to how the candidature should proceed.
- (b) Where a candidate has been accepted on probationary candidature under Rule 2.2(a), the candidature shall, upon confirmation of acceptance, be deemed to have commenced from the date of the probationary admission.

2.3. Alternative Admission Pathways

2.3.1. Equivalent Qualifications

- (i) An applicant for admission to candidature for the three-year PhD program who is a graduate of another institution and whose qualifications in the opinion of the Committee are equivalent to those prescribed in Rule 2.1(ii) and who has demonstrated appropriate research ability and experience as required by Rule 2.1(iii) shall proceed to the three-year PhD program under such conditions as the Committee may prescribe, which may include a period of probationary candidature as described in Rule 2.2(a).

With respect to this entry pathway, international students applying for admission to candidature for the three-year PhD, will be required to show either:

- (a) that he or she has met the University's required postgraduate admissions standard for English language competency (see the *UNE Policy on English Language Requirements for Admission*); or
- (b) that he or she has completed one or more of their degrees in the English language.

For instances where other types of relevant evidence for English language competency in a research context are offered by the applicant (eg the applicant has within the past five years authored or co-authored research publications in the English language) the Head of School must present a case arguing for the validity and acceptability of this evidence.

2.3.2. Transfer from another institution

An applicant who has been a candidate for a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in another institution may be admitted to candidature for the three-year PhD program in this University. The Committee shall decide, on recommendation of the Head of School, what period of the candidature completed in the other institution shall be counted as part of the period of candidature in the University, provided that not more than half of the maximum period of candidature specified in Rule 2.1(iv) shall be so allowed.

2.3.3. Upgrade from Research Masters

Students whose qualifications do not satisfy the admission requirements of Rule 2.1 and who are currently enrolled in a Masters degree that would satisfy Rule 2.1(ii)(a) (and have been so enrolled for at least 12 months full-time equivalent) and are undertaking research which in the view of the principal supervisor, is approaching PhD standard, may apply to be upgraded into the three-year PhD program. In such cases, the principal supervisor shall forward to the Committee through the relevant Head of School a request for upgrade along with any supporting evidence.

The Committee will wish to see either explicit evidence of refereed research publications by the student or reviews of at least two thesis chapters before considering a request to

upgrade from Masters to PhD. The reviews shall be carried out by two reviewers, one who may be internal and one who must be external to the University. Each reviewer should have a doctoral degree or equivalent. Any application for an upgrade with evidence attached must be endorsed by the Principal Supervisor and Heads of School and forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies, following one year equivalent full-time candidature and not exceeding 18 months full-time candidature, to ensure enough candidature is left to continue on into PhD candidature. The Committee will determine, in consultation with the principal supervisor, the appropriate period of PhD candidature should the upgrade be approved.

2.3.4. *Doctoral Foundation Year (Four-Year PhD Program)*

The Four-Year PhD Program is only available for international students. Such students will be required to demonstrate their anticipated capacity to pay full tuition fees for four years.

The Committee may on the recommendation of the Head of School concerned admit to candidature for the Four-Year PhD Program an applicant who:

- (a) holds a degree considered by the Higher Degree Research Committee, on the advice of the International Committee, to be equivalent to a bachelor's honours degree from an Australian University, *or* any masters degree; and
- (b) satisfies the English Language requirements as specified in the English Language Admission Requirements Policy;
- (c) requires additional research training and experience in order to be fully prepared to undertake the thesis research component and/or;
- (d) requires additional training in disciplines other than those studied in his or her previous degrees, prior to commencing the thesis research component.

Those admitted to the four-year PhD program will be required to complete a Doctoral Foundation year of preparation, as described in Rule 3.2., before being permitted to progress into the three-year PhD program.

3. **CONDITIONS OF CANDIDATURE**

3.1. **The Three-Year PhD Program**

- (i) Every six calendar months, full time equivalent, from the date of admission to candidature the candidate and principal supervisor shall submit to the Committee a report setting out details of the course of study and research and the candidate's progress over the previous 6 month period. The report will elaborate upon the broad outline of proposals submitted prior to admission to candidature as required under Rule 2.1(iii) and shall give reasons for any departures from the original proposals.
- (ii) The candidate will be required by the principal supervisor and the Head of School to formally undergo a Confirmation of Candidature process. This process is outlined under Rule 4.1.2.
- (iii) In special cases, the Committee, on the advice of the principal supervisor, may grant leave of absence from the course of study and research and the period of such leave shall not be counted as part of the prescribed term of candidature.
- (iv) The candidate shall pursue the course wholly under the control of the University.
- (v) On the recommendation of the Head of the supervising School the Committee may permit a candidate to pursue the course away from the University if the Committee is satisfied that:
 - (a) the candidate will have access to the required facilities; *and*
 - (b) a local supervisor resident or working in the same locality as the candidate can be appointed by the Committee, unless the Head of the supervising School recommends otherwise.

Each PhD candidate is required to spend periods of "face-to-face" consultation with his or her supervisors for a minimum of 54 days over the period of their candidature. The nature and extent of such consultation will be determined by the supervisors and the Head of

School after consultation with the candidate prior to the commencement of each year of candidature.

- (vi) A candidate may be required during the course to attend lectures and seminars and perform practical work to a satisfactory standard in subjects prescribed by the Committee. No candidate may enrol in any unit or units without the consent of the principal supervisor and the approval of the Committee. If the principal supervisor certifies that a unit is a requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy such units may not be credited to another degree. If however, such a unit is not a requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, it may be credited to another degree.

The candidate shall be given an official notification of any examination result obtained for a unit in which that candidate is permitted to enrol.

- (vii) The Committee must approve any request, from either the School or the candidate, that the candidate be permitted to enrol in another course concurrently with enrolment in either the three-year or four-year PhD program. This request must be accompanied by a strong rationale and must first have the approval of both the principal supervisor and the Head of the relevant School.

3.2. The Four Year program

- (i) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of School, a candidate may complete the whole or part of the program of study for the Doctoral Foundation year outside the University provided that the candidate shall attend the University when required by the Head of School and, in any case, for a period or periods of not less than 14 days during the Doctoral Foundation year.
- (ii) The Doctoral Foundation year shall normally be completed over two semesters of full-time study *or* over four semesters of part-time study.

3.2.1 The content of the first year of the 4 year PhD will be the equivalent of 48 credit points, full-time equivalent;

- (a) a program of study prescribed by the Head of School of supervised research and submission of a research report or dissertation at a minimum of 10 000 words;
- (b) any coursework unit or unit or other research or disciplinary training recommended by the relevant Head of School and approved by the Committee; and/or
- (c) an academic literacy and research skills unit.

3.2.2 The requirements for proceeding from year 1 to year 2 of the 4-year PhD are:

- (a) The minimum level of pass to be attained by the candidate in any unit undertaken during the Doctoral Foundation Year shall be Credit. The minimum level of pass in the research component of the Doctoral Foundation year shall be Distinction. The overall average of all components undertaken in the Doctoral Foundation year must be a minimum of Distinction.
- (b) The English Language score should now be the equivalent for entry to the 3 year PhD program.

Students may commence the program at the start of any semester.

Changes to the prescribed components of the Doctoral Foundation year may be considered for approval by the Committee on the recommendation of the relevant Head of School.

3.3 Exit Pathways - A candidate who meets the following:

- (a) minimum pass requirements (as specified in 3.2A) for all components of the Doctoral Foundation year shall be permitted to progress to candidature in the three-year PhD program.
- (b) completion of 48 credit points equivalent in the Foundation year at credit level i.e. less than an overall distinction level, may be awarded a post-graduate diploma.
- (c) Completion of 24 credit points equivalent in the Foundation year at credit level i.e. less than distinction level, may be awarded a post-graduate certificate.

If a candidate's principal supervisor or the relevant Head of School submits a report of unsatisfactory progress to the Committee, or if the candidate fails to satisfactorily complete prescribed coursework, the Committee shall invite the candidate to "show cause" why their candidature should not be terminated. If the candidate does not respond to the invitation by the stated date or the candidate's response is deemed unsatisfactory by the Committee, the Committee shall terminate the candidature.

4. SUPERVISION

- (i) The degree of Doctor of Philosophy is a supervised degree and the research and the preparation of the thesis must be carried out under the guidance of at least two Supervisors appointed by the Committee on the recommendation of the appropriate Head of School. Supervisors must be listed on the Register of Research Higher Degree Supervisors. The supervisors shall be provisionally appointed at the time the Committee decides that the applicant can be admitted to candidature. Within 12 months the appointment may be reviewed by the Committee in the light of the detailed research proposal.
- (ii) Except under exceptional circumstances, the Head of School shall nominate a minimum of two supervisors for each applicant. One supervisor shall be nominated as principal supervisor and the remaining as co-supervisor(s).
 - (a) Principal supervisors must normally be members of the University's academic staff and would normally possess a PhD.
 - (b) For external candidates, a suitable on-site supervisor, who has agreed to act as such, should be nominated, where appropriate, as the co-supervisor.
 - (c) The nomination of supervisors will include an estimate of the expected percentage input from each supervisor.
 - (d) In exceptional circumstances where multiple supervisors are thought to be impractical, the Head of School will forward a report to the Committee detailing the reasons why co-supervision is not practical and indicating what procedures will be put in place to handle supervisory duties where the nominated supervisor becomes unavailable for any reason. However, in cases where the exceptional circumstances have arisen due to lack of sufficient University expertise, serious consideration must be given to appointing a co-supervisor from outside the University with expertise in the candidate's proposed research area.
 - (e) Where a UNE supervisor is not available to undertake the principal supervisor's role, the Head of School may seek approval from the Committee to appoint an appropriately qualified Emeritus Professor, an adjunct appointment, an Honorary Fellow, or an Honorary Associate as principal supervisor. A principal supervisor so appointed will be required to enter into a contract with the University to undertake all of the duties and obligations specified for principal supervisors by completing and signing a Principal Supervisor Agreement
- (iii) In cases where an applicant's principal supervisor departs the University for reasons other than study leave, and no other staff member is suitably qualified or possesses the appropriate expertise to take on the role of principal supervisor, the Chair of the Committee will immediately consider a recommendation from the Head of School for the appointment of a suitably qualified individual from another institution to fulfil the role of principal supervisor. A principal supervisor so appointed will be required to complete and sign a Principal Supervisor Agreement
- (iv) The Committee, on the joint recommendation of the Head of School and relevant Faculty Dean, may recommend termination of candidature if it is satisfied that the University can no longer provide appropriate supervision for the candidate. In such circumstances, the University will provide any necessary administrative assistance to the student to facilitate his or her transfer to another institution.

The action described in this clause shall not be used as a disciplinary measure in cases of lack of student progress or as a solution for problems arising from unsatisfactory relationships between supervisor(s) and the student.

- (v) The principal supervisor shall present to the Committee the required reports on the candidate's work (see Rule 4.1.3). If the Committee receives a report that the candidate's

work is unsatisfactory it may resolve that the candidate be invited to "show cause" why the candidature should not be terminated. In cases of dispute between any supervisor and a candidate, due consideration will be given to the views of both parties. The following specific instances must be noted:

- (a) Where a supervisor has made every effort to get a PhD candidate's work up to expected standards and these efforts have not yielded the desired effect due to insufficient student commitment and/or effort, the supervisor has the right to withdraw from the supervisory role. A report detailing the grounds for this decision, signed by the Head of School, must be sent to the candidate and to the Committee. The candidate shall also have the right to submit a report, detailing his or her perspective, to the Committee. The Head of School would then be expected to make a recommendation as to how to proceed from this point. If the supervisor involved is also the Head of School, then the relevant PVC/Dean or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) shall sign the report to the candidate and to the Committee and shall make the recommendation regarding how to proceed from this point.
- (b) Where a candidate has made every effort to reconcile his or her work to meet expectations of their principal supervisor or co-supervisor but this effort has not yielded the desired effect because of an unsatisfactory supervisor-candidate relationship, the candidate has the right to request a change of principal supervisor (or any co-supervisor if required). The candidate should submit a request, detailing the grounds for making it, to the Head of School who will consult on the request and forward it to the Committee accompanied by a nomination of an alternative supervisor. The affected supervisor shall also have the right to submit a report, detailing his or her perspective, to the Committee.

4.1. Role of the Student

4.1.1. Induction and contact with supervisor/s

Once students have formally accepted the offer of candidature and enrolled, they must contact their nominated principal supervisor and arrange a suitable time to discuss the formal induction process offered in their School. Supervisors will be required to sign off when the student has undergone the induction process.

Students need to agree on contact arrangements and maintain regular communication with their supervisor for the duration of candidature.

4.1.2. Confirmation of candidature

The University requires all doctoral candidates to undertake a formal Confirmation of Candidature process. The confirmation process will be explained at the School induction sessions for new doctoral students. Newly enrolled students will need to get information during their induction sessions about the confirmation process, the support available to them during their candidature as indicated in relevant policy documents, the required tasks to be completed in the given timeframe, and the composition of the Confirmation Panel and how it will conduct its business.

For doctoral programs of three years duration, student progress will be assessed at 6 months after enrolment for full-time students and at the 12 month period for part-time students. For students in four year programs, assessment will be carried out at 12 months for full-time students and at the 24 month period for part-time students after work on their thesis or portfolio has begun.

4.1.3. Progress reports and re-enrolment

Students must ensure that all administrative requirements of the University, such as re-enrolling each year, providing progress reports, and conforming to procedures for variations of conditions of candidature, are met.

Students are required to report on their progress every 6 months of candidature. The progress reports provide an opportunity to formally record progress and any issues or concerns that arise during candidature.

Where inadequate progress has occurred the supervisor and Head of School may recommend to the relevant Committee that a student be requested to “show cause” why their candidature should not be terminated. The main reasons for a “show cause” letter being issued are the lack of response from a student in relation to submission of progress and re-enrolment forms to their supervisors, or lack of evidence of adequate progress.

4.1.4. Fieldwork and research overseas

There are certain requirements that must be met for a student to be able to study overseas or engage in off-campus fieldwork. Appropriate forms must be filled in and submitted, which enable all students to be insured while on University work. Arrangements for travel are dealt with through Faculty/Schools and students should seek assistance from their principal supervisor in ensuring the correct procedures are followed.

4.2. Role of the Principal Supervisor

- (i) The principal supervisor is in large measure responsible for ensuring that the high standard of the degree is maintained. It is expected that the principal supervisor will maintain close consultation with all co-supervisors and with the student throughout the period of candidature. The supervisor shall carry out the responsibilities in accordance with the following rules:
 - (a) The principal supervisor shall ensure that the research topic chosen by the candidate is at an appropriate academic level and is likely if successfully completed to be worthy of publication.
 - (b) The principal supervisor shall make recommendations to the Committee for any additional course work that may be required in terms of Rule 3.1.(vi).
 - (c) The principal supervisor shall advise the candidate on the quality of early drafts of the thesis, but the thesis finally presented shall be substantially the independent work of the candidate.
 - (d) The principal supervisor in consultation with any co-supervisors must complete the required report forms for each candidate in each year of candidature and discuss these reports with the candidate and Head of School.
 - (e) The periodic reports submitted in terms of Rule 4(v) & Rule 4.1.3 shall provide enough detail to enable the Committee to assess the progress of the candidate and the likelihood of completion of candidature within the prescribed time.
 - (f) If, after provision of feedback and guidance and subsequent allowance of a suitable period for the candidate to improve their work, the principal supervisor becomes firmly of the opinion that the candidate is not making satisfactory progress the principal supervisor, after consultation with co-supervisor(s) and the Head of School, shall recommend to the Committee that the candidate be invited to "show cause" why the candidature should not be terminated. This recommendation may incorporate the suggestion that the candidate be admitted to candidature in an appropriate master's degree.

4.3 Show Cause Procedure

All candidates as well as all individuals undertaking a supervisory role for the PhD will be familiar with the responsibilities associated with PhD supervisors and PhD candidates, the PhD examination procedures and procedures for handling any difficulties that might arise during supervision, and the consequences of failing in their obligations. These responsibilities are outlined in documents available on the Research Services website.

5. EXAMINATION PROCESS

5.1. Submission Requirements

- (i) On completion of the course of advanced study and research, the candidate shall present for examination a thesis embodying the results of the candidate's work which shall be substantially an original contribution to the subject concerned.

- (ii) The thesis, exclusive of any appendices, shall in no case exceed 100 000 words and in scientific subjects should in general not exceed 50 000 words (200 pages). There may be special instances where, with the permission of the Committee on recommendation of the principal supervisor, the thesis may exceed these limits. In special cases, with the permission of the Committee on the recommendation of the principal supervisor, the thesis may be written in a language other than English or presented, at least in part, in a multi-media format.
- (iii) The candidate shall state generally in the preface of the thesis and specifically in footnotes where appropriate, the sources from which the information is derived, the extent to which the candidate has made use of the work of others and the portion of the work which is claimed as original.
 - (a) The candidate may not present as the thesis any work that has been the basis of the award of a degree at this or another university, but will not be precluded from incorporating such in the thesis provided that, in presenting the thesis, the candidate clearly indicates the part of the work which has been so incorporated.
 - (b) The candidate shall upon submission of the thesis, make arrangements for all original data to be retained in an area of safe storage for a period of not less than five years from the date of submission. The data stored must be in a form that would, at a minimum, permit replication of all analyses reported in the thesis.
- (iv) The candidate shall submit to the Secretary to the Higher Degree Research Committee four copies of the thesis, three of which shall be soft bound in a form approved by the Committee with the top copy unbound for deposit in the Dixson Library. The candidate shall also submit an electronic copy of the thesis in a form approved by the Committee. If the thesis has multi-media components approved according to Rule 5.1.(ii), four copies of such components must also be submitted along with clear instructions as to their usage as well as a listing of computer hardware, software and other requirements. All multi-media components must be accessible by any examiner.
- (v) At the time the thesis is submitted, the principal supervisor shall send to the Committee a certificate stating:
 - (a) that the principal supervisor and co-supervisor(s) have discussed with the candidate and amongst themselves the academic content of the thesis in its final form and that, while neither expressing nor implying a judgement about the merit of the work, in the principal supervisor's opinion all are agreed that it is ready for submission for examination for the degree;
 - (b) that all requirements of the School, in regard to the deposition of museum material or any other supporting material have been met; *and*
 - (c) that the physical form and presentation of the thesis are appropriate to the discipline.

Should the principal supervisor be unwilling to provide a certificate in these terms, the principal supervisor shall so advise the candidate and shall send to the candidate and the Committee a written statement setting out the grounds on which the certificate is withheld. This statement will not be forwarded to any examiners.
- (vi) The principal supervisor shall forward to the Committee the certificate referred to in paragraph 5.1(v) before a thesis is accepted for examination. When, for any reason, the certificate is withheld, the Committee may decline to accept the thesis for examination or may accept it following such consultation or under such additional conditions as the Committee may deem to be appropriate for specific cases.

5.2. Thesis Examination Process

- (i) On receiving a thesis the Committee, on the recommendation of the principal supervisor and Head of the School, shall appoint three examiners at least two of whom shall normally be external to the University of New England* plus one reserve examiner. A pool of at least five potential examiners from which the three

* Special cases can be made.

plus reserve are selected must have been assembled through consultation between the principal supervisor, the candidate and all current co-supervisors. The candidate will not be given any indication of the final set of examiners that have been appointed. The Head of School, or principal supervisor as appropriate, will be expected to obtain written or emailed consent, from each examiner excepting the reserve, to examine the thesis within two months of its receipt. The Committee is to be advised as to whether each examiner has had experience supervising and examining higher degree research students. In cases where a thesis has been permitted to exceed the normal 100 000 word limit, examiners shall be informed of this fact so they may consider it when making their decision to examine.

- (ii) If an additional examiner/adjudicator is required during the examination process, the choice will be made from the original pool of examiners, unless otherwise instructed by the Committee.
- (iii) No person who has been a principal supervisor or co-supervisor of the candidate shall be appointed as an examiner. No person who is currently or has ever been in a personal relationship with the candidate or any current supervisor will be approved as an examiner.
- (iv) Each examiner shall make a separate written report on the merits of the thesis but thereafter may be required to consult with the other examiners and report to the Committee. Each examiner will be reminded to provide his or her report within two months of receipt of the thesis. However, if an examiner fails to provide his or her report, after appropriate reminders, within a maximum of three months, the Committee, after consultation with the relevant Head of School, may notify the examiner that his or her services are no longer required and the reserve examiner may then be activated as a replacement.

5.3. Thesis Examination Outcomes

- (i) Taking into account the recommendations of the examiners, the Committee may:
 - (a) recommend that the degree be awarded;
 - (b) recommend that the degree be awarded conditional upon the making of such amendments as the Committee deems appropriate;
 - (c) request the examiners to consult and report to the Committee;
 - (d) appoint an additional examiner or examiners;
 - (e) appoint an external adjudicator who shall consider and report to the Committee upon the thesis and any supporting papers invited or requested by the Committee and the reports of the examiners;
 - (f) require the candidate to sit for such written, oral or practical examinations as the Committee may prescribe;
 - (g) permit a candidate to revise the thesis for re-examination if, in the opinion of the Committee the work is of sufficient merit to warrant this concession;
 - (h) recommend that the degree be not awarded.
- (ii) A candidate awarded the degree in terms of Rule 5.3.(i)(b) shall complete the amendments within three months for minor amendments and six months for major amendments. These will be made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor, the relevant Head of School, or both.
- (iii) A candidate permitted to revise a thesis for re-examination in terms of Rule 5.3.(i)(g) shall complete the revision within 9 months under the supervision of a principal supervisor or supervisors endorsed by the Committee.
- (iv) A candidate who has revised a thesis in terms of Rule 5.3.(i)(g) and who fails the re-examination shall not be eligible for any further examination.
- (v) An external adjudicator will only be appointed by the Committee if the three examiners are unable to come to a consensus recommendation. If the adjudicator recommends that the candidate's thesis be revised and resubmitted, then the adjudicator will serve as the sole examiner for the resubmitted thesis.

5.4 Process Upon Recommendation of "Degree Not Be Awarded"

- (i) Where the Committee intends to make the unfavourable recommendation described in Rule 5.3.(i)(h), the candidate and principal supervisor will be given

an opportunity to separately respond to the examiners' comments. In such cases the candidate and principal supervisor shall be allowed a maximum of eight weeks from the date of the letter of notification by which to submit a response. The Committee will make its final recommendation on the basis of all information received.

- (ii) If the thesis is sent to new examiners, to an adjudicator or into a consultation process, the candidate will be invited at each stage to reply to resulting comments leading toward a recommendation which the Committee determines will be unfavourable to the candidate. Candidate responses will be considered by the relevant examiner(s) or adjudicator at the appropriate stage whereupon a final recommendation will be forwarded to the Committee. At all stages, the candidate must confine his or her comments to matters of academic and substantive concern in his or her thesis.
- (iii) The Committee will consider all information so gathered in reaching its final determination as to whether the degree be awarded.

5.5 Appeals Against a Recommendation of "Degree Not Be Awarded"

- (i) Candidates have the right of appeal against an unfavourable examination outcome described in Rule 5.3.(i)(h) and will be invited to submit a report to the Academic Board detailing any concerns they may have about the examination process. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Academic Board within four weeks of receiving the advice of the unfavourable outcome. The formal appeal, recommendation, all examiners' reports, candidate responses and any other relevant material shall then be referred to the Academic Board for review and final decision.
- (ii) Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
 - (a) procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination;
 - (b) documental evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of one or more examiners.
- (iii) Standing Committee will not consider any appeal where the candidate simply rejects the academic assessments of his or her work or where the candidate complains about inadequacy of supervision or other problems arising during the course of the candidate's PhD program (problems encountered during candidature should be handled by grievance procedures at the appropriate time – see Rule 3).
- (iv) Any member of the Standing Committee involved in making the recommendations in Rule 5.3.(i)(h) from the Higher Degree Research Committee will absent themselves from all discussions of the appeal. If the Standing Committee sends a formal recommendation of fail, thereby upholding the procedural fairness of the Higher Degree Research Committee's recommendation, to the Academic Board, these same individuals shall absent themselves from the Board meeting during discussion of the recommendation. There shall be no appeal against the final decision of the Standing Committee.