

## Professional Doctorate for Industry/Professions (ProfD) Rules

<b>Document Type:</b>	Rules
<b>Administering Entity:</b>	Research Services
<b>TRIM Number:</b>	ABC11/199
<b>Date Endorsed by Academic Board:</b>	28 November 2011
<b>Date Approved by Council:</b>	5 December 2011
<b>Indicative time for Review:</b>	5 years from approval date
<b>Responsibility for Review:</b>	Academic Board Higher Degree Research Committee
<b>Related Policies or Other Documents:</b>	Conferring Awards Posthumously: Higher Degree Research Policy Confirmation of Candidature Policy General Rules

### Context of the ProfD

The Professional Doctorate for Industry/Profession is designed as an applied research doctorate that focuses on the research and development journey for an innovation. Demonstrating innovation impact or potential for impact in relevant contexts will be an expected aspect of this professional doctorate. The innovation process and its associated innovation will be situated within the candidate's own industry/profession context/workplace. The ProfD focuses explicitly on innovation in context, which means that an innovation, and the research surrounding it, needs to be properly embedded within a candidate's specific industry, workplace and/or profession. This therefore requires candidature for this award to be limited to a part-time mode of study and the candidate must already be working within their intended context for innovation, with appropriate commitment and support having been secured from their employer in that context.

### 1. Interpretation

In these rules, unless any contrary intention appears:

- (a) *ProfD* means Professional Doctorate for Industry/ Professions;
- (b) *the Committee* means the Higher Degree Research (HDR) Committee or an Examinations Sub Committee of the HDR Committee;
- (c) *school* means school in The University of New England;
- (d) *course* means the program of advanced level course work and the Innovation Portfolio;
- (e) *unit* is interpreted as a period of study in a subject and is a component of a course;
- (f) *industry/profession* means the context for which the candidate will be conducting their innovation portfolio research;
- (g) *Innovation Portfolio* refers to the integrated research outcome that is examined for purposes of awarding the degree;
- (h) *ProfD Coordinator* means the person responsible for overseeing all program-and project-related aspects of ProfD candidature.

---

## 2. Admission to Candidature

2.1. A candidate may be admitted on the recommendation of the ProfD Coordinator to the six-year (Part-time only) Professional Doctorate program if the candidate has fulfilled *both* **(a)** academic and **(b)** industry/profession requirements:

**(a) Academic Requirements for Candidature:** The applicant shall:

- (i) hold 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 Master's program; *or*
- (ii) hold the degree of Bachelor with first class Honours or second class Honours in the First Division; or equivalent; *or*
- (iii) hold another degree, plus subsequent qualifications and/or relevant research experience that are deemed by the ProfD Coordinator to satisfy the academic requirements for candidature; *or*
- (iv) hold similar qualification(s) acceptable to the University from another institution(s). Such qualifications must be of the standard of Australian or British universities in the University's judgement.

**(b) Industry/Profession Requirements for Candidature:** The applicant shall:

- (i) have a minimum of five (5) years of relevant experience in an industry or profession; *and*
- (ii) wherever possible, but mandatory in cases where criterion 2.1. (a) (i) has not been met, demonstrate he/she has successfully undertaken prior contextualised research activity in a relevant profession/industry at the equivalent of Masters level. Such demonstrated prior contextualised research could include previous:
  - > research surrounding the development and implementation of innovations;
  - > policy research;
  - > market research;
  - > research associated with commercialisation activities;
  - > action research;
  - > workplace evaluations;
  - > evaluation of innovation(s) and/or innovation adoption;
  - > change management, monitoring and evaluation; and/or
  - > any other evidence of research and innovation development capacity deemed sufficient and relevant by the ProfD Coordinator.

2.2. The candidate, prior to admission, must identify a mentor from a relevant industry/profession, who is willing and able to commit to advising the candidate, in conjunction with the candidate's UNE supervisors, on their ProfD research.

- 
- 2.3. The candidate must also, prior to admission, seek a formal letter of support from their organisation or workplace supporting their candidature in the ProfD.
  - 2.4. Every applicant for admission to candidature shall submit to the ProfD Coordinator, in addition to the normal application for candidature, an Innovation Portfolio Project Prospectus. This prospectus will help the ProfD Coordinator, in consultation with relevant others, judge the suitability of the proposed project for the ProfD and to help identify possible UNE supervisors.

### 3. **Supervision**

- 3.1. The ProfD is a supervised research degree and supervisors and mentors shall have a general advisory role during the course work portion of the degree. The candidate's research and preparation of the Innovation Portfolio **must** be carried out under the guidance of a supervisory team comprising (normally) two members of the University staff **and** the candidate's nominated industry/profession mentor. UNE supervisors will be appointed by the relevant Head of School on the recommendation of the ProfD Coordinator. At least one such supervisor shall have a proven and current record of research and experience in the supervision of postgraduate research candidates. One supervisor will be nominated as the principal supervisor who shall be responsible for coordinating the supervision in accordance with such procedures and guidelines as the Committee shall determine from time to time.
- 3.2. The industry/profession mentor shall be considered to be an advisor to the candidate and his/her supervisors and will therefore not be subject to the requirement for Adjunct status and listing on the supervisory register. However, the industry/profession mentor may, where appropriate, seek an Adjunct appointment at UNE, in which case they would be able to take on a formal co-supervisory role. Candidature will not commence until and unless an industry/profession mentor has been secured by the candidate.
- 3.3. In exceptional circumstances where multiple UNE supervisors are thought to be impractical, the Head of School, after consulting the ProfD Coordinator, will forward a report to the Committee detailing the reasons why UNE co-supervision is not practical and indicating what procedures will be put in place to handle principal supervisory duties where the nominated principal 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.
- 3.4. The relevant Head of School, on the recommendation of the ProfD Coordinator, may appoint an additional supervisor or supervisors; such a supervisor may be an emeritus professor or an adjunct appointment of the University.
- 3.5. The Head of School, on the recommendation of the ProfD Coordinator, may replace a supervisor at any time.

- 
- 3.6. The principal supervisor is in large measure responsible for ensuring that the high standard of the degree is maintained. The principal supervisor shall carry out the responsibilities in accordance with the following rules:
- (a) the principal supervisor leads the candidate's supervisory team;
  - (b) the principal supervisor, in consultation with the supervisory team, the ProfD Coordinator and relevant Head of School, shall ensure that the innovation and research trajectory undertaken by the candidate in the Innovation Portfolio is at an appropriate academic level **and** has an appropriate degree of industry/profession and other contextual relevance and is likely, if successfully completed, to generate further research outcomes such as publication, commercialisation and/or wider implementation;
  - (c) the principal supervisor, in conjunction with the rest of the supervisory team, shall advise the candidate on the quality of drafts of their portfolio, but the portfolio finally presented shall be substantially the independent work of the candidate;
  - (d) the principal supervisor shall receive from the candidate progress reports required in terms of Rule 5.1. and shall forward these, together with comment from the ProfD Coordinator and the relevant Head of School, to Research Services with his or her assessment of the candidate's progress;
  - (e) if the principal supervisor, ProfD Coordinator or the relevant Head of School is of the opinion that the candidate is not making satisfactory progress, they shall recommend to the Committee that the candidate be invited to show cause why the candidature should not be terminated.
- 3.7. Supervisors and industry/profession mentors, who have not previously supervised a UNE ProfD candidate, will be contacted by the ProfD Coordinator to discuss the ProfD and expectations surrounding its supervision and research outcomes. They will also be required to complete the online ProfD induction process for supervisors and industry/profession mentors. The ProfD Coordinator will be required to sign off when a supervisor or industry/profession mentor has completed the induction process.

#### 4. **Conditions of Candidature**

- 4.1. The ProfD is explicitly a distance education doctorate focusing on contextually situated innovation research and as such the candidate normally will undertake their entire candidature while situated in their workplace. Candidates will be expected to maintain regular face-to-face or virtual contact with all members of their supervisory team throughout their candidature, commencing in the coursework phase.
- 4.2. No candidate may enrol in, or remain enrolled in, any other course or unit either at the University or at any other institution without the consent of the principal supervisor and the approval of the ProfD Coordinator.
- 4.3. A candidate shall give at least three months' notice to the supervisory team and the ProfD Coordinator of the anticipated date of their portfolio submission.
- 4.4. Initially, a candidate shall enrol from the date of commencement of the first unit of study.

---

4.5 Once candidates have formally accepted the offer of candidature and enrolled, they must contact their nominated principal supervisor to discuss arrangements for working with the supervisory team and to ensure that the candidate completes the formal online ProfD induction process for candidates. The principal supervisor will be required to sign off when the candidate has completed the ProfD induction process. Candidates need to agree on contact arrangements and maintain regular communication with their supervisory team for the duration of candidature.

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

## 5. **Progress Report**

5.1. Annually, within 12 months following the anniversary of commencement of the research phase of the candidature, and at such other times considered expedient by the candidate, the principal supervisor, ProfD Coordinator or the committee, the candidate shall submit a report on his or her progress. The principal supervisor, ProfD Coordinator and the relevant Head of School shall comment on the candidate's report on progress before that report is forwarded to Research Services

5.2. Following an unsatisfactory progress report, the Committee may continue the candidature or consider termination of the candidature under the conditions of Rule 6.3. The Committee may seek clarification or advice from the candidate, the principal supervisor, ProfD Coordinator or the relevant Head of School prior to deciding whether to continue candidature or consider termination of candidature.

## 6. **Withdrawals; Termination of Candidature**

6.1. (a) A candidate may withdraw from candidature by writing to Research Services.

(b) A candidate may not withdraw from candidature after submission of the portfolio except that a candidate who has been invited to revise the portfolio in terms of Rule 13.6.(e) and who does not accept that invitation shall be deemed to have withdrawn from candidature.

6.2. The ProfD Coordinator may readmit to candidature a person who has withdrawn. The ProfD Coordinator shall decide what part, if any, of the candidature completed prior to the withdrawal shall be counted towards the new period of candidature.

6.3. In the event:

(a) that a principal supervisor reports a candidate's progress to be unsatisfactory; *or*

(b) of the candidate's failure to complete prescribed course work at a standard determined by Rule 9.2; *or*

(c) of the candidate's failure to comply with any other provisions of these rules;

---

the candidature will be terminated by the Committee unless it determines otherwise on the basis of written or other evidence placed before it. Before candidature may be terminated in terms of this rule the candidate will be invited to show cause, by a date to be determined by the Committee, why candidature should not be terminated.

## **7. Advanced Standing**

- 7.1. Advanced standing may be granted, by the ProfD Coordinator on the recommendation of the principal supervisor, for a maximum of one unit passed at a university, provided that unit:
  - (a) is of equivalent standard to units available for the ProfD program;
  - (b) is appropriate to the candidate's ProfD program;
  - (c) has not counted to a completed qualification.
- 7.2. Only under exceptional circumstances shall advanced standing be granted for the advanced research methodology unit (PROF 798).
- 7.3. Advanced standing may be granted for a unit passed elsewhere after admission to candidature provided that the candidate has previously obtained the permission of the ProfD Coordinator to enrol in such a unit.

## **8. Course Requirements**

A candidate for the degree shall pursue a course consisting of advanced course work and the innovation portfolio approved by the ProfD Coordinator in consultation with the principal supervisor.

## **9. Course Work**

- 9.1. A candidate will be required to complete a program of advanced level course work approved by the ProfD Coordinator, on the recommendation of the supervisor,. Normally, the advanced level course work will comprise four units: PROF 795, PROF 796; PROF 797 and PROF 798.
- 9.2. Candidates will be required to achieve a Distinction average across the four course work units before proceeding to the Innovation Portfolio research component of the degree.
- 9.3. The examination grade of each course work unit shall be recorded on the candidate's official transcript of academic record.
- 9.4. If the candidate does not achieve a Distinction average across the four advanced units of study, the ProfD Coordinator, in consultation with the principal supervisor and the relevant Head of school, shall recommend to the Committee that the candidate be withdrawn from ProfD candidature.
- 9.5. If a candidate receives a fail (N) or failed incomplete (NI) grade on any coursework unit they will be asked to show cause why their candidature should not be terminated.

---

## 10. Innovation Portfolio Proposal

- 10.1. Within 12 months after initial enrolment in the innovation portfolio component of the ProfD (i.e. PROF 799), the candidate, following consultation with his/her supervisory team, shall undergo Confirmation of Candidature, in accordance with the Confirmation of Candidature Policy. The candidate will be required to present an Innovation Portfolio Proposal to the ProfD Coordinator, who will chair the confirmation panel. The candidate will also be required to participate in a thorough review of their Innovation Portfolio Proposal involving a seminar or other appropriate means. Once the Innovation Portfolio Proposal is considered by the confirmation panel to be satisfactory, a précis of the research proposal shall be reported to Research Services. The confirmation process will be explained in the ProfD induction sessions for new candidates. Newly enrolled candidates 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.
- 10.2. If, within 15 months after initial enrolment in the innovation portfolio, the candidate has not submitted a research proposal considered satisfactory by a confirmation panel, the principal supervisor, in consultation with the ProfD Coordinator and the relevant Head of School shall present a report on the candidate's progress to Research Services. In the event that unsatisfactory progress is reported, the Committee shall invite the candidate to show cause as to why candidature should not be terminated.

## 11. ProfD Innovation Portfolio

- 11.1. On completion of the program of coursework, innovation and research, a candidate shall present for examination an Innovation Portfolio embodying the results of the candidate's innovation and research which shall be substantially an original contribution. All portfolio components will centre on the candidate's innovation, its development, implementation, developmental evaluation and, where appropriate, evaluation of impact, and critical reflection and anticipations.
- 11.2. The Innovation Portfolio, exclusive of any appendices or supplemental materials, will normally have a maximum of 75 000 words, including linkage texts between the various portfolio components, but excluding any appendix materials. There may be special instances where, with the permission of the Committee on recommendation of the principal supervisor, the portfolio may exceed these limits.
- 11.3. The Innovation Portfolio shall be written in English unless, to accommodate the requirements of a particular discipline, the Committee has given prior permission for it to be written in another language. Applications for such permission must be lodged with the secretary of the Committee not less than six months before the portfolio is submitted.
- 11.4. (a) A candidate shall state generally in the preface of the portfolio and specifically in notes, the sources from which the information is derived, the extent to which he or she has made use of the work of others and the portion of work which is claimed as original.  
  
(b) A candidate may not present as the portfolio any work which has been submitted for examination for any award at this University or another institution, but will not be precluded

---

from incorporating such work in the portfolio, provided that, in presenting the portfolio for examination, the candidate indicates the part of the work which has been so incorporated.

- 11.5. On the recommendation of the principal supervisor, the ProfD Coordinator may allow a candidate to submit with the portfolio supporting material such as CD/DVDs, audio tapes, video tapes and computer discs. Part of the Innovation Portfolio may also include reference to online materials or other multimedia formats. An application for permission to submit supporting material shall be made not less than three months before the proposed date of submission of the portfolio unless, in special circumstances, the ProfD Coordinator allows a later application.
- 11.6 The candidate shall submit to the Secretary to the Committee a copy of the Innovation Portfolio in a format approved by the Committee. All online, multi-media or creative practice components must be accessible by examiners.

The submitted Innovation Portfolio shall incorporate:

- (a) an abstract of the portfolio;
  - (b) a statement summarising the intellectual property arrangements associated with the portfolio;  
*and*
  - (c) a statement, electronically signed by the candidate, certifying that the substance of the portfolio has not been nor is currently being submitted for any other degree or award and that, to the best of his or her knowledge, all help received in preparing the portfolio and all sources used have been acknowledged in the portfolio.
- 11.7. The candidate shall, upon submission of the portfolio, 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 portfolio.
- 11.8. (a) At the time the portfolio is submitted, the principal supervisor shall provide a certificate stating:
- (i) that the principal supervisor, in conjunction with the supervisory team, has discussed with the candidate the academic and industry/profession content of the portfolio 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 it is ready for submission for examination for the degree;
  - (ii) that all requirements of the school, in regard to the deposition of museum material or any other supporting material have been met;
  - (iii) that all intellectual property requirements and obligations have been met; *and*
  - (iv) that the physical form and presentation of the portfolio are appropriate to the ProfD.

- 
- (b) 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 Committee a written statement setting out the grounds on which the certificate is withheld.
- 11.9. The certificate referred to in Rule 11.8 shall be received before a portfolio is accepted for examination. When, for any reason, the certificate is withheld, the Committee may decline to accept the portfolio 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.

## 12. Examination

- 12.1. (a) On receiving notice of intention to submit a portfolio the Committee, on the recommendation of the ProfD Coordinator, Head of the School and principal supervisor, shall appoint three examiners at least two of whom shall be external to the University of New England\* plus one reserve examiner. A pool of at least six potential examiners (two from each category listed under 12.1 (b)) from which the three plus reserve are selected must have been assembled through consultation between the principal supervisor, the supervisory team, the ProfD Coordinator and the candidate. 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 portfolio 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 candidates. In cases where a portfolio has been permitted to exceed the normal 75 000 word limit, examiners shall be informed of this fact so they may consider it when making their decision to examine.

\*Special cases can be made.

- (b) One examiner must be appointed from each of the following categories:
- (i) an **academic** with doctorate or professional doctorate who examines primarily from the university/academic perspective;
  - (ii) an **acknowledged professional leader, practitioner or policy expert**, where a doctorate is not a necessary prerequisite, who examines primarily from relevant industry/profession/workplace/policy contextual perspectives;
  - (iii) a **'boundary spanner'** with doctorate and with expertise/experience in academic as well as relevant industry/profession/workplace/policy contexts (e.g. professional/industry leader with doctorate; academic who is now a professional professional/industry practitioner/leader; former professional/industry practitioner who is now an academic; or Profession/industry-based researcher).

The fourth reserve examiner may be drawn from any of the three categories.

- 
- 12.2. No person who has been a principal supervisor or co-supervisor of the student shall be appointed as an examiner. No person with a real or substantial possibility of conflict of interest that is, in a reasonable person's opinion, likely to influence the examination process will be approved as an examiner.

(see Australian Council of DDoGS *Conflict of Interest Guidelines* 2011 on the Research Services Website)..

- 12.3. Each examiner shall make a separate written report on the merits of the portfolio and shall submit a summary recommendation form prescribed by the Committee. Before submitting the report an examiner may consult the other examiner or examiners. The examiners shall inform the Committee whether consultation has taken place.
- 12.4. The identity of examiners shall not be revealed to a candidate until the conclusion of the examination process at which time the Committee shall either reveal or withhold their names in accordance with their instructions.
- 12.5. The examiners' reports on the portfolio, together with the result of the prescribed course work shall be considered by the Committee which shall recommend:
- (a) that the degree be awarded; *or*
  - (b) that the degree be awarded subject to the candidate making such amendments to the portfolio as specified by the examiners and to the satisfaction of the supervisory team and, if appropriate, the ProfD Coordinator and/or relevant Head of School; *or*
  - (c) that the degree not be awarded.
- 12.6. Before making a recommendation in terms of Rule 12.5. the Committee may:
- (a) request that the examiners consult and report to the Committee;
  - (b) appoint an additional examiner or examiners;
  - (c) appoint an external adjudicator who shall consider and report to the Committee upon the portfolio and any supporting papers and the reports of the examiners;
  - (d) require the candidate to sit for such examinations as the Committee may prescribe;
  - (e) permit the candidate to revise the portfolio for re-examination if, in the opinion of the Committee, the work is of sufficient merit to warrant this concession; and
  - (f) consult with the candidate's supervisor or supervisors, with the ProfD Coordinator, with the relevant Head or Heads of School or with such other persons as the Committee deems appropriate.
- 12.7. In cases where an examiner or examiners report unfavourably upon a portfolio the Committee may invite the candidate to respond to the examiners' comments. In such cases the candidate shall be

---

allowed a maximum of eight weeks from the date of the letter of notification by which to submit a response. The Committee may refer any such response to any of the examiners for comment.

- 12.8. (a) A candidate permitted to revise a portfolio in terms of Rule 12.6.(e) shall complete the revision within a period of time and under such conditions as the Committee shall prescribe.
- (b) A candidate who has revised a portfolio in terms of Rule 12.6.(e) and who fails the re-examination shall not be eligible for any further examination.
- 12.9. Except as provided in Rule 12.10, a portfolio which has been revised in terms of Rule 12.6.(e) shall be examined by the examiners of the original version of the portfolio if they are available. If an examiner of the original version is unavailable, the Committee shall appoint a replacement examiner on the recommendation of the Head of School concerned, after consultation with the ProfD Coordinator and the principal supervisor. Each examiner of a revised portfolio shall be provided with copies of the reports of all examiners of the original version of the portfolio.
- 12.10. 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 portfolio be revised and resubmitted, then the adjudicator will serve as the sole examiner for the resubmitted portfolio.
- 12.11. In cases where the Committee invokes the provision of Rule 12.5 (c) the recommendation and the examiners' reports and any other relevant material shall be referred to the Standing Committee of the Academic Board for review and final decision. There shall be no appeal against the final decision.
- 12.12. An examiner or adjudicator shall be asked to submit his or her report on the portfolio within two months of receipt of a copy of it. An examiner or adjudicator who does not report within a reasonable time may be replaced by the Committee. Any report subsequently received from a replaced examiner or adjudicator shall not be considered by the Committee.
- 12.13. A candidate may be awarded the ProfD cum laude in cases where the examiners unanimously and independently agree that the portfolio is of exceptional quality in every respect and can be awarded without requirement of anything other than minor editorial amendments.
- 12.14. Where any examination, adjudication or consultation report is received by the Committee, on which basis the Committee is considering recommending that the candidate not be awarded the degree (Rule 9.3.1h), the candidate and his/her supervisory team shall be notified in writing of the content of that report and may within eight weeks lodge a response limited to the academic/industry/profession and substantive matters raised in the report. The Committee shall take into account the submissions from the supervisory team and/or candidate in determining whether the degree be awarded.

---

### 13. Intellectual Property<sup>1</sup>

- 13.1. Where innovation research and development are conducted in cooperation with or under the sponsorship of an industry, profession or workplace, or where the intellectual property associated with an innovation may have commercial significance, the University requires that negotiations with respect to the ownership and any assignment for management of any intellectual property arising from or associated with the innovation that is the focus of portfolio project must be formalised, prior to approval of enrolment in the portfolio project, in accordance with the UNE Knowledge Assets and Intellectual Property Policy (<http://www.une.edu.au/policies/pdf/knowledgeassetsintellectualproperty.pdf>) and using the appropriate form available from Research Services.
- 13.2. In the event that details of any intellectual property or process improvement is contained within a portfolio, and where the candidate does not seek to restrict public access to that project as pursuant to sub-section 14.2, the principal supervisor, the ProfD Coordinator and/or the relevant Head of School may seek to protect the interests of the University or the industry sponsor, or both, and apply through Academic Board for such restriction to be approved.
- 13.3. In the event that a project contains sensitive or potentially patentable or commercialisable innovation and/or research results, the University shall ensure that examiners sign an appropriate confidentiality agreement prior to examining the project. The University shall take whatever other action is necessary to protect patentable material in a way which will not introduce undue delay in the awarding of the degree.
- 13.4. In all other cases, and consistent with UNE Knowledge Assets and Intellectual Property Policy (especially relating to patents, royalties and proprietary information), the candidate shall normally hold copyright in any intellectual property associated with or arising from their research.

### 14. Access to Portfolios

Refer to the General Rules (Rule 5 Access to Theses)

### 15. Appeals against a Recommendation of Degree Not Be Awarded

- 15.1 Candidates have the right of appeal against an unfavourable examination outcome described in Rule 12.5. (c) and will be invited to submit a report to the Standing Committee of Academic Board (the Standing Committee) 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 and supervisory team responses and any other relevant material shall then be referred to the Standing Committee for review and final decision.
- 15.2. Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
- (a) procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination; and/or
  - (b) documentary evidence of prejudice or bias by one or more examiners.

---

<sup>1</sup> This section drew heavily upon the *Rules for the Degree of the Professional Doctorate (Transdisciplinary Studies)* from Central Queensland University (2007 version approved by their Academic Board).

- 
- 15.3. The Standing Committee will not consider any appeal where the candidate simply rejects the academic assessments of his/her work or where the candidate complains about inadequacy of supervision or other problems arising during the course of the candidate's research program. Problems encountered during candidature should be handled by grievance procedures at the appropriate time.
- 15.4 Any member of the Standing Committee involved in making the recommendations in Rule 12.5. (c) from the Higher Degree Research Committee will absent him/herself 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.
- 15.5 The final appeal to the Standing Committee does not affect the right of a candidate to seek a review (but not a further appeal) of the examination process by the University Ombudsman or the NSW Ombudsman.

16. **Relaxing Clause**

In exceptional circumstances, the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the HDR Committee, may relax any rule.