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### 1. FORMAL MATTERS
We acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the lands in which our meetings take place, the Wadawurrung, Gunai Kurnai, Boon Wurrung and Wurundjeri people, and pay our respects to their Elders past and present.

### 2. APOLOGIES AND WELCOME
Recommendation RHDC1/20/1

Apologies for the meeting be received and accepted.
2.2 Guest Speaker Dr Sara Weuffen
Dr Sara Weuffen will speak on her findings on Indigenous HDR students.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING
Members are invited to confirm the minutes of the previous meeting RHDC6/19 held on 21 November 2019.
Recommendation RHDC1/20/2
Research Higher Degree Committee confirms the minutes of meeting RHDC6/19 held on 21 November 2019.

4. STARRING OF ITEMS AND APPROVAL OF NON-STARRED ITEMS

4.1 Starred items
Consider which items should be starred and therefore open for discussion in addition to those already marked with an asterisk.

4.2 Non-starred items
Recommendation RHDC1/20/3
All items on the agenda “not starred” be adopted without discussion and the action recommended be taken, or the information therein noted.

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
The Chair will update the committee on business arising from previous meetings.

6. CHAIR’S REPORT
The Chair will provide a verbal report.

7. DVCRI REPORT
The Deputy Vice Chancellor of Research and Innovation (DVCRI) is an apology and there will be no report.

8. HDR CANDIDATURE MATTERS AND UPDATE

8.1 HDR Completions
8.2 HDR Administration and Management Report

For noting
Agenda paper 8.2

8.3 Supervisors Added to the Register

For noting
Agenda paper 8.3

9. NEW BUSINESS

9.1 Workload allocation for HDR Supervision
The allocation for HDR supervision in workload allocations being used in the academic schools is reported to be ½ hour per week per candidate which is considered insufficient.

The allocation for associate supervisors is 20 hours per year for a full time student, which is significantly under allocated.

We need a realistic hour allocation.

For discussion
A/Prof Wendy Wright

9.2 Supervision Expectations in the HDR Handbook
Consider drafting and adding guidelines on supervision expectations/engagement (e.g. hours required from both the student and supervisors) in the Higher Degree Research Handbook. There are clear guidelines for student engagements (both face-to-face and student private study time) for undergraduate students.

For discussion
Dr Rob Watson
Submitted by Dr Louisa Lam

9.3 Student Grievance Policy and Procedure
We have missed a recent opportunity to contribute to the revised version of these University Policy and Procedures. (Links available at: Student Appeal Procedure CG1464 and Student Appeal Policy CG1488). HDR candidates are not adequately considered in Student Appeals Procedure. For example there is no opportunity for HDR candidates to appeal against an examination outcome, since this sits under Regulation 5.1 and not Regulation 5.3 (Assessment – for undergraduate students). Also information regarding an appeal against a final grade is couched in language suitable for undergraduate coursework students and not HDR candidates. It is proposed that RHDC members review the current policy and make a set of recommendations to ensure that HDR candidates are adequately considered.

For discussion
Rebekah Bailey

9.4 Changes to Regulation 5.1 impacting HDR Theses and Examinations Policy
The changes to Regulation 5.1 have resulted in alterations to the HDR Theses and Examinations Policy. A copy of the policy with tracked changes is attached for the information of, and endorsement by, committee members.

For endorsement
A/Prof Wendy Wright
Agenda paper 9.4

10. REPORT FROM TEAM LEADER, HDR
The Higher Degree by Research Team Leader will provide a verbal report.

For reporting
11. REPORT FROM GRADUATE SCHOOL COORDINATOR
The Graduate School Coordinator will provide a verbal report.

For reporting
Dr Robert Watson

12. REPORTS FROM THE SCHOOLS ON HDR MATTERS
12.1 Federation Business School
For noting
Agenda paper 12.1

12.2 School of Arts
For noting
Agenda paper 12.2

12.3 School of Education
For noting
Agenda paper 12.3

12.4 School of Health and Life Sciences
For noting
Agenda paper 12.4

12.5 School of Nursing and Healthcare Professions
For noting
Agenda paper 12.5.1
Agenda paper 12.5.2

12.6 School of Science, Engineering and Information Technology
For noting
Agenda paper 12.6

13. ATHENA SWAN UPDATE
There will be no report.

14. OTHER DOCUMENTS FOR NOTING

14.1 Changes to Regulation 5.1
Chair Academic Board, DVC Academic and Vice Chancellors Senior Team (VCST) have all requested changes to Regulation 5.1 which have recently been approved by VCST. The tracked changes version is provided for members to note these changes.

For noting
Agenda paper 14.1

14.2 Changes to Candidature Management Policy and Procedure relating to confirmation of candidates applying to transfer from Masters by Research to PhD
Proposed changes to the Candidature Management Policy are highlighted in the attached document. These include:

- clarification of requirements for probationary Masters by Research candidates wishing to transfer to the PhD program, and requirements for confirmation for these candidates.
- clarification on word limits for confirmation documents regarding referencing and footnotes

These are minor changes are for noting only.

For noting
Agenda paper 14.2.1 - Policy
Agenda paper 14.2.2 - Procedure
14.3 HDR Handbook Final Edit

For noting
Agenda paper 14.3

14.4 Sepp Report 2019

For noting
Agenda paper 14.4

14.5 SDP Evaluation Report

For noting
Agenda paper 14.5

14.6 HDR Space Survey Results

For noting
Agenda paper 14.6

15. OTHER BUSINESS
16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting RHDC2/20 is scheduled for Thursday 21 May 2020.
Minutes - Unconfirmed

Research Higher Degrees Committee

Meeting: RHDC6/19

Members:
- Professor Fadi Charchar (Chair)
- Associate Professor Wendy Wright (Deputy Chair)
- Associate Professor Robyn Brandenburg (ADR SoE)
- Associate Professor David Piedrafita (ADR SHLS)
- Professor Manzur Murshed (ADR SEIT)
- Dr Jackie Tuck (Acting ADR FBS, HDRC FBS)
- Professor Simon Cooper (ADR SNHP)
- Rebekah Bailey
- Dr Rob Watson
- Ms Amy Hunter (Director, Research Services)
- Student Representative (Vacant)

Apologies:
- Professor Chris Hutchison (DVCRI)
- Dr Simon Cooper (HDRC SoA)
- Associate Professor Jeremy Smith (ADR SoA)
- Associate Professor Elisa Zentveld (Chair Academic Board)
- Dr Grant Palmer (HDRC SHLS)

Attendees:
- Associate Professor Margaret Plunkett (HDRC SoE)
- Dr Madhu Chetty (HDRC SEIT)
- (HDRC SNHP)
- Emily Hearnshaw (Secretariat)

Date and time: Thursday 21 November 10.30am-12.30pm

Venue:
- T103 Mt Helen Campus
- 2W263 Gippsland Campus
- 901_245 Berwick Campus

Telephone: 5327 6173  Email: e.hearnshaw@federation.edu.au

Formal Matters
The Chair acknowledged the Traditional Owners of the lands in which the meetings took place, the Wadawurrung, Gunai Kurnai, Boon Wurrung and Wurundjeri people, and paid respects to their Elders past and present.
Minutes - Unconfirmed

1. Apologies and welcome

1.1 Welcome
The Chair welcomed the new Director of Research Services, Ms Amy Hunter.

1.2 Apologies
Recommendation RHDC6/19/1
Apologies for the meeting were received and accepted.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

Members confirmed and approved the minutes of previous meeting RHDC5/19 held on 10 October 2019.
Recommendation RHDC5/19/2
Research Higher Degree Committee confirms the minutes of meeting RHDC5/19 held on 10 October 2019.

3. Starring of items and approval of non-starred items

3.1 Starred items
Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15 were starred.
Items 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16 were unstarred.

3.2 Non-starred items
Recommendation RHDC6/19/3
All items on the agenda “not starred” were adopted without discussion and the action recommended taken, or the information therein noted.

4. Business arising from the minutes

4.1 Action summary from RHDC5/19
The Chair said that the action sheet would be refined and pared down, ready to go with essential action items at RHDC1/20 on 13 February 2020.
Professor Wright asked for feedback on the Toolkit for ADRs and HDRCs document.
Regarding Actions arising from RHDC5/19, item 8.1 Review of Student surveys: Working party members were confirmed.

5. Chair’s report

The Chair will provide a verbal report, with the following main points:
Destination Australia Scholarships:
- 36 for Ballarat, 1 for Gippsland, 1 for Wimmera.
- For both undergraduates and post-graduates, at the university’s discretion.
Minutes - Unconfirmed

- They could be used for international students.
- Destination Scholarships are available to students who would move to Ballarat or Gippsland in order to study. They are not open to existing Federation University students.
- There was a budget of $80000 to spend on marketing for Destination Australia scholarships. Going forward the plan was to develop strong projects, which could then be advertised.
- Members asked for clear guidance as to what scholarships were available, and the conditions and amounts of each.

**ACTION – Professor Charchar to write a paper outlining the different scholarships available, ready to present at RHDC1/20 on 13 February 2020.**

Associate Professor Wright and Professor Charchar went to the Australian Council of Graduate Research Conference. The Australian Government had developed new, strict guidelines about international interference. Federation University would need to develop policies to ensure compliance.

**ACTION – Professor Charchar and Associate Professor Wright to share the interference guidelines with members.**

Also at the ACGR meetings Federation University was recognized for coming second in engaging with [industry].

There was also a strong emphasis on mental health for HDR candidates, and Federation University was reportedly doing well on this front.

The Research Strategy was nearly finalized.

The Research Priority Areas Strategy was being finalized.

The call for Research Centres would be going out shortly, and the deadline would be the end of January.

6. Deputy Vice Chancellor of Research and Innovation’s (DVCRI) report

There was no report as the DVCRI was an apology.

7. HDR candidature matters and update

7.1 HDR Completions

7.2 HDR Administration and Management Report

7.3 Supervisors added to the register

8. New Business

8.1 Scholarships Ranking Process

Members discussed the scholarships ranking tool. They were in agreement that due to the work done by the working party, it had been greatly improved. However, there was still some work to be done to make sure that Federation University students were not disadvantaged, and that the scores could be compared across Schools. Point 3 line 30 was discussed as the cap of 8 was problematic.

**ACTION – Re-convene the working party to continue work refining the Scholarships Ranking Tool.**
8.2 RTP Scholarship Allocations 2020

Top ranked for each school
(Guaranteed stipends)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisnu Arya Surendra</td>
<td>SSEIT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Martin</td>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Miller</td>
<td>SNHP</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Kitt</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikaela Cole</td>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second ranked for each school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Weir</td>
<td>SSEIT</td>
<td>21.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masudus Salehin</td>
<td>SNHP</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Quick</td>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew Frith</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Rosseland</td>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools were all given the choice of:
1. Awarding two scholarships.
2. Awarding one scholarship now. Take the value of the second scholarship and use it to top up TWO Destination Australia scholarships.

The course of action taken by each school would be dependent on the number and quality of scholarship applicants.

If Schools decided to hold the second scholarship in order to use it to top up 2 scholarships, the applicants would need to re-apply for the new scholarships.

ACTIONS
- Conditional letters to first ranked applicants would be sent within the next 3-4 days.
- All Schools to let Rebekah Bailey know within the next three days if they would like to award the second scholarship. Aim is to get a conditional letter out before Friday 29 November.
- All Schools to let Rebekah Bailey know which applicants given a candidature only offer by Friday 6 December.

The next round of Research Priority Area scholarships would be discussed at RHDC1/20 on the 13 February 2020.
Next stages for Schools

- Assembling supervisor panels.
- Completing the supervisor section and the school section of the application.
- The aim is to get the offers to the students as quickly as possible.
- More information can be found in the RTP Teams folder.

ACTION – Professor Charchar to let the schools know about the Destination Australia Scholarships within the next few days.

9. Report from Team Leader, Higher Degree by Research

Ms. Bailey gave a report with the following main points:

- 39 applications had been received, which was a good number, on par with previous years.
- Annual Progress Reporting was underway. Schools had received their ‘Satisfactory’ reports.
- Students must be re-enrolled by 18 January 2020, or they would be fined. They had been advised via email.
- CampusSolutions was operational.
  - Data entry was continuing.
  - Significant date emails would still be sent from Research Master.
  - Online forms for withdrawal and leave from study would soon be available. They would go through an approval and compliance check by the Graduate Research School, and then on to the schools for approval. The CampusSolutions workload process would then automatically update the student’s information.
  - Consumption would now be in days, not EFTSIL.
  - Supervisors and ADRs/HDRCs would gain access in early 2020.
- Regulation 5.1 would be approved by Academic Board this week. This would enable moving forward of policies which would make everything much more straightforward. The new HDR Handbook reflected the new policies.

10. Report from Graduate School Coordinator

Dr Rob Watson gave a brief report with the following main points:

- The survey of student needs had been developed. Dr Watson invited feedback, and let him know if anyone was interested in begin part of the focus groups which would be held early in 2020.
- The HDR Handbook was ready for distribution. It was electronic, and contained links to more information. This marked the first time in the last five years that Federation University had a handbook. Members had a suggestion that promotional bookmarks or postcards could be designed which included links to find the Handbook.
- HDR Conference Evaluation – Once again the conference had been a great success. See agenda paper for full evaluation.
- SEPP Report would be sent to all RHDC members on completion. Amongst problems flagged was the number (40%) of students who self-identified that they were studying off-campus. Members queried how the question was being asked, and if it truly reflected students’ location relationship with the campuses.
Minutes - Unconfirmed

Professor Wright indicated that the student survey working party would be looking at the SEPP questions as well.

11. Reports from the Schools on HDR matters

11.1 Federation Business School
11.2 School of Arts
11.3 School of Education
11.4 School of Health and Life Sciences
11.5 School of Nursing and Healthcare Professions
11.6 School of Science, Engineering & Information Technology

12. Athena Swan update

13. Other documents for noting


14. Other business

• Professor Simon Cooper announced that Dr Louisa Lam had been appointed HDRC for the School of Nursing and Healthcare Professions.
• The Chair issued a reminder – Please act on examination reports quickly.
• Professor Charchar announced the results of the Graduate Research School’s 2019 Dean’s Award winners:
  o Excellence in a PhD Thesis – Lachlan Kent
  o Excellence in a PhD Thesis – Benjamin Buurman
  o Excellence in Graduate Research Supervision – High Commendation – Dr Soma Pillay
  o Excellence in Graduate Research Supervision – High Commendation – Professor Joarder Kamruzzaman
  o Excellence in Graduate Research Supervision – High Commendation – Associate Professor Shyh Wei Teng
  o Excellence in Graduate Research Supervision – Winner – Associate Professor Jerry Courvisanos

15. Date of next meeting

The next meeting RHDC1/20 was scheduled for Thursday 13 February 2020.
Show Cause Committee

Meeting No. | CR 1/20
---|---
Date and Time | Wednesday 8 January 2020
Venue | F200 Mt Helen, and via Skype

Show Cause Hearing Committee Members

- Professor Fadi Charchar, Dean Graduate Studies; Chair
- Dr Grant Palmer, Higher Degree Research Coordinator, School of Health and Life Sciences
- Dr Brendan O’Brien, Senior Lecturer, School of Health and Life Sciences

Student | Matthew Shumack, Student
Executive Officer | Emily Hearnshaw, Administration Assistant (Graduate Research School)

Research Higher Degree Committee Members

- Professor Fadi Charchar (Chair)
- Associate Professor Wendy Wright (Deputy Chair)
- Professor Chris Hutchison (DVCRI)
- Associate Professor Robyn Brandenburg (ADR SoE)
- Associate Professor David Piedrafita (ADR SHLS)
- Professor Manzur Murshed (ADR SEIT)
- Dr Jackie Tuck (Acting ADR FBS, HDRC FBS)
- Professor Simon Cooper (ADR SNHP)
- Associate Professor Jeremy Smith (ADR SoA)
- Associate Professor Elisa Zentveld (Chair Academic Board)

1.1 Show Cause Student 30129533

Recommendation CR1/20

The Research Higher Degrees Committee approved that the enrolment for student ID 30129533 be continued with the following conditions:

- The deadline for submission would be 30 June 2020.
- The student would send a submission plan to all of his supervisors and the Dean of Graduate Studies by Wednesday 15 January 2020.
- The student was required to make contact with Dr Damian Morgan every two weeks and provide updates on progress.
- The committee strongly recommended that the student submit drafts in progress regularly, even if they were felt to be incomplete.
- If the conditions were not met, the candidature would be terminated.
Completions

Recommendations for Higher Degree by Research Awards

Federation Business School
Alan Labas – Doctor of Philosophy
Nasrin Rahman – Doctor of Philosophy
Suborna Barua – Doctor of Philosophy

School of Arts
Karen Pruis – Doctor of Philosophy
Susan Walter – Doctor of Philosophy

School of Education
Kay Job – Doctor of Philosophy
Moya Elvey – Doctor of Philosophy

School of Health and Life Sciences
Lachlan Kent – Doctor of Philosophy
Michelle Maier – Doctor of Philosophy
Shakir Bahaddin Shakir – Doctor of Philosophy

School of Nursing and Healthcare Professions

School of Science, Engineering and Information Technology
Igor Grigoryev – Doctor of Philosophy
Mohammad Rahul Reza Chowdhury – Doctor of Philosophy
## Annex A – New applications and Confirmation of Candidature

### New Applications – Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Degree - PhD</th>
<th>Degree - Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar

**Signature:**

### New Applications for Candidature – Approved out of session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frac</th>
<th>Title of Thesis/Program</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30383094</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>An effective approach to image/video compression and analytics.</td>
<td>Manzur Murshed &amp; Guojun Lu &amp; Shyh Wei Teng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30383156</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Synthesis of graphene based non-noble metal electro-catalyst for fuel cell applications.</td>
<td>Madhu Chetty &amp; Mehmood Chadhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30383144</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>An assessment of the effectiveness of cybersecurity management systems and guidelines.</td>
<td>Iqbal Gondal &amp; Taiwo Oseni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30383324</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Voltage and current regulation in smart grid.</td>
<td>Syed Islam &amp; Gayan Kahandawa Appuhamilage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30383330</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Machine learning for effective stope stability and grade control in open stoping mining.</td>
<td>Greg You &amp; Gayan Kahandawa Appuhamilage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30304963</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Modelling ductile fracture in steel with the scaled boundary finite element method.</td>
<td>Ean Tat Ooi &amp; Fatemeh Javidan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30383483</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Data mining on nutrition data.</td>
<td>Madhu Chetty &amp; Adrian Shatte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30384052</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Personalized recommendation for data-driven learning.</td>
<td>Feng Xia &amp; Guojun Lu &amp; Adrian Shatte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30384126</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Digital business transformation through a post-modern ERP strategy.</td>
<td>Xiaohui Zhao &amp; Taiwo Oseni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HDR Administration & Management Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>CRICOS Provider No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>F/T</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>30340011</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Promoting emotional wellbeing in pre-service teachers through personal practices.</td>
<td>Susan Emmett &amp; Sara Weuffen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30128900</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Galloping through Ballarat: The social, cultural and economic contribution of the horse to Ballarat and district.</td>
<td>David Waldron &amp; Anne Beggs-Sunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30384231</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Smoking cessation among the migrant health professionals in Victoria, Australia.</td>
<td>Muhammad Aziz Rahman &amp; Louisa Lam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30384242</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>The role of user entity behaviour analytics to detect network attacks in real time.</td>
<td>Madhu Chetty &amp; Feng Xia &amp; Gour Karmakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30058486</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>A fine line - representations of body modification in contemporary media.</td>
<td>Linda Wight &amp; Simon Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30385243</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Hemp based packaging papers: A new engineered solution.</td>
<td>Vincent Verheyen &amp; Alicia Reynolds &amp; David Vercoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30021790</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Advancing syntactic and semantic interoperability for data in the agricultural and food industries.</td>
<td>Peter Dahlhaus &amp; Nathan Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30386042</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Weightlessness and the broken horse.</td>
<td>Jill Orr &amp; Angela Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30386355</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>A security and privacy framework for different layers of Internet of Things (IoT) smart objects.</td>
<td>Joarder Kamruzzaman &amp; Gour Karmakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30132237</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>General Practitioner care for palliative patients in regional Victoria.</td>
<td>Joanne Porter &amp; Michael Barbagallo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30123636</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>P/T</td>
<td>Transition to practice for final year nursing students.</td>
<td>Joanne Porter &amp; Ainsley James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30089858</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Psychometric properties and qualitative investigation of a youth-focused digitally-based assessment system for depression and the anxiety disorders.</td>
<td>Britt Klein &amp; Shaun Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30376482</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>Impact of climate change on tropical cyclones predictability: role of oceanatmosphere teleconnection process.</td>
<td>Savin Chand &amp; Christopher Turville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For noting only - Applications will be considered out of session due to the number of outstanding documents required for approval.

Annex A3: New Applications for Candidature- Declined applications
## Confirmation of Candidature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Principal Supervisor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30319528</td>
<td>Keir Reeves</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30111820</td>
<td>Damian Morgan</td>
<td>Confirmed - subject to conditions (resubmission due by 10/01/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30307498</td>
<td>Erik Eklund</td>
<td>Deferred (represent by 21/02/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30364776</td>
<td>Andrew Barton</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30347708</td>
<td>Ean Tat Ooi</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30307364</td>
<td>Fadi Charchar</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30361862</td>
<td>Venki Balasubramanian</td>
<td>Confirmed - subject to conditions (resubmission due by 06/01/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30365413</td>
<td>Keir Reeves</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30111820</td>
<td>Damian Morgan</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30305496</td>
<td>David Waldron</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30061479</td>
<td>Iqbal Gondal</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30120921</td>
<td>Michael Tuck</td>
<td>Deferred (represent by 11/05/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30130994</td>
<td>Marg Camilleri</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30332805</td>
<td>Jacqueline Wilson</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30111730</td>
<td>David Bean</td>
<td>Confirmed - subject to conditions (resubmission due by 05/02/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30098918</td>
<td>Philip Taylor</td>
<td>Confirmed - subject to conditions (resubmission due by 07/02/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30366590</td>
<td>Mehmood Chadhar</td>
<td>Confirmed - subject to conditions (resubmission due by 02/03/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30361862</td>
<td>Venki Balasubramanian</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30364532</td>
<td>Wendy Cross</td>
<td>Confirmed - subject to conditions (resubmission due by 20/03/2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar**

**Signature:**
## Annex B – Delegation of Authority AB1/10/13 – Approved

### APPROVAL OF TD GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Principal Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30109198</td>
<td>Submitted 11/11/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Jacqueline Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30089734</td>
<td>Submitted 13/11/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Greg You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30345267</td>
<td>Submitted 18/11/2019</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Carole Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30307226</td>
<td>Submitted 15/11/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Iqbal Gondal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30312903</td>
<td>Submitted 15/11/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Vincent Verheyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30121481</td>
<td>Submitted 04/12/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Linda Wight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30308056</td>
<td>Submitted 21/11/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Verity Archer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30304830</td>
<td>Submitted 28/11/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Andrew Greenhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>30298033</td>
<td>Submitted 17/12/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Jenene Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30112660</td>
<td>Submitted 17/12/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Iqbal Gondal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30092038</td>
<td>Submitted 18/12/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Michael Tuck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30304831</td>
<td>Submitted 20/12/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fiona Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30016206</td>
<td>Submitted 31/12/2019</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Angela Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30085059</td>
<td>Submitted 08/01/2020</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Warren Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30318872</td>
<td>Submitted 16/01/2020</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Gour Karmakar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar

Signature:

### EXTENSION TO CANDIDATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30070784</td>
<td>Extension to 20/02/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30134324</td>
<td>Extension to 01/09/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30335567</td>
<td>Extension to 27/11/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30077732</td>
<td>Extension to 28/02/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30312529</td>
<td>Extension to 29/06/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30123476</td>
<td>Extension to 31/03/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HDR Administration & Management Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Extension Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30311302 Extension to 19/06/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30035043 Extension to 03/08/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30109755 Extension to 04/03/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30318872 Extension to 17/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30077851 Extension to 28/12/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30326758 Extension to 27/06/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30109281 Extension to 20/06/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30053925 Extension to 20/03/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30329743 Extension to 20/08/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30329746 Extension to 27/08/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30125026 Extension to 27/08/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30321074 Extension to 31/07/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30054179 Extension to 31/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30088898 Extension to 17/02/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30027419 Extension to 16/11/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30307084 Extension to 31/08/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30311509 Extension to 01/08/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30375228 Extension to 24/04/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30316394 Extension to 12/06/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar

Signature:
## LEAVE FROM STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30301198</td>
<td>01/07/2019 - 31/12/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30084919</td>
<td>01/10/2019 - 01/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30320357</td>
<td>09/09/2019 - 30/11/2019 (extended sick leave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30109281</td>
<td>25/09/2019 - 31/12/2019 (extended sick leave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30318878</td>
<td>02/12/2019 - 01/02/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30359598</td>
<td>21/10/2019 - 30/11/2019 (extended sick leave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30074889</td>
<td>24/09/2019 - 24/03/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30111625</td>
<td>04/08/2019 - 03/02/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30338941</td>
<td>27/07/2019 - 04/11/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30081615</td>
<td>01/01/2020 - 30/06/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30313008</td>
<td>01/01/2019 - 31/12/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30054179</td>
<td>05/11/2019 - 15/12/2019 (extended sick leave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30307688</td>
<td>04/09/2019 - 03/03/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30052418</td>
<td>23/03/2019 - 08/08/2019 (extended sick leave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30321898</td>
<td>15/10/2019 - 14/04/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30120991</td>
<td>24/10/2019 - 23/04/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30313008</td>
<td>01/01/2020 - 16/03/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30311438</td>
<td>23/12/2019 - 22/03/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>30091914</td>
<td>30/10/2019 - 29/04/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30131099</td>
<td>01/10/2019 - 31/03/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30124048</td>
<td>13/01/2020 - 12/07/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar

Signature:

## CHANGES TO SUPERVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Old Principal Supervisor</th>
<th>New Principal Supervisor</th>
<th>Old Assoc / Co Supervisor</th>
<th>New Assoc / Co Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30335567</td>
<td>Linda Jones</td>
<td>Colette Browning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wendy Cross / Simon Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30088898</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rani Kerin</td>
<td>Dan Tout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HDR Administration & Management Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SONHP</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30359578</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30359566</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30311560</td>
<td>Simon Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Schultz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30133859</td>
<td>Meg Tasker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Wight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rani Kerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30027419</td>
<td>Beth Edmondson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erik Eklund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Threasa Meads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30094699</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles El-Hage / Nicholas Bamford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>30050663</td>
<td>Maxine Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robyn Brandenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon McDonough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30061479</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alireza Oseni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30076469</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30308788</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa Riddiford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30369572</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Gherardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30329743</td>
<td>Rob Townsend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marg Camilleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marg Camilleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30340675</td>
<td>Madhu Chetty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mehmood Chadhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mehmood Chadhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30324581</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerryn Bagley / Karen Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30106759</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xiaoli Jiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30376090</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauricio Pinheiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30075332</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suzanne McLaren / Beyon Miloyan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar

Signature:
Annex C – Items not covered under Delegation of Authority AB1/10/13

### WITHDRAWAL FROM STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>30130959</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30026584</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30343773</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30082608</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar

### ENROLMENT AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30134324</td>
<td>Changed to P/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30114074</td>
<td>Changed to P/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30089015</td>
<td>Changed to F/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30370226</td>
<td>Changed to F/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30332805</td>
<td>Changed to F/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30324581</td>
<td>Changed to P/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30365182</td>
<td>Upgraded from Masters to PhD, updated program and course codes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar

Signature:
# CHANGE OF THESIS TITLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30319528</td>
<td>The Development of Melbourne as a Cluster Port During its Golden Age 1851-1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30089734</td>
<td>Three-dimensional numerical study on the batter stability mechanism of Maddingley Brown Coal Open Pit, Victoria, Australia, using PLAXIS 3D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>30111820</td>
<td>Why do residential aged care workers get injured at work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30347708</td>
<td>Development of the Scaled Boundary Finite Element Method for Seismic Analysis of Fracture in Concrete Gravity Dams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30085059</td>
<td>Training and Testing of 1v1 Agility in Australian Football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>30298033</td>
<td>A case study of teacher roles in engaging with student aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30361862</td>
<td>Optimized Bandwidth Allocation for Internet of Things using Software Defined Networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30271703</td>
<td>Alienation or agency? Analysing the associations of farm labour to define the socio-political position of the modern farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>30307364</td>
<td>The association of Circular RNAs with hypertension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>30116863</td>
<td>Building social capital through the delivery of outdoor education at Victorian government schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30329444</td>
<td>The regional trifecta: entrepreneurs, managers and community leaders, an ethnographic typology of leaders collaborating in a regional Victorian community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>30365413</td>
<td>A People's History of Australian Keynesianism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>30049185</td>
<td>Positive attitude change to school: Narrative inquiry into adolescent students’ lived experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30061479</td>
<td>Creation, application and evaluation of a new cybersecurity index for the Australian healthcare sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>30120921</td>
<td>Modernisation of Mining Methods: A Critical Analysis of the introduction of Autonomous Haulage, Tele – remote Systems and associated implications to traditional mining operations in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>30364532</td>
<td>Effects of Protection Motivation Theory on Clinical Factors among Patients with Cardiovascular Disease.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominee - Chair: Prof Fadi Charchar

Signature:
## Supervisors added to the Register

### Annex A – New applications and Confirmation of Candidature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Principal Supervisor</th>
<th>Associate Supervisor</th>
<th>Co-Sup</th>
<th>Date approved</th>
<th>Date Reregister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gao</td>
<td>Kai</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29/10/2019</td>
<td>29/10/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>Xioaming</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29/10/2019</td>
<td>29/10/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzsimons</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/11/2019</td>
<td>14/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song-Turner</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/11/2019</td>
<td>14/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Jeong-ah</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/11/2019</td>
<td>14/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultanova</td>
<td>Nargiz</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/11/2019</td>
<td>14/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taheri</td>
<td>Sona</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/11/2019</td>
<td>14/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Jiangang</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/11/2019</td>
<td>14/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Charlynn</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/11/2019</td>
<td>14/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellicci</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21/11/2019</td>
<td>21/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td>Aziz</td>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>SONHP</td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21/11/2019</td>
<td>21/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Mingfang</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21/11/2019</td>
<td>21/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>Yanan</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21/11/2019</td>
<td>21/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Fachao</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27/11/2019</td>
<td>27/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Ziyu</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27/11/2019</td>
<td>27/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlhaus</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>10/12/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>10/12/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercoe</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/12/2019</td>
<td>18/12/2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Supervisors added to the Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orr</td>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>Camp St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulway</td>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Ying</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talpey</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cui</td>
<td>Jiansheng</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Chun</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOSEIT</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo</td>
<td>Bin</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Zaixing</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>SOHLS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Uni Wide Comment Draft 08-05-2019

Feedback being collated for Sponsor (FS)

Purpose

The purpose of this Policy is to outline the expectations and responsibilities of University Higher Degree by Research candidates, University staff and external examiners regarding the presentation and examination of theses.

Scope

1.1. This policy applies to:

- all candidates enrolled in HDR programs at FedUni
- registered HDR supervisors
- all individuals invited to participate in a HDR examination for a FedUni candidate, and
- all staff with administrative responsibilities related to HDR students, supervisors and examiners.

1.2. This policy applies to all accredited Higher Degree by Research (HDR) programs offered by FedUni, including:

- Masters by Research
- Doctor of Philosophy
- Doctor of Professional Studies

1.3. Theses developed for undergraduate honours programs are not covered by this policy and related procedure, and honours students should instead refer to School or course-specific information.

Legislative Context

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved submission date</td>
<td>The approved date by which a candidate must submit their thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR</td>
<td>Associate Dean Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Student enrolled in a Higher Degree by Research program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deferred</strong></td>
<td>An examination outcome; <strong>The</strong> thesis should be classified as DEFERRED; the thesis requires substantial revision and re-examination by external experts and the Candidate should be permitted to submit the thesis for examination in a revised form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DGRS</strong></td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School – FedUni staff member responsible for: academic oversight of HDR programs, HDR candidates and HDR supervision. The DGRS is assisted in this role by the ADRs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td>The process by which a person, having received a written offer of a place, registers their program and course of study with FedUni by submitting a form of enrolment signed by both the applicant and the course coordinator or person of equivalent authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failed</strong></td>
<td>An examination outcome; <strong>The</strong> thesis should be classified as FAILED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FedUni</strong></td>
<td>Federation University Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Program</strong></td>
<td>One of the following courses of study: Masters Degree (Research), Doctoral Degree (Research), Doctoral Degree (Professional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Degree by Research candidate</strong></td>
<td>A student enrolled in a Higher Degree by Research Program at FedUni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Research School (GRS)</strong></td>
<td>Central department of the University with oversight of matters pertaining to higher degree by research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major corrections</strong></td>
<td>An examination outcome; <strong>The</strong> thesis should be PASSED subject to major corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; (that is, the thesis requires new data collection, new or revised data analysis, substantive rewriting of one or more chapters, or contains a large volume number of stylistic/presentation errors. These actions should be undertaken with ongoing input from the supervisory team).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor corrections</strong></td>
<td>An examination outcome; <strong>The</strong> thesis should be classified as PASSED, subject to minor corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; (i.e. that is, the thesis is suitable for conferral once the author has addressed nominated passages, textual errors, and referencing correction mistakes. These actions should largely be able to be undertaken independently by the candidate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passed</strong></td>
<td>An examination outcome; <strong>The</strong> thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHDC</strong></td>
<td>Research Higher Degrees Committee – A standing committee of Academic Board that deals with matters pertaining to Higher Degree by Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP</strong></td>
<td>Research Training Program: Federal Government funding scheme that enables the provision of HDR fee offset and stipend scholarships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Statement

3.1. This policy ensures that research candidates, supervisors, examiners and administrators have clear information about:

- the expected format and presentation of HDR theses, and
- HDR examination processes and requirements.

It ensures that that FedUni’s HDR theses and examination processes are consistent with the expectations of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and the Higher Education Standards (Threshold Framework) 2015 (HESF).

3.2. A thesis presented for a doctoral degree must demonstrate the requirements as per the AQF Level 10 criteria and demonstrate that the candidate has:

- conducted research independently at a high level of originality and quality,
- made a significant and original contribution to knowledge,
- an understanding of the relationship of the investigations undertaken and application to a wider field of knowledge, and
- substantial knowledge of research principles and methods applicable to the field of learning.

3.3. A thesis presented for a masters by research degree must demonstrate the requirements as per the AQF Level 9 criteria and demonstrate that the candidate has:

- successfully undertaken supervised study, and
- completed a program of research, research training and independent study,
- made a contribution to knowledge demonstrating a critical appreciation and understanding of the relationship of their own work to that of other work in the field, and
- applied an advanced body of knowledge in a range of contexts.

3.4. Candidates should also consult the University’s Research Integrity and Compliance policies when preparing a thesis for examination. In particular, candidates should be aware of the following items which constitute examples of research misconduct:
• fabrication of data; that is, claiming results where none have been obtained.
• falsification of data, including changing records.
• plagiarism, including self-plagiarism.
• misleading or false attribution of authorship.
• failure to abide by University policy and procedural requirements for research (e.g. ethical compliance in respect of human or animal research ethics).

4. The Thesis

4.1. Thesis format and requirements

4.1.1. A HDR thesis submitted for examination must be written in English unless provided with an exemption by RHDC, and be of a satisfactory standard of literary presentation, including an accepted referencing system appropriate to the candidate’s discipline area.

4.1.2. A HDR thesis must not contain material which has been accepted for the award of any other qualification at FedUni or any other institution, nor any material previously published or written by any person (including the candidate), except where due reference is made and appropriate arrangements regarding copyright have been made.

4.1.3. HDR theses must be presented in one of the approved formats:

• Conventional thesis,
• Thesis incorporating published papers,
• Practical works and an exegesis.

Requirements for the format of theses are set out in Regulation 4.1 and the HDR Theses and Examinations Procedure.

4.1.4. Candidates should consult with their supervisory panel for guidance regarding a chosen thesis style, and conventions for their discipline regarding formatting and referencing, before writing begins.

4.1.5. The thesis presented by a Candidate for examination shall conform with the requirements of this section unless otherwise agreed by the RHDC.

4.1.6. A Doctoral Degree (Research) thesis will normally be:

• a text of not more than 80,000 words reporting original scholarship and research carried out by the candidate under supervision, or
• a major work or collection of works, including but not restricted to visual presentation, literary production or computer software development, carried
out by the candidate under supervision and accompanied by an exegesis or scholarly commentary of between 20,000 and 40,000 words.

4.1.76. A Masters Degree (Research) will normally be:

- a text of not more than 40,000 words reporting original scholarship and research carried out by the candidate under supervision, or
- a major work or collection of works, including but not restricted to visual presentation, literary production or computer software development, carried out by the candidate under supervision and accompanied by an exegesis or scholarly commentary of between 10,000 and 20,000 words.

4.1.8 Thesis word counts do not include appendices or references.

4.1.9 Candidates must submit for examination a PDF copy of their thesis. The presentation of the thesis is set out in the HDR Theses and Examinations Procedure.

4.1.59. The thesis presented by a candidate for examination shall conform with the requirements of this section unless otherwise agreed by the RHDC.

4.2. Acknowledgements in the thesis

4.2.1. The thesis must include the following acknowledgements and statements, as applicable:

- acknowledgement of financial support, including support provided by the Australian Government as outlined in the RTP Scholarship Policy,
- acknowledgements of industry engagement or access to external facilities to undertake the research,
- acknowledgement of the contribution provided by professional editing and proof-reading services,
- acknowledgement of contributions made by individuals to the thesis or research project.

4.3. Presentation of a thesis including publications

Candidates enrolled before 1st January 2019 should refer to the HDR Candidature Management Policy approved on 19th October 2015 for details on requirements for the thesis including publications. Section 4.3 applies to all candidates commencing on or after 1st January 2019.

4.3.1. Candidates may include published or submitted papers and book chapters in their thesis only where the following criteria are satisfied:
the work is substantially the candidate’s (typically evidenced by bearing the candidate’s name as the primary author),

the content is clearly related to the subject matter of the thesis, and contributes to the argument of the thesis, and

the thesis is presented in a manner that allows a cohesive research narrative.

4.3.2. Papers selected for inclusion in a PhD or Masters degree thesis should be peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, or refereed conference papers. Candidates submitting papers for publication during their candidature should select journals that are rigorously peer-reviewed and are highly suitable to their research area. Evidence of publication or acceptance should be included as an appendix to the thesis. A thesis including publications may include some chapters that are in preparation for submission for publication.

4.3.3. A PhD thesis incorporating publications would normally include at least three published or accepted chapters.

4.3.4. A Masters by Research thesis incorporating publications would normally include at least one published chapter.

4.3.45. Research outputs that have been published or submitted for publication outside of the term of candidature may be included in the thesis, however, the following rules apply:

- the work must be accompanied by a statement confirming that it has not been presented for a previous qualification (either by the current candidate, or by any other person),
- Candidates should also be clearly aware that incorporation of previously published material may only form up to 66% of the thesis. Furthermore, inclusion of previously published work does not exempt candidates from their minimum study period as appropriate to the course being undertaken (as per the Regulation 4.1).

4.3.56. Requirements for Theses including publications are set out in the HDR Theses and Examination Procedure.

4.4. Presentation of a thesis comprising creative work and exegesis

4.4.1. A thesis submission may comprise creative work and exegesis or exegetical work. The extent of these two components within the thesis should be negotiated between the candidate and the supervision team, having regard to the academic requirements of the degree being sought. The thesis proportions, where designated to comprise creative work and dissertation must be specified at confirmation and the dissertation component cannot be less than 25% of the work. Candidates are encouraged to discuss this with their supervisors early in candidature. In particular, the thesis plan that is presented as part of the confirmation of candidature milestone should include consideration of:
• the form and nature of the practice-based work,
• overall volume and percentage weighting of work in the creative and
exegetical components, and
• how the creative work or practice-based component can be 'examined' (for
example, whether examiners may need to attend a live performance or
exhibition).

4.4.2. If the performance or exhibition is held prior to submission of the thesis, the
candidate must present an abstract of the thesis prior to the performance or
exhibition. Confidentiality of the examination will be maintained. This may require
scheduling private sessions or performances for examiners, and may require that
examiners attend the performance or exhibition at different times. If the performance
or exhibition involves audience participation or interaction with the candidate, the
candidate must not be in a position to inappropriately influence the examiners’
assessment of the creative work. The exegesis and creative work must be
examined as an integrated whole. A durable record of the performance or exhibition
(in print or electronic format) must be submitted with the thesis or within six weeks
of submission of the thesis.

4.5. Use of proof-reading services

4.5.1. Candidates may engage professional proof-reading services prior to
submitting the thesis for examination. Candidates are referred to the Institute of
Professional Editors’ 'Find an Editor' search tool for guidance in selecting proof-
reading services. Funding for proof reading is the responsibility of the School of
enrolment or of the candidate themselves.

4.5.2. The University follows the best-practice guidelines recommended by the
Australian Council of Graduate Research for engaging proof-reading services prior
to thesis submission. Candidates must refer to these Guidelines to understand the
scope and limits of services that may be obtained, and obtain approval from the
principal supervisor, prior to engaging professional proof-reading services.

5. Examination

All University staff and candidates involved in HDR thesis examination should have
an understanding of the national best-practice Graduate Research Good Practice
Principles, as released by the Australian Council of Graduate Research.

5.1. Eligibility to submit for examination

5.1.1. To be eligible to submit a thesis or exegesis for examination a candidate
must:
• Be currently enrolled in a Higher Degree by Research program,
• Have been enrolled for at least the minimum period required as defined in
Regulation 4.1 (one year full-time or part-time equivalent),
• Have had their candidature confirmed, and
- Have approval from the School Dean or nominee to submit the thesis.

5.2. Submission of thesis for examination

5.2.1. Candidates must complete and submit the Intention to Submit form at least four weeks prior to their intended submission date.

5.2.2. All theses submitted for examination must be accompanied by a completed Release of Thesis form, and include a statement of originality incorporating an acknowledgement of others’ contributions, editorial assistance, copyright provisions, required summaries and other relevant approvals. A thesis will not be released for examination without these materials in place. For further guidance, candidates are directed to the HDR Theses and Examination Procedure.

5.2.3. Normally, a candidate will submit a thesis for examination with the endorsement of the supervisory panel, as demonstrated by the signatures on the Release of Thesis form.

5.2.4. In certain circumstances, a candidate may submit a thesis for examination without the endorsement of the supervisory panel. Such a thesis will not be accepted unless the candidate has signed an acknowledgement outlining:

- an awareness of the reason/s for the supervisor’s lack of endorsement of the thesis,
- an awareness of the range of examination outcomes that are possible, and
- personal responsibility for the thesis result, including responsibility for any tuition fees applicable during a period of thesis revisions.

5.2.5. Once the thesis has been submitted for examination, the candidate is recorded as having a "TD" Grade which indicates that the candidate is under examination. This grade does not attract course fees, unless the TD grade is activated after the HECS census dates (31 March and 31 August for each year), in which case course fees may be charged for that semester. The official date for the recording and commencement of the TD grade is the date that the thesis is submitted for examination.

5.2.6. Resubmission of a thesis with post-examination revisions must occur within the timeframe designated by School Examination Committee.

5.2.7. Where the candidate requires further time to undertake post-examination revisions, a special case for consideration may be addressed to the Dean, GRS.

5.2.8. The Graduate Research School is responsible for sending theses to the nominated examiners within a timely period.

5.3. Eligibility of Examiners

5.3.1. An individual may be appointed as an examiner where they have:
• an appropriate disciplinary and academic background of relevance to the thesis content,
• be recognised as an international expert in the field or discipline of the thesis, international standing in the field of research, and
• evidence of recent research activity, as demonstrated by peer-reviewed publications output, receipt of research funding and/or research-training activity.

5.3.2. An individual would be expected to hold a Research Doctorate Degree (or equivalent to a Level 10 award under the AQF) in order to be appointed to an Examination Panel for either masters or doctoral level candidates.

5.3.3. In exceptional circumstances, an examiner without a Research Doctorate may be acceptable, where it can be shown that they possess equivalent professional experience. The Dean DGRS must approve exceptions.

5.3.4. Examiners must be external to the University. Current Emeritus Professors, adjuncts and honorary staff of the University are ineligible. Previous staff of the University may be eligible if a significant period has elapsed (at least five years) since their employment, and it is clear that the staff member has not interacted with the candidate and/or work being examined.

5.3.5. Current or previous supervisors of the candidate cannot be appointed as examiners.

5.3.6. Consideration will be made of the balance of expertise on the panel, and the independence of examiners across the panel. Generally, more than one examiner for a given thesis will not be appointed from the same institution, particularly if from the same unit (e.g. faculty or research centre).

5.4. Avoiding conflicts of interest

5.4.1. When nominating examiners, supervisors must consider conflicts of interest.

5.4.2. Examiners must declare any real or perceived conflict of interest (either professional, personal or commercial) that exists between the individual, the candidate and/or the supervisory panel. The Dean DGRS will determine whether such a conflict results in ineligibility to serve on the Examination Panel.

5.4.3. All parties should consult the Australian Council of Graduate Research’s Guidelines for Managing Conflicts of Interest, which provides assistance in identifying major and minor types of conflict.

5.4.4. Where the Dean DGRS becomes aware of a conflict of interest during the examination and/or prior to the release of the examination outcome to the candidate, the examiner may be stood down and/or their report may be considered ineligible.

5.5. Nomination and number of Examiners
5.5.1. Theses submitted for all HDR programs require a minimum of two external examiners, and at least one reserve external examiner.

5.5.2. The principal supervisor, in consultation with the supervisory panel, is responsible for nominating examiners.

5.5.3. The Recommendation of Examiners form should be submitted to the Graduate Research School for approval by the Dean of Research. The Dean of Research may consult with the relevant Associate Dean in considering such approvals.

5.5.4. Where examiners are unavailable or unresponsive to a request to examine, that examiner will be stood down and a reserve will be substituted to help ensure a timely examination process.

5.5.5. The University reserves the right to appoint the reserve as a third examiner for the purposes of:

- ensuring the examination panel has an appropriate depth and breadth of disciplinary expertise for the topic under examination, and/or
- providing additional information to assist in moderating the examination results (e.g. where the first two examiner’s reports are divergent).

5.5.6. Where the latter case is applied, a third examiner would be introduced prior to the initial examination outcome being released to the candidate.

5.5.7. In the event that a thesis is being re-examined and new examiners are required, the process for nomination and appointment is as per sections 7.5.2 and 7.5.3.

5.5.8. The nomination and appointment of examiners should be done in confidence. Supervisors may request that the candidate provide a list of examiners who are unsuitable (e.g. due to co-authorship); however, other than this, the candidate should not have any role in identifying or nominating prospective examiners. Participation of the candidate in the nomination process may result in one or more examiners being stood down.

5.6. Responsibilities of Examiners

5.6.1. Examiners have responsibility to:

- familiarise themselves with the requirements of FedUni’s examinations process and the expectations of the AQF, for the degree being examined,
- conduct the examination in a fair, rigorous and timely manner,
- declare any conflicts of interest of relevance to the examination,
- provide a clear recommendation to the Graduate Research School in-confidence respect to the category of examination outcome, and support this with a written report providing evidence for the decision, and
- respond to requests from the Dean of Research.

5.7. Timeliness of the examination period
5.7.1. Candidates and supervisors are advised that the expected time for an examination, from receipt of the submitted thesis to release of the moderated report to the candidate, is approximately 12 – 16 weeks.

5.7.2. Delays in the examination process can be introduced by:

- incomplete nomination forms,
- unresponsiveness of examiners in providing an outcome,
- the need to invite reserve examiners.

5.7.3. The Graduate Research School will make every effort to achieve a timely examination outcome. This will include regular engagement with appointed examiners, the introduction of a reserve examiner where one or more original examiners have become unresponsive, and timely processing of examination reports and moderation outcomes.

5.8. Categories of examination outcomes

5.8.1. Candidates may receive one of five possible examination outcomes, which are labelled and defined as per below:

- The thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination; or
- The thesis should be classified as PASSED, subject to minor corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; (i.e. the thesis is suitable for conferral once the author has addressed nominated passages, textual errors, and referencing mistakes. These actions should largely be able to be undertaken independently by the candidate); or
- The thesis should be PASSED subject to major corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; (i.e. the thesis requires new data collection, new or revised data analysis, substantive rewriting of one or more chapters, or contains a large number of stylistic/presentation errors. These actions should be undertaken with ongoing input from the supervisory team); or
- The thesis should be classified as DEFERRED; the thesis requires substantial revision and re-examination by external experts and the Candidate should be permitted to submit the thesis for examination in a revised form; or
- The thesis should be classified as FAILED.

5.8.2. A candidate who receives either:

- PASSED, subject to major corrections, or
- DEFERRED

may be required to re-enrol for a minimum period of six calendar months. The candidate is responsible for meeting any applicable tuition costs associated with a period of re-enrolment to action effect major revisions.
5.9. **Post-examination responsibilities**

5.9.1. The Graduate Research School is responsible for

- Administering and compiling Examiners’ Reports for review by the Dean, GRS,
- Notifying the Chair, School Examination Committee (SEC), to form-convene the SEC,
- Administering approval for the Recommendation of Award, and
- Ensuring the Recommendation of Award is included in the Academic Board minutes for noting.

5.9.2. The Dean, Graduate Research School (DGRS), is responsible for:

- Completing the DGRS Report to provide the SEC with a recommendation based on the Examiner’s Reports,

5.9.3. The Chair, SEC is responsible for:

- Reviewing the DGRS report and referring DGRS Reports to the SEC for further consideration, where required, and
- Providing Candidates and Principal Supervisors with a recommended course of action for the Candidates after thesis examination.

5.9.4. The School Examination Committee is responsible for:

- Reviewing the DGRS Report when referred from the Chair, SEC and recommending a course of action for the Candidate,
- Approving the Summary of Revisions and the thesis after corrections or amendments have been made, where required,
- Approving theses for re-examination by external examiners, where required,
- Advising the Graduate Research School to send the thesis to a third examiner, where required,
- Approving thesis summaries for publication in graduation documents, and
- Providing a final recommended examination outcome via the Results Recommendation Form to the Chair, RHDC and Chair, Academic Board.

5.9.5. The Chair, RHDC, is responsible for:

- Reviewing the recommended outcome from the SEC; and
- Referring the recommended outcome back to the SEC where approval has not been granted, or
- Approving the recommended outcome for referral to the Chair, Academic Board.

5.9.6. The Chair, Academic Board is responsible for:
• Approving the recommended outcome for referral to the next meeting of Academic Board

5.10. School examination Examination committee Committee

5.10.1. The Associate Dean, Research of the School of enrolment forms convenes the School Examination Committee upon being notified by the Graduate Research School.

5.10.2. The School Examination Committee should be comprised of at least three people. Members should:

- be University staff members who hold registration as a principal supervisors,
- have tenure for at least as long as the expected duration of the examination,
- hold a Research Doctorate (or other qualification equivalent to AQF Level 10), and
- be senior discipline experts with sufficient experience to be able to ensure rigour and quality within the examinations process.

5.11. The examination recommendation

5.11.1. The Dean, GRSDGRS receives the Examiner Reports and provides a recommendation to the SEC, via the Chair, SEC in the form of a DGRS Report. The Dean, GRSDGRS may request additional information from any examiner, supervisor or discipline expert.

- The Dean, GRSDGRS may recommend an examination outcome (see 6.8 Categories of examination outcomes) or, where examiner reports differ, the appointment of a third examiner.
- The recommendation must only be based only on materials formally submitted by the Candidate for the examination.
- The Dean, GRSDGRS reserves the right to redact the examiner's comments prior to release to the candidate and/or the supervisory panel. Where this occurs, recipients will be notified that the report has been provided in an abridged format version.

5.11.2. The Chair, SEC, is responsible for reviewing the Examiner reports and the DGRS Report.

- The Chair, SEC, may refer the DGRS Report to the SEC for further consideration or communicate the DGRS outcome directly to the Principal Supervisor and Candidate.
- Where the Chair, SEC, refers the report to the SEC, the SEC may provide an alternative outcome to the Principal Supervisor and the candidate.
- Where a recommendation is that thesis examination be deferred or that the thesis be passed subject to corrections, the SEC must oversee the candidate completion plan and timeline for re-submission or correction of the thesis.
• Where the SEC requests that the thesis be sent to a third examiner, the SEC will advise the Graduate Research School to send the thesis to the reserve examiner. The SEC will advise the principal supervisor of this action.

5.12. Undertaking revisions

5.12.1. Where corrections or revisions are required, the candidate is responsible for preparing a revised thesis, together with the Corrections Template to respond to the examiners' comments. This should be submitted through the Graduate Research School to the SEC. In responding to revisions, the candidate should clearly indicate any amendments made, and a rationale for adopting (or not adopting) the recommendations provided in the examiners' report.

5.12.2. Candidates should note that having published sections of the thesis in a peer-reviewed format is not, on its own, an adequate defence for not actioning suggested changes to unpublished sections.

5.12.3. Corrected theses are submitted to the School Examination Committee which must complete the Results Recommendation Form and confirm that the thesis is ready for a Recommendation of Award.

5.13. Requirements for thesis re-examination

5.13.1. Where a candidate receives a result of deferred, the principal supervisor is required to submit a covering page to the SEC, detailing the revisions made and the overall impact of these on the cogency and original contribution of the thesis (appropriate to the degree being sought).

5.13.2. Where an examination outcome of deferred is confirmed by the SEC, the following will apply:

• where the original thesis examiner/s have indicated a willingness to re-examine, they will normally be invited to form the re-examine the thesis.
• where one or more of the original thesis examiners are unwilling or unavailable, nominations for new examiners will be sought from the principal supervisor, as per section 6.5. The replacement examiners will be notified that the thesis is being submitted for re-examination.
• The re-examiners will receive the University's advice to the candidate for the revision of the thesis, including the original examiner's reports and an integrated list of revisions as agreed to by the candidate and the supervisor and approved by the SEC; and a comprehensive statement from the candidate outlining the substantive changes that have been made to the thesis, and a concise defence against any recommendations for changes that have not been accepted.
• The re-examiners will be asked to assess this material against the relevant AQF descriptors relevant to the degree being sought, without consideration of any prior materials submitted by the candidate.
5.13.3. A research thesis which is undergoing external re-examination is eligible for only one of three examination outcomes:

**Passed**: except for minor textual errors and/or minor corrections to referencing, the thesis is suitable for immediate conferral;

**Passed subject to corrections**: the thesis is suitable for conferral once the author has addressed nominated passages, textual errors, referencing corrections. Such corrections will be made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; or

**Failed**: the thesis is not suitable for conferral.

5.13.4. Where, following consideration of the reports of the examiners, it is determined that the thesis does not meet the standard expected for the [doctoral] degree PhD, but the Research Higher Degree Committee (RHDC) is satisfied that the research is of suitable merit, the RHDC may recommend that the appropriate Master’s masters degree be awarded. The award of the Masters’ masters degree is subject to the acceptance of that degree by the candidate and any such conditions as specified by the RHDC.

5.13.5. Following re-examination, the Dean, GRSDGRS, shall receive the examination reports, and provide a moderated recommendation to the SEC. In arriving at their decision, the Dean may request additional information from any examiner, either in written format or via an interview.

5.13.6. Following re-examination, the Dean, GRSDGRS may only recommend only one of the re-examination outcomes listed in 5.13.3 and follow the requirements as set out in section 5.11.

### 5.14. Oral defence

5.14.1. An oral defence is not mandatory at FedUni. However, at the request of the School Examination Committee, the candidate and/or the Dean, GRSDGRS, the candidate may be required to:

- **conduct** an oral presentation explaining the thesis findings, context, and contribution to the research discipline area, and/or
- **participate** in an interview to confirm that all revisions have been completed to the satisfaction of the School Examination Committee and the Dean, GRSDGRS.

5.14.2. If required, the oral defence shall serve the purpose of confirming or moderating the outcome of the thesis revisions process. The presentation itself does not attract a separate assessment report.

5.14.3. Such an interview may take place physically in person, or by tele- or video-conference.

### 5.15. Thesis summaries
5.15.1. The Candidate must submit two thesis summaries:

- 300-word abstract of their thesis in plain language
- 30-word summary for the Graduation Booklet.

5.15.2. Summaries must be submitted to the SEC for approval.

5.16. Recommendation of awards

5.16.1. Once revisions have been completed (where required) the School Examination Committee will complete the Results Recommendation Form, approve the summaries and submit them to the Graduate Research School.

5.16.2. The Graduate Research School obtains final approval for Recommendation of Award from the Chair, RHDC, and the Chair, Academic Board.

5.17. Examinations undertaken in-confidence

5.17.1. In the event that a thesis contains sensitive or potentially patentable research results, the University shall ensure that examiners sign an appropriate confidentiality agreement prior to examining the thesis. The University shall take whatever other action is necessary to protect patentable material contained in theses in a way which will not introduce undue delay in the awarding of the degree.

5.18. Payment of honoraria

5.18.1. Examiners shall be eligible to receive an honorarium payment consistent with the rates applied for the examination of research theses, as published by Universities Australia from time to time. The honoraria will be paid only after receipt of an examination report (and would be offered to any examiner who has supplied a report, even if that report is later set aside).

5.19. Appeals

5.19.1. A candidate, supervisor or examiner who has reasonable grounds for dissatisfaction with any formal decision made under this policy or procedure may lodge an appeal by written request to the Dean, GRSDGRS, within 28 days of date of issue of the decision. If the candidate or supervisor can demonstrate that the due process was not followed or that new evidence is available, they may lodge an additional further internal appeal with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation).

5.19.2. With regard to matters relating to academic assessment, a candidate who has reasonable grounds for dissatisfaction with any formal decision may appeal. Appeals processes can be found in the Academic Appeals Policy and Academic Appeals Procedure.

Supporting Documents
HDR Candidate Selection Policy
HDR Candidature Management Policy
HDR Candidature Management Procedure
HDR Supervision Policy
HDR Theses and Examinations Procedure
Higher Education Deferral or Leave from Studies Procedure
Higher Education Graduate Attributes Policy
Regulation 4.1
Responsibilities for Supervision of HDR Candidates Procedure
Selection and Awarding of HDR Place Procedure
Student Appeal Policy
Student Appeal Procedure
Student Grievance Policy
Student Grievance Procedure
Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Candidates Procedure
Withdrawal from All Studies Procedure (Higher Education)

Responsibility

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) as the Approval Authority is responsible for monitoring the implementation, outcomes and scheduled review of this procedure.

The Dean, Graduate Studies Enter as the Policy Sponsor is responsible for maintaining the content of this procedure as delegated by the Approval Authority.

Others who have responsibility for ensuring compliance with this Policy include:

- Dean, Graduate Research Schools
- Deans or Nominees of Academic Schools
- Associate Deans of Research or Nominees
- Graduate Research School
- Candidates
• Principle Supervisors, Associate Supervisors, Co-Supervisors, Provisional Principle Supervisors
• Examiners
• Research by Higher Degree Committee

Promulgation

The HDR Thesis and Examination Policy will be communicated throughout the University via:

1. an Announcement Notice under ‘FedNews’ website and through the University Policy - ‘Recently Approved Documents’ webpage to alert the University-wide community of the approved Policy;
2. inclusion on the University Policy, Procedure and Forms website; and/or
3. distribution of e-mails to Head Dean of School / Head of Department / University staff; and/or
4. documentation distribution, eg. posters, brochures.

Implementation

This policy will be implemented throughout the University via:

1. information Sessions; and/or
2. training Sessions.
A **Formal Matters**

A1 **Welcome / Apologies**
Assoc Prof Jeremy Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the above apologies.

A2 **Minutes**
Members were asked to confirm the minutes of the previous Research Committee meeting held on Wednesday 23 October 2019

Resolution SoA RC 06-19-1: The Committee confirmed the minutes of meeting held Wednesday 23 October 2019

A3 **Action Items & Matters Arising from Previous Minutes**
The Chair led a discussion on the action item and matters arising from the previous meeting. Most items were completed or discussed further under Section B of the agenda. Completed action items were removed.

B **Items for Reporting / Discussion**

B1 **Conference hosting guidelines**
The Chair/ ADR presented new conference hosting guidelines to the Committee for its consideration and approval. The ensuing discussion noted that the guidelines are clear, straightforward, and that there is no policy at the University level for conference hosting.

Resolution SoA RC 06-19-2: The Committee approved the conference hosting guidelines, which the School of Arts will adopt.
B2 AusAct Conference
The AusAct conference proposal (circulated prior to the meeting) was discussed, noting the following points:
- CSU have formal responsibility for the budget, with no financial impost for Federation University
- It is a good opportunity to highlight/showcase the Arts Academy and its offerings, as well as the region.

Resolution SoA RC 06-19-3: The Committee approved the AusAct Conference proposal for the Arts Academy to host the 2020 AusAct: Australian Actor Training Conference to be held 2-4 October 2020.

B3 Updated Adjunct/Honorary process
The updated application and renewal process for Adjuncts and Honoraries was discussed by the Committee and subsequently approved. The new guidelines emphasise the need for applicants to demonstrate future potential to contribute in targeted research areas as well as detail recent achievements. The guidelines are to be followed in conjunction with the University policy and procedure on Honorary Adjunct and Visiting Appointments.

ACTION: The ADR to publicise the new adjunct and honorary guidelines to the staff

Resolution SoA RC 06-19-4: The Committee approved the new guidelines proposed by the ADR for the application and renewal of adjunct, honorary and visiting academic staff.

B4 Research Committee membership & Terms of Reference
As this committee was set up as an ‘interim’ committee following the academic restructure in July 2018, it was time to re-visit the terms of reference and membership. The committee reviewed and discussed the draft terms of reference circulated with the agenda papers. Points covered included: membership, deputy chair position, and relationship to HDR committee and line of communication to it. The HDRC, Dr Simon Cooper was nominated as the deputy Chair.

ACTION: The Chair to update the terms of reference with minor amendments as discussed.
ACTION: The Chair to call for nominations for Committee membership at the end of January 2020

Resolution SoA RC 06-19-5: The Committee approved the terms of reference subject to the inclusion of amendments around representation of elected staff at different academic levels.

B5 Research Mentors
The Chair spoke of his interest in setting up a mentor program for staff. A mentoring scheme had been set up by the previous ADR which was discussed. Two staff volunteered under that scheme. Group mentoring by FoR codes was suggested as a strategy for implementing the University’s new scheme. It was agreed to re-visit this at the next meeting early 2020.

C Standing Items/Committee Matters

C1 Chair’s Report
The Chair’s report included the following topics:
- Grant applications 2017-19 report recently provided by Research Services. It raised the question of what the data means in terms of planning? Development opportunities and tangible support for researchers will be the basis for research support planning for 2020.
• 12 Feb 2020 Research day planning had progressed. The venue and catering had been confirmed using RSP funds. Approximately forty staff had registered to attend the day. The day’s program is yet to be developed.

**ACTION:** ADR to identify key grant awardees as a base for planning.

C2 **School Research Budget**
The budget report (included in the agenda papers) was noted.

C3 **HDR Coordinator Update**
The HDRC’s report (included in the agenda papers) was noted.

C3 **HDR Rep Report**
- No report

D **Any Other Business**

D1 **Events and Seminars**
Schools had been requested to nominate events. One offer of a seminar involving Professoriate members from the Schools of Arts and Education was discussed. The Chair will look at the calendar of key events to determine where SoA can fit in.

**ACTION:** ADR to coordinate the School’s commitment for 2020. ADR to contact members of the Professoriate to inquire about future interest.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday 10 March 2020
School of Arts Research Committee

Terms of Reference

The School of Arts (SOA) Research Committee is responsible for providing advice to the Dean of Arts, the School of Arts Leadership Team and the School Board on strategic directions, policy, procedures, funding and activities related to research and research training in the context of the University’s and the School’s research plans.

The School Research Committee, chaired by the Associate Dean, Research, in consultation with the Dean, will set, implement and review the School’s research plan. The Committee will report regularly to the University Research Committee, School Board, the School of Arts Leadership Team and School staff. The Research Committee will oversee the development and implementation of the School’s research plans, priorities, objectives, and Higher Degrees research supervision in line with the University’s Strategy.

The School Research Committee aims to foster and develop the research culture of the School and improve the quality and impact of its research in a context of cross-School collaboration.

The School Research Committee is responsible for six broad research areas within SOA:

- strategic research directions
- policies, procedures and compliance
- HDR supervision and research
- advice on funding relating to research
- quality assurance related to research and research training
- research-related activities, programs and initiatives.

The School Research Committee will:

- foster the conduct of research throughout the School and the development of its research culture
- develop and implement School research plans, priorities, objectives and initiatives, which are consistent with the University’s research strategy, research priorities and objectives
- advise the School on research funding, resource needs and priorities
- develop guidelines relating to the expenditure of the School research budget
- where necessary, advocate policy and procedure change during relevant reviews
- assess applications for research related travel, and School research grant schemes
- ensure compliance with School research expenditure guidelines
- determine and implement School-guidelines relating to research and research training
- ensure the School complies with national codes of conduct in research
- facilitate the exchange and dissemination of information concerning research and research training within and beyond the School
- oversee the establishment of guidelines and processes for the selection, supervision and progress of the School’s HDR students
- address and respond to other research matters as they arise.

The School Higher Degree by Research Committee will be a sub-committee of the School Research Committee.
The School Research Committee may establish its own ad hoc committees and working parties as necessary, which will report back to the School Research Committee.

**Membership:**

The committee will have a maximum of eight members, and will seek to ensure there is representation from across the School’s campuses. The membership will be comprised of:

- The Dean
- Deputy Dean
- Associate Dean, Research
- Higher Degree, Coordinator
- School of Arts Early career researcher
- Two elected academic staff (Levels D/E – one, ABC - one)
- Higher Degree student representative

Membership may lapse if members fail to attend three consecutive meetings without reason, apology or proxy.

**Co-option**

The Committee may co-opt members from time to time for a specified period and purpose. Co-opted members need not be members of the School of Arts and will have full voting rights.

**Chair and Deputy Chair**

The Chair of the Research Committee will be Associate Dean, Research. Normally, the Committee will elect a Deputy Chair from its members at its first meeting of each academic year.

**Meetings**

The Committee will meet at least six times per year, usually at least two weeks prior to FedUni Research Committee meetings. For the purposes of a meeting, a quorum will be fifty per cent of total membership. Meetings will be chaired at Mt Helen campus, Gippsland or Camp Street as appropriate.

Meetings will be conducted via video-link, or audio-link when this is not possible, between campuses.

**Administrative Support**

An Academic Services Officer will be responsible for providing secretarial support for meetings.

**Reporting**

The minutes of School Research Committee meetings will be forwarded to School Board and FedUni Research Committee.
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION – RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Members

Assoc Prof Robyn Brandenburg (ADR & Chair) Prof Claire McLachlan (Dean)
Ms Amy Claughton Assoc Prof Annette Foley
Assoc Prof Dean Cooley Dr Amanda McGraw
Dr Anna Fletcher Assoc Prof Margaret Plunkett (HDRC)

Apologies

Assoc Prof Dean Cooley

Meeting No, Date & Time

5-19 Friday 29 November 2019 9:30-11:30am

Venues

Churchill 2W263
Mt Helen T208C

Skype Conference ID

51823906

Executive Officer

Ms Roberta West Ph: 5122 6774 E: Roberta.west@federation.edu.au

A  Formal Matters

A1 Welcome / Apologies

• The Chair acknowledged the Traditional Custodians of the lands and waters where we met and paid her respects to Elders past, present and emerging and to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and First Nations Peoples.
• The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting
• Apologies were noted as above

A2 Minutes

Members were invited to confirm the minutes of the previous Research Committee meeting held on Friday 4 October 2019.

Resolution SoE RC 5-19-1: The Committee confirmed the minutes of meeting held Friday 4 October 2019.

A3 Action Items & Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

The Chair led a discussion on the Action Items and matters arising from the previous meeting. Some items discussed included:

• The future of the school’s research focus areas. The Chair will continue discussions with the focus area leaders.
• Adjunct & Honorary staff – as discussed at the recent ADR induction and Research Committee meeting:
  o Applications and renewals will be scrutinised by the VC.
  o a complaint from a current adjunct regarding the lack of engagement and acknowledgement was also discussed
Minutes

Conference travel funding – applications will be accepted for consideration and approval at all Research committee meetings. This will replace the two formal conference funding application rounds held this year.

Writing Group – Amy gave an update on writing group activities in Mt Helen and Churchill.

Resolution SoE RC 5-19-2: The Committee reviewed the Action Items and noted matters arising from previous minutes. Completed items were removed.

B Items for Reporting / Discussion

B1 Chair’s Report: Research Sharing Day / Seminar Series - Feedback

- The Chair provided feedback on the Research Sharing day held 15 Nov 2019. She acknowledged the work done by the planning team. Everyone did their job well and contributed to a well-run day. The Chair would like to continue with this ‘shared responsibility/shared contributions’ model for future events. Positive feedback was received for the program and its structure; the tone and collegial nature of the day; and for being a safe and welcoming environment for ECRs.
- The Seminar Series has begun and launched with Associate Professor Dawn Garbett who presented about collegiality and wellbeing.
- A research repository is being set up in TEAMS called Education Research, where information on publications, presentations from the Research Sharing day and Seminar Series will be stored and available to staff.
- The Chair gave a brief update on discussions/information from the ADR induction and University Research Committee. The new strategic plan approved by the University Council will soon be released. Amy Hunter, new Research Director has begun. Also mentioned was tools and workshops for research; online tutorials; masterclasses for selected researchers; grant writing; schools will be supported with funding with emphasis on groups and not individuals.
- Strategic planning will be necessary to help staff aim higher when publishing their research.

B2 HDR Recruitment and Strategy

As the number of HDR students is dwindling strategies for attracting and keeping new students is needed. Some possible strategies discussed included:

- Sending the post grad program to schools
- Being proactive with good students
- Personal approaches
- Projects created with PhD component
- Increased training for HDR supervisors / training for new supervisors

B3 HDR – supervision time allowance for students

The DVCRI advised that the supervision allowance for full-time students is 50 hours per year for principal supervisors and 25 hours per year for associate supervisors. Best-practice models of supervision are to be in set in place and benchmarked across the country. There will be no more than four principal supervisions and four co-supervisions.

Members were concerned that the proposed supervision hours was not sufficient.
The Dean advised that staff should flag any issues regarding supervision and workload at their PRDP meetings.

B4 ECR Workshop (2020)

The ADR and ECR representative have discussed how best to support the School’s ECRs. Possibilities discussed included:

- ECR workshops/orientation focussing on early career progression and the setting of expectations.
- HDR Symposium

**ACTION:** The ADR & ECR representative will work together to plan ECR activities in 2020.

B5 SoE Research Focus Areas (PeCALE; SJIDE; QUITE; RAVE)

No reports

**ACTION:** RFA reports are to be requested for inclusion in agenda papers for all future meetings.

B6 Seminar Series

Discussed in B1.

B7 ECR List

As there is no ECR list available from the university, Amy Claughton has worked to put one together for the School.

C Standing Items/Committee Matters – for noting

C1 School Research Budget – RSP & RTP

The Committee noted the research budget report that was circulated with the agenda.

D Any Other Business

As this was the last meeting for the year, the Chair thanked everyone for his or her contribution and anticipated that there will be much to look forward to in 2020.

**Next Meeting:** TBA
Confirmed Minutes

SNHP Research Committee

Meeting No: SNHP 3/19 – School of Nursing & Healthcare Professions Research Committee

Date and Time: Tuesday, 3rd Sept 2019 @ 10.30 am

Venue: 901-216 (BWK)

Present

Dr Joanne Porter (Chair)
Dr Louisa Lam
Associate Professor Danny Hills
Dr Ainsley James
Dr Blake Peck

Ms Catherine Chung
Ms Carolyn Bailey
Robyn Lampard (Minutes)

Executive Officer: Mrs Robyn Lampard

Meeting opened: 10.00am
Meeting closed: 11.16am

Procedural Matters

1. Welcome & Apologies

1.1 Welcome
The Chair welcomed members to the meeting.

1.2 Apologies
Prof Wendy Cross, Prof Simon Cooper, Colette Browning, Ms Kaye Knight, Ms Anita Raymond

2. Starring of Items and Approval of Non-Starred Items

2.1 Starred Items
All items adopted.

2.2 Non-Starred Items

Resolution 2/18/1:
All items on the agenda “not starred” be adopted without discussion, and the action recommended be taken or the information therein noted.

3. Minutes

3.1 SNHP 2/19
The SNHP Research Committee was invited to confirm the minutes from meeting SNHPRC 2/19 held on 9th July 2019.

Resolution 2/18/2:
The SNHP Research Committee confirms the minutes from the meeting SNHPRC 2/19 held on 9th July 2019 and forwards to the SNHP School Board for noting. Confirmed by Ainsley and Danny.

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

4.a Representative from Paramedicine
Wendy C still seeking agreement from Anita Giannis to represent Paramedicine.

4.b Newsletter/Media Progress
It has been decided that there is no need for a separate School Media representation. Staff can profile their own publications using Twitter or the Federation University Facebook page.
NO ACTION REQUIRED.

4.c Research Admin Support
Still no Administrator. Dean still in discussion with Andrew Evans to obtain an administrator.

4.d Key Note regional Talks
Planning has been delayed until a research administrator is appointed, due to the logistics and time constraints. Will review in 2020.

4.e Research Support – Research Assistants
BIRCH are employing 3 research assistants which may hopefully be used by the School as well.

5. Preliminary Matters
Nil

6. Chair's Report

6.1 HDR
School HDR pre-submission guidelines are near completion
7. Industry Committees

7.1 University Research Committee
   • See 11.1

7.2 University HDR Committee
   • See 11.1

8. ECR report
   ECR meetings are being held at each campus during early October. Robyn to liaise with Ainsley to remind ECR’s of these events.

   Ainsley James

9. HDR matters

   Supervision expectations

   No report

   Catherine Chung

11. Items for detailed discussion

11.1 Updates from University and HDR Committees
   a. Research Priority Areas and new University Research plan in discussion
   b. Chair of ethics committee attended University Research meeting – no solution currently regarding processing of quality improvement and evaluation pathways. A range of other issues discussed.
      To note – for Industry ethics applications, if approved by National Ethics, only one page required with Federation Ethics.
      For multiple students’ ethics applications you can send in a bulk Ethics application.
   c. HDR scholarships ranking form updated
   d. 10 University and 10 RTP scholarships to be advertised soon. Encourage students to apply.
   e. HDR conference in Ballarat successful – venue may change for next year?
   f. Requests made to offer HDR accommodation scholarships – this is for conference or data collection.
12. Other Business

Colette Browning
Colette B to report at next meeting on International Longevity Centre Australia

Danny Hills
Danny recently ran a Research Tools workshop at Mt Helen campus where they learnt about new research tools, setting up an ORCID profile, discussing metrics and outputs. He recommends that these are run at each campus during a non-teaching period.

Carolyn Bailey
LRH has received a grant of $200,000 for 2020 for research into obesity and pregnancy as it has the highest rates in the state of Victoria (low SES).

Carolyn Bailey passed her PhD pre-submission

Ainsley James

Danny Hills
Danny and Wendy along with members from Monash Health, Deakin University and Ballarat Health have formed a group to focus on Care in Residential Aged Care, applying for a grant of $190,000

Blake Peck
Blake met with Western Alliance who have changed their focus on applying for grants. They will identify 6 key areas, including Ageing and Children and Family Health. They will call for expressions of interest from people with expertise in these key areas.

13. Future Actions

SPSS Workshop 3rd October Berwick Campus run by Jo Larkins

Mask Ed event 9th & 10th October run by Kerry Reid Searle from CQU

Chair

Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the School of Nursing & Health Professions Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, 3rd October 2019 at 10.30am and will be Face to Face.

Meeting closed at 11.15am
SNHP Research Committee

Meeting No: SNHP 4/19 – School of Nursing & Healthcare Professions Research Committee

Date and Time: Tuesday, 8th October 2019 @ 10.30 am

Venue: 901-216 (BWK)

Present
Prof Simon Cooper (Chair)
Prof Wendy Cross (Via SKYPE)
Prof Colette Browning
Dr Joanne Porter
Dr Louisa Lam

Associate Professor Danny Hills
Dr Ainsley James
Robyn Lampard (Minutes)

Executive Officer: Mrs Robyn Lampard

Meeting opened: 10.00am

Procedural Matters

1. Welcome & Apologies

1.1 Welcome
The Chair welcomed members to the meeting.

1.2 Apologies
Ms Kaye Knight, Ms Anita Raymond, Ms Catherine Chung, Ms Carolyn Bailey, Mr Blake Peck

2. Starring of Items and Approval of Non-Starred Items

2.1 Starred Items
All items adopted.

2.2 Non starred Items
Resolution 2/18/1:
All items on the agenda “not starred” be adopted without discussion, and the action recommended be taken or the information therein noted.
3. Minutes

3.1 SNHP 2/19

The SNHP Research Committee was invited to confirm the minutes from meeting SNHPRC 3/19 held on 3rd September 2019.

Resolution 2/18/2:
The SNHP Research Committee confirms the minutes from the meeting SNHPRC 3/19 held on 3rd September 2019 and forwards to the SNHP School Board for noting. Confirmed by Ainsley and Danny.

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

5. Preliminary Matters
   Nil

6. Chair’s Report

6.1 HDR

A number of HDR’s coming through therefore a need for additional supervisors within the School.
Other training required/standards discussed:
Methods/statistics training – Jo-Anne Larkin
Candidature presentation skills development
Pre-submission presentations
Mid-candidature presentations

7. Industry Committees

7.1 University Research Committee

7.2 University Research Committee

8. ECR report

Email sent to all staff to identify ECR’s (defined as researchers within 5 years of obtaining their PhD) in order to let them know about ECR meetings - run by the University. Responses received from Louisa, Rhian, Swapnali, Biswajit and Ainsley (Also Rosey and possibly Daniel.)
School needs to arrange discussions around career development, time management, networking, etc.

Ainsley James
9. **HDR matters**

**Supervision expectations**

Need to increase the number of 1st level supervisors for HDR’s. Each team to have a minimum of 2 supervisors. Several senior supervisors have many HDR’s to supervisor and the School may need to arrange mentoring of new supervisors. Decision made that 2 supervisors are better than 3 in order to avoid confusion for candidates.

Catherine Chung

10. **Industry Developments**

Report from Anita, read by Ainsley.

Consideration of a Level D joint appointment, probably in Allied Health by 2020.

Attachment

Anita Raymond

11. **Items for detailed discussion**

11.1

Need to develop and increase strong partnerships in order to collaborate on ARC and NHMRC grants in addition to Cat 2, 3 and 4 grants.

This will also assist in improving staff outputs. Need to look for a couple of quality projects and work collaboratively as a School towards obtaining grants.

12. **Other Business**

International Longevity Centre (Global Alliance) has formed an Australian arm titled Australian Association of Gerontology (AAG), a research alliance formed to influence policies on ageing.

Members are:

- Benetas
- Brotherhood of St Lawrence
- CPAR
- COTA
- Latrobe University
- NARE
- University of Melbourne
- University of New Castle
- Monash University

Does Federation wish to become part of this group?

Cost of joining?

Benefits to the School:

- profile of University both nationally and internationally
- Research projects

School is already members of:

- BIRCH
- MARC
- Western Alliance
Wendy suggested that we consider joining once we have had the opportunity to see how our existing memberships are faring. Potential benefits are the international focus. In the meantime, Colette will continue to attend meetings as a private member.

Colette Browning

Opportunity to partner with School of Education and School of Arts to house the Akirteh Institute of African Studies (AIASA). Wendy to discuss the opportunity with Deans from the other Schools. Currently located at Victoria University, led by Dr Mimmie Watts and Deputy Chair Prof Ian Rouse.

Wendy Cross

MARC Update.
3 Main projects
- Dementia working party – Julia Gilbert involved
- Mental Health working Party – focus Grief in older People
- Major grants working Party – developing CRE proposal focused on minimising BPSD.
Strategic Planning group is focusing on new proposals and strategies in developing MARC

Danny Hills

Collaborative Evaluation Unit.
A grant received of $400K to develop an evaluation framework.
Currently at stage 3 – developed resources for an online platform.
Significant potential for this work in the Latrobe Valley.

Joanne Porter

★ 13.  Future Actions

Chair

Date of Next Meeting
Dates for meetings in 2020 are yet to be set.

Meeting closed at 12.30pm
LRH report - HREC committee has almost tripled the number of applications processed at this time last year. We currently have 4 clinical trials running - with one large orthopaedic drug trial. We continue to build our research unit and soon to be advertising position of Research Manager, currently we have HREC officer and clinical trial coordinators within the team. A Research Internet page has been developed on LRH home page to support all regional applications. ERM and BIOGRID continue to be useful and successful tools for researchers. LRH currently in negotiation with Monash Partners - with a value submission document accepted for LRH membership. We continue to work with our regional Uni partners Monash Uni - Rural School adjunct Senior Lecturer working in education precinct 2 days per week - We can confirm support to fund PhD scholarship position with FedUni & look to have AP adjunct FedUni in new year at LRH. We would also like to grow in area Allied Health in collaboration with the new programs being offered from FedUni Gippsland campus. We hope to provide more training opportunities for staff into the new year in collaboration with our partners.
School of Science, Engineering and Information Technology
Minutes

Committee Meeting No: SEITRC 4/19

Date & Time: Thursday, 10 October 2019 at 1:30pm
Venue: BER_901_216_Meeting; MTH_F200_Training; CHLL_4N251_Meeting

Members:
Professor Guojun Lu (Chair)
Professor Syed Islam
Professor Steve Wilcox
Associate Professor Shyh Wei Teng
Professor Alexander Kruger
Professor Manzur Murshed
Associate Professor Madhu Chetty
Dr Gopi Chattopadhyay
Dr Stephen Carey
Dr Tanveer Choudhury
Mr Muhammad Malik
Mr Stafford McKnight

In Attendance: Ms Helen Wade
Executive Officer: Ms Annette O'Shea

FORMAL MATTERS

1. Welcome
Chair welcomed Committee members to the fifth meeting for 2019.

2. Apologies
2A. Dr Stephen Carey and Mr Stafford McKnight were apologies for meeting SEITRC 5/19.

3. Starred Items and Approval of Non-Starred Items
3A. Starred Items
Agenda items 1-9 were starred and discussed at the meeting.

3B. Non-Starred Items
Resolution SEITRC 5/19/1
The School of Science, Engineering and Information Technology Research Committee resolved that all items on the agenda “not starred” be adopted without discussion, and the action recommended be taken or the information therein noted.

4. Minutes and Matters arising from the Minutes
4A. Minutes
The Committee was invited to confirm the Minutes of meeting SEITRC 4/19 held Thursday, 29 August 2019.
Resolution SEITRC 5/19/2
The School of Science, Engineering and Information Technology Research Committee confirmed the Minutes of meeting SEITRC 4/19 held Thursday, 29 August 2019 and forwards to the Research Committee (University) for noting.
4B. Matters arising from the Minutes
Item 8A paragraph 3 should read...there should be three (3) Research Priority Areas and who are the key stakeholders.....
Item 8A paragraph 3 dot point 3 should read...with return in research income of 1:5; and...
Item 9A paragraph 1 should read... Associate Professor Madhu Chetty is Acting HDR Coordinator....

4C. Action Items
Committee members noted the Action Items within the meeting minutes and Committee members provided updates.

5A (i) – A school response will be put together by the Dean, AD Research and AD Engagement to be submitted to University Research Committee.

Action item – 4C (i): A school response will be put together by the Dean, AD Research and AD Engagement to be submitted to University Research Committee.

CHAIR’S REPORT

5. Chair’s Report
5A. Chair’s Report
Professor Guojun Lu, Associate Dean Research provided Committee members with an updated on the following key points:
- Helen Bartlett, Jason Giri, Syed Islam, and Guojun Lu recently visited our partner universities in China.
  - HUST-FedUni now has five joint programs with HUST. It is proposed to broaden and deepen our relationships. These will include:
    - Joint PhD Supervision Scheme
    - The student will remain in China with a block visit and be classed as external students.
    - Graduate Research School will offer a number of fee waivers and HUST will provide the stipend component.
    - Both part-time and full time options will be available.
  - ZUT: a joint research workshop to be organized in near future, with the hope of joint grant applications.
  - Shaoguan University may offer opportunities for joint PhD projects in the future.

The Dean advised further outcomes of the visit:
- A workshop will be held with HUST in November whereby Dr Kim Dowling and Environmental Science representative will attend.
- Ongoing academic visits to China will enable further collaboration with our partner universities and Guojun will be consulted.

Gopi advised that a conference in 2020 in India could open up the possibility of joint endeavours also. A number of FedUni staff will attend and further discussion can be had.

Alex identified a need for a liaison person so that there is knowledge of interactions with OS universities. It was advised that Guojun as the new AD Engagement will be the liaison.
Action item – 5A (i): Guojun to advise committee members of the dates of proposed workshops with ZUT and HUST after his upcoming visit. Preferred time is end of February.

Grant success has been achieved in the following:
- Shyh Wei Teng – Soil CRC for 2 scholarships
- Iqbal Gondal – Cyber Security
- Savin Chand – CSIRO

Scholarship Opportunities exist with 10 RTP scholarships available for domestic students. The Graduate School also has a number of other scholarships available.

FOR DISCUSSION

6. 6A. SoSEIT Research Grant Scheme
We have recently been advised the $60k of our RSP funding was allocated to a CRC which no longer exists. The Dean is following up on the funds and their allocation back to the school.

Action item – 6A: The Dean to ascertain if $60k funding will be allocated back to the school.

7. 7A. International PhD Scholarships (Henry Sutton PhD scholarships)
After filtering 56 quality applications were assessed by the panel. 12 of those are to be offered scholarships. There are a number of quality applicants left in the pool and will be recommended for other university scholarships.

Saleem sought clarification around the criteria for publications. What does high quality mean?

Action item – 7A (i): Clarification around the peer review criteria for Academic and Student to be sought by the leadership team and Academic Board.

Action item – 7A (ii): Identification of residential locations of applicant to be provided to the committee.

The 10 scholarships were spread across the schools discipline areas with the final 2 needing co-contribution from supervisor’s research grants.

It was requested that the ranking procedure be advertised in future.

8. 8A. The Proposed University Research Priority Areas
An RPA workshop was held that was highly attended. The main theme discussed was how many centres and groups does FedUni want? The DVC-RI was updated with attendee’s strengths. There were no decisions made or advised. Still to be decided is whether the groups be called centres or institutions.
REPORTS

9. Reports
   9A. HDR Coordinators Report
       Madhu advised that presently the handling of applications for supervisors and
       school forms for scholarship applicants are keeping him busy.

   9B. HDR Student Representative Report
       Saleem is seeking clarification around the criteria for conferences and the peer
       review quality. This item will be addressed in response to action item 7A (i).

   9C. Research Training Program (RTP) Report
       Annette advised that we were allocated $44,250 for 2019 and we have approved
       expenditure of $30,200.

10. General Business
    10A. General Business
        The Dean offered his sincere gratitude and thanks on behalf of himself and the
        school to our outgoing AD Research, Professor Guojun Lu for the outstanding job
        and substantial contribution along with a number of new initiatives heading up the
        School Research Grant opportunities and the Henry Sutton Scholarships
        process. Thanks also to Stephen Carey from the Dean and the school to our
        outgoing HDRC who has achieved wonderful outcomes for the committee and the
        HDR students over their candidature.

        The Dean welcomed to the Leadership Team the new AD Research Professor
        Manzur Murshed and the new HDRC Associate Professor Madhu Chetty.

        Action item – 10A (i): The new Chair to look at the TOR for the committee and the
        membership of the committee.

        The Dean also reiterated the request for all Academic Staff to provide their
        research activity data to Helen Wade. This will help formulate the 2018/2019
        School Research Report.

        The Dean advised that an awards process will be introduced for 2020 for award in
        Research, Teaching and Engagement.

        The question relating to whether a teaching allocation for international scholarship
        recipients would be available. It was identified that candidates must be assessed
        for suitability and that training is available.
Gopi advised that he believed there is a great opportunity for joint PhDs with Manipal University and would like to investigate further.

**Action item – 10A (ii): The new AD Engagement to meet with Dr Gopi to discuss the possibility of Joint PhDs with Manipal University.**

The next School of Science, Engineering and Information Technology Research Committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, 4 December 2019 commencing at 1.30pm in the Room 901-216 Berwick Campus, Room H120 Mt Helen Campus, and Room 4N251 Gippsland Campus.

The meeting concluded at 3:10pm.
1. Context

1.1. This Regulation came into operation on 29 June 1995 and has been subsequently revised.

1.2. This Regulation is informed by the following:


1.2.2. AQFC. 2013. Australian Qualifications Framework. 2nd Edition

1.2.3. AVCC. 2005, August. Universities and Their Students: Principles for the Provision of Education by Australian Universities.


1.2.5. NHMRC/AVCC. 2007. Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.

1.2.6. DDOGS. 2014. Graduate Research Good Practice Principles and Guidelines.

1.3. The Regulation is derived from these overarching frameworks, principles, codes and guidelines. Where these frameworks, principles, codes and guidelines are revised, the most current revision takes precedence.

2. Definitions

2.1. Higher Degree by Research

In this Regulation unless the contrary intention appears “Higher Degree by Research” means a qualification located at level 9 or 10 of the Australian Qualifications Framework, which is based on individual research and conducted under the supervision of an experienced researcher with expertise in the discipline. Higher Degrees by Research include: the Masters Degree (Research), the Doctoral Degree (Research), and the Doctoral Degree (Professional).
2.2 Masters Degree (Research)
A degree awarded for an original contribution to knowledge achieved in up to two years of full-time candidature. The program may include some course work but the focus of the degree is on research, and graduates have specialised knowledge and skills for research, and/or professional practice, and/or further learning.

2.3 Doctoral Degree (Research)
A degree awarded for a substantial original contribution to knowledge achieved in two to four years of full-time candidature. The program may include some course work but the focus of the degree is on research, and graduates have systematic and critical understanding of a complex field of learning and specialised research skills for the advancement of learning and/or professional practice.

2.4 Doctoral Degree (Professional)
A degree program which combines a research project, course work and structured research tasks which are specifically related to professional practice and are often carried out in the workplace. At least two-thirds of the program is based on research.

2.5 Committee
The Committee means the authorised committee operation under the delegation of Academic Board.

2.6 Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee
An ad-hoc committee of the Council and shall consist of the Vice-Chancellor and at least two other persons nominated by the Vice-Chancellor (who will be experts in the relevant discipline). Council must approve the membership of the Committee on each occasion prior to the formation of the Committee.

2.7 Candidate
A Student whose application for candidature for the study of a higher degree by research has been approved by the Academic Board.

2.8 Council
The Council of Federation University Australia.

2.9 Field work
Research and related activities involving the use of equipment, facilities, and resources which are essential for conduct of the research and normally external to the University.

2.10 Full-time
A Candidate who is enrolled as a full-time Candidate and whose primary commitment of time is to higher degree scholarship and research.

2.11 Part-time
A Candidate who is enrolled as a part-time Candidate and whose primary commitment of time is not to higher degree scholarship and research; such a Candidate is normally able to commit an average of approximately 20 hours per week to higher degree scholarship and research. In equivalence terms, part-time candidature is half of full-time candidature.

3 Exercise of powers by Academic Board
3.1 When exercising the powers conferred upon it by this Regulation, the Academic Board shall consider any relevant recommendation made to it by
the Committee and may delegate responsibilities and powers to the Committee or to the Chair of the Committee.

3.2. A Candidate may appeal to the Academic Board against a decision by the Committee relating to assessment, progress or termination of candidature.
PART B – HIGHER DOCTORATES THE DOCTORAL DEGREE (RESEARCH)

4. Types of programs

4.1. The degrees

The degree of Doctor of Science (DSc) and Doctor of Letters (DLitt) shall be awarded on the recommendation of Academic Board to the Council. The Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee shall make a recommendation only after receiving a report from the examiners. The report must certify that the scholarly work submitted for examination is ongoing and is a substantial contribution to the advancement of the relevant field of learning which gives the Candidate a current and an authoritative standing in the field of knowledge in which the work falls and is entitled to general recognition for such by leading scholars in the field.

5. Eligibility for admission

5.1. A Candidate shall be admitted to candidature as a student of the University to enable submission of the portfolio.

5.2. A Candidate for the degree shall:

5.2.1. Be a graduate of the University (or a predecessor institution) for at least 10 years and has been engaged in scholarly activity and/or research in the University for a period of not less than five years; or

5.2.2. Be a graduate of another approved university for at least 10 years, who has been a full-time member of the staff of the University and has been engaged in scholarly activity and/or research in the University for a period of not less than five years; or

5.2.3. Have a substantial and sustained record of scholarship which in the opinion of the University is satisfactory and adequate for the purposes of this award.

6. Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee

6.1. The Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee is responsible for the processes of admission, examination and recommending the awarding of Higher Doctoral Degrees to Council.

7. Work submitted for examination

A Candidate for a Higher Doctoral degree shall make a submission to the Chairperson of the Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee, nominating the degree title and including:

7.1. A Portfolio consisting of:

7.1.1. A curriculum vitae; and

7.1.2. A bibliography of up to 10 pieces of the Candidate’s work which the Candidate considers to be their best published work. This requirement may be varied at the discretion of the Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee.
Committee; and

7.1.3. A signed 500 word (approximate) summary of the work which details the extent to which the work is original work and, in the case of collaborative work, the extent of the applicant's contribution to the work; and

7.1.4. An exegesis of no more than 4000 words which consists of:

i. A statement identifying the contribution of the body of work to the field of knowledge;
ii. A statement identifying achievement against indicators of quality relevant to the Candidate's field;
iii. A statement, where appropriate, identifying the economic, social and or cultural contribution of the body of work; and
iv. An statement that identifies the Candidate's standing in the field;
and

7.1.5. Five copies of each piece of scholarly work, up to 10 pieces; and

7.1.6. A declaration indicating those sections of the work, if any, which have been submitted previously for a degree or other award in any university.

7.2. Where conjoint papers are to be submitted, the Candidate's contribution must be clearly specified. The degree of Doctor under this Part B shall not be awarded for conjoint work unless the Candidate produces sufficient evidence indicating responsibility for the initiation and conduct or direction of the major portion of the work.

7.3. A Candidate must not submit for assessment work in respect of which an award has been conferred in any university, or, without permission of the University, work which has previously been presented for any such award.

8. Criteria

8.1. The criterion for the award of the degree shall be that the body of work as presented and as justified in the exegesis is a substantial contribution to the advancement of the relevant field of learning. It is expected that this gives to the Candidate a current and authoritative standing in the field of knowledge in which the work falls which is generally recognised by leading scholars in the field.

9. Examination

9.1. On receiving a report from the Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee that the published work is prima facie worthy of examination for the degree and confirming the appropriateness of the selected degree title, the relevant Executive Dean, in consultation with the Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee, and under the auspices of Academic Board, shall appoint at least three external examiners of international standing in the discipline. The examiners may require the Candidate to answer orally, or in writing, any questions concerning the published work.

9.2. A Candidate shall not be recommended for the Award of a Higher Doctorate under this Regulation unless all examiners report that the work satisfies the requirements
10. Fees

10.1. A Candidate shall be required to pay such fees as determined by the Council from time to time.

11. Effects of changes in the Regulation

11.1. Where the Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee is of the view that a Candidate for a Higher Doctoral degree has been or may be adversely affected by an amendment to this Regulation 5.1 which has occurred subsequent to the Candidate's admission to candidature, the Candidate may be permitted to continue under such Statutes, Regulations or requirements of the Institution in force at any time during the period of candidature and on such conditions as prescribed by the Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee.
PART B – THE SCHEDULE

These Rules shall apply to the degrees of:

1) Doctor of Letters (DLitt),

2) Doctor of Science (DSc),

and any other higher doctorates accredited by the University.
PART C – THE DOCTORAL DEGREE (RESEARCH)

12. Types of programs

12.1.4.1. This regulation shall apply to all Doctoral Degrees (Research) awarded by the University.

12.2.4.2. The Doctoral Degrees (Research) awarded by the University are specified in “Part CB The Schedule.”

4.3. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Research) (PhD) shall be awarded without classification on the basis of the Candidate having met the requirements of a Doctoral Degree as per the AQF Level 10 criteria and having:
- conducted research independently at a high level of originality and quality,
- made a significant and original contribution to knowledge,
- demonstrated an understanding of the relationship of the investigations undertaken to a wider field of knowledge, and
- demonstrated substantial knowledge of research principles and methods applicable to the field of learning.

12.3.4.4. The following types of programs may be approved by the Academic Board as appropriate for a Candidate to undertake in order to qualify for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Research):

12.3.4.4.1. Original scholarship and research carried out by the Candidate under supervision; or

12.3.4.4.2. Preparation and presentation of a major work or collection of works, including but not restricted to visual presentation, literary production or computer software development, carried out by the Candidate under supervision and accompanied by a written exegesis.

12.4.4.5. Thesis format alternatives are specified in Section 1911 and Section 2012.

12.5.4.6. Candidates may be eligible to enrol in cotutelle, joint or dual Doctoral Degree (Research) programs according to the rules and regulations stipulated through Memoranda of Understanding or other agreements approved by the University.

13. Duration of program

13.1.5.1. The minimum period of PhD candidature shall be one year of full-time study and the maximum period four years of full-time study or the equivalent in part-time study.

13.2.5.2. In exceptional cases the Academic Board may approve an extension of the maximum period of candidature.

13.3.5.3. In exceptional cases the Academic Board may approve a reduction in the minimum period of candidature.

13.4.5.4. Subject to the approval of the Academic Board, candidature may incorporate varying segments of full-time and part-time enrolment.

13.5.5.5. A Candidate who enrolls part-time must be able to complete the program within the maximum allowable period of candidature.

13.6.5.6. Candidature will be on a continuous basis unless otherwise approved by the Academic Board.

13.7.5.7. Candidates may elect to study on-campus and normally shall carry out such work, other than field work, at the University, or they may study off-campus where they shall be approved by the Committee to pursue their studies at another suitable location.
14.6. **Enrolment**

14.1.6.1. The Academic Board may approve the enrolment of a person for the Doctoral Degree (Research) if it is satisfied that:

14.1.1.6.1.1. The person is eligible for admission under Section 157; and

14.1.2.6.1.2. The research program proposed is appropriate for candidature for the PhD degree and is acceptable to the Faculty School; and

14.1.3.6.1.3. The applicant has adequate training and ability to pursue such a program; and

14.1.4.6.1.4. Adequate supervision and facilities can be provided for undertaking the proposed research project, including a supervisory and study environment of research activity or other creative endeavour, inquiry and scholarship.

14.2.6.2. Any person admitted to candidature for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy will proceed to undertake the research program and other requirements specified by the Academic Board in respect of the person’s candidature.

14.3.6.3. A Candidate shall conduct research in accord with the code of research conduct and professional practice specified by the University.

15.7. **Eligibility for admission**

15.1.7.1. To be clearly eligible for admission as a Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on the basis of formal qualifications, a person must demonstrate:

15.1.1.7.1.1. Successful completion of a Masters by Research degree that included a dissertation, demonstrating the ability to undertake research at PhD level; or

15.1.2.7.1.2. Successful completion of an undergraduate degree and subsequent additional Honours degree, graduating with first class or second class(upper division) Honours, that included a dissertation demonstrating the ability to undertake research at PhD level; or

15.1.3.7.1.3. Enrolment in a Masters Degree (Research) and sufficient research capability to successfully undertake a Confirmation of Candidature demonstrating the capacity to undertake research at PhD level.

15.2.7.2. An applicant who does not meet clearly eligible entry requirements on the basis of formal qualifications will be required to provide further qualifying information evidence of equivalent research capability to support their application. Such applicants must demonstrate:

15.2.1.7.2.1. Qualifications and/or research skills, professional research experience, or publications which are assessed by the Academic Board as being at least equivalent to or as a satisfactory substitute for any of the qualifications prescribed in Section 457.1; or

15.2.2.7.2.2. Successful completion of a Masters by Coursework degree that included research training and a dissertation demonstrating the ability to undertake research at PhD level, with the combined training and dissertation being equivalent to an Honours degree, at least upper second division.

15.3.7.3. An applicant who does not hold a valid passport from, and who is not a citizen of, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Canada, New Zealand or the Republic of Ireland must, in applying for candidature, provide the required...
evidence of a satisfactory level of competence in oral and written English as specified by the Academic Board and advertised on the University’s website.

16.8. **Candidature**

16.1.8.1. A Candidate shall be:

16.1.1.8.1.1. Required to re-enrol in each calendar year following the initial enrolment by the date specified by the University, until such time as the thesis has been submitted for examination or their candidature will be terminated; and

16.1.2.8.1.2. Deemed to be enrolled during any period in which the thesis is being examined; and

16.1.3.8.1.3. Required, in the event of having to submit a thesis in a revised form, to continue to enrol until the thesis has been submitted for re-examination.

8.1.4. Required to re-enrol as requested by the Academic Board where there are delays in submission, for example as a result of an appeal outcome or other extenuating circumstances.

16.2.8.2. Re-enrolment is subject to approval by the Academic Board upon its consideration of progress reports.

16.3.8.3. A Candidate may apply for permission to change enrolment status to either full-time or part-time or for leave from studies for a defined period of time, and the Academic Board may grant such an application subject to such conditions as it sees fit.

16.4.8.4. A Candidate may withdraw from candidature at any time by written notice to the Academic Board.

17.9. **Progression**

17.1.9.1. A Candidate shall be provided with:

17.1.1.9.1.1. Continuing supervisory support; and

17.1.2.9.1.2. Appropriate resources required for timely completion of a high quality research project; and

17.1.3.9.1.3. Clarification of ownership and management of intellectual property; and

17.1.4.9.1.4. Assistance to develop key research and employability skills; and

17.1.5.9.1.5. Opportunities to engage with scholarly communities and to be actively involved in the intellectual culture of the University.

17.2.9.2. Initial admission to PhD candidature is on a provisional basis, and an application for confirmed candidature must be made within 12 months of commencing full-time probationary candidature or within 24 months of commencing part-time probationary candidature, unless otherwise approved by Academic Board.

17.3.9.3. In order for candidature to be confirmed, the Candidate must complete such processes as determined by the Academic Board to demonstrate that a viable PhD research program has been developed, satisfactory progress has been made, and that the degree requirements can be completed within the period allowed.

17.4.9.4. The Principal Supervisor and the **Executive Dean of the School of enrolment** (or nominee) will provide the Academic Board with written advice as to whether candidature should be confirmed.
17.5.9.5. The Principal Supervisor together with the Candidate will obtain approval from the relevant ethics committee within the University prior to collection of data where such approval is necessary.

17.6.9.6. A Candidate applying to convert from Masters Degree (Research) enrolment to PhD candidature must successfully undertake the Confirmation of Candidature process, as determined by the Academic Board, to demonstrate the capacity to undertake research at PhD level.

17.7.9.7. The Principal Supervisor and the Executive Dean of the School of enrolment (or nominee) will provide the Academic Board with written advice as to whether transfer of candidature should be permitted.

17.8.9.8. In the event of transfer, the length of PhD candidature will be adjusted to take into account part or all of the period spent as a Masters Candidate.

17.9.9.9. Throughout candidature a Candidate shall submit written reports on academic progress as and when requested by the principal supervisor, Executive Dean of the School of enrolment (or nominee), or the Academic Board, not less frequently than annually. Such reports shall be discussed with the Principal Supervisor.

17.10.9.10. When the Principal Supervisor or the Executive Dean of the School of enrolment (or nominee) considers that a Candidate is not making satisfactory progress or is not complying with regulations, the Academic Board may require the Candidate to show cause why candidature should not be terminated.

17.11.9.11. If the Academic Board, after giving the Candidate an opportunity to show cause and after considering all the evidence before it, believes the Candidate is not making satisfactory progress or is not complying with regulations, it may:

- Terminate the Candidate’s enrolment for the degree; or
- Specify in writing the conditions under which the Candidate’s enrolment for the degree may continue.

17.12.9.12. Failure to agree to or comply with the conditions will result in termination of candidature.

18.10. Supervisory arrangements

18.1.10.1. The Academic Board shall appoint a supervisory panel of a minimum of two supervisors from among the persons listed in the Register of Higher Degree Research Supervisors as qualified to be the Principal Supervisor and the Associate or Co-Supervisors of a Doctoral Candidate, or from among persons otherwise deemed eligible by the Academic Board.

18.2.10.2. One member of the supervisory panel will be designated as the Principal Supervisor for the period of candidature. The Principal Supervisor will be a member of academic staff of the University except in specific cases, such as a relevant adjunct or honorary appointment, approved by the Academic Board.

18.3.10.3. The Principal Supervisor shall:

- Be listed on the Register of Higher Degree Research Supervisors; and
- Be an active researcher with relevant scholarly expertise; and
- Hold a Doctoral Degree or have demonstrable equivalent research experience in a relevant discipline as determined by the Chair, Research Higher Degree Committee; and
- Operate in accord with the code of supervisory practices adopted by the Academic Board, including professional development and performance review; and
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18.3.5.10.3.5. Provide opportunities for the Candidate to engage with scholarly communities; and

18.3.6.10.3.6. Maintain close and meet on regular contact basis with the Candidate and document such meetings; and

18.3.7.10.3.7. Supervise and counsel the Candidate in all aspects of the Candidate's research project and the preparation of the thesis; and

18.3.8.10.3.8. Monitor progress and ensure the Candidate is made aware in writing of inadequate progress or of work which is below the standard generally expected, specifying shortcomings and suggesting ways of addressing them; and
generally expected, specifying shortcomings and suggesting ways of addressing them; and

18.3.9.10 18.3.9. Discuss with the Candidate proposed future work and the general planning of the thesis; and

18.3.10. Provide timely feedback to the Candidate when required; and

10.3.10. 18.3.11. Comment critically and constructively and within a month on the work forwarded by the student and monitor the student's performance relative to the standard required for the degree; and

18.3.10.10 18.3.11. Provide the Academic Board with accurate reports on the Candidate's progress.

18.4.10.4. An Associate Supervisor will be a member of academic staff of the University, except in specific cases, such as a relevant adjunct or honorary appointment, which must be approved by the Academic Board, and a co-supervisor will be an external person of recognised standing in the field of the Candidate's research.

18.5.10.5. The supervisory panel will provide guidance to the Candidate in the design, conduct and timely completion of the research project, support in publication and dissemination of research findings, and advice on the acquisition of research and other skills as appropriate.

18.6.10.6. If a Principal Supervisor is to be absent from University duties, or otherwise unavailable and unable to undertake this supervision, for a period of up to three consecutive months, then the Associate Supervisor may act as the Principal Supervisor during this period. If a Principal Supervisor is to be absent from University duties, or otherwise unable to undertake this supervision, for more than three consecutive months, the Academic Board shall on the advice of the Executive Dean of Faculty the School of enrolment appoint an acting Principal Supervisor from among persons on the register of principal Supervisors or otherwise deemed eligible by the Academic Board.

19.11. The Thesis

19.1.11.1. On completing the program of advanced study and research, a Candidate shall submit a thesis based on work carried out during candidature. A thesis may adopt one of the following formats:

19.1.1.1. Conventional thesis; or

19.1.2. Thesis incorporating published papers; or

19.1.3. Practical works and an exegesis.

19.2.11.2. The thesis is to be presented in accord with the requirements outlined in Section 2012.

19.3.11.3. A conventional thesis may incorporate or include as an appendix any publication up to two publications resulting from the work completed during candidature whether or not the Candidate is the sole author or one of the joint authors.

19.4.11.4. A thesis incorporating published papers is one where normally three or more papers based upon the candidate’s research form a substantial part of the thesis content rather than, as above, where one or more papers are included as appendices. In this case, the majority of the thesis will be in the form of papers published, accepted for publication, submitted for publication or drafted for submission. Such a thesis will have equivalent intellectual content and rigour, and make the same contribution to knowledge as a conventional thesis. The material presented for a Doctor of Philosophy (Research) incorporating published papers must be presented in a logical sequence to form a coherent whole. These...
include A maximum of 66% of the papers in a thesis incorporating published papers, up to 66% of which publications may be papers published prior to enrolment in the program and must have been published within ten years prior to the date of enrolment.

19.5.11.5. A Candidate may not present in the thesis any work for which another award has been conferred by the University or any other academic institution, but a Candidate shall not be precluded from incorporating extracts from such work in the thesis provided that the sum of any such extracts does not constitute the major proportion of the thesis and provided also that the source of each such extract is stated explicitly.

19.6.11.6. The thesis shall adhere to the principles of research and academic integrity concerning plagiarism, contract cheating, and research ethics as stipulated in the code of research conduct and professional practice specified by the University.

19.7.11.7. The thesis shall identify the extent to which the work of others is being relied upon by providing appropriate acknowledgment, citation, and reference in the text and in the bibliography/reference list.

19.8.11.8. The statement of authorship and originality signed and dated by the Candidate when the thesis is submitted for examination will include a declaration that no other person's work has been relied upon or used without due acknowledgment in the main text and bibliography/reference list of the thesis. This statement will also acknowledge editorial assistance and copyright provisions and approvals, and include acknowledgement that a plagiarism report has been submitted to the University.

19.9.11.9. In cases where ethics approval was required for any component of the research, a statement must be submitted with the thesis from the Chair of the relevant ethics committee, declaring that all necessary ethics-related processes have been completed.

20.12. Presentation of a Thesis

20.1.12.1. The thesis presented by a Candidate for examination shall conform to the requirements of this section unless otherwise agreed by the Academic Board.

20.2.12.2. A PhD thesis will normally be:

20.2.1.12.2.1. A text of not more than 100,000 words reporting original scholarship and research carried out by the Candidate under supervision; or

20.2.2.12.2.2. A major work or collection of works, including but not restricted to visual presentation, literary production or computer software development, carried out by the Candidate under supervision and accompanied by an exegesis or scholarly commentary of no more 40,000 words.

20.3. If a thesis or exegesis exceeds the respective upper word limit it may not be acceptable for submission and the Candidate may be asked to reduce the word count.

24.13. Submission of thesis for Examination

24.1.13.1. A Candidate shall notify the University of their intention to submit the thesis for examination using the appropriate proforma available on the University's website.

24.2.13.2. Candidates for higher degrees shall present for examination the required number of copies of the thesis text and/or an electronic version of the thesis.

24.3. If the thesis includes a major work or collection of works, the major work or collection of works shall be presented in a format suitable for examination. A thesis
may be rejected as unfit for examination if it does not conform to the requirements set out in this section.

13.3. The thesis, may include materials and formats such as performances, creative works, folios or electronic media appropriate to the discipline as approved by Dean of the School of enrolment. The thesis proportions, where designated to comprise creative work and dissertation must be specified at confirmation and the dissertation component cannot be less than 25% of the work.

21.4.13.4. Written work submitted for examination shall be in the English language, unless an exemption is granted by the Academic Board prior to submission.

21.5.13.5. If the thesis is based on research conducted in collaboration, the nature and extent of the Candidate's contribution to the research shall be clearly indicated.

21.6.13.6. Any practical works submitted must demonstrate a systematic line of enquiry and investigation, and there must be a demonstrable and essential link between the practical works and the exegesis. The exegesis should reveal and elaborate the line of enquiry and investigation pursued in preparation of the practical works and provide commentary on individual practical works and overall.

21.7.13.7. A Candidate shall identify all sources of background knowledge and the extent to which the work of others is being relied upon by providing appropriate acknowledgment, citation and reference in the text of the thesis and in the bibliography reference list.

22.14. Arrangement

22.1.14.1. The thesis text shall be prepared and submitted using the thesis templateguidelines as approved by Academic Board.

22.2.14.2. A “Statement of authorship and originality” in the following words, will appear on the thesis template. This statement must be signed and dated by the Candidate. “Statement of authorship and originality”: Except where explicit 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 by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma. No other person's work has been relied upon or used without due acknowledgment in the main text and bibliography reference list of the thesis. No editorial assistance has been received in the production of the thesis without due acknowledgement. Except where duly referred to, the thesis does not include material with copyright provisions or requiring copyright approvals.

23.15. Examination of the thesis

23.1.15.1. After considering recommendations from the supervisor(s), as informed by consultation with the candidate, and the relevant Executive Dean of the Faculty School of enrolment, the Academic Board shall appoint at least two examiners who will be external to the University.

23.2.15.2. Examiners shall:

23.2.1.15.2.1. Hold a PhD or possess equivalent relevant professional experience; and

23.2.2.15.2.2. Be independent of the conduct of the candidate’s research; and

23.2.3.15.2.3. Have current Be recognised as an international standingexpert in the field or discipline or field of research in which the Candidate’s research program has been conducted thesis; and

23.2.4. Have empathy with the theoretical framework used by the candidate;
and

23.2.4.15.2.4. Be without bias and real or perceived conflict of interest, and sign a conflict of interest declaration.

23.3.15.3. Where an examiner fails to return an assessment within three two months of being sent the thesis, the Academic Board may appoint a replacement examiner.

23.4.15.4. The name of any examiner shall not be disclosed to a Candidate prior to or during examination, and will be disclosed to the Candidate on completion of examination only with the agreement of the examiner.

23.5.15.5. Examiners are required to assess the thesis in terms of whether the Candidate has made a significant and original contribution to knowledge, has demonstrated an understanding of the relationship of the investigations undertaken to a wider field of knowledge, and has demonstrated substantial knowledge of research principles and methods applicable to the field of learning. In addition to providing the Academic Board with written comments bearing on these criteria, the examiners, acting independently, will recommend to the Academic Board that:

23.5.1.15.5.1. The thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination; or

23.5.2.15.5.2. The thesis should be classified as PASSED, subject to the minor corrections outlined in reports from examiners being made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; or

23.5.2.15.5.3. The Candidate that is the thesis is suitable for conferral once the author has addressed nominated passages, textual errors, and referencing mistakes. These actions should largely be required to pass a written and/or oral examination in subject matter directly related to the thesis before the thesis is classified as PASSED be undertaken independently by the candidate; or

15.5.4.23.5.4. The thesis should be PASSED subject to major corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; that is the thesis requires new data collection, new or revised data analysis, substantive rewriting of one or more chapters, or a large number of stylistic/presentation errors. These actions should be undertaken with ongoing input from the supervisory team; or

23.5.3.15.5.4. The thesis should be classified as DEFERRED; the thesis requires substantial revision followed by re-examination by external experts and the Candidate should be permitted to submit the thesis for examination in a revised form; or

23.5.4.15.5.5. The thesis should be classified as FAILED.

23.6.15.6. An overall grade will be awarded by the Academic Board on consideration of the individual recommendations of the examiners.

23.7.15.7. If the recommendations received from examiners differ markedly, the Academic Board may take such action as it thinks fit, such as the appointment of an additional examiner to supply an examination report.

23.8.15.8. The Academic Board may require that the Candidate be examined orally on the substance of the thesis. Such oral examination shall be conducted under arrangements made by the Academic Board in consultation with the examiners, the principal supervisor, and the Executive Dean of Faculty the School of enrolment. The Candidate shall be advised in advance of the persons to be present at the examination and of the general arrangements for the conduct of the examination.

23.9.15.9. In the case of a Candidate who accepts an invitation to submit a revised thesis for re-examination, the Candidate shall be provided with guidelines for revision of the
thesis based on the reports of the examiners. Only in exceptional cases will more than a single attempt at revision of the thesis be permitted.

23.10.15.10. Where a thesis is to be corrected or revised and submitted for re-examination, the Candidate must complete the requirement within a time limit specified by the Academic Board.

23.11.15.11. Where a thesis is to be revised and submitted for re-examination, the examiners will normally be those who evaluated the thesis on initial submission.

15.12. Where a thesis is re-examined, the thesis is eligible for one of only three possible examination outcomes:

15.12.1. The thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination; or
15.12.2. The thesis should be classified as PASSED subject to minor corrections, textual errors and/or referencing corrections.
15.12.3. The thesis should be classified as FAILED.

24.16. Admission to the degree

24.1.16.1. When the Academic Board is satisfied that a Candidate has fulfilled the conditions prescribed for admission to the Doctoral Degree (Research), the Academic Board shall recommend to Council that the Candidate be admitted to that degree.

24.2.16.2. When this recommendation has been confirmed by Council the Candidate will be deemed as completed.

25.17. Fees

25.1.17.1. A Candidate shall be required to pay such fees as determined by the Council. Candidates who exceed the maximum period of candidature as specified in 2a) may be required to pay tuition fees.

26.18. Effects of changes in the Regulation

26.1.18.1. Where the Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee is of the view that a Candidate for a Higher Doctoral degree has been or may be adversely affected by an amendment to this Regulation 5.1 which has occurred subsequent to the Candidate’s admission to candidature, the Candidate may be permitted to continue under such Statutes, Regulations or requirements of the Institution in force at any time during the period of candidature and on such conditions as prescribed by the Research Higher Doctoral Degrees Degree Committee.
PART CB THE SCHEDULE

These rules shall apply to

1) Doctor of Philosophy (Research) – the PhD

and any other Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Research) accredited by the University.
PART DC – THE DOCTORAL DEGREE (PROFESSIONAL)

27.19. Types of Programs
27.1.19.1. This regulation shall apply to all Doctoral Degrees (Professional) awarded by the University.

27.2.19.2. The professional doctorates awarded by the University are specified in Part DC The Schedule.

27.3.19.3. In Part DC:

27.3.1.19.3.1. “Program” means a program of structured learning and independent supervised study that produces significant and original research outcomes equivalent in total to 360 progress units/credit points of study, and of which the research component normally forms 240 progress units/credit points (66%, or two years of a three year program).

27.3.2.19.3.2. “Advanced coursework” means structured learning to enhance the candidate’s capacity to make a significant contribution to original knowledge in the discipline and/or research integrated practice developed in collaboration with a relevant professional, industry, statutory or regulatory body;

27.3.3.19.3.3. “Research component” means a research proposal for candidature and production of a professional thesis, dissertation, exegesis or equivalent;

27.3.4.19.3.4. “Professional thesis” means a thesis, dissertation, exegesis or equivalent research-based project output addressing an important problem or question concerning policy and/or practice in a professional, industry, community, statutory or regulatory body.

27.3.5.19.3.5. Thesis format alternatives are specified in Section 35. These include a thesis incorporating published papers, up to 66% of which may be papers published prior to enrolment.

27.4.19.4. The Doctor of Philosophy (Professional) shall make a significant and original contribution to knowledge in the context of professional practice.

19.5. A professional doctorate shall be awarded without classification on the basis of the Candidate having met the requirements of a Doctoral Degree (Professional) as per the AQF Level 10 criteria and:

19.5.1. completed appropriate advanced coursework and

19.5.2. completed a professional thesis that makes a contribution to knowledge in the discipline, and/or

19.5.3. undertaken research-integrated practice developed in conjunction as described above, which demonstrates an understanding of the relationship of the investigations undertaken, and

19.5.4. demonstrates critical reflection and analysis of issues relevant to professional policy and/or practice.

27.4.2.19.5.6. A professional doctorate program must be approved by the Academic Board. A Candidate for a professional doctorate may be awarded credit by the Academic Board in respect of the advanced coursework program in accordance with Regulation 5.2 and this Regulation and any other relevant legislation.

27.6.19.7. Proposals from Faculties for professional doctorate programs which involve variations in the proportion of advanced coursework and research component may be approved by the Academic Board only on the basis of demonstrated
Candidates may be eligible to enrol in cotutelle, joint or dual Doctoral Degree (Professional) programs according to the rules and regulations stipulated through Memoranda of Understanding or other agreements approved by the University.

28.20. Duration of program

28.4.20.1. The advanced coursework shall be completed within the normal progression rules of the University.

28.2.20.2. Variation to the proportions of coursework and research component will not be approved for individual Candidates.

28.3.20.3. The maximum period of candidature shall be 4 four years of full-time study or the equivalent in part-time study. The normal period for completion of the research component shall be 2.0 two years full-time study or equivalent part-time study.

28.4.20.4. In exceptional cases the normal period for the research component may be extended by the Academic Board.

28.5.20.5. Subject to the approval of the Academic Board, candidature may incorporate varying segments of full-time and part-time enrolment.

28.6.20.6. A Candidate who enrolls part-time must be able to complete the program within the maximum allowable period of candidature.

28.7.20.7. Candidature will be on a continuous basis unless otherwise approved by the Academic Board.

28.8.20.8. Candidates may elect to study on-campus where they shall pursue their studies wholly under the control of the University and normally shall carry out such work, other than field work, at the University, or they may elect to study off-campus where they shall be approved by the Committee to pursue their studies at another suitable location.

28.9.20.9. Successful completion of advanced coursework and research-integrated practice, normally to the value of 120 progress units credit points, which will support the research outcomes; of this advanced coursework at least 90 progress units credit points will involve courses at Doctoral level and normally at least 60 progress units credit points will involve research education.

28.10.20.10. A professional thesis, dissertation, exegesis or equivalent, the length of which may vary with each discipline, with the norm being 45,000 words (or equivalent if presented in an alternative medium approved by the Academic Board). The Research component will be equivalent to 240 progress units credit points.

29.21. Enrolment

29.4.21.1. The Academic Board may approve the enrolment of a person for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Professional) if it is satisfied that:

29.1.4.21.1.1. The applicant is eligible for admission under Section 3022; and

29.1.2.21.1.2. The proposed research component is appropriate for candidature for the degree of professional doctorate and is acceptable to the relevant Faculty/School; and

29.1.3.21.1.3. The applicant has adequate training and ability to pursue such a program; and

29.1.4.21.1.4. Adequate supervision and facilities can be provided for undertaking the research component, including a supervisory and study
environment of research activity or other creative endeavour, inquiry or scholarship.

29.2.21.2. Any person admitted to candidature for the degree of professional doctorate will proceed to undertake the program and other requirements specified by the Academic Board in respect of the person's candidature.

29.3.21.3. A Candidate shall undertake the advanced coursework in accordance with the normal regulations of the University.

29.4.21.4. A Candidate shall conduct the research component in accord with the code of research conduct and professional practice specified by the University.

30.22. Eligibility for admission

30.1.22.1. To be clearly eligible for admission as a Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Professional) on the basis of formal qualifications, a person must demonstrate:

30.1.1.22.1.1. Successful completion of a Masters Degree (Research) that included a dissertation, demonstrating the ability to undertake research at PhD professional doctorate level; or

30.1.2.22.1.2. Successful completion of an undergraduate degree and subsequent additional Honours degree, graduating with first class or second class (upper division) Honours, that included a dissertation demonstrating the ability to undertake research at PhD professional doctorate level; or

30.1.3.22.1.3. Enrolment in a Masters Degree (Research) and sufficient research capability to successfully undertake a Confirmation of Candidature demonstrating the capacity to undertake research at PhD professional doctorate level.

30.2.22.2. An applicant who does not meet the clearly eligible entry requirements on the basis of formal qualifications will be required to provide further qualifying information-evidence of equivalent research capability to support their application. Such applicants must demonstrate:
30.2.1. Qualifications and/or research skills, professional research experience, or publications which are assessed by the Academic Board as being at least equivalent to or as a satisfactory substitute for any of the qualifications prescribed in Section 30.2.1; or

30.2.2. Successful completion of a Masters by Coursework degree that included research training and a dissertation demonstrating the ability to undertake research at PhD/Professional Doctorate level, with the combined training and dissertation being equivalent to an Honours degree, at least upper second division.

30.3. All applicants should normally hold at least two years (full-time equivalent) of relevant professional experience and such professional qualifications and professional accreditation as may be required to engage in research-integrated practice relevant to the proposed program.

30.4. An applicant who does not hold a valid passport from, and who is not a citizen of, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Canada, New Zealand or the Republic of Ireland must, in applying for candidature, provide the required evidence of a satisfactory level of competence in oral and written English as specified by the Academic Board and advertised on the University’s website.

30.5. Notwithstanding the provisions of Regulation 5.2 and this Regulation, a Candidate for a professional doctorate may be admitted by the Academic Board to the program with credit for specific advanced coursework on production of satisfactory evidence of prior academic study completed by the Candidate and assessed by the Academic Board as being equivalent to advanced coursework included within the program.

30.6. No Candidate may receive credit totalling more than 80 progress units of advanced coursework. Of this credit, no more than 40 progress units may be granted for units of study undertaken at Masters level. Credit will not be granted for units of study undertaken below Masters level nor for units of study not related to the area of study. Credit will not normally be granted for any or all of the research component of the program.

30.7. On admission of a Candidate who has transferred from another professional doctorate program (or equivalent) at the University, or another recognised tertiary institution, the Committee will determine the period of candidature and the level of any credit towards the Doctoral Degree (Professional) program.

31.23. Candidature

31.1. A Candidate shall be:

31.1.1. Required to re-enrol in each calendar year following the initial enrolment by date specified by the University, until such time as the advanced coursework has been completed and the professional thesis has been submitted for examination, or their candidature will be terminated; and
31.1.2. Deemed to be enrolled during any period in which the professional thesis is being examined; and

31.1.3. Required, in the event of having to submit a professional thesis in a revised form, to enrol for a period prescribed by the Academic Board until the revised thesis has been submitted for re-examination.

23.1.4. Required to re-enrol as requested by the Academic Board where there are delays in submission, for example as a result of an appeal outcome or other extenuating circumstances.

31.2. Re-enrolment in the research component of the degree is subject to approval by the Academic Board upon satisfactory progress as identified in progress reports or otherwise.

31.3. A Candidate may apply for permission to change enrolment status to either full-time or part-time or for leave from studies for a defined period of time, and the Academic Board may grant such an application subject to such conditions as it sees fit.

31.4. A Candidate may withdraw from candidature at any time by written notice to the Academic Board.

31.5. Conversion to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Research) may be approved by the Academic Board.

32.24. Progression in the Research Component

32.1. A Candidate shall be provided with;

32.1.1. Continuing supervisory support; and

32.1.2. Appropriate resources required for timely completion of a high quality research project; and

32.1.3. Clarification of ownership and management of intellectual property; and

32.1.4. Assistance to develop key research and employability skills; and

32.1.5. Opportunities to engage with scholarly communities and to be actively involved in the intellectual culture of the University.

32.2. The Candidate will pass the required advanced coursework before commencing the research component. Relevant University Higher Education regulations for courses apply.

32.3. Initial admission to the professional doctorate program is on a probationary basis, and, following completion of the advanced coursework component, an application for confirmed candidature must be made within six months of commencing the research component full-time or within 12 months of commencing the research component part-time.

32.4. In order for candidature to be confirmed, the Candidate must complete such processes as determined by the Academic Board to demonstrate that the development of a viable research program has been developed, satisfactory progress has been made, and that the degree requirements can be completed within the period allowed.

32.5. The Principal Supervisor and the Executive Dean of the School of enrolment (or nominee) will provide the Academic Board with written advice as to whether candidature to undertake the proposed research should be confirmed.

32.6. The Candidate will obtain approval from the relevant ethics committee within the University prior to collection of data where such approval is necessary.
32.7.24.7. A Candidate applying to transfer from Doctoral Degree (Professional) enrolment to PhD candidature must successfully undertake the Confirmation of Candidature process, as determined by the Academic Board, to demonstrate the capacity to undertake research at the PhD level.

32.8.24.8. The Principal Supervisor and the Executive Dean of the School of enrolment (or nominee) will provide the Academic Board with written advice as to whether change of candidature should be permitted.

32.9.24.9. In the event of change of candidature, the length of PhD candidature will be adjusted to take into account part of all of the period spent as a Doctoral Degree (Professional) Candidate.

32.10.24.10. Throughout candidature a Candidate shall submit written reports on academic progress as and when requested by the Principal Supervisor, Executive Dean of the School of enrolment or the Academic Board, not less frequently than annually. Such reports shall be discussed with the Principal Supervisor.

32.11.24.11. When the Principal Supervisor or the Executive Dean of Faculty the School of enrolment considers that a Candidate is not making satisfactory progress or is not complying with regulations, the Academic Board may require the Candidate to show cause why candidature should not be terminated.

32.12.24.12. If the Academic Board, after giving the Candidate an opportunity to show cause and after considering all the evidence before it, believes the Candidate is not making satisfactory progress or is not complying with regulations, it may:

32.12.1.24.12.1. Terminate the Candidate’s enrolment for the degree; or

32.12.2.24.12.2. Specify in writing the conditions under which the Candidate’s enrolment for the degree may continue.

32.13.24.13. Failure to agree to or comply with the conditions will result in termination of candidature.

33.25. Supervisory arrangements

33.1.25.1. The Academic Board shall appoint a supervisory panel of a minimum of two supervisors from among the persons listed in the Register of Higher Degree Research Supervisors as qualified to be the Principal Supervisor and the Associate or Co-Supervisors of a Doctoral Candidate, or from among persons otherwise deemed eligible by the Academic Board.

33.2.25.2. One member of the supervisory panel will be designated the Principal Supervisor for the period of candidature. The Principal Supervisor will be a member of academic staff of the University except in specific cases, such as a relevant adjunct or honorary appointment, approved by the Academic Board.

33.3.25.3. The Principal Supervisor shall:

33.3.1.25.3.1. Be listed on the Register of Higher Degree Research Supervisors; and

33.3.2.25.3.2. Be an active researcher with relevant scholarly expertise; and

33.3.3.25.3.3. Hold a Doctoral Degree or have demonstrable equivalent research experience in a relevant discipline as determined by the Chair, Research Higher Degree Committee; and

33.3.4.25.3.4. Operate in accord with the code of supervisory practices adopted by the Academic Board, including professional development and performance review; and
33.3.5. Provide opportunities for the Candidate to engage with scholarly communities; and

33.3.6. Maintain close and Meet on regular contact basis with the Candidate and document such meetings; and

33.3.7. Supervise and counsel the Candidate in all aspects of the Candidate’s research project and the preparation of the thesis; and

33.3.8. Monitor progress and ensure the Candidate is made aware in writing of inadequate progress or of work which is below the standard generally expected, specifying shortcomings and suggesting ways of addressing them; and

33.3.9. Discuss with the Candidate proposed future work and the general planning of the thesis; and

33.3.10. Provide timely feedback to the Candidate when required; and

25.3.10. Comment critically and constructively and within a month on the work forwarded by the student and monitor the student’s performance relative to the standard required for the degree; and

33.3.10. Provide the Academic Board with accurate reports on the Candidate’s progress.

33.4. An Associate Supervisor will be a member of academic staff of the University, except in specific cases, such as a relevant adjunct or honorary appointment, which must be approved by the Academic Board, and a co-supervisor will be an external person of recognised standing in the field of the Candidate’s research.

33.5. The supervisory panel will provide guidance to the Candidate in the design, conduct and timely completion of the research project, support in publication and dissemination of research findings, and advice on the acquisition of research and other skills as appropriate.

33.6. If a Principal Supervisor is to be absent from University duties, or otherwise unavailable and unable to undertake this supervision, for a period of up to three consecutive months, then the Associate Supervisor may act as the Principal Supervisor during this period. If a Principal Supervisor is to be absent from University duties, or otherwise unable to undertake this supervision, unavailable for more than three consecutive months, the Academic Board shall on the advice of the Executive Dean of nominate the School of enrolment appoint an acting Principal Supervisor from among persons on the register of principal Principal Supervisors or otherwise deemed eligible by the Academic Board.

34.26. The program

34.1. To be awarded a professional doctorate the Candidate shall;

34.1.1. Satisfactorily complete designated advanced coursework; and

34.1.2. Gain approval from the Academic Board, via the confirmation process, for a proposed research component; and

34.1.3. Complete the research component, as prescribed by the Academic Board; and

34.1.4. Submit a thesis for external assessment.

34.2. On completing the research component, a Candidate shall submit a thesis based...
on work carried out during candidature. A thesis may adopt one of the following formats:

34.2.1. Conventional thesis; or
34.2.2. Thesis incorporating published papers; or
34.2.3. Practical works and an exegesis.

34.3. The thesis is to be presented in accord with the requirements outlined in Section 35.

34.4. A Candidate may not present in the professional thesis any work for which another award has been conferred by the University or any other academic institution, but a Candidate shall not be precluded from incorporating extracts from such work in the thesis provided that the sum of any such extracts does not constitute the major proportion of the thesis and provided also that the source of each such extract is stated explicitly.

34.5. The thesis shall adhere to the principles of research and academic integrity concerning plagiarism, contract cheating and research ethics as stipulated in the code of research conduct and professional practice specified by the University.

34.6. The thesis shall identify the extent to which the work of others is being relied upon by providing appropriate acknowledgment, citation, and reference in the text and in the bibliography.

35. Presentation of the professional thesis

35.1. The thesis presented for examination by a Candidate shall conform to the requirements of this section unless otherwise agreed by the Academic Board.

35.2. A thesis submitted for the Doctoral Degree (Professional) will normally be:

35.2.1. A text of not more than 4,550,000 words reporting original scholarship and research carried out by the Candidate under supervision; or
35.2.2. A major work or collection of works, including but not restricted to visual presentation, literary production or computer software development, carried out by the Candidate under supervision and accompanied by an exegesis or scholarly commentary of between 10,000 and 20,000 words.

35.3. If a thesis or exegesis exceeds the respective upper word limit it may not be accepted for submission and the Candidate may be asked to reduce the word count.

35.4. A conventional thesis may incorporate or include as an appendix any publication resulting from the work completed during candidature whether or not the Candidate is the sole author or one of the joint authors.

35.5. Where the professional thesis takes the form of an exegesis it will include the preparation and presentation of a major work or collection of works, including but not restricted to visual presentation, literary production or computer software...
development, carried out by the Candidate under supervision. The practical works must demonstrate a systematic line of enquiry and investigation, and there must be a demonstrable and essential link between the practical works and the exegesis. The exegesis should reveal and elaborate the line of enquiry and investigation pursued in preparation of the practical works and provide commentary on individual practical works and overall.

35.6.27.6. A professional thesis "incorporating published papers" is one where normally three or more papers based upon the candidate’s research form a substantial part of the thesis content rather than, as above, where one or more papers are included as appendices. In this case, the majority of the thesis will be in the form of papers published, accepted for publication, submitted for publication or drafted for submission. Such a thesis will have equivalent intellectual content and rigour, and make the same contribution to knowledge as a conventional thesis. The material presented for a Doctoral Degree (Professional) incorporating published papers must be presented in a logical sequence to form a coherent whole. A maximum of 66% of the papers in a thesis incorporating publications may be published prior to enrolment in the program and must have been published within ten years prior to the date of enrolment.
sequence to form a coherent whole.

36.28. Submission of thesis for examination

36.1.28.1. A Candidate shall notify the University of their intention to submit the thesis for examination using the appropriate proforma available on the University’s website.

36.2.28.2. Candidates for higher degrees shall present for examination the required number of copies of the professional thesis. If the thesis includes a major work or collection of works, the major work or collection of works shall be presented in a format suitable for examination. A thesis may be rejected as unfit for examination if it does not conform to the requirements set out in this section. The University will provide evidence to the examiners that the coursework has been successfully completed.

37.29. General requirements

37.1.29.1. Written work submitted for examination shall be in the English language unless an exemption is granted by the Academic Board prior to submission.

37.2.29.2. The thesis should normally be based on work conducted independently. In exceptional circumstances, a clearly identifiable component of a joint research project may be approved. Such work must be certificated as the independent work of the candidate. Any such proposals must be clearly signalled at confirmation and approved by the Academic Board. If the thesis is based upon research conducted in collaboration, the nature and extent of the Candidate’s contribution to the research shall be clearly indicated.

37.3.29.3. A Candidate shall identify all sources of background knowledge drawn upon in writing the professional thesis and the extent to which the work of others has been relied upon by providing appropriate acknowledgment, citation and reference in the text of the professional thesis and in the bibliography/reference list.

38.30. Arrangement

38.1.30.1. The thesis text shall be prepared and submitted using the thesis template guidelines as approved by Academic Board.

38.2.30.2. A “Statement of authorship and originality” in the following words, will appear on the thesis template. This statement must be signed and dated by the Candidate.

“Statement of authorship and originality”:
Except where explicit 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 by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma. No other person’s work has been relied upon or used without due acknowledgment in the main text and bibliography/reference list of the thesis. No editorial assistance has been received in the production of the thesis without due acknowledgement. Except where duly referred to, the thesis does not include material with copyright provisions or requiring copyright approvals.
39. **Assessment and Examination**

39.1. **30.3.** After considering recommendations from the supervisor(s), as informed by consultation with the candidate, and the relevant Executive Dean of Faculty, the Academic Board shall appoint a minimum of two examiners who will be external to the University.

39.2. **30.4.** Examiners shall:

39.2.1. Hold a PhD or possess equivalent relevant professional experience; and

39.2.2. Be independent of the conduct of the candidate’s research; and

39.2.3. Have current international standing as an expert in the field or discipline or field of research in which the Candidate’s research program has been conducted; and

39.2.4. Have empathy with the theoretical framework used by the candidate; and

39.2.5. Be without bias and real or perceived conflict of interest, and sign a conflict of interest declaration.

39.3. **30.5.** Where an examiner fails to return an assessment within two months of being sent the professional thesis, the Academic Board may appoint a replacement examiner.

39.4. **30.6.** The name of any examiner shall not be disclosed to a Candidate prior to or during examination, and will be disclosed to the Candidate on completion of examination only with the agreement of the examiner.

39.5. **30.7.** Examiners are required to assess the professional thesis in terms of whether it makes a significant and original contribution to knowledge in the context of professional practice, demonstrates an understanding of the relationship of the investigations undertaken to a wider field of knowledge, and shows advanced, searching and expansive critical reflection or analysis of professional policy and/or practice. In addition to providing the Academic Board with written comments bearing on these criteria, the examiners, acting independently, will recommend to the Academic Board that:

39.5.1. **30.7.1.** The thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination; or

39.5.2. **30.7.2.** The thesis should be classified as PASSED, subject to the minor corrections outlined in reports from examiners being made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; or

39.5.3. **30.7.3.** The Candidate that is the thesis is suitable for conferral once the author has addressed nominated passages, textual errors, referencing mistakes. These actions should largely be required to pass a written and/or oral examination in subject matter directly related to the thesis before the thesis is classified as PASSED be undertaken independently by the candidate; or

39.7.4. **30.7.3.** The thesis should be PASSED subject to major corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; that is the thesis requires new data collection, new or revised data analysis, substantial rewriting of one or more chapters, or a large number of stylistic/presentation errors. These actions...
should be undertaken with ongoing input from the supervisory team; or

39.5.3.30.7.4. The thesis should be classified as DEFERRED; the thesis requires substantial revision and re-examination by external experts and the Candidate should be permitted to submit the thesis for examination in a revised form; or
39.5.4.30.7.5. The thesis should be classified as FAILED.

39.6.30.8. An overall grade will be awarded by the Academic Board on consideration of the individual recommendations of the examiners.

39.7.30.9. If the recommendations received from examiners differ markedly, the Academic Board may take such other action as it thinks fit, such as appointment of an additional examiner to supply an examination report.

39.8.30.10. The Academic Board may require that the Candidate be examined orally on the substance of the thesis. Such oral examination shall be conducted under arrangements made by the Academic Board in consultation with, the principal supervisor, and the Executive Dean of Faculty the School of enrolment. The Candidate shall be advised in advance of the persons to be present at the examination and of the general arrangements for the conduct of the examination.

39.9.30.11. In the case of a Candidate who accepts an invitation to submit a revised thesis for re-examination, the Candidate shall be provided with guidelines of the thesis based on the reports of the examiners. Only in exceptional cases will more than a single attempt at revision of the thesis be permitted for revision.

39.10.30.12. Where a thesis is to be corrected or revised and submitted for re-examination, the Candidate must complete the requirement within a time limit specified by the Academic Board.

39.11.30.13. Where a thesis is to be revised and submitted for re-examination, the examiners will normally be those who evaluated the thesis on initial submission.

30.14. Where a thesis is re-examined by external examiners, the thesis is eligible for one of only three examination outcomes:

30.14.1. The thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination; or
30.14.2. The thesis should be classified as PASSED subject to minor corrections, textual errors and/or referencing corrections.
30.14.3. The thesis should be classified as FAILED

40.31. Admission to the degree

40.1.31.1. When the Academic Board is satisfied that a Candidate has fulfilled the conditions prescribed for admission to the Doctoral Degree (Professional), the Academic Board shall recommend to the Council that the Candidate be admitted to that degree.

40.2.31.2. When this recommendation has been confirmed by Council the Candidate will be deemed as completed.

41.32. Fees

41.1.32.1. A Candidate shall be required to pay such fees as determined by the Council. Candidates who exceed the maximum period of candidature as specified in 2 (2) may be required to pay tuition fees.

42.33. Effects of changes in the Regulation

42.1.33.1. Where the Committee is of the view that a Candidate has been or may be adversely affected by an amendment to this Regulation 5.1 which has occurred subsequent to the Candidate’s admission to candidature, the Candidate may be permitted to continue under such Statutes, Regulations or requirements of the Institution in force at any time during the period of candidature and on such conditions as prescribed by the Higher Degrees by Research Committee.
conditions as prescribed by the Higher Doctoral Degrees Committee.
PART DC THE SCHEDULE

1) These rules shall apply to the following Degrees of Doctor of Philosophy (Professional):
   a) Doctor of Business Administration,
   b) Doctor of Education,
   c) Doctor of Education (Educational Leadership)
   d) Doctor of Information Technology,
   e) Doctor of Psychology,

   and any other Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Professional) accredited by the University.
PART ED - MASTERS DEGREES (RESEARCH)

43.34. Types of programs

43.1.34.1. This regulation shall apply to all Masters Degrees (Research) awarded by the University.

43.2.34.2. The Masters Degrees (Research) awarded by the University are specified in Part ED 'The Schedule'.

43.3. A Masters Degree (Research) shall be awarded without classification on the basis that a Candidate meets the requirements of a masters degree as per the AQF Level 9 criteria and:

34.3.1. Has successfully undertaken supervised study, and completing

34.3.2. has completed a program of research, research training and independent study which may involve advanced coursework, and

34.3.3. which makes a contribution to knowledge demonstrating a critical appreciation and understanding of the relationship of his or her work to that of other work in the field. Integral to this study will be the application of an advanced body of knowledge in a range of contexts.

34.3.4. has applied an advanced body of knowledge in a range of contexts.

43.3.34.4. The following types of programs may be approved by the Academic Board as appropriate for a Candidate to undertake in order to qualify for the award of a Masters Degree (Research).

34.3.1.34.4.1. Scholarship and research carried out by the Candidate under supervision; and

34.3.2.34.4.2. A combination of advanced coursework and research of which no less than two-thirds of the total load of the program will be devoted to research, research training and independent study; or

34.3.3.34.4.3. Preparation and presentation of a major work or collection of works, including but not restricted to visual presentation, literary production or computer software development, carried out by the Candidate under supervision and accompanied by a written exegesis.

43.4.34.5. Thesis format alternatives are specified in Section 5042. These include a thesis incorporating published papers, up to 66% of which may be papers published prior to enrolment.

43.5.34.6. Candidates may be eligible to enrol in cotutelle, joint or dual Masters Degree (Research) programs according to the rule and regulations stipulated through Memoranda of Understanding or other agreements approved by the University.

44.35. Duration of the program

44.1.35.1. The minimum period of Masters Degree (Research) candidature shall be one year of full-time study and the maximum period shall be two years of full-time study or the equivalent in part-time study.

44.2.35.2. In exceptional cases the Academic Board may approve an extension of the maximum period of candidature.

44.3.35.3. In exceptional cases the Academic Board may approve a reduction in the minimum period of candidature.

44.4.35.4. Subject to the approval of the Academic Board, candidature may incorporate varying segments of full-time and part-time enrolment.

44.5.35.5. A Candidate who enrolls part-time must be able to complete the program within the maximum allowable period of candidature.

44.6.35.6. Candidature will be on a continuous basis unless otherwise approved by the
Candidates may elect to study on-campus where they shall pursue their studies wholly under the control of the University and normally shall carry out such work, other than field work, at the University, or they may elect to study off-campus where they shall be approved by the Committee to pursue their studies at another suitable location.

**45.36. Enrolment**

45.4.36.1. The Academic Board may approve the enrolment of a person for a Masters Degree (Research) if it is satisfied that:

45.1.36.1.1. The person is eligible for admission under Section 46.37, and the program proposed is appropriate for candidature for the Masters Degree (Research) and acceptable to the Faculty/School; and

45.1.2.36.1.2. The applicant has adequate training and ability to pursue such a program; and

45.1.3.36.1.3. Adequate supervision and facilities can be provided for undertaking the proposed research project, including a supervisory and study environment of research activity or other creative endeavour, inquiry and scholarship.

45.2.36.2. Any person admitted to candidature for a Masters Degree (Research) will proceed to undertake a research program and other requirements specified by the Academic Board in respect of the person’s candidature.

45.3.36.3. A Candidate shall conduct research in accord with the code of research conduct and professional practice specified by the University.

**46.37. Eligibility for admission**

46.4.37.1. To be clearly eligible for admission as a Candidate for a Masters Degree (Research) a person must demonstrate:

46.1.37.1.1. Successful completion of an undergraduate degree and subsequent additional Honours degree, graduating with at least second class Honours, that included a dissertation demonstrating the ability to undertake research at Masters level; or

46.1.2.37.1.2. Qualifications and/or research skills, professional experience,
46.1.3.37.1.3. Publications that are assessed by the Academic Board as being at least equivalent to or a satisfactory substitute for any of the qualifications prescribed in Section 4637.1.

46.2.37.2. Candidates who do not meet clearly eligible entry requirements will be required to undertake an additional programme of study considered by the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the appropriate Faculty, to be, in combination with any relevant past research experience, at least equivalent to a fourth year of advanced undergraduate study and research in a relevant field. The Academic Board will extend as necessary the maximum period of candidature in these cases.

46.3.37.3. An applicant who does not hold a valid passport from, and who is not a citizen of, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Canada, New Zealand or the Republic of Ireland must, in applying for candidature, provide the required evidence of a satisfactory level of competence in oral and written English as specified by the Academic Board and advertised on the University’s website.

47.38. Candidature

47.1.38.1. A Candidate shall be:

47.1.1.38.1.1. Required to re-enrol in each calendar year following the initial enrolment the date specified by the University, until such time as the thesis has been submitted for examination, or their candidature will be terminated; and

47.1.2.38.1.2. Deemed to be enrolled during any period in which the thesis is being examined; and

47.1.3.38.1.3. Required, in the event of having to submit a thesis in a revised form, to continue to re-enrol until the thesis has been submitted for re-examination;

47.1.4. Required to re-enrol as requested by the Academic Board where there are delays in submission, for example as a result of an appeal outcome or other extenuating circumstances.

47.2.38.2. Re-enrolment is subject to approval by the Academic Board upon its consideration of progress reports.

47.3.38.3. A Candidate may apply for permission to change enrolment status to either full-time or part-time or for leave from studies for a defined period of time, and the Academic Board may grant such an application subject to such conditions as it sees fit.

47.4.38.4. A Candidate may withdraw from candidature at any time by written notice to the Academic Board.

48.39. Progression

48.1.39.1. A Candidate shall be provided with:

48.1.1.39.1.1. Continuing supervisory support; and

48.1.2.39.1.2. Appropriate resources required for timely completion of a high quality research project; and
48.1.3.39.1.3. Clarification of ownership and management of intellectual property; and

48.1.4.39.1.4. Assistance to develop key research and employability skills; and

48.1.5.39.1.5. Opportunities to engage with scholarly communities and to be actively involved in the intellectual culture of the University.

48.2.39.2. Initial admission to Masters Degree (Research) candidature is on a provisional basis, and an application for confirmed candidature must be made within six months of commencing full-time probationary candidature or within 12 months of commencing part-time probationary candidature.

48.3.39.3. In order for candidature to be confirmed, the Candidate must complete such processes as determined by the Academic Board to demonstrate that a viable Masters Degree (Research) program has been developed, satisfactory progress has been made, and the degree requirements can be completed within the period allowed.

48.4.39.4. The Principal Supervisor and the Executive Dean of the School of enrolment (or nominee) will provide the Academic Board with written advice as to whether candidature should be confirmed.

48.5.39.5. The Principal Supervisor together with the Masters Candidate will obtain approval from the relevant ethics committee within the University prior to collection of data where such approval is necessary.

48.6.39.6. A Candidate applying to convert from Masters Degree (Research) enrolment to Doctoral Degree (Research) candidature must successfully undertake the Confirmation of Candidature process, as determined by the Academic Board, to demonstrate the capacity to undertake research at PhD level, that a viable PhD research program has been developed, satisfactory progress has been made, and the PhD degree requirements can be completed within the period allowed.

48.7.39.7. The Principal Supervisor and the Executive Dean of the School of enrolment (or nominee) will provide the Academic Board with written advice as to whether transfer of candidature should be permitted.

48.8.39.8. In the event of transfer, the date of commencement of PhD candidature will be adjusted to take into account part or all of the period spent as a Masters Candidate.

48.9.39.9. Throughout candidature a Candidate shall submit reports on academic progress as and when requested by the principal supervisor, Executive Dean of the School of enrolment, or the Academic Board, not less frequently than annually. Such reports will be discussed with the Principal Supervisor.

48.10.39.10. When the Principal Supervisor or the Executive Dean of the School of enrolment (or nominee) considers that a Candidate is not making satisfactory progress or is not complying with regulations, the Academic Board may require the Candidate to show cause why candidature should not be terminated.

48.11.39.11. If the Academic Board, after giving the Candidate an opportunity to show cause and after considering all the evidence before it, believes the Candidate is not making satisfactory progress or is not complying with regulations, it may:

48.11.1. Terminate the Candidate's enrolment for the degree; or

48.11.2. Specify in writing the conditions under which the Candidate's enrolment for the degree may continue.

48.12.39.12. Failure to agree to or comply with the conditions will result in termination of candidature.

49.40. Supervisory arrangements
49.1.40.1. The Academic Board shall appoint a supervisory panel of a minimum of two supervisors from among the persons listed in the Register of Higher Degree Research Supervisors as qualified to be the Principal Supervisor and the Associate or Co-Supervisors of a doctoralMasters Candidate, or from among persons otherwise deemed eligible by the Academic Board.

49.2.40.2. One member of the supervisory panel will be designated the Principal Supervisor for the period of candidature. The Principal Supervisor will be a member of academic staff of the University except in specific cases, such as a relevant adjunct or honorary appointment, approved by the Academic Board.

49.3.40.3. The Principal Supervisor shall:

49.3.1.40.3.1. Be listed on the Register of Higher Degree Research Supervisors; and

49.3.2.40.3.2. Be an active researcher with relevant scholarly expertise; and

49.3.3.40.3.3. Hold a Doctoral Degree or have demonstrable equivalent research experience in a relevant discipline as determined by the Chair, Research Higher Degree Committee; and

49.3.4.40.3.4. Operate in accord with the code of supervisory practices adopted by the Academic Board, including professional development and performance review; and

49.3.5.40.3.5. Provide opportunities for the Candidate to engage with scholarly communities; and

49.3.6.40.3.6. Maintain close and regular contact with the Candidate and document such meetings; and

49.3.7.40.3.7. Supervise and counsel the Candidate in all aspects of the Candidate's research project and the preparation of the thesis; and

49.3.8.40.3.8. Monitor progress and ensure the Candidate is made aware in writing of inadequate progress or of work which is below the standard generally expected, specifying shortcomings and suggesting ways of addressing them; and

49.3.9.40.3.9. Discuss with the Candidate proposed future work and the general planning of the thesis; and
49.3.10. Provide timely feedback to the Candidate when required; and

40.3.10. 49.3.11. Comment critically and constructively and within a month on the work forwarded by the student and monitor the student’s performance relative to the standard required for the degree; and

49.3.10.40.3.11. Provide the Academic Board with accurate reports on the Candidate’s progress.

49.4.40.4. If a Principal Supervisor is to be absent from University duties, or otherwise unavailable and unable to undertake this supervision, for a period of up to three consecutive months, then the Associate Supervisor may act as the Principal Supervisor during this period. If a Principal Supervisor is to be absent from University duties, or otherwise unavailable for more than three consecutive months, the Academic Board shall on the advice of the Executive Dean of Faculty the School of enrolment appoint an acting Principal Supervisor from among persons on the register of Principal Supervisors, or otherwise deemed eligible by the Academic Board.

50.41. The Thesis

50.1.41.1. On completing the program of advanced study and research, a Candidate shall submit a thesis based on work carried out during candidature. A thesis may adopt one of the following formats:

50.1.1.41.1.1. Conventional thesis; or

50.1.2.41.1.2. Thesis incorporating published papers; or

50.1.3.41.1.3. Practical works and an exegesis.

50.2.41.2. The thesis is to be presented in accord with the requirements outlined in Section 5443.

50.3.41.3. A conventional thesis may incorporate or include as an appendix any publication up to two publications resulting from the work completed during candidature whether or not the Candidate is the sole author or one of the joint authors.

50.4.41.4. A thesis incorporating published papers is one where normally one or more papers based upon the candidate’s research form a substantial part of the thesis content rather than, as above, where one or more papers are included as appendices. In this case, the majority of the thesis will be in the form of papers published, accepted for publication, submitted for publication or drafted for submission. Such a thesis will have equivalent intellectual content and rigour, and make the same contribution to knowledge as a conventional thesis. The material presented for a Masters Degree (Research) incorporating published papers must be presented in a logical sequence to form a coherent whole. A maximum of 66% of the papers in a thesis incorporating publications may be published prior to enrolment in the program and must have been published within ten years prior to the date of enrolment.

50.5.41.5. The practical works must demonstrate a systematic line of enquiry and investigation, and there must be a demonstrable and essential link between the practical works and the exegesis. The exegesis should reveal and elaborate the line of enquiry and investigation pursued in preparation of the practical works and provide commentary on individual practical works and overall duration of program.

50.6.41.6. A Candidate may not present in the thesis any work for which another award has been conferred by the University or any other academic institution, but a Candidate shall not be precluded from incorporating extracts from such work in the thesis provided that the sum of any such extracts does not constitute the major proportion of the thesis and provided also that the source of each such extract is stated explicitly.
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proportion of the thesis and provided also that the source of each such extract is stated explicitly.

50.7.41.7. The thesis shall adhere to the principles of research and academic integrity concerning plagiarism, contract cheating and research ethics as stipulated in the code of research conduct and professional practice specified by the University.

50.8.41.8. The thesis shall identify the extent to which the work of others is being relied upon by providing appropriate acknowledgment, citation, and reference in the text and in the bibliographyreference list.

50.9.41.9. The statement of authorship and originality signed and dated by the Candidate when the thesis is submitted for examination will include a declaration that no other person's work has been relied upon or used without due acknowledgment in the main text and bibliographyreference list of the thesis. This statement will also acknowledge editorial assistance and copyright provisions and approvals, and include acknowledgment that a plagiarism report has been submitted to the University.

50.10.41.10. In cases where ethics approval was required for any component of the research, a statement must be submitted with the thesis from the Chair of the relevant ethics committee, declaring that all necessary ethics-related processes have been completed.

51.42. Presentation of a Thesis

51.1.42.1. The thesis presented by a Candidate for examination shall conform to the requirements of this section unless otherwise agreed by the Academic Board.

51.2.42.2. A Masters Degree (Research) thesis will normally be:

51.2.1.42.2.1. a text of not more than 40,000 words reporting original scholarship and research carried out by the Candidate under supervision, or

51.2.2.42.2.2. a major work or collection of works, including but not restricted to visual presentation, literary production or computer software development, carried out by the Candidate under supervision and accompanied by an exegesis or scholarly commentary of between 10,000 and 20,000 words.

51.3.42.3. If a thesis or exegesis exceeds the respective upper word limit it may not be acceptable for submission and the Candidate may be asked to reduce the word count.

52.43. Submission of thesis for examination:

52.1.43.1. A Candidate shall notify the University of their intention to submit the thesis for examination using the appropriate proforma available on the University’s website.

52.2.43.2. Candidates for higher degrees shall present for examination the required number of copies of the thesis text. If the thesis includes a major work or collection of works, the major work or collection of works shall be presented in a format suitable for examination. A thesis may be rejected as unfit for examination if it does not
conform to the requirements set out in this section.

43.3. The thesis, may include materials and formats such as performances, creative works, folios or electronic media appropriate to the discipline as approved by Dean of the School of enrolment. The thesis proportions, where designated to comprise creative work and dissertation must be specified at confirmation and the dissertation component cannot be less than 25% of the work.

53.44. General requirements:

53.1.44.1. Written work submitted for examination shall be in the English language, unless an exemption is granted by the Academic Board prior to submission.

53.2.44.2. If the thesis is based on research conducted in collaboration, the nature and extent of the Candidate's contribution to the research shall be clearly indicated.

53.3.44.3. A Candidate shall identify all sources of background knowledge and the extent to which the work of others is being relied upon by providing appropriate acknowledgment, citation and reference in the text of the thesis and in the bibliography reference list.

54.45. Arrangement

54.1.45.1. The thesis text shall be prepared and submitted using the thesis template guidelines as approved by Academic Board.

54.2.45.2. A “Statement of authorship and originality” in the following words, will appear on the thesis template. This statement must be signed and dated by the Candidate. “Statement of authorship and originality”:

Except where explicit 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 by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma. No other person’s work has been relied upon or used without due acknowledgment in the main text and bibliography reference list of the thesis. No editorial assistance has been received in the production of the thesis without due acknowledgement. Except where duly referred to, the thesis does not include material with copyright provisions or requiring copyright approvals.

55.46. Examination of the thesis

55.1.46.1. After considering recommendations from the supervisor(s), as informed by consultation with the candidate, and the relevant Executive Dean of Faculty the School of enrolment, the Academic Board shall appoint at least two examiners, at least one of whom will be external to the University.

55.2.46.2. Examiners shall:

55.2.1. Hold at least a MastersPhD degree or possess equivalent relevant professional experience; and

55.2.2. Be independent of the conduct of the candidate’s research; and

55.2.3. Have current national or international standing be recognised as an expert in the field or discipline or field of research in which the Candidate's research program has been conducted thesis; and

55.2.4. Have empathy with the theoretical framework used by the candidate; and
55.2.4.6.4. Be without bias and real or perceived conflict of interest, and sign a conflict of interest declaration.

55.3.46.3. Where an examiner fails to return an assessment within three to two months of being sent the thesis, the Academic Board may appoint a replacement examiner.

55.4.46.4. The name of any examiner shall not be disclosed to a Candidate prior to or during examination, and will be disclosed to the Candidate on completion of examination only with the agreement of the examiner.

55.5.46.5. Examiners are required to assess the thesis in terms of whether the Candidate has conducted a research program in ways that demonstrate command of the knowledge and skills pertinent to the area of investigation as well as a critical appreciation and understanding of the relationship of the work to that of others. In addition to providing the Academic Board with written comments bearing on these criteria, the examiners, acting independently, will recommend to the Academic Board that:

55.5.1.46.5.1. The thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination; or

55.5.2.46.5.2. The thesis should be classified as PASSED, subject to minor corrections outlined in reports from examiners being made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; or

55.5.2.46.5.2. The Candidate, that is, the thesis is suitable for conferral once the author has addressed nominated passages, textual errors, and referencing mistakes. These actions should largely be required to pass a written and/or oral examination in subject matter directly related to the thesis before the thesis is classified as PASSED, be undertaken independently by the candidate; or

46.5.3. The thesis should be PASSED subject to major corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board; that is, the thesis requires new data collection, new or revised data analysis, substantial rewriting of one or more chapters, or contains a large number of stylistic/presentation errors. These actions should be undertaken with ongoing input from the supervisory team; or

55.5.4.46.5.4. The thesis should be classified as DEFERRED; the thesis requires substantial revision and re-examination by external experts and the Candidate should be permitted to submit the thesis for examination in a revised form; or

55.5.4.46.5.5. The thesis should be classified as FAILED.

55.6.46.6. If the recommendations received from examiners differ, the Academic Board may take such action as it thinks fit, such as the appointment of an additional examiner to supply an examination report.

55.7.46.7. The Academic Board may require that the Candidate be examined orally on the substance of the thesis. Such oral examination shall be conducted under arrangements made by the Academic Board in consultation with the examiners, the principal supervisor, and the Executive Dean of Faculty, the School of enrolment. The Candidate shall be advised in advance of the persons to be present at the examination and of the general arrangements for the conduct of the examination.

55.8.46.8. In the case of a Candidate who accepts an invitation to submit a revised thesis for re-examination, the Candidate shall be provided with guidelines for revision of the thesis based on the reports of the examiners. Only in exceptional cases will more than a single attempt at revision of the thesis be permitted.

55.9.46.9. Where a thesis is to be corrected or revised and submitted for re-examination, the Candidate must complete the requirement within a time limit specified by the
Academic Board.

55.10.46.10. Where a thesis is to be revised and submitted for re-examination, the examiners will normally be those who evaluated the thesis on initial submission.

46.11. Where a thesis is re-examined by external examiners, the thesis is eligible for one of only three examination outcomes:

46.11.1. The thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination; or
46.11.2. The thesis should be classified as PASSED subject to minor corrections, textual errors and/or referencing corrections;
46.11.3. The thesis should be classified as FAILED

56.47. Admission to the degree

56.1.47.1. When the Academic Board is satisfied that a Candidate has fulfilled the conditions prescribed for admission to the Masters Degree (Research), the Academic Board shall recommend to Council that the Candidate be admitted to that degree.

56.2.47.2. When this recommendation has been confirmed by Council the Candidate will be deemed as completed.

57.48. Fees

57.1.48.1. A Candidate shall be required to pay such fees as determined by the Council. Candidates who exceed the maximum period of candidature as specified in 2 (1) may be required to pay tuition fees.

58.49. Effects of changes in the Regulation

58.1.49.1. This regulation may be subject to amendment from time to time. Under such circumstances, candidature will continue under the revised stipulations of the Regulation, rather than those prevailing at the commencement of candidature, but only if there is no disadvantage to the student by applying the revised stipulations.
PART THE SCHEDULE

Masters Degrees (Research)

These rules shall apply to the following Masters Degrees (Research):

Master of Applied Science,

Master of Applied Science: Bio-Science,

Master of Applied Science: Social Sciences,

Master of Arts,

Master of Business,

Master of Education,

Master of Engineering Science,

Master of Human Movement: Social Sciences,

Master of Human Movement: Bio-Sciences,

Master of Mathematical Sciences,

Master of Nursing,

Master of Science,

Master of Computing,

and to any other Masters Degree (Research) accredited by the University.
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Purpose

The purpose of this Policy is to outline the expectations and responsibilities of University and Higher Degree by Research candidates during the period of candidature. The policy stipulates the compulsory milestones of candidature and provides guidance regarding candidature matters, including the management of leave and candidate grievances.

Scope

This Policy applies to all Higher Degree by Research enrolled candidates, persons with supervisory or administrative responsibilities for HDR candidates and candidature management.

Legislative Context

Policy Base
Regulation 5.1 - Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Masters Degree by Research and Professional Doctorates

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Employee</td>
<td>Any staff member employed by FedUni to undertake academic activity, including permanent, fixed-term contract, casual, honorary and adjunct appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Progress Report</td>
<td>APR – a formal procedure whereby research progress is considered by the candidate, supervisor and School of enrolment, administered by the Graduate Research School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved submission date</td>
<td>The approved date by which a candidate must submit their thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate / Supervisor agreement</td>
<td>Formal written agreement between the supervisor and candidate outlining meeting frequency and methods, expertise provision and other candidature matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Candidature</td>
<td>Milestone by which a candidate confirms that their research project is viable and is approved to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferment</td>
<td>A period of up to 12 months where a student requests to delay enrolment in an offered course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies – FedUni staff member responsible for: academic oversight of HDR programs, HDR candidates and HDR supervision. The DGS is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assisted in this role by the ADNs.

EFTSL
Estimated full time study load.

Enrolment
The process by which a person, having received a written offer of a place, registers their program and course of study with FedUni by submitting a form of enrolment signed by both the applicant and the course coordinator or person of equivalent authority.

ESOS Act
Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000, as amended from time to time.

External Candidate
Where a candidate conducts their research from an approved external location, such as a laboratory, and an agreement exists between the location and FedUni.

FedUni
Federation University Australia

Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Program
One of the following courses of study: Masters Degree (Research), Doctoral Degree (Research), Doctoral Degree (Professional).

Higher Degree by Research candidate
A student enrolled in a Higher Degree by Research Program at FedUni.

Graduate Research School (GRS)
Central department of the University with oversight of matters pertaining to higher degree by research.

Leave from studies
Period of either six or 12 months, covering a normal teaching period(s), where an enrolled student is excused from formal study.

Off-campus candidate
Where a candidate studies at a location other than on campus or an approved external facility.

Probationary candidate
A FedUni student enrolled in a Masters Degree (Research), Doctoral Degree (Research), or Doctoral degree (Professional) who has not yet completed the confirmation of candidature process.

RHDC
Research Higher Degrees Committee – A standing committee of Academic Board that deals with matters pertaining to Higher Degree by Research

RTP
Research Training Program: Federal Government funding scheme that enables the provision of HDR fee offset and stipend scholarships.

School (School of enrolment)
Academic unit at Federation University in which candidates are enrolled

Skills Development Program (SDP)
A series of seminars and workshops provided by the Graduate Research School.

Stipend
A fortnightly scholarship paid to a candidate to cover living expenses

Supervisor – Associate Supervisor (AS)
A staff member of FedUni who meets the requirements of and has been approved for inclusion on the Register of Supervisors as a supervisor and provides support to a candidate and to the Principal Supervisor.

Supervisor – Co-supervisor
An individual who is external to FedUni who meets the requirements of and has been approved for inclusion on the Register of Supervisors as a supervisor and provides support to a candidate and to the Principal Supervisor.

Supervisor – Principal Supervisor (PS)
A staff member of FedUni who meets the requirements of and has been approved for inclusion on the Register of Supervisors as a Principal Supervisor and has primary oversight of a HDR candidate’s research.

Supervisor – Provisional Principal (PP)
A staff member who does not meet the requirements to be listed as a Principal Supervisor on the Register of Supervisors but has the support of their School to act as a Principal Supervisor under the guidance of a mentor who is registered as a Principal Supervisor.

Timely completion
Submission of a thesis by the approved submission date with the maximum period of candidature (four years for PhD candidates or part time equivalent, two years for a masters by research candidate or part time equivalent)

Policy Statement

Actions

1. Minimum resources

The acceptance of a Higher Degree by Research (HDR) candidate by a School indicates that the School has the required finances, space and supervision to support the candidate through to timely completion.

The support provided by the School will be supplemented by the provision of University services including the Library, Information Technology Services, and Graduate Research School.
1.1. Periods of candidature

The period of candidature is defined as:

- Three years full time or part time equivalent for PhD candidates, or
- 18 months full time or part time equivalent for Masters by Research candidates.

Candidates may apply for an extension to candidature, as per Section 4.2.

1.2.1.1. On-campus students

The minimum level of resources/services provided by Schools for all HDR candidates who are undertaking their program on-campus are listed below. Part-time candidates may be required to share some resources, where appropriate.

1.4.1.3. Physical Facilities / Resources

At a minimum, candidates should be provided with:

- a desk and chair located in a secure space,
- access to computer technology appropriate to the research needs of the topic,
- reasonable access to stationery, photocopying, telephone, internet and postal services,
- reasonable after-hours access to facilities, and
- any other resources identified as essential to a particular candidate’s research program (e.g. scientific and technical equipment, laboratory or studio facilities).

1.4.1.3. Financial Support

The School must provide the required financial support for the approved project, including costs such as:

- required computing software,
- field work, laboratory or studio requirements, and
- consumables

Schools must advise candidates of the estimated amount of financial support they will receive and record this information on the HDR Candidate / Supervisor Agreement.

Schools may provide additional financial support within School guidelines, such as conference participation and editing / proofreading of theses.

1.4.1.4. Research Environment & Culture

Schools are responsible for the inclusion and integration of HDR candidates into the academic environment of the School of enrolment. The School should ensure that candidates are:

- included in School-based research seminars/conferences,
- included in academic professional development opportunities where appropriate,
- encouraged to network and interact with University staff and any scholarly visitors, and
- provided with opportunities for social interaction (e.g. access to School staff room) with staff and other research candidates.

1.4.1.5. Off-campus and external candidature

Where a School approves a candidate for off-campus or external candidature, the School will need to ensure that:

- the candidate has access to online seminars, School activities and other training and development opportunities,
- appropriate supervision is provided, including specifying the means and frequency of communication between the candidate and Principal Supervisor,
- processes are in place to support the candidate to prepare and undertake Confirmation of Candidature, where applicable,
- the candidate has access to resources/facilities appropriate for the research program,
- the candidate has email/internet access, and
- the candidate has access to at least the equivalent level of financial support as on-campus candidates.

All other conditions of candidature apply to all candidates, whether enrolled on campus or via off campus or external candidature.
2. Conditions of Candidature

2.1. Periods of candidature

The period of candidature is defined as:

- Three years full time or part time equivalent for PhD candidates, or
- 18 months full time or part time equivalent for Masters by Research candidates.

Candidates may apply for an extension to candidature, as per Section 4.2.

1.7.2.2. Enrolment & Lapse of Candidature

It is a requirement that HDR candidates re-enrol in their program each semester. A candidate will be regarded as having abandoned their program of study and their candidature will lapse under one or more of the following circumstances:

- failure to re-enrol, with no response communication from the University,
- taking unapproved leave,
- failing to return from leave without having sought approval for additional leave, or
- failing to participate in a progress review and failing to respond to reasonable requests to do so.

Following a lapse of candidature, re-instatement is possible under certain circumstances. Applications for readmission of candidature must be endorsed by the Principal Supervisor and ADR of the School of enrolment and approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies.

1.8.2.3. Full-time / Part-time Candidature

Candidates requesting to change to full-time / part-time candidature may apply to FedUni stating the reasons for the requested change. Applications for change to conditions of candidature must obtain the endorsement of the Principal Supervisor and the School’s Dean and the approval of RHDC. Candidates requesting a change from full-time to part-time candidature, who hold a stipend, may be required to relinquish the stipend. These candidates should refer to the HDR Scholarships Policy and the RTP Scholarship Policy.

1.9.2.4. Hours of study and employment

In order to complete a HDR program within the period of candidature it is reasonable to expect full-time HDR candidates to spend an average of 37.6 hours per week on a regular basis over the life of the degree. The expectation for part-time study is at least 50% of the full-time load.

Paid employment commitments during the period of candidature will not be accepted as grounds for an extension of either candidature or scholarships.

1.10.2.5. Concurrent Enrolment

Candidates may only enrol in another degree or diploma during their candidature where they have satisfactory progress and with the approval of their Principal Supervisor, ADR of the School of enrolment and RHDC. A detailed request must be made to RHDC via the School and include hours of enrolment in the proposed program and how the enrolment will affect their higher degree studies.

2.3. Candidature requirements

Milestones and candidature requirements associated with HDR candidature at FedUni include:

1. Research Induction and Orientation
2. Candidate / Supervisor Agreement
3. Prescribed sessions of the HDR Skills Development Program
4. Confirmation of candidature
5. Annual Reviews and interim progress reports
6. Project specific research-based milestones (various)
7. Ethics approval (where required)

2.4.3.1. Research Induction and Orientation

Graduate Research School Orientation

Candidates must complete the prescribed HDR Orientation Seminar outlined in the HDR Skills Development Program (SDP). This will normally include an overview of policy, procedure and expectations and information on codes of conduct, integrity and ethics, intellectual property and other research related issues.

School Induction

In addition, Schools are responsible for ensuring that candidates undertake;
1. the University Occupational Health and Safety Induction and
2. Local Induction as outlined in the Induction Policy and Procedure.

Research Integrity Induction
Candidates are also required to successfully complete the FedUni approved Research Integrity module prior to attempting confirmation.

2.2.3.2. Candidate / Supervisor Agreement
Candidates and supervisors are required to complete and submit to the Graduate School, the Candidate / Supervisor Agreement within the first four weeks of candidature.

2.3.3.3. Prescribed sessions of the HDR Skills Development Program
Candidates must complete prescribed sessions outlined in the HDR Skills Development Program in each year of candidature. Cases for recognition of prior learning and experience will be considered. Written cases must be provided to the Dean of Graduate Studies or nominee. Compulsory modules to be complete prior to attempting confirmation are described in the Skills Development Program online resources. Requirements will be communicated to students during Orientation.

2.4.3.4. Confirmation of candidature
Admission to HDR candidature is on a probationary basis, and candidature must be confirmed as follows:
- PhD Candidates: within the first 12 months of full-time enrolment, or part time equivalent.
- Masters candidates: within the first 6 months of full-time enrolment, or part time equivalent.

In order for candidature to be confirmed, the Candidate must demonstrate that a viable PhD research program has been developed, satisfactory progress has been made, and the degree requirements can be completed within the approved candidature period; three years full time or part-time equivalent for PhD candidates and 1.5 years full time or part-time equivalent for Masters by Research candidates.

The probationary candidate is required to present their research proposal to a Confirmation Panel and submit a written report, prepared in line with the Confirmation of Candidature Guidelines. Presentations are normally no more than 25 minutes and the written proposal will be no more than 10000 words for PhD probationary candidates and 5000 words for Masters by Research probationary candidates, including the main text, explanatory footnotes and captions, and excluding references. Reports must not exceed 10,000 words for PhD confirmations and 5,000 for Masters by Research confirmations (excluding references). Candidates may also include up to 2000 words for references / bibliography. Processes for confirmation requirements are available in the Higher Degree by Research Candidature Management Procedure and include satisfactory completion of prescribed sessions of the HDR Skills Development Program in the first year of candidature.

Failure to confirm within the required timeframes may impact on candidate scholarships or support, as advised in the HDR Scholarships Policy and the RTP Scholarship Policy.

The Confirmation Panel
The confirmation panel should comprise of:
- the Associate Dean (Research) (Chair) or nominee,
- the Principal Supervisor,
- an academic staff member from FedUni with relevant disciplinary experience and knowledge,
- a discipline expert, from another University, and
- an industry partner, where appropriate.

The Principal Supervisor and Panel Chair should ensure that no conflict of interest exists between panel members and the candidate.

In projects conducted on sacred aboriginal sites, involving aboriginal artefacts or ceremonies, and First Nations peoples, a senior member of the local Aboriginal community should be invited to join the panel, as appropriate. This person may also be recognised as a discipline expert depending on the nature of the proposed research and their position within the indigenous community.

The Confirmation Panel will recommend to the RHDC one of the following outcomes:
- Confirmed,
- Confirmed subject to conditions – candidate must meet conditions within 8 weeks to be confirmed,
- Confirmation deferred – the candidate will be required to attempt confirmation again within 12 weeks, or
- Not confirmed – the candidate will be required to ‘show cause’ as to why candidature should not be terminated.
Where the recommendation is ‘Confirmed subject to conditions’ or ‘Confirmation deferred’, the Panel will provide a written report outlining the reasons for its decision. The report will include details of what tasks will need to be completed with associated timelines. Only in exceptional circumstances will more than two attempts to gain confirmation of candidature be permitted.

The Confirmation Panel is responsible for providing feedback to the candidate on their research project and associated completion timeline.

### 2.5.3.5. Annual and Interim Progress Reports

All candidates are required to participate in the Annual Progress Report (APR) during each year of enrolment. A candidate will also be required to participate in an Interim Progress Report where they:

- hold an international student visa holders,
- are identified as ‘At Risk’ in previous progress reports,
- have consumed the maximum period of candidature, or
- are nominated by their supervisor or Dean of School.

When completing an Annual or an Interim Progress Report, candidates will be asked to report on:

- their research progress since their last report,
- their research work plan for the next 12 months, or to completion (whichever is sooner),
- a self assessment on issues that have impacted their progress, and
- other matters related to their research / supervision.

It is recommended that Candidates meet with their Principal Supervisor or supervisory team prior to completing the APR, however APR timelines must still be met. Candidates will also be provided with the opportunity to submit a Confidential Report.

Where a candidate is not enrolled or has submitted their thesis, they are not required to participate in progress reporting.

### Confidential Reports

Candidates may submit a confidential report during the progress reporting cycle, or at any time via email. Confidential reports are not provided to, or discussed with, supervisors or other staff unless the candidate grants permission. Where a candidate submits a confidential report, it will be provided to the Dean of the School of enrolment and the Dean of Graduate Studies, unless a conflict of interest exists. In such instances, the report will be provided to the DVC RI (or nominee).

### Progress report outcomes

The Principal Supervisor and Associate Dean Research must review Annual and Interim Progress Reports and recommend one of the following outcomes:

- Satisfactory progress: the candidate is making sufficient progress to complete their research program by the approved submission date.
- School action required: the candidate is making progress, however action is required on behalf of the School and candidate to ensure timely completion.
- At Risk: The candidate is at risk of not completing their program by the approved submission date or to the required standard, and intervention is required.
- Show cause: the candidate has not made sufficient progress and is required to show cause as to why their candidature should not be terminated.

Candidates who have been placed At Risk by their School of enrolment will be required to meet with their Principal Supervisor or supervision team to complete an intervention strategy. The strategy must set out the next six months of activity to ensure that the research project will be completed by the approved submission date. A copy of the intervention strategies must be provided to the Graduate Research School.

If a candidate is placed At Risk on two or more consecutive occasions, they may be asked to Show Cause.

### 2.6.3.6. Show Cause

A candidate may be required to show cause as to why their candidature should not be terminated in any of the following instances:

- two or more consecutive Annual Progress Reports indicate that they are At Risk,
- candidature is not confirmed at the end of the probationary period of enrolment,
- on recommendation of the Dean or nominee,
- failure to maintain adequate and regular contact with the University,
- failure to submit written reports on academic progress when requested,
- reached the maximum period of candidature,
• failure to meet the requirements of the Skills Development Program.

Candidates who are required to show cause will be notified in writing via email to their nominated FedUni email address. Details regarding the Show Cause process can be found in the Candidature Management Procedure.

Candidates are required to provide a written submission detailing why their candidature should not be terminated. Where a report is not provided by the candidate, candidature will be terminated. Applications for Leave from Studies will not be considered once notification for a Show Cause hearing has been given.

A Show Cause Committee (SCC) convened by the Chair, RHDC will consider the candidate’s show cause submission and details of candidature, and make one of the following recommendations;

a) Candidate’s progress is satisfactory,
b) Candidate’s enrolment for the degree is terminated, or
c) Candidate’s enrolment for the degree continues, with conditions.

Chair of the SCC formally advises the candidates of the decision and the process of appeal.

2.7.3.7. School Milestones and requirements

Schools and/or funding bodies may request that additional milestones must be met as a condition of candidature. Additional milestones must be documented (e.g. Letter of Offer of Admission to Candidature, Conditions of Candidature statement, student contract) and agreed to by the candidate and the Principal Supervisor and a copy must be provided to the Graduate Research School.

2.8.3.8. Ethics Approval

Research projects and practices must conform to accepted community standards and to the University’s Responsible Conduct of Research Policy. Any research project involving human subjects must be approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee. Any research involving animals must be approved by the Animal Experimentation Ethics Committee. Ethics applications must be submitted with the name of the supervisor as the principal researcher; however, candidates should be involved in preparing applications for approval. This may involve interaction with the appropriate ethics officer.

Where projects involve research involving human or animal subjects, data cannot be collected before formal ethics approval has been granted. Any data collected before such approval cannot be presented in the thesis or published under the University’s name. Ethics project approval codes are generally required to publish data.

2.9.3.9. Student Evaluation of the Postgraduate program Survey (SEPP)

The Student Evaluation of the Postgraduate Program (SEPP) is an evaluation by the candidate of the HDR program. All HDR candidates are encouraged to complete the SEPP; responses are anonymous. HDR candidates are invited to complete an evaluation annually until they submit their thesis/portfolio for examination.

3.4. Variations to candidature

3.4.1. Leave from studies and Leave of absence

Leave of absence entitlements do not extend scholarship or candidature periods. Candidates have access to the following leave of absence entitlements:

- Recreation Leave: 20 working days of recreation leave per year. This may be accrued and carried forward, but entitlements are forfeited on the cessation of the stipend. Taking recreation leave does not extend the period of candidature or scholarship entitlements.
- Sick Leave: up to 20 working days of sick leave per year. This may be accrued and carried forward but entitlements are forfeited on cessation of candidature.

Candidates may access leave entitlements as assigned to Academic and General Staff, with the exception of Leave without Pay and Long Service Leave. Entitlements include:

- Compassionate/Bereavement Leave
- Jury Service
- Domestic Violence Leave

Candidates should refer to the Human Resources website for further details.

Paid periods of leave are available for stipend holders, and can be viewed in the HDR Scholarships Policy and the RTP Scholarship Policy.

A candidate may apply for Leave from Studies extending for at least one teaching period (six months) and up to one...
year. Leave from Studies periods pause candidature for the duration of the leave. The period of candidature is thus extended by the same amount as the duration of this form of leave.

Applications for Leave from Studies by candidates who have not yet undertaken Confirmation of Candidature or whose progress is unsatisfactory will only be considered after a candidature management plan has been developed by the candidate and Principal Supervisor, and endorsed by the School’s Associate Dean Research and approved by the Dean, Graduate Studies.

Taking leave of studies stops stipend payments for a designated period and may extend the period of stipend entitlement. Full leave entitlements are described in the Candidature Management Procedure.

### 3.2.4.2. Extension of Candidature

Under exceptional circumstances, candidates can request an extension of up to six months, or part time equivalent, subject to the approval of the Dean, Graduate Studies.

PhD Candidates may request a second extension to candidature beyond the periods of candidature where their HDR studies have been severely impacted by circumstances beyond their control. Such circumstances may include, but are not limited to:

- Documented medical issues with substantial periods of leave,
- Unforeseen circumstances which impact the progress of a candidate’s research topic, e.g. natural disaster in a data collection area.

Requests for extension to candidature must be submitted at least four weeks prior to the approved submission date. Candidates who do not submit their thesis or request an extension prior to their approved submission date will be considered as having lapsed candidature and section 2.1 of this policy will apply.

### 3.3.4.3. Change of thesis title

A candidate may request a change to the title of their research project (and therefore their thesis). Applications for change of thesis title must be approved by the candidate’s Principal Supervisor and submitted to the Graduate Research School. Candidates who are impacted by UN or Australian Sanctions may be required to seek Government permission to change thesis title. A change in thesis title may occur without significant change to the research topic.

### 3.4.4.4. Change of research topic

A proposed change in research topic must show that suitable supervision and other required resources are available for the new research topic, and the proposal must be endorsed by the Dean of the School of enrolment and approved by the Research by Higher Degree Committee. There will be no extension to the total duration of candidature arising from change in either research topic or a change in supervisory team, or both.

Significant changes to a candidate’s research topic may require the candidate to undertake the Confirmation of Candidature process again as determined by RHDC.

Candidates who are impacted by UN or Australian Sanctions may be required to seek Government permission to change projects.

### 3.5.4.5. Conversion from a Masters by Research to a PhD program

Masters by Research candidates may apply to transfer to a PhD program after having their master's program confirmed. Masters by Research candidates will be required to undertake the Confirmation of Candidature steps as outlined in the Candidature Management Procedure for PhD probationary candidates, with the exception that it must take place within the first nine months (or equivalent part-time) of candidature.

If a candidate transfers from a master's degree to a PhD, the total duration of the their enrolment will be up to three years from the date that the candidate commenced the master's degree. There will be no extension to the total duration of candidature arising from transfer from Masters to PhD.

Applications for transfer between programs must be endorsed by the Dean of the School of enrolment and approved by the Chair, RHDC.

### 3.6.4.6. Conversion from PhD to a Masters by Research program

Transfers from a PhD program to a masters program will normally be considered where an extension for candidature...
has not already been approved. Where a candidate has already exceeded the maximum allowable time for a Masters by Research candidate, their thesis must be submitted within six months of their transfer request, or part-time equivalent and any stipends will be terminated on approval of the conversion request.

Applications for transfer between programs must be endorsed by the Dean of the School of enrolment and approved by the Chair, RHDC.

3.4.7 Withdrawal from Studies
Information on ceasing candidature is located in the Withdrawal from All Studies Procedure (Higher Education).

3.4.8 Readmission to candidature after withdrawal
Readmission to candidature after withdrawal may be considered where support from the Principal Supervisor and Dean of School exists. Candidates must readmit to the same program within 12 months of withdrawing and must submit their thesis within the semester of readmitted enrolment.

4.5 Research Integrity and Compliance

4.5.1 Intellectual Property, Moral Rights and Commercialisation
Candidates should be aware of the University’s policy relating to intellectual property, moral rights and commercialisation prior to undertaking research. Information regarding these areas at FedUni can be found in the Intellectual Property Policy.

4.5.2 Publications arising from the HDR research project
FedUni and supervisors have a responsibility to assist candidates in understanding authorship requirements, and providing guidance in publishing their work during candidature and immediately following submission of the thesis for examination.

Candidates, supervisors and all other parties should refer to FedUni’s Research Integrity Policy, Authorship Procedure and Intellectual Property Policy for guidance in these areas.

4.5.3 Data management
Candidates must be aware of data management and storage requirements, as outlined in the Research Data Management Policy.

4.5.4 Misconduct

Academic misconduct
Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to conduct that involves academic fraud, plagiarism and any other dishonest conduct to gain academic or general advantage; or conduct that otherwise contravenes the provisions of the University’s academic rules, policies and procedures.

The Academic Integrity Policy applies to all FedUni staff and students. Breaches of the Academic Integrity Policy will be dealt with under the Academic Misconduct Procedure.

Research misconduct
The University adheres to the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, (The Code), and requires all researchers, including HDR candidates and research managers to be familiar with, and abide by its provisions and to conduct their research and related tasks in accordance with these provisions and all other relevant legal, regulatory and policy requirements.

The Research Integrity Policy applies to all FedUni staff and students. Breaches of the Research Integrity Policy will be dealt with under the Research Integrity and Misconduct Procedure.

Advice regarding academic and research misconduct can be sought from the University Integrity Officer.

5.6 Grievances and Appeals

HDR Candidates should refer to the Student Grievance Policy and Student Grievance Procedure regarding processes and principles for submitting a grievance.

Should a candidate wish to appeal any decision which they believe adversely impacts on candidature or progress, then the University’s Student Appeal Policy and Procedure provides a framework to do so.

6.7 Graduation

Graduations are administered by the University Graduate Office. Candidates are eligible to graduate after the University Council approves the award of the degree. Candidates wanting to attend a graduation ceremony will need to abide by timelines and requirements as set out on the FedUni Graduations webpage.
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Responsibility

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) holds overall responsibility for ensuring research is undertaken in accordance with this Policy and the accompanying Procedures. Others who have responsibility for ensuring compliance with this Policy include:

- Dean, Graduate Research School
- Deans or Nominees of Academic Schools
- Associate Deans of Research or Nominees
- Graduate Research School
- Candidates
- Principle Supervisors, Associate Supervisors, Co-Supervisors, Provisional Principle Supervisors
- Examiners
- Research by Higher Degree Committee

Promulgation

The HDR Candidature Management Policy will be communicated throughout the University via:

1. an Announcement Notice under ‘FedNews’ website and through the University Policy - ‘Recently Approved Documents’ webpage to alert the University-wide community of the approved Policy;
2. inclusion on the University Policy, Procedure and Forms website; and/or
3. distribution of e-mails to Head of School / Head of Department / University staff; and/or
4. documentation distribution, eg. posters, brochures.
5. Other - please describe

Implementation

The HDR Candidature Management Policy will be implemented throughout the University via:

1. information Sessions; and/or
2. training Sessions; and/or
3. Other - please describe
# Records Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Minimum Retention Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Candidature Panel Report Forms</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Candidature candidate written proposal</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports – Annual and Interim</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation to Thesis Title / Supervisor Form</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Leave Forms and supporting documents (med. Certificates etc)</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of Candidature request</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HDR Candidature Management Procedure

Uni Wide Comment Draft 08-05-2019

Feedback being collated for Sponsor (FS)

Purpose

The Candidature Management Procedure is designed to provide practical steps to candidates, supervisors, Schools and Graduate Research School regarding roles, responsibilities and processes in relation to the administrative management of candidature at Federation University, in accordance with overarching external regulatory requirements.

This procedure covers the following activity:

- Inductions
- Confirmations of Candidature
- Annual, Interim and Ad Hoc Progressing reporting
- Absentee leave and Leave from Studies
- Changes to Candidature, such as study fraction and extensions
- Show Cause

Scope

This procedure impacts on candidates, supervisors, Associate Deans Research (or Nominee), Deans (or Nominee) and Graduate Research School.

Legislative Context

Regulation 5.1 - Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Masters Degree by Research and Professional Doctorates

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Employee</td>
<td>Any staff member employed by FedUni to undertake academic activity, including permanent, fixed-term contract, casual, honorary and adjunct appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Progress Report</td>
<td>APR – a formal procedure whereby research progress is considered by the candidate, supervisor and School of enrolment, administered by the Graduate Research School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved submission date</td>
<td>The approved date by which a candidate must submit their thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR</td>
<td>Associate Dean Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Student enrolled in a Higher Degree by Research program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate / Supervisor agreement</td>
<td>Formal written agreement between the supervisor and candidate outlining meeting frequency and methods, expertise provision and other candidature matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Candidature</td>
<td>Milestone by which a candidate confirms that their research project is viable and is approved to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferment</td>
<td>A period of up to 12 months where a student requests to delay enrolment in an offered course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies – FedUni staff member responsible for: academic oversight of HDR programs, HDR candidates and HDR supervision. The DGS is assisted in this role by the ADRs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFTSL</td>
<td>Estimated Effective full time study load.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>The process by which a person, having received a written offer of a place, registers their program and course of study with FedUni by submitting a form of enrolment signed by both the applicant and the course coordinator or person of equivalent authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOS Act</td>
<td>Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000, as amended from time to time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Candidate</td>
<td>Where a candidate conducts their research from an approved external location, such as a laboratory, and an agreement exists between the location and FedUni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedUni</td>
<td>Federation University Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Program</td>
<td>One of the following courses of study: Masters Degree (Research), Doctoral Degree (Research), Doctoral Degree (Professional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree by Research candidate</td>
<td>A student enrolled in a Higher Degree by Research Program at FedUni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Research School (GRS)</td>
<td>Central department of the University with oversight of matters pertaining to higher degree by research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave from studies</td>
<td>Period of either six or 12 months, covering a normal teaching period(s), where an enrolled student is excused from formal study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus candidate</td>
<td>Where a candidate studies at a location other than on campus or an approved external facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary candidate</td>
<td>A FedUni student enrolled in a Masters Degree (Research), Doctoral Degree (Research), or Doctoral degree (Professional) who has not yet completed the confirmation of candidature process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHDC</td>
<td>Research Higher Degrees Committee – A standing committee of Academic Board that deals with matters pertaining to Higher Degree by Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RTP  Research Training Program: Federal Government funding scheme that enables the provision of HDR fee offset and stipend scholarships.

School (School of enrolment)  Academic unit at Federation University in which candidates are enrolled

Skills Development Program (SDP)  A series of seminars and workshops provided by the Graduate Research School.

Stipend  A fortnightly scholarship paid to a candidate to cover living expenses

Supervisor – Associate Supervisor (AS)  A staff member of FedUni who meets the requirements of and has been approved for inclusion on the Register of Supervisors as a supervisor and provides support to a candidate and to the Principal Supervisor.

Supervisor – Co-supervisor  An individual who is external to FedUni who meets the requirements of and has been approved for inclusion on the Register of Supervisors as a supervisor and provides support to a candidate and to the Principal Supervisor.

Supervisor – Principal Supervisor (PS)  A staff member of FedUni who meets the requirements of and has been approved for inclusion on the Register of Supervisors as a Principal Supervisor and has primary oversight of a HDR candidate’s research.

Supervisor – Provisional Principal (PP)  A staff member who does not meet the requirements to be listed as a Principal Supervisor on the Register of Supervisors but has the support of their School to act as a Principal Supervisor under the guidance of a mentor who is registered as a Principal Supervisor.

Timely completion  Submission of a thesis by the approved submission date with the maximum period of candidature:

- three years for PhD candidates or part time equivalent (or up to four years under exceptional circumstances – see section 4.2)
- 18 months for a masters by research candidate or part time equivalent (or up to two years under exceptional circumstances – see section 4.2)

Submission of a thesis by the approved submission date with the maximum period of candidature (four years for PhD candidates or part time equivalent, two years for a masters by research candidate or part time equivalent)

Term  Definition

Policy  The University approved centrally controlled policy repository (policy library) which is the authoritative source for all University-wide policies and procedures, accessible through the FedUni website policy portal

Administration Management System (PAMS)  A formal, comprehensive review of a policy or procedure conducted by the Policy Sponsor for the purposes of establishing the need for amendment (major or minor) or further development
Actions

1. Minimum Resources

Minimum requirements are described in the HDR Candidature Management Policy.

2. Conditions of Candidature

Enrolment

As stipulated in Regulation 5.1, all HDR candidates are required to re-enrol each year until their thesis has been submitted for examination, or their candidature will be terminated. Candidature enrolment in each academic year must be approved by RHDC on the basis of Annual Progress Report (APR) results. International candidates will be required to contact the Graduate Research School to re-enrol in their program. Domestic candidates are responsible for their own re-enrolment.

Timeline: APR details are forwarded to RHDC for October/November meeting. Candidates will be emailed regarding re-enrolment dates when they are released, normally by late November.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate Research School forwards to RHDC the details from the APR for all candidates who are required to re-enrol in the following year</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>The results of the Annual Progress Reports are forwarded to RHDC which informs them if a candidate should be excluded from re-enrolling in the following year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RHDC endorses the re-enrolment of candidates</td>
<td>RHDC</td>
<td>RHDC endorse candidates as being eligible to re-enrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Candidates are emailed advising enrolment is open</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>All eligible candidates will be emailed confirming their course and program details prior to the enrolment period opening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Candidate enrols in their course via the student management system.</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidates are responsible for enrolling prior to the commencement of semester. Candidates who re-enrol after census date may be fined by the University. Candidates who remain unenrolled after...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lapse of candidature

The Graduate Research School will attempt to contact students via phone and email prior to enacting lapse of candidature processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Graduate Research School identifies students whose candidature has lapsed</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Candidates may be identified as lapsed where they have:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• failed to re-enrol, taken unapproved leave, failed to return from leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• failed to participate in a progress review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduate Research School contact PS to request additional information regarding candidate</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>GRS confirms with Principal Supervisor if the candidate has been in contact or if there is a known issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduate Research School advises candidate of possible lapse of candidature via email and post</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Candidate is provided with four weeks to respond to the written request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Candidate contacts University and recommences</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate may contact the university, reenrol or complete missed actions and recommence candidature. Candidates may be subject to Show Cause processes where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Where the candidate does not contact the University, the Graduate Research School discontinues enrolment</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>GRS discontinues candidate in student management system and advises Principal Supervisor and School of enrolment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Candidature Requirements

**Research Induction and Orientation**

All commencing candidates are required to participate in the Graduate Research School Induction within the HDR Skills Development Program. Candidates are also
required to undertake a Local Induction and Occupational Health and Safety Induction as outlined in the Induction Procedure. Schools are responsible for conducting these inductions.

Candidates will receive an email confirming the location, time and date of the Graduate Research School Induction. Off campus and external candidates are encouraged to attend in-person; however, arrangements will be made for external and off campus students who cannot attend.

Graduate Research School Inductions are held at the commencement of the semesters each year in March and July/August.

Candidate / Supervisor Agreement

Candidates and supervisors are required to complete the Candidate / Supervisor Agreement and submit a copy to the Graduate Research School within the first four weeks of candidature.

Prescribed Skills Development Program

Masters by Research candidates and PhD candidates must complete a total of 4 core and at least 3 optional sessions (plus confirmation of candidature) from the FedUni HDR Skills Development Program during their first year of probationary candidature (or part time equivalent). Full candidature will not be confirmed unless these requirements are met.

Masters by Research candidates must complete a further three core sessions plus at least two optional sessions in their second year of candidature (or part time equivalent).

PhD candidates must complete a further two core sessions plus at least two optional sessions during their second year of candidature (or part time equivalent) and at least two optional sessions in their third year of candidature (or part time equivalent).

Confirmation of Candidature

- PhD confirmations must be completed within the first 12 months of full-time enrolment, or part time equivalent. This is usually at 9 months after commencement of degree for full-time.
- Master by Research must take place within the first 6 months of full-time enrolment, or part time equivalent.
- Masters by research candidates requesting to convert to PhD candidature must follow the requirements of PhD confirmation of candidature.
- Confirmations can be held at any time of the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Notification of intention to Confirm</td>
<td>Probationary candidate</td>
<td>Candidate submits Notification of Intention Confirm Form to supervisor for approval to undergo confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confirmation approved panel recommended</td>
<td>Principal Supervisor</td>
<td>The Principal Supervisor nominates panel members, completes the Notification of intention to Confirm panel section and forwards to the ADR of School for approval. The ADR reviews, discusses and finalises panel membership with supervisor where required. AD R submits Notification of Intention to Confirm form to the GRS. The ADR reviews, discusses and finalises panel membership with supervisor where required. AD R submits Notification of Intention to Confirm form to the GRS. GRS confers with panel members to set an agreed time, date and location for the confirmation of candidature seminar and panel meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR reviews panel selection and provides complete Notification of Intention to Confirm form to GRS</td>
<td>ADR</td>
<td>The ADR reviews, discusses and finalises panel membership with supervisor where required. AD R submits Notification of Intention to Confirm form to the GRS. GRS confers with panel members to set an agreed time, date and location for the confirmation of candidature seminar and panel meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS notifies panel members and probationary candidate of confirmation seminar details.</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>GRS confers with panel members to set an agreed time, date and location for the confirmation of candidature seminar and panel meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Submission of written proposal</td>
<td>Probationary candidate</td>
<td>The written proposal will be no more than 10000 words for Doctoral probationary candidates and 5000 words for Masters by Research probationary candidates, including the main text, footnotes and captions, and excluding references. All other requirements can be found in the Confirmation of Candidature Guidelines. GRS forwards required documentation to the panel, at minimum one week prior to the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared in accordance with CoC guidelines, the candidate submits the written proposal to GRS two weeks prior to the seminar date.</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>GRS forwards required documentation to the panel, at minimum one week prior to the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advice to Panel members of Seminar details</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>GRS forwards required documentation to the panel, at minimum one week prior to the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS confirms all CoC details with panel members, supervisory team and candidate.</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>GRS forwards required documentation to the panel, at minimum one week prior to the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS forwards required documentation to the panel, at minimum one week prior to the seminar.</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>GRS forwards required documentation to the panel, at minimum one week prior to the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Candidate’s written report</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>GRS forwards required documentation to the panel, at minimum one week prior to the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Panel Template report</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>GRS forwards required documentation to the panel, at minimum one week prior to the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Confirmation seminar and panel review takes place</td>
<td>Probationary candidate, Confirmation Panel</td>
<td>The Probationary candidate makes an oral presentation of no more than 25 minutes to the Confirmation Panel and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory team</td>
<td>audience in accordance with CoC Guidelines.</td>
<td>The candidate responds to questions on their research from the Panel and audience at the conclusion of the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel members, not able to physically attend the seminar, may provide feedback on the Candidate’s written report, to the Panel Chair, prior to the seminar date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Panel provides recommendation to RHDC.</td>
<td>Chair, Confirmation Panel, Panel members</td>
<td>Confirmation Panel deliberate and the Chair advises the RHDC via a written report, their recommended outcome within five days of the seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Panel provides feedback to the candidate / probationary candidate</td>
<td>Panel Chair – Graduate Research School</td>
<td>In all outcomes the Panel will provide a written report to the candidate via GRS within five days of the presentation, outlining the reasons for its decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>GRS forwards panel report to the candidate, advising of confirmed status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome: Confirmed</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>1. Where the recommendation is that candidature be 'Subject to conditions' the report will include details of what tasks will need to be completed with associated timelines, to confirm candidature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome: Confirmed subject to conditions</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>2. The candidate will be provided with up to eight weeks to complete the conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. The candidate must provide evidence that the conditions have been met to the Confirmation Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. The Confirmation Panel must advise the GRS that the conditions have been met within five days of approving the Candidate for candidature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome: Confirmation deferred</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>1. Where the recommendation is that 'Confirmation deferred' the report will include details of what tasks will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity | Responsibility | Steps | Outcome: Not Confirmed
--- | --- | --- | ---
Supervisory team | CoC Panel | need to be completed with associated timelines. | a. Confirmed
2. The candidate will be provided with up to twelve weeks to revise the seminar and/or written submission.
3. The candidate must recommence the confirmation process with only one of the following outcomes to be recommended:
b. Not confirmed

Outcome: 
Not Confirmed

Confirmation Panel | GRS | The Confirmation Panel provides confirmation report to GRS to commence show cause process. The report will include justification as to why the candidate has not been confirmed.
The panel must advise the probationary candidate that the outcome is ‘not confirmed’
The GRS will advise the candidate of the ‘Show Cause’ procedure.

8. Recording of Confirmation undertaken | Graduate Research School | GRS will record each outcome of the confirmation process and any further action to be undertaken on the candidate record.
RDHC will be advised of changes to the Candidates status due to resubmitted documents; subsequent seminar or ‘Show Cause’ committee outcomes.

Annual and Interim Progress Reports

All candidates are required to participate in the Annual Progress Report during each year of enrolment. Candidates will also be required to participate in Interim Progress Reports where they meet conditions outlined in the Candidature Management Policy.

Notification of Progress Reports are sent to the students preferred email address as indicated in the student management system.
Annual Progress Report Steps

Timeline: Preparation and submission of APRs will occur every 12 months during July / August. Candidates have four weeks to complete the survey. Supervisors will have two weeks to confirm and respond to candidates’ APRs.

Interim Progress Reporting

Timeline: Interim progress reporting will occur every 12 months during January / February. Graduate Research School will require the details of candidates requiring interim progress reporting in December.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Progress Report questions reviewed from previous cycle</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Graduate Research School will review the information required for the progress report and suggest any revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Progress Report questions approved by RHDC</td>
<td>RHDC</td>
<td>Any revisions made to the progress report questions will be tabled at RHDC prior to June for discussion and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eligible Candidates emailed student section of Progress Report</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Candidates will be notified via email that the Progress Report is open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Candidates respond to survey</td>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>It is compulsory for all enrolled candidates to complete the Progress Report within four weeks of receipt. It’s recommended that candidates meet with their supervisory team prior to completing the progress report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Responses forwarded to candidates Principal Supervisor for comment</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Completed surveys are forwarded to supervisors for comment. Candidates are also provided with an opportunity to give confidential feedback directly to the Dean of School and Dean of Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Supervisors provide commentary on candidates progress | Supervisor | Supervisor provides commentary and recommendation on candidate’s progress:  
  - Satisfactorily progressing;  
  - At Risk; or  
  - Requested to Show Cause |
| 7. ADR provides recommendation to RHDC | ADR | Associate Dean Research provides additional commentary and recommendation to RHDC on candidates progress. |
## Show Cause

Conditions under which a candidate may be asked to show cause are described in the Candidature Management Policy.

**Timeline:** Show Causes procedures may be undertaken at any time of the year. The Candidate will be provided with 10 business days to provide written response to the request to attend the Show Cause Committee. The written response will be provided to the Show Cause Committee members three business days prior to the committee meeting. The candidate must be advised of the outcome within 10 business days of the Show Cause Committee meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. At Risk candidates meet with their supervisors and complete an Intervention Strategy</td>
<td>Candidates / Principal Supervisors</td>
<td>Once completed, the Intervention Strategy should be forwarded to the Graduate Research School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activity

1. **Candidate is identified for Show Cause procedure**

   **Responsibility**
   - Supervision Team,
   - ADR, Chair, RHDC,
   - Dean, Graduate Research School

   **Steps**
   - Candidates identified as not making satisfactory progress satisfactorily progressing or failing to meet conditions of candidature as outlined in Regulation 5.1 and Candidature Management Policy.
   - The request will include:
     - Specific issues and details related to the request for Show Cause
     - Details regarding dates of incidents/requests
     - Any attempt to address these issues directly with the Candidate.
     - Statement with any further information/details relevant to the hearing.
   - The Chair, RHDC will assess the available evidence to determine if the request for Show Cause can be supported. If the request cannot be supported, mediation will be put in place to resolve the issue.

2. **A request to form a Show Cause Committee is made to the Chair, RHDC.**

   **Responsibility**
   - Supervision Team,
   - ADR, Chair, RHDC

   **Steps**
   - The Chair, RHDC will assess the available evidence to determine if the request for Show Cause can be supported. If the request cannot be supported, mediation will be put in place to resolve the issue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Chair, RHDC to form Show Cause Committee (SCC), Graduate Research</td>
<td>Chair, RHDC</td>
<td>The Chair of the Show Cause Committee will be the Chair, RHDC or nominee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School to provide Executive Officer for Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>At least one member of the committee should be from the candidate’s School of enrolment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Candidate advised in writing of Show Cause hearing</td>
<td>Executive Officer, SCC</td>
<td>The EO to the SCC will send the candidate notification of the show cause hearing, including timelines, instructions and details regarding Appeal. The letter will include the reason the candidate has been requested to show cause. The letter will also include details for the appeals process and student counselling process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chair, Research Higher Degrees Committee nominates members</td>
<td>Chair, Research Higher Degrees Committee</td>
<td>Chair, Research Higher Degrees Committee nominates two members to form the Show Cause Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Executive Officer organises Show Cause Hearing</td>
<td>Executive Officer, SCC</td>
<td>EO to the SCC organises date, time and venue for the hearing and notifies the committee and candidate. Information to the candidate will also include details regarding a support person attending the hearing. The hearing should take place within 10 business days of receiving the written response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Candidate provides written response to Show Cause hearing request</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>The Candidate responds in writing to the request. The response must address the issues outlined in the Show Cause hearing notification and include a study plan for the next six months/to completion and a realistically achievable timeline for completion. The response must be received within 10 business days from the date of the letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and returns it to Graduate Research School</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Candidate fails to respond to the notification of Show Cause hearing, their candidature will be terminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Notify candidate of show cause date</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Supervisors may also provide additional statements in this step. Within 5 business days of receipt of the written response, the EO will advise the candidate of the time, date and location of the hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Candidates response provided to SCC</td>
<td>EO, SCC</td>
<td>The written response from the Candidate must be provided to the SCC at least three business days prior to the hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Show Cause hearing takes place</td>
<td>Show Cause Committee, Candidate</td>
<td>The candidate may choose not to attend the Show Cause hearing. If the Candidate chooses not to attend the hearing, the written response will be reviewed. Candidates may elect to bring a support person to the hearing with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Show Cause Committee recommends outcome</td>
<td>Show Cause Committee</td>
<td>The SCC will make one of the following recommendations: - Candidate has been making progress, - Candidates enrolment for the degree should be terminated, or - Candidate’s enrolment for the degree may continue, with conditions specified in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Recommendation forwarded to Chair, RHDC and Research Higher Degrees Committee for approval</td>
<td>EO, SSC</td>
<td>Where the next available RHDC meeting is more than 5 business days away, the recommendation should be completed via circulatory resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Research Higher Degrees Committee approves or declines the recommendation</td>
<td>Research Higher Degrees Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Chair, RHDC formally advises Candidate of outcome in writing</td>
<td>EDGS and EO to the SCC</td>
<td>The Candidate will be provided with the outcome within 10 business days of the SCC meeting and information regarding the University Appeals process and student counselling process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Evaluations of Postgraduate Programs

Timeline: The SEPP is available to candidates in Semester 2 each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate Research School reviews previous SEPP and makes recommendations for changes to questions to RHDC, if required.</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Graduate Research School will review response rates, inter-annual trends and other available data to assess the viability and relevance of questions in the SEPP and recommend changes where required to RHDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RHDC considers and approves / rejects any changes recommended</td>
<td>RHDC</td>
<td>The recommended changes will be presented at RHDC for endorsement by a Graduate Research School representative. RHDC can approve or reject changes as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Updated questions provided to appropriate University department for update to eValuate</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>All updated questions are entered into eValuate for the next SEPP round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strategic Planning sends survey to candidates</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Candidates are sent the SEPP in semester two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Data are collated and reported to Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Graduate Research School analyses data and provides a report to RHDC and Schools</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Graduate Research School will compare SEPP data to previous years responses and formulate a report on appearing trends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Variations to Candidature

Candidates receiving a stipend scholarship should refer to the HDR Scholarship Policy and RTP Scholarship Policy regarding how enrolment variations may impact on their stipend payments.

**Changes to study location: External or off-campus enrolment changes**
Candidates requesting to change their study location from on campus to off-campus or an external research location; or vice versa, must have the approval of their Principal Supervisor, School Associate Dean Research and Chair, RHDC. Candidates changing study location will be required to complete a revised Candidate / Supervisor Agreement. The Agreement should detail:

- Agreed working hours / days
- Occupational Health and Safety requirements
- Access to appropriate technology
- Communication plan

Where a candidate has requested to study from an external research location, the Principal Supervisors and Associate Dean Research of the School of enrolment must ensure that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) exists between that site and FedUni and that the site provides a research environment that offers appropriate resources, facilities and research expertise for the duration of the enrolment.

Candidate / Supervisor Agreements and other supporting documents should be submitted to the Graduate Research School prior to off campus or external study commencing.

**Change of study fraction**

Candidates may request a change of study fraction from part-time to full-time, or full-time to part-time. Full-time study is categorised as at least 37.6 hours per week with part-time study defined as at least 50% of a full-time load.

**Leave from study**

A candidate may apply for Leave from Study extending for at least one teaching period (six months) and up to one year. Leave from Studies periods pause candidature for the duration of the leave. Where candidates have appropriate medical certificates, candidates may request Leave from Study periods of between four weeks and six months.

- Leave from study types:
  - Extended sick leave (periods greater than four weeks)
  - Parental leave (Primary carer)
  - Leave from study

Candidates requesting Leave from study without medical certificates must also submit a completion plan.

**Leave of absence**

Absentee leave includes the following leave types:

- Recreation leave
- Sick leave (fewer 20 business days)
- Compassionate leave
- Jury Service
- Special Leave / Cultural Leave
- Parental Leave (Partner)

Absentee leave does not result in a suspension of candidature. Fees continue to be payable and candidature continues to be consumed during these leave types. Specific leave entitlements under these categories are outlined in the Candidature Management Policy.

Concurrent enrolment

Candidates may request to enrol in another degree or diploma with the approval of their Principal Supervisor, ADR of the School of enrolment and RHDC. Applications should include:

- updated Candidate/ Supervisor Agreement,
- details of the course of study to be undertaken, and
- a Completion plan to submission.

Candidates may not commence additional study until approval has been provided. Additional study load cannot be used as a reason for extension to candidature.

Variation to candidature steps:

Steps 7-9 apply to Leave from Study only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Candidate discusses variation with principal supervisor or supervisory team</td>
<td>Candidate, Supervisor/s</td>
<td>Candidate completes the appropriate form and request approval from Principal Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Candidate requests variation</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>A certificate signed by a recognised medical practitioner must accompany requests for sick leave or paid parental leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Principal Supervisor approves / rejects variation</td>
<td>Principal Supervisor</td>
<td>Forms must be submitted at least two weeks prior to required date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ADR approves / rejects variation</td>
<td>ADR</td>
<td>PS forwards approved document to ADR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GRS checks variation for compliance, records</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>ADR forwards completed form to GRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change and updates university systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GRS forwards variation details to RHDC for noting</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>Absentee leave is not required to be noted by RHDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Candidate sent reminder to re-enrol</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Candidate sent a 'Return to Study' email approximately four weeks before their leave expires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Candidate re-enrolls via Student Management System</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>The candidate is responsible for self-enrolment on the Student Management System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Candidate submits study plan to Supervisor</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate submits a study plan for the next six months to their supervisor and Graduate Research school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conversion from Master by Research to PhD program**

Masters by Research candidates may transfer to a PhD program after having their Master's program confirmed, or may must be recommended for conversion by their supervisor and ADR. Masters by Research candidates will be required to undertake the Confirmation of Candidature steps as outlined for PhD probationary candidates. Masters candidates confirming in to a PhD program must complete the confirmation process within 7 to 9 months (or part time equivalent) from initial enrolment.

Once confirmed, Graduate Research School will assist the candidate to transfer their program and course details to the appropriate PhD program.

**Conversion from PhD program to Master by Research**

Transfers from a PhD program to a Master’s program will only be considered where an extension for candidature has not already been approved. Where a candidate has already exceeded the maximum allowable time for a Masters by Research candidate, their thesis must be submitted within six months of their transfer request, or part time equivalent and any scholarships will be ceased.

**Extensions**

Candidates are responsible for submitting an Extension Request form at least 4 weeks before their expected end date. Candidates should refer to the HDR Scholarship Policy and RTP Scholarship Policy regarding extensions and scholarships. Where candidates are late in submitting an extension request form, scholarships may be ceased and, where approved, payments may not recommence for up to four weeks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Candidate and Supervisor meet</td>
<td>Candidate, Supervisor</td>
<td>Candidate and supervisor meet to discuss the possibility of submission by the approved submission date. If timely submission is not possible, discuss requirements for extension to candidature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Candidate completes Extension Request Form and includes a research plan</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Extension Request form should be endorsed by the supervisor and Dean or nominee of School and submitted to Graduate Research School. Candidates may submit form via mail, electronically or in person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extension request forwarded to Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Graduate Research School, RHDC</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies approves / rejects request for extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate Research School adds extension details to RMS</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>GRS adds new expected completion date to the RMS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change to thesis title**

Changes in research thesis title may be restricted for candidates from sanctioned countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Candidate discusses required change with Supervisor or Associate Dean Research (or nominee)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>If the candidate requests a change of supervisor they should follow the procedure outlined in the HDR Supervision Procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Candidate submits appropriate forms to Graduate Research School for processing</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduate Research School updates with supervision / thesis changes</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change of research topic**

Changes in research topic may be restricted for candidates from sanctioned countries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Candidate discusses required change with Supervisor or Associate Dean Research (or nominee)</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>If the candidate wishes to <strong>where a change in supervision is required</strong>, or they should follow the procedure outlined in the <a href="#">Appointment of Supervisor Procedure</a>. HDR Supervision Procedure should be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Candidate completes the required form and requests approval from Principal Supervisor and Dean of School</td>
<td>Candidate, PS, Dean of School</td>
<td><strong>A change of research topic cannot proceed without support from the School.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Candidate submits appropriate forms to Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dean of Graduate Studies assess change of research topic and approves / rejects</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
<td><strong>Dean of Graduate Studies assesses change in research topic and approves / rejects.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduate Research School updates RSMS with supervision / thesis changes</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Withdrawal from all studies**

Candidates should refer to the University [Higher Education Deferral or Leave form Studies Procedure](#).

**Readmission to candidature after withdrawal**

Readmission to candidature after withdrawal may be considered where support from the Principal Supervisor and Dean of School exists. Candidates must readmit to the same program and must submit their thesis within the semester of readmitted enrolment.

**Supporting Documents**

- HDR Candidate Selection Policy
- HDR Candidature Management Policy
- HDR Candidature Management Procedure
Responsibility

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) as the Approval Authority is responsible for monitoring the implementation, outcomes and scheduled review of this procedure.

The Dean, Graduate Studies as the Policy Sponsor is responsible for maintaining the content of this procedure as delegated by the Approval Authority.

Others who have responsibility for ensuring compliance with this Policy include:

- Dean, Graduate Research School
- Deans or Nominees of Schools
- Associate Deans of Research or Nominees
- Graduate Research School
- Candidates
- Principal Supervisors, Associate Supervisors, Co-Supervisors, Provisional Principle Supervisors
- Examiners
- Research by Higher Degree Committee
Related Items

- Completion Plan (DOCX 216.1kb)

Promulgation

This procedure will be communicated throughout the University via:

1. an Announcement Notice under ‘FedNews’ website and through the University Policy - ‘Recently Approved Documents’ webpage to alert the University-wide community of the approved Policy;
2. inclusion on the University Policy, Procedure and Forms website; and/or
3. distribution of e-mails to Head of School / Head of Department / University staff; and/or
4. documentation distribution, eg. posters, brochures.

Implementation

This procedure will be implemented throughout the University via:

1. Information Sessions; and/or
2. Training Sessions.

Records Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Minimum Retention Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Candidature Panel</td>
<td>Graduate Research</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Forms</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Candidature candidate written proposal</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports – Annual and Interim</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation to Thesis Title / Supervisor Form</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Leave Forms and supporting</td>
<td>Graduate Research</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Minimum Retention Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents (med. Certificates etc)</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of Candidature request</td>
<td>Graduate Research School</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate Research School or delegate</td>
<td>Temporary - retain on the student file for 7 Years from date of program completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Federation University

Federation University acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the lands and waters where our campuses, centres and field stations are located, and pay our respects to Elders past and present. We extend this respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and First Nations Peoples.

The Aboriginal Traditional Custodians of the lands and waters where our campuses, centres and field stations are located include:

- **Wimmera** Wotjobaluk, Jaadwa, Jadawadjali, Wergaia, Jupagulk
- **Ballarat** Wadawurrung
- **Berwick** Bunurong Boon Wurrung and Wurundjeri
- **Gippsland** Gunai Kurnai
- **Nanya** Station Mutthi Mutthi and Barkindji
- **Brisbane** Turrbal and Jagara
Welcome to Federation University Australia (the University). We are very pleased that you have chosen to study your Higher Degree by Research (HDR) with us. We endeavour to provide HDR candidates with the highest possible standard of support.

This handbook has been prepared to assist HDR candidates at the University. The handbook covers a wide range of topics that are relevant to our HDR programs. The handbook has been arranged into three sections (Getting Started at Federation University; Early Candidature; and Late Candidature), but it is a good idea to become familiar with the contents of all sections when starting out on your HDR journey.

Throughout the handbook there are links to more detailed documentation with which you are encouraged to become familiar. In particular, candidates should read the HDR Candidature Management Policy and other important policies and procedures located on our Research website.

Any questions can be directed to the generic email account: research.degrees@federation.edu.au. Your message will be answered by the most appropriate person in the Graduate Research School team.

Degrees to which this handbook applies

Higher Degrees by Research are supervised research training programs. The HDR programs offered at the University are:

• Masters Degree (Research) 18 months full time
• Doctoral Degree (also known as a PhD) three years full time
Applying for admittance to a Higher Degree by Research

Candidates are admitted to their degrees following a formal application process. All prospective candidates must demonstrate that they have met academic entry requirements and international students must also meet English language entry requirements.

The Graduate Research School has provided a Frequently Asked Questions page regarding the application process. Further information about applying for a HDR is also available online, along with specific information for international research applicants.

Admission to all HDR programs is on a probationary basis. Candidates progress from probationary status to confirmed candidature after successful completion of the Confirmation of Candidature (CoC), details of which are provided in the Early Candidature section of this handbook.

Amend your personal details

Update your personal details (for example, name, phone number, address, etc.) using My Student Centre.

Communication

A Federation University email account is provided to all HDR candidates on enrolment. It is vital that you monitor this account as this is where many important university communications will be sent. Failure to monitor and maintain this email account is not considered an excuse for failing to respond to communications. It is possible to redirect emails from your university account to other email accounts. If assistance is required in this regard, please contact the ITS Service Desk.

HDR News

All candidates will receive regular HDR News, circulated by email. HDR News is created by the Research Training team at the Graduate Research School. It outlines upcoming training opportunities and provides information specifically relevant to HDR candidates. The University also provides a more general bulletin called FedNews, which HDR candidates should also monitor for opportunities and important information that may be relevant to them. Previous FedNews bulletins are available online. If a candidate finds that they do not receive these bulletins automatically via their university email account, they can be viewed on the website or a request for a RSS feed can be made.

The Graduate Research School

The Graduate Research School is led by the Dean of Graduate Studies and comprises academic and professional staff whose roles are to support HDR candidates and ensure compliance with government requirements for HDR programs.

Although HDR candidates are supported academically and financially via one of the University’s six academic schools, Federation University’s Graduate Research School is also involved in supporting HDR candidates. In particular, the staff of the Graduate Research School provide:

- a central administrative role for HDR candidature.
- research training and development opportunities for HDR candidates and their supervisors.

The central administrative role of the Graduate Research School includes processing applications for candidature and scholarships, enrolment, facilitating and documenting confirmation of candidature, documenting leave, accepting theses for examination and processing examination results, which is just to name a few of its many responsibilities.
The research training role of the Graduate Research School team includes the development and delivery of the HDR Skills Development Program (SDP).

Candidates may contact the Graduate Research School via research.degrees@federation.edu.au. More information on research at Federation University can be found online; hovering your mouse over the “Research” tab in the blue banner near the top of this page reveals links to a wide range of information.

Duration of candidature

Doctoral (PhD) candidature is for a period of three years full-time study or the equivalent in part-time study (six years). Candidature for Masters by Research is for a period of 18 months full-time study or the equivalent in part-time study (three years). Extensions to these durations are possible where there are exceptional circumstances; however, all candidates are expected to complete within the durations stated and, therefore, should plan for this outcome.

Hours of study

Full-time candidates should plan to spend, on average, 37.6 hours a week on their studies. In other words, full-time PhD candidature should be considered at least as time consuming as a full-time job. Part-time candidates are expected to spend at least 50% of this time (18.8 hours per week) on their studies. A prospective candidate should not accept a place unless they are prepared to devote such time to their candidature as they cannot otherwise expect to achieve satisfactory progress.

Employment during candidature

Full-time students are usually permitted to undertake part-time, paid employment except where scholarship conditions apply. Such employment must not interfere with the recommended hours of study as stated. Paid employment commitments during the period of candidature will not be accepted as grounds for an extension of either candidature or a scholarship.

Leave

There are various types of leave available to HDR candidates. It is important that you distinguish between the different types of leave, and that you apply for the appropriate leave type for your circumstances. Examples include recreation leave (vacations or holidays), sick leave (time off for illness) and parental leave (following the birth of a child). Candidates may also access other leave entitlements applicable to academic and general staff of the University such as compassionate/ bereavement leave; leave for jury service; and domestic violence leave. More information on these types of leave can be found on the Human Resources webpage.

Academic Schools

All HDR candidates are enrolled via one of our academic schools. A candidate’s main source of support is their principal supervisor, who will generally be based in the same school of enrolment (further details about HDR supervision can be found in the Early Candidature section of this handbook). Each school is led by a dean, who is assisted in matters relating to research (including HDR matters) by an associate dean (Research). In some schools, the Associate Dean (Research) is assisted by an HDR coordinator.

Links to our six academic schools are linked below:

- School of Nursing and Healthcare Professions (SoNHP)
- School of Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)
- School of Health and Life Sciences (SHaLS)
- Federation Business School (FBS)
- School of Education (SoE)
- School of Arts (SoA)

Regulations, policies and procedures

The University’s HDR programs are governed by Regulation 5.1, which outlines the prescribed elements for each program. There is also a range of HDR-related Policies and Procedures that all HDR candidates should become familiar with.

Full-time and part-time candidature

Domestic HDR candidates may enrol on a full-time or part-time basis, subject to approval by the school of enrolment and the Dean of Graduate Studies. International students who have an Australian student visa are required to enrol on a full-time basis. A form to request a change of enrolment can be found on the HDR Forms page.
Periods of recreation or sick leave are not subtracted from the duration of candidature.

Leave from studies is a different kind of leave. It is usually taken for longer periods of time than other types of leave. Candidature is suspended during leave from studies and, therefore, this period of leave is not included in the calculation of candidature time expended. A [Amend your program status form](http://example.com) must be completed prior to taking this type of leave. Leave from studies usually extends for at least six months and up to one year. Where the candidate has appropriate medical certificates, they may request leave from studies for periods between four weeks and six months.

Further information on types of leave and leave entitlements can be found in the [HDR Candidature Management Policy](http://example.com).

**HDR induction/orientation**

All accepted HDR candidates must complete the compulsory HDR induction/orientation module that forms part of the [Federation University HDR Skills Development Program (SDP)](http://example.com). Completion of this induction/orientation module can be face to face, or online via a live webinar or a recording. Registration is via the University’s online learning environment, Moodle. All HDR candidates should have access to the SDP via Moodle. Failure to complete such prescribed modules may prohibit the candidate from attempting confirmation of candidature.

Candidates must also participate in an induction/orientation program arranged by their academic school, which will include information regarding occupational health and safety. It is highly recommended that international HDR candidates make contact with our [Multicultural Student Services](http://example.com) team and participate in their orientation program.

**HDR Skills Development Program on Moodle**

All HDR candidates should become familiar with the [HDR Skills Development Program](http://example.com) on Moodle. This online platform holds a host of HDR resources and information. Candidates are automatically enrolled in this shell when starting their degree and its access and use will be covered during the HDR induction/orientation program.

**Minimum resources/support**

The following (minimum level) of resources/services will be provided by the relevant academic school for all HDR candidates undertaking their program on campus. These minimum resources should be made available to candidates when they commence study. In instances where the candidate believes the provision of resources is not reasonable, they should address their concerns to the relevant schools’ ADR or (where appropriate) the HDR coordinator.

On-campus candidates should be provided with:

- a desk and chair located in a secure space dedicated to HDR candidates (this might be shared space), where possible, in reasonable proximity to the school that is providing principal supervision
- secure storage
- access to computer (hardware/software) facilities appropriate to the research needs of the candidate
- reasonable amounts of stationery and access to photocopying, telephone, fax and postal services
- reasonable after-hours access to facilities (taking into account relevant occupational health and safety requirements)
- any other resources identified as essential to a particular candidate’s research program (for example, scientific and technical equipment, laboratory or studio facilities)

An adequate level of financial support to undertake the approved project, as approved by the Dean, shall be provided by the academic school to meet relevant research costs. The academic school should ensure that candidates are included in school-based research seminars/conferences; encouraged to network and interact with school staff and any scholarly visitors; and be provided with opportunities for social interaction with staff and other research candidates.

**Services and support for HDR candidates**

**A troubleshooting list is provided in Appendix B.**

We offer a range of student advocacy and support services, that include disability support, counselling and a Student Advisory Centre. Such services are available to all enrolled candidates. It is important that candidates be proactive with regard to seeking support so that problems and issues can be addressed as they arise.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander candidates can find support and assistance at the Aboriginal Education Centre.

All international candidates should engage with the [Multicultural Student Services Office](http://example.com).

The Library provides a range of services for HDR candidates such as advice on your literature review, use of Endnote bibliographic software, citing and referencing help, workshops, databases access, delivery of resources available in other libraries, guidance on publishing, managing your research data,
advice on copyright and deposit of your e-thesis. All HDR candidates are encouraged to make early contact with their School Liaison Librarian to discuss individual research requirements. Further information is available from http://libguides.federation.edu.au/research.

The career development and employment team can assist with such things as planning for a career after graduation, part-time work and applying for positions (for example, creating curriculum vitae and resumes, addressing selection criteria and preparing a cover letter).

The Graduate Research School also supports a Federation HDR Facebook group, which is a great source of information and a means to network with other HDR candidates at the University.

Information Technology Support
The ITS Service Desk can assist candidates with IT support needs and issues.

HDR Skills Development Program (SDP)
The Research Training team within the Graduate Research School recognises the importance of education and training to support HDR candidature. We are pleased to offer a range of personal and professional development initiatives aimed to enhance the higher degree experience. The Skills Development Program provides a variety of opportunities to build skills and knowledge that can assist with timely and successful completion of your degree and increase employment opportunities. While all HDR candidates are encouraged to participate, it is a requirement that candidates enrolled after January 2019 must complete certain elements of the SDP in each year of candidature in order to satisfy the requirements of their candidature. More information on the SDP program and its compulsory elements is available online.

Scholarships and external funding
The University offers a limited number of scholarships to support HDR candidates each year. An annual HDR scholarship round takes place each year (closing date usually around the end of October) to award scholarships provided by the Australian Government’s Research Training Program (RTP) funds. External grants and other types of funding become available from time to time. Such opportunities are normally advertised via FedNews, HDR News and online.

Any research support provided to HDR candidates should be acknowledged in research outputs such as publications, conference presentations and artworks.

Acknowledgement of support from the Australian Government’s Research Training Program, including RTP stipend scholarships and fee-offset scholarships is a requirement for all recipients and is outlined in the Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship Policy. Most domestic HDR candidates are supported by an RTP fee-offset scholarship. The wording for such an acknowledgment is as follows:

For HDR candidates in receipt of both a RTP Stipend and RTP Fee-Offset

<Student name> was/is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Stipend and RTP Fee-Offset Scholarship through Federation University Australia.

For HDR candidates in receipt of an RTP Fee-Offset only

<Student name> was/is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP Fee-Offset Scholarship through Federation University Australia).
Your supervisory panel/team

A supervisory panel, or team, must be in place at all times to support each HDR candidate. The panel will consist of a principal supervisor and at least one associate supervisor, who are members of the academic staff. A supervisory panel may also include one or more co-supervisors (with relevant expertise but not employed by Federation University). All supervisors must be approved and listed on the University’s Register of Supervisors. Further information regarding supervisor registration and responsibilities can be found in the HDR Supervision policy, and its related procedures, which include the Supervision of HDR Candidates Procedure and the Responsibilities for Supervision of HDR Candidates Procedure.

The principal supervisor is normally the candidate’s first point of contact for support. The supervisory panel is responsible for ensuring that candidates have the support they require for the timely and successful submission of their thesis/exegesis.

It is important that the expectations of a candidate and their supervisor are compatible. All candidates are required to complete the HDR Candidate – Principal Supervisor Agreement by the end of the first four weeks following enrolment. This agreement should be revisited from time to time and can be amended and resubmitted.

Further information regarding the responsibilities of supervisors, candidates, schools and the University can be found in the HDR Candidature Management Policy. If a candidate has concerns about their supervisory panel, they should talk to their HDR co-ordinator or the ADR. Where the supervisory team includes the HDR Coordinator and/or the ADR, the issue should be discussed with the relevant deputy dean or dean.

HDR Skills Development Program (SDP)

The HDR Skills Development Program (SDP) has the dual goals of supporting HDR candidates to achieve timely completion and to develop and document a suite of transferrable skills that is useful across many fields of endeavour. There are prescribed elements in the SDP, which all HDR candidates must complete except where a recognition of prior learning has been granted.

Confirmation of Candidature

Admission to all Higher Degree by Research programs is on a probationary basis. Candidates progress from probationary status to confirmed candidature after successful completion of the Confirmation of Candidature (CoC) process.

- Doctoral candidates should aim to complete CoC within nine months (and no more than 12 months) of commencing their full-time probationary candidature. Part-time candidates should plan to complete CoC within 18 months and no later than 24 months after beginning their candidature.

- Masters by research candidates must complete CoC within six months of commencing their full-time probationary candidature. The equivalent for part-time candidates is within 12 months.

The Confirmation of Candidature Guidelines detail the requirements of candidates for this important milestone. All candidates enrolled after January 2019 must attend the SDP session titled “Preparing for Confirmation of Candidature” along with several other prescribed sessions before attempting confirmation. The Graduate Research School also recommends that you attend the CoC presentations of other candidates.
Project budget
The CoC document must provide budget details, which outline the project costs and the source(s) of funds to cover these costs. Costs may include fieldwork, laboratory equipment and reagents, consumables, outsourced transcription of interviews or professional editing. Such costs can be considerable and should be considered when developing the project. Discussions regarding the minimum level of financial support available to HDR candidates in your school are covered as part of the HDR Candidate – Principal Supervisor Agreement. Candidates may also have access to, and may apply for, additional funds from external funding sources.

Preparing the thesis
Although there will be some aspects of your thesis that are tightly prescribed, there is a certain amount of flexibility relating to how an HDR thesis is presented for examination.

Plan the structure and approach of your thesis early in your candidature.

Helpful information regarding the prescribed and flexible aspects of your thesis can be found in the “Format of Thesis” section of the HDR Examination Procedure. Further information is detailed in the document: “How to present your thesis”.

The planned approach to your thesis/exegesis should be discussed with and supported by your supervisory team, who are aware of disciplinary ‘norms’.

The Graduate Research School recommends that candidates carefully examine several recent examples of successful Federation University HDR theses in their research discipline. These can be found in the Library catalogue and may be available in both electronic and hard copy forms.

Staying Enrolled
As stipulated in Regulation 5.1, all HDR candidates are required to re-enrol each year. Failure to re-enrol may lead to the termination of your candidature.

International candidates are required to contact the Graduate Research School to re-enrol in their program. Domestic candidates are responsible for their own re-enrolment via HDR online enrolment – a link will be sent to your university email address, but if you do not receive it, please email research.degrees@federation.edu.au.

The Graduate Research School will attempt to contact students via phone and email prior to enacting processes leading to the termination of their candidature; however, re-enrolment is firmly the responsibility of the candidate.

Building a publication record during candidature
The University and the Graduate Research School encourage candidates to build a publication record during their candidature where this is possible and appropriate. While this can have many benefits, including improving your research track record, which is important for some career pathways, it is important to recognise that there are also some costs, including the significant time involved in preparing manuscripts for publication. During your candidature discuss the potential for publication of your research with your supervisory team.

HDR candidates who publish during their candidature, generally work in collaboration with their supervisory team and target high-quality, peer-reviewed journals or contribute to peer-reviewed books and/or chapters and conference proceedings. Candidates wishing to publish their research must ensure that they understand the copyright implications of publishing and avoid ‘predatory’ publishers. Training opportunities and support for these and other important issues can be accessed during your candidature as part of the SDP. If publishing during your candidature sounds appealing, discuss this with your supervisory team and look for the opportunities that will help you attain this goal.

Student Evaluation of the Postgraduate program (SEPP)
The University and the Graduate Research School care about their candidates’ experiences and seek feedback on this via the annual Student Evaluation of the Postgraduate Program (SEPP) questionnaire. A link to this questionnaire will be forwarded directly to all enrolled candidates annually. All candidates are encouraged to complete this online questionnaire. Your honest responses will help the Graduate Research School and other sections of the University further improve the programs and the support that is provided to HDR candidates. The SEPP questionnaire is anonymous and cannot be traced back to an individual.

Annual and Interim Progress Reports
The candidature requirements for all HDR candidates include compulsory participation in the annual progress report (APR) during each year of enrolment. The APR is an important opportunity for the University to check a candidate’s progress and provide support where necessary. A candidates will receive notification by email when it is time to complete the APR, which is in the form of a two-part online survey.

One part is completed by the HDR candidate and the other is completed by their principal supervisor on behalf of the supervisory team. Candidates should meet with their principal supervisor (or supervisory team) to discuss
their progress, and any concerns, prior to the completion of the relevant section of the report. Candidates and supervisors should be honest about the challenges of the research program. Documentation of such challenges and issues can be useful if an extension to candidature is being considered. Some candidates must also complete interim progress reports (IPR) in addition to APR in the following circumstances:

- Candidates who hold an international student visa.
- Candidates who have been identified as being ‘at risk’ in previous progress reports.
- Candidates who have expended the maximum period of candidature.
- Candidates nominated by their principal supervisor or Dean of School.

Following submission of the APR or the IPR by the HDR candidate and their principal supervisor, the principal supervisor and the Associate Dean (Research) must review the report and recommend one of the following outcomes:

- **Satisfactory Progress.** The candidate is making sufficient progress to complete their research program by the approved submission date.
- **School Action Required.** The candidate is making progress, however action is required on behalf of the school and candidate to ensure timely completion.
- **At Risk.** The candidate is at risk of not completing their program by the approved submission date or to the required standard, and intervention is therefore required.
- **Show Cause.** The candidate has not made sufficient progress and is required to show cause as to why their candidature should not be terminated.

Candidates who receive an At Risk recommendation can expect to receive a detailed action plan intended to assist them to recover their candidature. Candidates who receive At Risk outcomes in two consecutive reports, or who fail to meet the requirements of the action plans may be asked to show cause as to why their candidature should not be terminated.

**Confidential section of the APR**

The student’s part of the APR includes an optional confidential section which may be used when a candidate wishes to share something that they do not want their supervisory panel to see. This confidential section of the report will be provided only to the candidate’s Dean of School and the Dean of Graduate Studies and not to members of the supervisory panel. Where a conflict of interest exists (such as the Dean being on the supervisory panel/team), the confidential information will be provided only to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor of Research and Innovation.

**Show Cause**

A candidate may be required to show cause as to why their candidature should not be terminated when any of the following circumstances apply:

- Two or more consecutive Annual Progress Reports indicate that they are at risk.
- Candidature has not been confirmed at the end of the probationary period of enrolment.
- On recommendation of the Dean of School or nominee.
- Failure to have maintained adequate and regular contact with the University.
- Failure to have submitted written reports on academic progress when requested.
- Reached the maximum period of candidature.
- Failure to have met the requirements of the Skills Development Program.

Candidates who are required to show cause will be notified in writing via email to their nominated university email address. Details regarding the Show Cause process can be found in the Candidature Management Procedure.

Candidates are required to provide a written submission detailing why their candidature should not be terminated. Where a report is not provided by the candidate, candidature will be terminated. Applications for leave from studies will not be considered once notification for a Show Cause hearing has been given.
Research Integrity and Ethics Approvals

It is important that research carried out at the University is conducted ethically and with integrity. Issues regarding authorship of publications, conflicts of interests, use of samples and methods or approaches developed or obtained by other researchers all fall within the purview of research integrity. An online course in research integrity is available to all researchers, including HDR candidates, and is highly recommended. The course is available via the Epigeum online platform, and you can arrange access by contacting Paula Di Maria (phone +61 03 5122 6591; email paula.dimaria@federation.edu.au).

Research ethics may be considered as a subset of research integrity. Projects and practices carried out by staff and HDR candidates at the University must conform to accepted community standards regarding ethics. The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research outlines these standards and all candidates should familiarise themselves with this document.

Any research project involving human subjects must be approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee. Any research involving animals must be approved by the University’s Animal Experimentation Ethics Committee.

Discuss the ethics requirements of your project with your supervisory team, who will assist you to develop and submit an ethics application where appropriate. If there is any doubt about the need for ethics approval, the matter can be discussed with the Coordinator, Research Ethics (email: research.ethics@federation.edu.au; or phone +61 3 5327 9765). Failure to seek appropriate ethics approval prior to the collection of data could result in an inability to use the data in your thesis and may lead to disciplinary action.

The Research Ethics and Integrity webpages are a useful source of relevant information, resources and application forms.
Late Candidature

Many of the points raised in the earlier sections will also be relevant during late candidature, including requirements for progress reporting and matters of research integrity. In the following sections we have detailed some information that is important for candidates nearing completion of their degrees and submission of their theses.

Thesis editing

Candidates may seek professional editorial assistance for their thesis; however, the input from the editor should be restricted to copy editing and proofreading only. In relation to matters of substance and structure, the professional editor may draw attention to problems, but should not provide solutions. Funds to support professional editing of your thesis should be requested during the proposal stage of the project (for example, in the budget for CoC). There is no guarantee that such funds will be made available.

Preparing and presenting a thesis for submission

While there are general and specific thesis formatting requirements that must be adhered to (please see the HDR Examination Procedure for more details), there is also scope for diversity in thesis presentation. Therefore, it is recommended that issues of style and presentation of the thesis be determined early in your candidature. This can save time and frustration prior to submission of your thesis for examination.

The principal supervisor will recommend examiners and will know the accepted practice in the discipline. Therefore, candidates should seek advice from their principal supervisor on matters of style and presentation. Perusal of several examples of successful theses from their discipline is also recommended (check the library catalogue). A booklet “How to present your thesis” may also be useful.

Plagiarism and Turnitin

Plagiarism is a serious matter and should be avoided at all costs. To help candidates consider this important issue, the University provides free access to the Turnitin system, via Moodle. Turnitin works by comparing the text in a submitted document to internet content, journal databases and a global database of student assignments. Turnitin uses advanced pattern-making technology to identify similar passages of text in the submitted document. The tool can help a candidate identify passages of text that may not have been cited correctly, or that need quotation marks, or page numbers appended.

Submission of the thesis

Candidates are required to notify the University that they are getting ready to submit their thesis for examination using the intention to Submit form. This form must be submitted to Research Services 30 working days prior to the submission of the thesis/exegesis + portfolio. It must include the title of the thesis and an electronic and hard copy of the abstract (300 word limit) provided on the template located in the form. This form must be signed by the candidate, their principal supervisor and the Dean of School or nominee (often the ADR or HDR coordinator).
Examiners are nominated by your principal supervisor. Under no circumstances may the candidate contact the nominated thesis examiners at any stage of the examination process. Examiners must indicate their willingness to return the marked thesis in a timely manner. The University requests that examiners return their recommendations within 4 to 6 weeks for a masters degree (research), and 6 to 8 weeks for a doctoral degree. However, there can be delays beyond these indicated timeframes, which may occur for various reasons that are outside the control of the Graduate Research School.

The examiners make recommendations to the University as to whether a higher degree by research should be awarded. However, the University is the final arbiter of this process. In addition to providing the Academic Board with written comments relating to the examination criteria, the examiners, acting independently, will provide the Academic Board with one of the following recommendations:

- The thesis should be classified as PASSED without further examination.
- The thesis should be classified as PASSED, subject to minor corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board. That is, the thesis is suitable for conferral once the author has addressed nominated passages, textual errors, and referencing corrections. These actions should largely be able to be undertaken independently by the candidate.
- The thesis should be PASSED subject to major corrections made to the satisfaction of the Academic Board. That is, the thesis requires new data collection, new or revised data analysis, substantive rewriting of one or more chapters, or a large volume of stylistic/presentation errors. These actions should be undertaken with ongoing input from the supervisory team.
- The thesis should be classified as DEFERRED because the thesis requires substantial revision and re-examination by external experts and the candidate should be permitted to submit the thesis for examination in a revised form.
- The thesis should be classified as FAILED.

Oral defence

An oral defence of the thesis is not mandatory at the University. However, at the request of the School Examination Committee, candidate and/or the Dean of Graduate Studies, the candidate may be required to:

- provide an oral presentation that explains the thesis findings, context, and contribution to the research discipline area
- participate in an interview to confirm that all necessary revisions have been completed to the satisfaction of the School Examination Committee and the Dean of Graduate Studies. The requirement for an oral presentation or interview is relatively rare; it may take place physically, or by tele- or video-conference. If required, the oral defence shall serve the purpose of confirming or moderating the outcome of the thesis revision process. The presentation itself does not attract a separate assessment report.

Status of a candidate whilst under examination

Once the thesis has been submitted for examination, the candidate is assigned a “TD” grade, which indicates that the candidate is under examination. Scholarships cease at this point. This grade does not attract course fees, unless the TD grade is activated after the HECS census dates (31 March and 31 August for each year), in which case, course fees may be charged for that semester. The official date for the recording and commencement of the TD grade is the date that the thesis is submitted for examination.

Graduation

Candidates are eligible to apply to graduate after the University Council has approved the award of the degree. Candidates will be advised by Research Services of the appropriate forms that are required to be completed prior to attending a graduation ceremony.

Complaints or candidate grievance

If a candidate has a complaint, concern or enquiry about some aspect of their candidature or their research program, most issues can be dealt with by making an appointment to talk to the person who can solve your problem (for example, your supervisor, HDR co-ordinator, ADR or Dean of School). It is good practice for candidates to keep a record of these discussions; such records can become extremely important in the unfortunate event that the situation escalates. The Student Advisory Service can help you to prepare for a meeting or (given appropriate notice, and in appropriate circumstances) may accompany a candidate to a meeting to provide support.

If this approach doesn’t work, then formal steps can be taken via the Student Grievance procedure.

Respect. Now. Always

Federation University Australia is committed to providing a respectful, safe and supportive learning environment. More information about the University’s Respect. Now. Always. campaign is available online.
Finding a job and the Career Development and Employment Service

While this section has been placed at the end of the handbook, graduate employment should be considered even before undertaking HDR candidature. Simply having a postgraduate research degree will not guarantee employment. Good planning and identification of opportunities for relevant experience (for example, training, teaching and networking) are required. The Skills Development Program provides sessions relevant to career development. All students have free access to the Career development and employment team, both during candidature and after graduation.

Any questions?

Any questions or inquiries can be directed to the email research.degrees@federation.edu.au. Your message will be answered by the most appropriate person in the Graduate Research School team.

APPENDIX A - Introduction Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TICK WHEN COMPLETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Complete enrolment process and receive confirmation of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arrange student card from Student HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meet with principal supervisor as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify key people in your school (HDR Coordinator, ADR, admin support person, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ensure that you have access to minimum resources (e.g. desk, computer, etc.) when you start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ensure you can access and monitor your Federation University email. Use the IT Services helpdesk if required phone 1800 333 864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Familiarise yourself with the “Information for current HDR candidates” section of the Research webpages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Familiarise yourself with the “HDR Skills Development Program” (SDP) on Moodle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Complete school induction. The HDR Coordinator or the Associate Dean, Research in your school should arrange this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Complete Graduate Research School (GRS) induction (face to face, webinar or Moodle recording as part of the SDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Within the first four weeks of full-time study, complete HDR Candidate – Principal Supervisor Agreement with your principal supervisor or team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Familiarise yourself with the HDR candidate management policy and other policy and procedure documents relevant to HDR candidature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Familiarise yourself with the University’s support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Establish which school funds are available to you to support your research project and how to access the funds (talk to your supervisor about this)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Develop a rough project plan and timeline that outlines key milestones (e.g. Confirmation of Candidature, ethics approval, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B - Troubleshooting.

TROUBLESHOOTING FORMS

• Many HDR forms can be found here

Who to see about resources to get started

• Student card:
  1. Contact/visit Student HQ

The bare essentials (e.g. desk, computer, etc.):
  1. Principal Supervisor;
  2. School Admin Officer;
  3. HDR Coordinator;
  4. School Associate Dean of Research

Navigating the Skills Development Program (SDP)

• To find out about the SDP, go to the SDP webpage
• To identify which sessions are compulsory/optional, and to register your intention to attend face to face or webinar sessions, explore the SDP Moodle shell

Difficulty accessing the SDP Moodle shell?
  1. Contact Paula Di Maria (ph. 5122 6591)

Identifying required modules:
  1. SDP Information can be found here;
  2. Program

Health concerns and taking time off

• Taking leave (recreational, personal, etc.):
  1. Complete the leave form and submit
• Taking leave from studies: (usually six to 12 months during which time candidature is suspended and then candidature will be extended for the period of leave).
  1. Talk to your principal supervisor about the situation and complete the leave form and submit

Accessing Federation University Health Services:

• There are a variety of health services provided at various campuses.
  Mental Health:
    1. Counselling;
    2. BeyondBlue;
    3. Lifeline 24/7 telephone counselling (131114)

Concerns about progress

• Dealing with concerns (suggested order of people to talk to when appropriate):
  1. Principal supervisor or member of supervisory team;
  2. School HDR Coordinator;
  3. School Associate Dean of Research;
  4. Graduate Research School representative

• At Risk:
  1. Website information;
  2. Candidate Management Policy;

• Show Cause:
  1. Candidate Management Policy

• Student Advocacy:
  1. Student Advisory Service

• Withdrawal from studies:
  1. Talk it over with supervisors or HDR coordinator;
  2. Complete form to withdraw

IT matters

• The IT Service Desk can assist with various IT-related concerns to do with hardware, software and how to use our systems, including setting up your account, email, internet, printing software and hardware issues.
• You can call the IT Service Desk on 1800 333 864 or go to the online Service Desk.

Running out of time

• Importance of planning for timely completion:
  All candidates should plan to finish a PhD within 3 years full-time study (or equivalent part-time) and Masters by Research within 18 months full-time study (or equivalent part-time).

• Extensions to candidature (only available in unforeseen or exceptional circumstances):
  1. Extension form

Raising concerns

It is always best to raise concerns as they arise, because hoping that they will resolve themselves or go away may hold up candidature. Any concerns or unexpected delays should be noted in the annual progress report. The confidential section of the Annual Progress Report can be used where a candidate doesn’t want the supervisor/s to see the concern.

• Concerns:
  1. If possible, talk about the concern with your supervisor/s;
  2. Talk to the school HDR Coordinator;
  3. Talk to the school ADR;
  4. Submit a confidential report at any time to research.degrees@federation.edu.au
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Introduction

The 2019 Student Evaluation of Postgraduate Programs (SEPP) survey was administered by the Federation University Australia Student HQ. This annual, de-identified, online survey was open from 09/09/2019 to 14/10/2019. The survey received a 46% response rate, compared to 50% response rate in 2018 and 45.3% in 2017. Table 1 presents the number of surveys invitations sent out and the number returned in each School. The response rate at both the program and course code level are provided in Table 2.

The survey results indicated that in the previous 12 months, 51 (40.2%) of the respondents were studying off-campus, 73 (57.5%) on-campus and 3 (2.4%) a combination of the two.

The SEPP results for each of its item (tables 3 to 39) are presented in the order that they occurred in the survey. A list of all items in the 2019 Sepp may be found in Appendix A. The SEPP items sit broadly within the following groupings, which were also displayed on the survey itself:

- Commencement
- Support from your Academic School
- Supervision
- Service and Support
- Library

The report provides descriptive and inferential statics to explore the 2019 SEPP results. The results for each SEPP item are provided at the School and also at a combined (all respondent) level. Because there was a change to the Federation University structure since the 2018 SEPP was administered, involving a move from faculties to schools, a comparison of the 2018 and 2019 SEPP results between these structures was inappropriate. However, a comparison between 2018 and 2019 results for each item at the combined level has been provided (percentages given in light blue text are for 2018).
SEPP Response information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of surveys sent and number of surveys returned</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>63/29</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>63/29</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>16/6</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>17/7</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>93/53</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>24/6</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2. Response Rate by Course and Program Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Generated</th>
<th>Overall Completed</th>
<th>Overall Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Visual and Performing Arts)-AU0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU9</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Master of Arts (Visual and Performing Arts) (Research)-AU9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Business)-BU0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Mathematical Sciences)-CM0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Information Technology)-CU0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV9</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Master of Computing (by Research)-CV9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI9</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Master of Engineering Science (by Research)-EI9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Engineering)-GU0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB9</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Master of Arts (by Research)-HB9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Psychology)-HH0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Humanities and Social Sciences)-HU0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Human Movement and Sport Sciences)-MU0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU9</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Master of Business (by Research)-MU9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN9</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Master of Nursing (by Research)-NN9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Nursing)-NU0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN9</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Master of Applied Science (by Research)-PN9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA9</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Master of Applied Science (by Research)-SA9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Science)-SU0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU0</td>
<td>Semester 2 2019-Doctor of Philosophy (Education)-TU0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEPP Items and Frequency of Responses

Commencement items

Item one asked “When I began my research degree I was provided with a clear statement of the responsibilities of supervisors”. Table 3 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>5 (3.8%; 2018, 1%)</td>
<td>4 (3.1%; 2%)</td>
<td>13 (10%; 11%)</td>
<td>54 (41.5%; 45%)</td>
<td>54 (41.5%; 41%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item two asked “When I began my research degree I was provided with a clear statement of the responsibilities of postgraduate candidates”. Table 4 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 4.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>2 (1.5%; 2018, 1%)</td>
<td>4 (3.1%; 1%)</td>
<td>7 (5.4%; 7%)</td>
<td>67 (51.5%; 47%)</td>
<td>50 (38.5%; 44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item three asked “When I began my research degree I was provided with procedural/administrative guidelines for higher degree study”. Table 5 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>2 (1.5%; 4%)</td>
<td>5 (3.8%; 2%)</td>
<td>14 (10.8%; 14%)</td>
<td>74 (56.9%; 54%)</td>
<td>35 (26.9%; 26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item four asked “When I began my research degree I was provided with an introduction into postgraduate research in the School”. Table 6 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 6.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>6 (4.6%; 4%)</td>
<td>6 (4.6%; 6%)</td>
<td>21 (16.2%; 12%)</td>
<td>54 (41.5%; 49%)</td>
<td>43 (33.1%; 30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item five asked “When I began my research degree I was provided with a clear statement of the resources and facilities available to me”. Table 7 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>3 (2.3%; 3%)</td>
<td>9 (6.9%; 3%)</td>
<td>22 (16.9%; 16%)</td>
<td>59 (45.4%; 51%)</td>
<td>37 (28.5%; 27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Support Items

Item six asked “My School provides opportunities to participate in its research activities”. Table 8 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 8.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>13 (10%; 2018, 6%)</td>
<td>6 (4.6%; 5%)</td>
<td>17 (13.1%; 13%)</td>
<td>65 (50%; 48%)</td>
<td>29 (22.3%; 28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item seven asked “My School ensures that research candidates have opportunities to meet as a group”. Table 9 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>11 (8.5%; 9%)</td>
<td>11 (8.5%; 8%)</td>
<td>23 (17.7%; 11%)</td>
<td>54 (41.5%; 48%)</td>
<td>31 (23.8%; 24%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item eight asked “My School ensures that a research seminar program is organised for postgraduate candidates”. Table 10 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 10.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>12 (9.2%; 9%)</td>
<td>6 (6.9%; 7%)</td>
<td>14 (10.8%; 11%)</td>
<td>51 (39.2%; 36%)</td>
<td>44 (33.8%; 37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item nine asked "I have been provided with adequate resources for research, including help with developing skills for communicating ideas orally to the community at large". Table 11 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 11.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Respondents Combined</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 (5.4%; 5%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 (2.3%; 4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 (10.8%; 12%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>72 (55.4%; 52%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>33 (25.4%; 27%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item ten asked “I have been provided with adequate resources for research, including a suitable workspace”. Table 12 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 12.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td><strong>7 (5.4%; 3%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 (5.4%; 6%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 (10%; 12%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>49 (37.7%; 44%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>54 (41.5%; 35%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 11 asked “My School provides me with and makes me aware of the necessary training to enable me to adhere to the University Occupational Health and Safety requirements”. Table 13 presents frequency of the responses to this statement.

**TABLE 13.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>10 (7.7%; 13%)</td>
<td>7 (5.4%; 6%)</td>
<td>27 (20.8%; 15%)</td>
<td>57 (43.8%; 48%)</td>
<td>28 (21.5%; 18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 12 asked “When I began my research degree I was provided with an adequate introduction to the School and its facilities”. Table 14 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 14.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>4 (3.1%; 8%)</td>
<td>8 (6.2%; 5%)</td>
<td>23 (17.7%; 13%)</td>
<td>60 (46.2%; 52%)</td>
<td>34 (26.2%; 22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 13 asked “My School deals with cultural and gender equity issues positively”. Table 15 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>45 (34.6%; 26%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%; 4%)</td>
<td>7 (5.4%; 3%)</td>
<td>40 (30.8%; 39%)</td>
<td>35 (26.9%; 28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supervision Items**

Item 14 asked “My supervisor provides an atmosphere in which I feel comfortable raising issues that concern me”. Table 16 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.
TABLE 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>1 (.8%; 2018, 1%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%; 1%)</td>
<td>4 (3.1%; 4%)</td>
<td>30 (23.6%; 31%)</td>
<td>90 (70.9; 63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 15 asked “My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance with respect to planning my research, identifying important goals and meeting deadlines”. Table 17 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

TABLE 17.
Item 16 asked “My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance with respect to the literature in my research area”. Table 18 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 18.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Study</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SSEIT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>3 (2.4%; 1%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%; 4%)</td>
<td>8 (6.3%; 1%)</td>
<td>36 (28.3%; 35%)</td>
<td>78 (61.4%; 59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 17 asked “My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance with respect to encouraging me to research in a self-directed or independent manner”. Table 19 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 19.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td><strong>6 (4.7%; 4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 (1.6%; 3%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 (7.0%; 6%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>43 (33.9%; 39%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>67 (52.8%; 48%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 18 asked “My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance and support with respect to ethical considerations”. Table 20 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 20.**
Item 19 asked “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor regularly provides me with prompt comprehensive and constructive feedback on submitted written work”. Table 21 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>10 (7.8%; 5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.8%; 2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.8%; 3%)</td>
<td>41 (32.3%; 34%)</td>
<td>74 (58.3%; 56%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 20 asked “My supervisor is supportive, encouraging and helpful”. Table 22 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 22.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>6 (4.7%; 3%)</td>
<td>6 (4.7%; 1%)</td>
<td>9 (7.1%; 7%)</td>
<td>32 (25.2%; 33%)</td>
<td>74 (58.3%; 56%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unable to Judge | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree
---|---|---|---|---
Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22
School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23
School of Nursing & Healthcare Professions (SNHP) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4
School of Education (SoE) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3
School of Arts (SoA) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 38
Federation Business School (BUS) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4
All Respondents Combined | 2 (1.6%; 1%) | 1 (0.8%; 2%) | 2 (1.6%; 1%) | 28 (22%; 24%) | 94 (74%; 72%)

Item 21 asked “My supervisor is interested in, and committed to, my research”. Table 23 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 23.**
Item 22 asked “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor is available for discussions/consultations when needed”. Table 24 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%; 1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.8%; 2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%; 1%)</td>
<td>33 (26%; 26%)</td>
<td>91 (71.7%; 68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 23 asked “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor is a source of new ideas for my research”. Table 25 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 25.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>3 (2.4%; 2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.8%; 1%)</td>
<td>6 (4.7%; 3%)</td>
<td>35 (27.6%; 26%)</td>
<td>82 (64.6%; 68%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 24 asked “I am satisfied with my supervisor's expertise with regard to my research topic”. Table 26 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>10 (7.9%; 4%)</td>
<td>3 (2.4%; 4%)</td>
<td>7 (5.5%; 3%)</td>
<td>43 (33.9%; 39%)</td>
<td>64 (50.4%; 50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>4 (3.1%; 2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%; 4%)</td>
<td>9 (7.1%; 4%)</td>
<td>41 (32.3%; 32%)</td>
<td>71 (55.9%; 58%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 25 asked “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor helps me network with other researchers in my area”. Table 27 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.
Item 26 asked “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor assists with publication of my research”. Table 28 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>13 (10.2%; 11%)</td>
<td>5 (3.9%; 6%)</td>
<td>13 (10.2%; 8%)</td>
<td>32 (25.2%; 34%)</td>
<td>64 (50.4%; 41%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29 presents the frequency of responses to this statement:

**TABLE 29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Study</th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>38 (29.9%; 28%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%; 3%)</td>
<td>11 (8.7%; 4%)</td>
<td>23 (18.1%; 22%)</td>
<td>53 (41.7%; 43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 27 asked “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor encourages me to present my work at appropriate seminars and conferences”. Table 29 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.
Item 28 asked “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor discusses issues of authorship with me”. Table 30 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 30**
### Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unable to Judge</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>32 (25.2%; 25%)</td>
<td>3 (2.4%; 3%)</td>
<td>6 (4.7%; 1%)</td>
<td>27 (21.3%; 26%)</td>
<td>59 (46.4%; 45%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service and Support Items**

Item 29 asked “My questions are answered in a timely, professional manner by the team in the Graduate Research School/Research Services”. Table 31 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.
Item 30 asked “I am aware of my rights and entitlements as a Higher Degree by Research candidate”. Table 32 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>7 (5.5%; 2018, 7%)</td>
<td>120 (94.5%; 93%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 31 asked “I am aware of the support services available to me as an HDR candidate at Federation University”. Table 33 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Tech</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>22 (17.3%; 22%)</td>
<td>105 (82.7%; 78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 32 asked “I am aware of the training and support available through the FedUni HDR Skills Development Program” (previously this item asked about the Graduate Centre Program, which was replaced in 2019 by the SDP). Table 34 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 (18.1%; 22%) 104 (81.9%; 78%)
Item 33 asked “The **FedUni HDR Skills Development** Program provides training relevant to my study needs” (previously this item asked about the Graduate Centre Program, which was replaced in 2019 by the SDP). Table 35 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

**TABLE 35**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>3 (2.4%; 4%)</td>
<td>124 (97.6%; 96%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 34 asked “I have attended seminars and training sessions offered in the FedUni HDR Skills Development Program” (previously this item asked about the Graduate Centre Program, which was replaced in 2019 by the SDP). Table 36 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>22 (17.3%; 16%)</td>
<td>105 (82.7%; 84%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 35 asked “I am kept informed about things that are relevant to HDR candidates” (previously this item asked about the Graduate Centre Program, which was replaced in 2019 by the SDP). Table 37 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Respondents Combined</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 (10.2%; 10%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>114 (89.8%; 90%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Library Items

Item 36 asked “The Liaison Librarian for my School has supported my progression through the program”. Table 38 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.

### TABLE 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>2 (1.6%; 0%)</td>
<td>125 (96.4%; 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37 asked “The Library's online resources and services have supported my progression through the program”. Table 39 presents the frequency of responses to this statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 39**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>I don’t know about this service</th>
<th>Not Valued</th>
<th>Somewhat valued</th>
<th>Highly valued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>48 (37.8%; 2018, 39%)</td>
<td>3 (2.4%; 1%)</td>
<td>28 (22%; 32%)</td>
<td>48 (37.8%; 26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

**Commencement and Support from your Academic School items (items 1 to 13)**

The “commencement” and “support from your academic school” item grouping indicate that only two of them had higher positive response rates in 2019, when compared with the same item from 2018. These were for item 3 (When I began my research degree I was provided with procedural/administrative guidelines for higher degree study) and item 9 (I have been provided with adequate resources for research, including help with developing skills for communicating ideas orally to the community at large). Positive response rates remained stable for Item 8 (my school ensures that research candidates have opportunities to meet as a group), item 10 (I have been provided with adequate resources for research, including a suitable workspace) and item 11 (My school provides me with and makes me aware of necessary training to enable me to adhere to University Occupational Health and Safety requirements). Positive response rates were determined by adding the positive responses percentages (e.g. Agree and Strongly Agree) for each item. Using this same method, an independent t-test demonstrated that the positive mean percentage total for the combined Commencement and School Support item grouping were not significantly different between 2018 (M = 76.9, SD = 6.9) and 2019 (M = 74.7, SD = 8.7), t(24) = -.722, p = 0.48.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Study</th>
<th>I don't know about this service</th>
<th>Not Valued</th>
<th>Somewhat valued</th>
<th>Highly valued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Information Technology (SSEIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Life Sciences (SHLS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing &amp; Healthcare Professions (SNHP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education (SoE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts (SoA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation Business School (BUS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Combined</td>
<td>6 (4.7%; 4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.8%; 4%)</td>
<td>34 (26.8%; 30%)</td>
<td>86 (67.7%; 62%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The item with the highest positive response set in this grouping (90%) asked “When I began my research degree I was provided with a clear statement of the responsibilities of postgraduate candidates”. This outcome is consistent with the 2018 response to this statement (91% positive response). The item with the lowest positive response rate (57.7%) asked “My School deals with cultural and gender equity issues positively”. This item received a lower positive response in this year’s SEPP when compared to 2018 (67%). This item also received a relatively high percentage of “unable to judge” responses in both 2018 (26%) and 2019 (34.6%). The fact that 7% of the respondents disagreed with this statement is a concern, as it indicates that some respondents have perceived cases where cultural and/or gender issues may not have been dealt with positively within their school.

There was a fall in the percentage of respondents agreeing that they were “provided with an introduction into postgraduate research in the school” (2019, 74.6% and 2018, 79%). A comprehensive induction into the School is vital if we want candidates to feel at home there. Indeed, a formal induction program is best practice (ACGR, 2018) and may help candidates avoid feelings of being marginalised from the school/faculty community, which is another reported variable associated with a failure to complete (for example see, Golde, 2005). Being the Graduate Research School Coordinator, the author of this report hears candidates lament that they don’t know where to find support and information in their school. This anecdotal evidence is further supported by the 2019 SEPP results, in that only 73.9% of respondents (a fall from 78% in 2018) gave positive responses that they were provided with a clear statement of the resources and facilities available to them. A comprehensive and meaningful School induction should cover such topics. Further, the author perceives that there are supervisors with little knowledge of such topics and, therefore, they are unable to assist their candidates to find the resources and facilities they may need.

Further evidence that candidates many not be receiving a comprehensive school induction can be found in the following responses. Item 10, asked “I have been provided with adequate resources for research, including a suitable workspace”. Eighteen percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. Twenty-one percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the school provided them with necessary training to adhere to OHS (item 11). Eighteen percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that “when I began my research degree I was provided with an adequate introduction to the School and its facilities” (item 12).

Supervisor Items (items 14 to 28)

The results for the supervisory grouping of items indicate that only one received a higher positive response rate in 2019, when compared with the same item from 2018. This item stated, “My supervisor is interested in, and committed to, my research”. The following items received positive responses at a rate similar to 2018, items 14 (My supervisor provides an atmosphere in which I feel comfortable raising issues that concern me), item 16 (My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance with respect to the literature in my research area), item 18 (My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance and support with respect to ethical
considerations), item 20 (My supervisor is supportive, encouraging and helpful) and item 25 (I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor helps me network with other researchers in my area). Positive response rates were determined by adding the positive responses percentages (e.g. Agree and Strongly Agree) for each item. Using this same method, an independent t-test demonstrated that the positive mean percentage total for the combined supervision responses were not significantly different between 2018 (M = 87.3, SD = 9.6) and 2019 (M = 85.3, SD = 10.8), t(28) = .52, p = 0.6.

The supervision grouping item with the highest positive response rate (94.5%) asked “My supervisor provides an atmosphere in which I feel comfortable raising issues that concern me”. This outcome was consistent with the 2018 response rate to this statement (94% positive). The item with the lowest positive response rate in 2019 (59%) asked “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor assists with publication of my research”. This item received a lower positive response in this year’s SEPP, when compared to 2018 (65%).

**Service and Support Items**

The service and support items indicate that four items had marginally higher positive response rates in 2019, when compared 2018. These were items 29 (My questions are answered in a timely, professional manner by the team in the Graduate Research School/Research Services), item 30 (I am aware of my rights and entitlements as a Higher Degree by Research candidate), item 31 (I am aware of the support services available to me as an HDR candidate at Federation University) and item 32 (I am aware of the training and support available through the FedUni HDR Skills Development Program). Positive responses in this case were determined by the percentage of respondents answering “yes” to an item. Due to the small number of items in this grouping, a comparison of percentage means at the combined level between 2019 and 2018 was not conducted. However, the means for this grouping in 2019 and 2018, with regard to positive responses, were almost identical (2018, M = 89.2, SD = 7.7; 2019, M = 89.4, SD = 6.9).

The item with the highest positive response rate (97.6%) asked “I am aware of the training and support available through the FedUni HDR Skills Development Program”. This outcome was consistent with the 2018 positive response rate to this statement (96% positive), but it should be noted that the corresponding item in 2018 asked about the previous program (the GCP). This is an outstanding result, given that the SDP was only initiated in 2019, while the GCP ran for many years. The item with the lowest positive response rate (81.9%) in this grouping asked “I am aware of the support services available to me as an HDR candidate at Federation University”. This item received a higher positive response rate in this year’s SEPP, when compared to 2018 (78%). However, HDR candidates knowing about the support that is available to them is vital, if we wish to retain more candidates and to have them feel supported throughout their study. The SDP offers a seminar exploring the full range of supports available across the University. A number of other SDP seminars (e.g. “Induction”, “Time management and looking after yourself”, “Preparing a literature review, etc.”) also highlight various support services that can be accessed for particular issues (e.g. mental and physical health,
finding and accessing resources, writing assistance, advocacy, etc.). An option to improve this item’s result going forward, might be to make the SDP “Support services for HDR candidates” seminar compulsory.

Library Items

The two library items received marginally higher positive ratings in 2019, when compared to 2018. Higher response rates in this case were determined by adding the positive responses percentages (e.g. Somewhat valued and Highly valued) for each item. Due to the small number of items in this grouping, a comparison of means at the combined level was not conducted. However, the means for this grouping at the combined level in 2018 (M = 75.0, SD = 24.0) and 2019 (M = 77.2, SD = 24.5) displayed quite similar positive response percentages.

Off-campus Compared to On-campus Study

The 2019 SEPP asked, for the first time, if respondents were studying off-campus, on-campus or a combination of each. Studying off-campus is a noted risk factor for withdrawal, and is associated with HDR isolation (for example, see Azad & Kohun, 2007). Fifty-one (40.2%) of the 2019 SEPP respondents identified that they were studying off-campus. If this percentage of HDR candidates responding to the 2019 SEPP as studying off-campus is indicative of the HDR population, we may be carrying considerable risk in this regard.

Comparing the 2019 SEPP results, between those studying on-campus and those studying off-campus, there is clear trend for those studying off-campus to use the “unable to judge” response at greater rates than their on-campus peers. For a number of items (for example, items 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 28) those studying off-campus gave the “Strongly Disagree” response at a greater rate than those studying on-campus. For example, item 19 states “I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor regularly provides me with prompt comprehensive feedback”. Off-campus candidates used the “Strongly Disagree” option for this item at more than twice the rate (8%) compared to those studying on-campus (3%). It must be noted that we are dealing with small numbers here, therefore, caution needs to be applied to such results. However, the SEPP does appear to indicate that the off-campus candidates experience may not be as satisfying as their on-campus peers, which would be congruent with the literature on this topic.
Conclusion
The 2019 SEPP survey results indicate that the overall HDR experience at Federation has remained rather stable between the 2018 and 2019 SEPP surveys. While a few items displayed small improvements in 2019, when compared with the 2018 results, most were basically the same or slightly lower with regard to positive (favourable) response rates.

The Graduate Research School has set a target to have at least 90% of SEPP respondents providing positive responses (e.g. Agree, Strongly Agree, Somewhat valued, Highly valued and Yes) to each item in the survey. In 2019 only 11 items achieved this target, compared to 13 items in 2018. Thus, there is still some way to go to reach this aspirational target. The 2019 results indicate that the Schools have an important role to play in lifting the positive response rates to many items in the SEPP. The number of items with positive responses at or greater than 80% rose slightly in 2019 (23 of 37 items, compared to 22 of 37 items in 2018).

It is important to note that there can be a 'ripple effect' within the SEPP data, which can mean events that happened years ago may be picked up in the current SEPP results. For example, commencement questions are asked of all HDR candidates, even if they commenced 1, 2 or more years ago. Thus, events that took place in 2017, could show up in the 2018, 2019 and subsequent SEPP results. For this reason, it would be better if the SEPP only picked up what had occurred since the last SEPP was conducted. This would allow the GRS and Schools to identify changes in the HDR experience that occurred since the last SEPP survey was completed. This might allow them to identify changes in practice and conditions that occurred during that time, which may then have influenced the change in positive or negative response rates. For this and other reasons, the current SEPP survey items and their administration needs review. Such a change, when combined with increasing the response rate to the SEPP, should help to give us a better insight into the HDR candidate experience at Federation.
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Appendix A

Student Evaluation of Postgraduate Program (SEPP) 2019

Question Banks

Commencement:

1. Z02 When I began my research degree I was provided with a clear statement of the responsibilities of supervisors.
2. Z03 When I began my research degree I was provided with a clear statement of the responsibilities of postgraduate candidates.
3. Z04 When I began my research degree I was provided with procedural/administrative guidelines for higher degree study.
4. Z05 When I began my research degree I was provided with an introduction into postgraduate research in the School.
5. Z06 When I began my research degree I was provided with a clear statement of the resources and facilities available to me.

Support from your Academic School

6. Z08 My School provides opportunities to participate in its research activities
7. Z09 My School ensures that research candidates have opportunities to meet as a group
8. Z10 My School ensures that a research seminar program is organised for postgraduate candidates.
9. Z21 I have been provided with adequate resources for research, including help with developing skills for communicating ideas orally to the community at large.
10. Z13 I have been provided with adequate resources for research, including a suitable workspace.
11. Z22 My School provides me with and makes me aware of the necessary training to enable me to adhere to the University Occupational Health and Safety requirements.
12. Z12 When I began my research degree I was provided with an adequate introduction to the School and its facilities.
13. Z54 My School deals with cultural and gender equity issues positively.

Supervision

14. Z11 My supervisor provides an atmosphere in which I feel comfortable raising issues that concern me.
15. Z23 My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance with respect to planning my research, identifying important goals and meeting deadlines.
16. Z24 My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance with respect to the literature in my research area.
17. Z25 My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance with respect to encouraging me to research in a self-directed or independent manner.
18. Z27 My supervisor provides me with appropriate guidance and support with respect to ethical considerations.
19. Z28 I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor regularly provides me with prompt comprehensive and constructive feedback on submitted written work.
20. Z30 My supervisor is supportive, encouraging and helpful.
21. Z31 My supervisor is interested in, and committed to, my research.
22. Z36 I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor is available for discussions/consultations when needed.
23. Z40 I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor is a source of new ideas for my research.
24. Z42 I am satisfied with my supervisor's expertise with regard to my research topic.
25. Z45 I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor helps me network with other researchers in my area.
26. Z46 I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor assists with publication of my research.
27. Z47 I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor encourages me to present my work at appropriate seminars and conferences.
28. Z48 I am satisfied with the degree to which my supervisor discusses issues of authorship with me.

Services and Support

29. My questions are answered in a timely, professional manner by the team in the Graduate Research School/Research Services.
30. I am aware of my rights and entitlements as a Higher Degree by Research candidate.
31. I am aware of the support services available to me as an HDR candidate at Federation University.
32. I am aware of the training and support available through the FedUni HDR Skills Development Program.
33. The FedUni HDR Skills Development Program provides training relevant to my study needs.
34. I have attended seminars and training sessions offered in the FedUni HDR Skills Development Program.
35. I am kept informed about things that are relevant to HDR candidates.

Library

36. The Liaison Librarian for my School has supported my progression through the program.
37. The Library's online resources and services have supported my progression through the program.

Supplementary

Please include: Tick box option for on-campus / off-campus

38. In the last 12 months have your studies been primarily on-campus or off-campus?
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Introduction
The Skills Development Program (SDP) was introduced in 2019, for the first time. The SDP is aimed at supporting Federation University Australia PhD and masters by research candidates to timely completion; and assists them to develop and document a suite of transferrable skills, useful across many fields of endeavor. This report presents participant attendance and evaluation data from the 2019 SDP.

Seminar Evaluation Data
All SDP seminars and occasional session attendance and participant evaluations for 2019 are outlined in this report. In some cases no participant evaluations were gathered for a particular face-to-face session. The usual reason for this was there were only small numbers of participants in session, which could have led to issues with respondent anonymity. The vast majority of quantitative evaluations outlined in this report used a five point Likert-type scale, with higher scores out of five representing agreement, satisfaction etc. The First Year program is presented first, followed by the Second and Third year program, which are then followed by occasional/pop-up workshops and the baseline survey for the longitudinal study of the introduction of the SDP.
# First Year Program

## SDP C01 Graduate Research School Orientation (Sessions held March and August 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Attendees/respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mt Helen & Churchill face-to-face | The length of the session was appropriate  
How satisfied are you with this session  
The session was well organised  
This session helped me to better understand the process of a Higher Degree by Research at FedUni反转 scale may have caused problem)  
The seminar helped me to identify key Graduate Research School & Research Services staff (reversed scale may have caused problem)  
The session helped to reduce my anxiety level (if applicable)  
The orientation seminar will help me to prepare for my HDR journey  
I was shown how to access Moodle and other online resources (reversed scale may have caused problem) | 4.48 / 5  
4.64  
4.78  
4.73  
3.85  
3.40 (n/a = 8) | Mt Helen n = 29 attendees  
Churchill n = 7 attendees  
Respondents n = 33 |
| Webinar |  | n = 7 attendees  
Respondents n = 0 |
| Recording | Viewed and assessment completed |  | n = 13  
Respondents n = 0 |

"How could we improve this GRS Orientation Seminar": (face-to-face) Satisfactory content; nothing it was great; Seems session needs more time; Maybe needed to be longer to incorporate discussion; It was all good and very interesting; This form would be better if the agree/disagree were at the same end; Less policy ref we get it and trust you; Discuss moodle; It was very informative; PERFECT; It was great for an opening/induction session.
## SDP B01 Transferable skills for researchers A (Sessions held March and August 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.57 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 19 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content of this session was useful</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>Churchill n = 6 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with this face-to-face session</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>Respondents n = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13 &amp; August 28</td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The venue was appropriate</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at the SDP sessions enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow HDR candidates</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was able to identify gaps in my skill set by attending this SDP session</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session helped me to identify skills useful in the progression of my candidature</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session has helped me to identify transferable skills which will be useful to me after completion of my higher degree by research</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>n = 9 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content of this session was useful</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Respondents n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with this webinar session</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at the SDP sessions enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow HDR candidates</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was able to identify gaps in my skill set by attending this SDP session</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session helped me to identify skills useful in the progression of my candidature</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session has helped me to identify transferable skills which will be useful to me after completion of my higher degree by research</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>n = 7 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content of this session was useful</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Respondents n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with this recorded session</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at the SDP sessions enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow HDR candidates</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was able to identify gaps in my skill set by attending this SDP session</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This session helped me to identify skills useful in the progression of my candidature
This session has helped me to identify transferable skills which will be useful to me after completion of my higher degree by research

“Is there anything that you would like to tell us?”: (face-to-face) No great session, Valuable Thank you!; n/a; Thanks for the reminder to discuss with supervisor; Thank you, I am enjoying these sessions; They help to keep me motivated!!; (webinar) The Skills Audit had less relevance to me than for other younger candidates. The tool is very long and somewhat repetitive (recording) thank you!

SDP B02 Managing your time and staying healthy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.44 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 12 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar Venue was appropriate</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>Churchill n = 6 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content of this session was useful</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>Respondents n = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session will assist with my time management</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session alerted me to the support that is available</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session alerted me to potential implications on HDR health</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session alerted me to the risk of non-completion and the importance of 'timely completion'</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session will assist me to avoid stress and to deal with stressors that may occur during my degree</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>n = 4 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the webinar format/access for this session</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Respondents n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content of this session was useful</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session will assist with my time management</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session alerted me to the support that is available</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session alerted me to potential implications on HDR health</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session alerted me to the risk of non-completion and the importance of 'timely completion'</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session will assist me to avoid stress and to deal with stressors that may occur during my degree</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates.

Recording
- The length of the session was appropriate: 4.30
- How satisfied are you with the webinar format/access for this session: 4.00
- The content of this session was useful: 3.80
- The session was well organised: 4.00
- There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions: 3.50
- The session will assist with my time management: 4.30
- The session alerted me to the support that is available: 3.80
- The session alerted me to potential implications on HDR health: 4.30
- This session alerted me to the risk of non-completion and the importance of 'timely completion': 4.50
- This session will assist me to avoid stress and to deal with stressors that may occur during my degree: 4.00
- Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates: 3.80

n = 12 attendees
Respondents n = 4
Viewed and assessment completed

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?": (face-to face) Not a reflection of the class (evaluation scores), JUST hard for me to change; Fantastic strategies Thank you!; Great stuff to refresh and learn; A 5-10min walking/stretching break would be great; (recording) Nothing about sickness.

SDP C02 Support services for HDR candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.42 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 10 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar Venue was appropriate</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Churchill n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>Respondents n = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session alerted me to the range of services that are available to me via Student Connect &amp; Library</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session helped me to identify key staff in Student Connect &amp; the Library</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session helped me to feel more comfortable about approaching the Student Connect &amp; Library teams for assistance</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to feel supported by FedUni</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>n = 4 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the webinar format/access for this session</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Respondents n = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session alerted me to the range of services that are available to me via Student Connect &amp; Library</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session helped me to identify key staff in Student Connect &amp; the Library</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session helped me to feel more comfortable about approaching the Student Connect &amp; Library teams for assistance</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to feel supported by FedUni</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>n = 18 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the recorded format/access for this session</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Respondents n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session alerted me to the range of services that are available to me via Student Connect &amp; Library</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session helped me to identify key staff in Student Connect &amp; the Library</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session helped me to feel more comfortable about approaching the Student Connect &amp; Library teams for assistance</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to feel supported by FedUni</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?": (face-to-face) I learned more tricks for library searching, which will be very helpful; (recording) Doctor Watson also provided additional valuable information such as discussing sourcing original documentation and the benefits of using library support such as document delivery, data bases, subject guides and search functions. Very valuable when starting out.
**SDP A01 Research frameworks and methodologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.38 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 13 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar Venue was appropriate</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>Churchill n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>Respondents n = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alerted me to the importance of having the various elements of a project aligned</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session described what a conceptual framework is and how they are used</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session described quantitative and qualitative research and how they are underpinned by different epistemologies</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session alerted me to the fact that there is no one “correct” way to do research</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Webinar: No webinar for this seminar

Recording: No recording for this seminar

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?" (face-to-face) I think the v diagram will be very useful! Another excellent session.
# SDP A02 Writing the literature review

## Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.39 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 16 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar Venue was appropriate</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>Churchill n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>Berwick n = 7 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session assisted my understanding of the literature review process</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session will assist me with my literature review</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>Respondents n = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>n = 2 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the webinar format/access for this session</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Respondents n = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session assisted my understanding of the literature review process</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session will assist me with my literature review</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>n = 6 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the recording format/access for this session</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Respondents n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session assisted my understanding of the literature review process</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session will assist me with my literature review</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?": (face-to-face) Very informative; Very appropriate. Excellent to assist understanding of the lit review process; Very informative session; It could have been more useful if it was given (unable to determine word) the (unable to determine word) of candidature; Well prepared thanks Wendy; Thankyou Wendy! Room a bit small; Good, Useful and interesting session. Venue a little tight; Would like to have same mode of presentation in future. Thanks; Fantastic input from fellow PhD masters students; I was able to see that what I have been doing is useful when planning for lit review; (recording) Two of the questions were not applicable for a recorded webinar.
### Location
- **Mt Helen & Churchill**
  - **Face-to-face**
  - **May 1 & Sept 11**
- **Webinar**
- **Recording**

### Question
- The length of the session was appropriate
- Seminar Venue was appropriate
- The content in this session was useful
- The session was well organised
- There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions
- This session gave me insight into the confirmation of candidature process at FedUni
- This session helped to reduce my anxiety in regard to confirmation of candidature (if applicable)
- This session will help me prepare for my confirmation of candidature

### Mean Score
- **4.40 / 5**
- **4.57**
- **4.60**
- **4.73**
- **4.67**
- **4.73**
- **4.46 (n/a = 4)**
- **4.55**
- **5.00**
- **5.00**
- **5.00**
- **5.00**
- **5.00**
- **5.00**
- **5.00**

### Number of participants
- Mt Helen n = 25
- Churchill n = 6
- Berwick n = 7
- Respondents = 30
- n = 6 attendees
- Respondents n = 2
- n = 13 attendees
- Viewed and assessment completed

### “Is there anything that you would like to tell us?”
- **(Face-to-face)** Useful to have models provided by successful candidates; Thank you; Very good; Very informative and relevant session; This was excellent; Well taught, Thanks Wendy; Very relevant to my current timing of my candidature; Very useful; Great variety of presenters;  
- **(Webinar)** A good opportunity to get details and hear from someone just going through the process.
### SDP D01 Managing the supervisory ( & other) research relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.56 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 13 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar Venue was appropriate</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>Churchill n = 5 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Respondents n = 16 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to better understand the supervisory roles</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session helped me to think about my role</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session will help me to avoid supervisor issues and if they do occur I know that support is available</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session alerted me to the fact that I am responsible for driving this project forward</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session alerted me to the importance of engagement with others and building supportive professional networks</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>n = 4 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the recoded format/access for this session</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to better understand the supervisory roles</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session helped me to think about my role</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session will help me to avoid supervisor issues and if they do occur I know that support is available</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session alerted me to the fact that I am responsible for driving this project forward</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session alerted me to the importance of engagement with others and building supportive professional networks</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recording**

- The length of the session was appropriate: 5.00
- How satisfied are you with the recoded format/access for this session: 5.00
- The content in this session was useful: 5.00
- The session was well organised: 5.00
- There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions: 5.00
- The session assisted me to better understand the supervisory roles: 5.00
- The session helped me to think about my role: 5.00
- The session will help me to avoid supervisor issues and if they do occur I know that support is available: 5.00
- This session alerted me to the fact that I am responsible for driving this project forward: 5.00
- Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates: 5.00
- This session alerted me to the importance of engagement with others and building supportive professional networks: 5.00

**Viewed and assessment completed**

- Respondents n = 1

---

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?": (face-to-face) What is required to become a superior; Thank you very much; Highlighting that we are the driver of the project was nice to hear as well as knowing there is support if the supervisor relationships not working. Would have been better to have this session earlier in the program. Did not know you could ask to record meetings - will have to look into it because it will be helpful to jog my memory.
## SDP D02 Presenting your research with confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>The seminar was … Well organised (n = 11); of a high standard (n = 5); Informative (n = 7); Of a suitable length (n = 3); Thought provoking (n = 4); Nil response (n = 0) The learning outcomes were clearly identified and achieved The content of the session (resources / activities / etc) were relevant to my needs I gained new ideas / insights I feel that I will be able to use this information Overall I am satisfied with the content of this seminar The presenter appears knowledgeable in the subject area and communicates content clearly The presenter caters for participants prior knowledge and answers questions effectively and comprehensively The presenter’s pedagogy is consistent and effective to the mode of delivery</td>
<td>4.6 / 5 4.9 4.6 4.3 4.9 4.9 4.5 4.7</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 12 attendees Churchill n = 5 attendees Respondents n = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 1 attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Is there anything that you would like to tell us?” (face-to-face)** The technology was a little unreliable for the videos, otherwise very good (Gippsland attendee); A very valuable session; Great work, more time, longer session; Good stage presence. Well done; Loved the Don McMillan video.
### SDP B03 Purposefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.8 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 10 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar Venue was appropriate</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Churchill n = 5 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Respondents n = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session provided tools and techniques that will assist me with</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintaining focus during HDR candidature</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session helped me to identify and harness personal motivation</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that will assist with HDR success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This seminar will help me overcome barriers to HDR success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill</td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Webinar

- Viewed and assessment completed

Recording

- Viewed and assessment completed

---

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?": (face-to-face) Possibly too short, but good introduction to subject; Loved it !! Thankyou; Thank you!; Thought provoking content, just a very short time to cover it all; Thank you very much! ;); Not long enough - Boot Camp; Fantastic session; interesting but I don't feel my way of working will change much. A reflection of me, not the session; I would like a longer all day session. This was a really great session - I really enjoyed it; Longer; Structure, clearer, too long - brushed over, too slow - more practical. Take-away; Thank you!!.
### SDP C03 Preparing the ethics application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>5.0 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 7 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Churchill n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Respondents n = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session will assist me to prepare an ethics application if required</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session will give me more greater confidence to prepare an ethics application</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This seminar helped to familiarise me with the application and application process</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>No webinar for this seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>No recording for this seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?": (face-to-face) There was no-one else here; David presented really well & made the ethics process seem less daunting than it was last year in honours; Excellent seminar; ETHICS needs to core as everyone needs to fully understand.

### SDP D07 Five minute thesis presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 5 presentation attendees</td>
<td>n = 20 lunch attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill &amp; Berwick</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 5 presentation attendees</td>
<td>n = 15 lunch attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Second & Third Year Program

#### SDP C05 Planning for timely completion (Sessions held March and August 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face March 13 &amp; August 7</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>4.71 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>Churchill n = 7 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>Respondents n = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session provided tools and techniques that will assist me with timely completion</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session explained what timely completion is and why it is important</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Is there anything that you would like to tell us?” (face-to-face) A really worthwhile session - thank you Wendy; Interesting session, made very clear the importance of planning and setting clear objectives.
## SDP B05 Constructing the thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>4.88 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 9 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Churchill n = 2 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>Respondents n = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session provided examples of thesis structure that will assist me to develop my own thesis plan</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 0 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?": (face-to-face) Thesis by publications support/workshop; Unfortunately there were limited numbers regarding attendance so networking with other fellow candidates was limited.
### SDP D03 Professional poster presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>5.00 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assisted me to reflect on making a presentation</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seminar will assist me to make a better presentation</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seminar will help me prepare for the next time I give a presentation</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>No webinar for this seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>No recording for this seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recording**: No recording for this seminar

**Webinar**: No webinar for this seminar

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?":

## SDP C04 Management of research data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session&lt;br&gt;The length of the session was appropriate&lt;br&gt;The content in this session was useful&lt;br&gt;The session was well organised&lt;br&gt;There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions&lt;br&gt;The session provided me with information that will help me to securely store my data&lt;br&gt;The session alerted me to software that can help me save and share data&lt;br&gt;Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>5.00 / 5&lt;br&gt;4.33&lt;br&gt;5.00&lt;br&gt;4.67&lt;br&gt;4.67&lt;br&gt;4.67&lt;br&gt;4.00&lt;br&gt;4.33&lt;br&gt;4.00</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 4&lt;br&gt;Churchill n = 0&lt;br&gt;Respondents n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 1 attendee&lt;br&gt;Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 0 attendees&lt;br&gt;Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Is there anything that you would like to tell us?”:
## SDP D04 Connection – how to create a support team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>4.83 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Churchill n = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Respondents n = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to develop interpersonal skills</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to develop my communication skills</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 4 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Is there anything that you would like to tell us?”: (face-to-face) Very good session; Learnt a great deal about connections; The session could have been longer. Great presenter; This was a gentle approach to inspiring insights. Much to think about; This was not what I expected but so much more useful than I anticipated, thank you Steb.
# SDP C06 Preparing a grant application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Helen &amp;</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Mt. Helen n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Churchill n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Respondents n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to identify funding sources</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to develop the skill of writing successful grants proposals</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>No webinar for this seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>No recording for this seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Is there anything that you would like to tell us?: (face-to-face) Very timely for my stage of my PhD."
## SDP D05 Navigating the world of publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp;</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>5.00 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 1 attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Churchill n = 2 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Respondents n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to identify where to publish</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session assisted me to know how to get my work published</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 1 attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Is there anything that you would like to tell us?”: (face-to-face) Thank you; Very helpful, thank you.
SDP B07 Writing Boot Camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivered at Mt Helen with Churchill HDRs travelling (face-to-face)</td>
<td>The process to submit an expression of interest was appropriate</td>
<td>4.80 / 5</td>
<td>n = 21 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied are you with information provided prior to the Boot Camp</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>Respondents n = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The venue for the Boot Camp was suitable</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The accommodation provided was suitable</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Boot Camp was well organised</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at the Boot Camp will assist me to submit sooner</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The support at the Boot Camp was sufficient for my needs</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There was appropriate food provided</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was able to get the writing done that I had planned</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would recommend the Boot Camp to other HDR candidates</td>
<td>Yes = 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How could the Boot Camp be improved?: (face-to-face) Perhaps it would be good to have some opportunity to participate in group activities as part of an active break - like the option to go on a group walk around the campus etc.; Name tags for participants; I met so many wonderful people and I kept forgetting their names; I think it was well orchestrated, but perhaps name tags for attendees; it was well organised (but we had to drive from Churchill) Berwick would be better; Plunger coffee, more substantial food the second night; Better food (healthier) and tea and coffee; A little bit more structure during the day - the flexibility was nice, but for me was a bit too much time without structured breaks to talk without disturbing anyone. The Sunday morning tea break was great for this purpose. Maybe an extra morning/afternoon tea set break on the Saturday? or one room set aside for people who want to use ‘pomodoro’ (timer) in a group?; Hold another one; None. For me it was wonderful; Move to Berwick and discuss quality of writing as well as word count; If there was an optional writing class or a sharing of writing structuring/planning techniques that would also be of benefit; I suggest running it more regularly. This has been invaluable for me and while I may not submit sooner, I am more likely to submit on time. I think if the University wants to be a presence outside of Ballarat, there needs to be a commitment to making the Boot Camp easier for people to get to. Melbourne is a good option. I think it's poor to expect the same people to travel from Gippsland and Berwick every time. This speaks more to the culture of the University; I thought it was great to have the election on as somewhere to go on Sat to reset my brain for a minute. I think it would be good to have a show or movie on in that room if you did this boot camp again, just as a reset space where it's ok to chat and your brain can be distracted with something light for a little while. I would also freshen the learning spaces each day by opening windows and wiping tables just to give the space a lift for each day - PS: obviously totally overthinking this question! Thanks again I've loved it. It's given me a big confidence boost to know that I have it in me to do this project; It was a well organised Camp; Unfortunately I arrived late as the start time was unrealistic. I missed the welcome and introduction, with the aims and motivation speaker and so I felt unsupported. We were told we would have get-togethers and sharing which we did not have, which I was very disappointed about. I find the sharing of study and writing tips very helpful and it was something I was hoping to get more of. I found the hints at the end of Saturday great. I know you were hesitant to stop people working, but also we needed breaks and if we had stuck to the original plan I would have planned my breaks around that. I need mini goals, my supervisors did not give me them so I was hoping to get them here. I did end up sharing my mini goals with the people from my accommodation, but I would have liked us to do this formally, maybe in small groups, several times over the weekend; Perhaps look at catering? E.g. Multigrain instead of white bread, muesli instead of (sweetened) Kellogg’s products and avoidance of snacks that have excessive unnecessary wrapping. As a University that includes health courses, social responsibility should be observed.

Do you have anything that you would like to share about this Boot Camp experience?: (face-to-face) It was great and very helpful!; I really enjoyed the boot camp. It really assisted me to get a large amount of words written that would have taken me weeks otherwise. I’d be happy to write a longer piece if needed to help Research Services to apply for funding to run it again. Or write up a case study or the like to encourage participants for next time; It was great; Thank you so much! I was very much looking forward to it and it hasn't disappointed; start writing earlier on Friday and continue later on Sunday; It was a fantastic opportunity get a large chunk of writing done, it felt like a milestone, and it was so lovely to have a chance to properly chat with other HDR students from all different areas and campuses. Thank you so much!; It was a good space and gave good motivation to get things
done; I cannot commend Research Services highly enough for organising this event. For me, the benefits arose from the collegiality of being among other PhDs and being able to share our experiences, but also from being in an environment where others were working. For those of us who predominately work from home, it was nice to have a break from the isolation. Being away from home meant that I was away from home-related and family-related distractions. Having Sharon and Rob there meant that when I became stuck in my language and needed some vocabulary inspiration, I had someone to ask and read over the work that I had produced. Excellent event and practical. The food and accommodation were convenient and the break times to eat again gave us all an opportunity to talk and share our experiences. I found this to be of much greater value than the HDR conference. Do it again next semester! Great collegiality. Rob and Sharon very approachable and flexible and made us all welcome. Very quiet workspace; it was an excellent and productive experience thank you; it was great, well organised and I hope that I feel the benefits over the coming months as I get closer to submission; The facilitators were fantastic. Thank you Rob and Sharon. You have obviously put a lot of time and effort into making this work. I feel more confident and hopeful about my writing. Sharing and learning with other students has been helpful. I think most people would be happy to contribute toward the cost of the Boot Camp if it meant more regular ones are available; Thanks for the thoughtful organization of this event. I really appreciated the healthy food provided and the mix of structure and flexibility e.g.: I felt comfortable leaving the writing sessions when I needed fresh air. Rob is so positive and he added a good energy to the shared space, even though I didn’t chat with him about my work specifically. He speaks to students in such an encouraging way. I would value more opportunities to attend similar sessions, even if we were asked to pay for accommodation and contribute to meals; This is my first time in the Boot Camp. It is a nice experience and very useful. I would definitely recommend to other HDR's who are at their writing phase. Looking forward to participate in next year's Boot Camp. Thanks Rob and Sharon for support and Fed Uni for organising this camp; The preparation for the weekend was very helpful. Filling in the forms, estimating how much we had done on each section of the thesis, was very helpful. Setting goals for the start of the retreat was great, and encouraging us to talk to our supervisors about this was very helpful. The food on the weekend was terrible. We had been told to bring snacks, and I carefully brought health snacks, and then you put junk food on the table. I should have been able to resist but while doing the difficult job of writing I could not. Because of the junk food by concentration decreased over the Saturday. This fact is good to know I suppose. The plastic and foam cups and plates were terrible. The food etc. could have been separate so I was not so tempted, and also so there was a place to chat if needed. The breakfast was lovely, thank you. The accommodation was fine. Thank you for organising this weekend. I know clearly a few more points about my study needs; Rob Watson should be commended for his organisation, planning and implementation of this event [as should Sharyn].
## SDP C07 Demystifying thesis examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen &amp; Churchill face-to-face</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>5.00 / 5</td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 1 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seminar will assist me to understand the examination process</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seminar will help me to prepare my thesis for examination</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seminar will help me to prepare psychologically for the examination period</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the mode of access for this session</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>n = 5 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The length of the session was appropriate</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Respondents n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content in this session was useful</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The session was well organised</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were appropriate opportunities for discussion and to ask questions</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seminar will assist me to understand the examination process</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seminar will help me to prepare my thesis for examination</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seminar will help me to prepare psychologically for the examination period</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at this SDP session enabled me to connect with and/or form support networks among my fellow candidates</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Viewed and assessment completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents n = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Is there anything that you would like to tell us?”: (face to face) Excellent presentation - thankyou!; (webinar) It wasn't possible to hear the audio from Andrew who was the only person other than me who spoke. Maybe a problem his end, maybe not. It would be great to encourage people to talk as this would help build a network. It's so interesting finding out the mad things people research! As a first year candidate I participated out of availability of time and found it very beneficial for looking what the end goal should look like. Knowing the required standard expected at the end will make my journey more understandable.
**SDP B09 Career planning – recognizing your skills**
As there were no registrations for the face-to-face session was cancelled. A webinar and recording were provided but no participation has been evident.

**SDP B10 Career planning – resumes and the selection criteria**
As there were no registrations for the face-to-face session was cancelled. A webinar and recording were provided but no participation has been evident.

**SDP D06 Research seminar, 3MT or spoken conference presentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 53 presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SDP Using SPSS to create Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td>No evaluation done for this workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 8 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>No evaluation done for this workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 4 attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SDP Using SPSS to create inferential Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen</td>
<td>No evaluation done for this workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 8 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>No evaluation done for this workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 4 attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Setting Up the thesis in Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moodle</td>
<td>No evaluation done for this workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 5 attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Endnote Training (Library)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>No evaluation done for this workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 11 attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3MT (Workshop and Heat)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Helen, Churchill &amp; Berwick</td>
<td>No evaluation done for this workshop and heat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Helen n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Churchill n = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berwick n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heat participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SDP Longitudinal Study: Baseline Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean Score/ Frequency/Response</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All      | What mode of study are you planning to utilise for your Higher Degree by Research? My intention is to:  
• Attend the minimum number of Skills Development Program (SDP) sessions in order to meet the requirements  
• Attend as many SDP sessions as I can  
• I'm not sure about my intentions regarding attendance at SDP sessions  
How do you feel about being required to complete mandatory research skills training during your candidature?  
Do you think that mandatory training during candidature will help you complete the degree successfully?  
Do you think that mandatory training during candidature will help you complete the degree in a timely manner?  
Do you have any concerns about mandatory training during candidature?  
When I attend SDP sessions, I intend to participate mostly:  
• Face-to-face at Gippsland  
• Face-to-face at Mt Helen  
• Via Webinar  
• Via recordings  
The SDP sessions seem to be designed to help me achieve successful and timely completion of my higher degree by research  
The SDP sessions seem to be designed to help me to fill gaps in my skills set that are relevant to my candidature  
The SDP sessions will be a useful way for me to connect with my fellow HDR candidates and to form and maintain support networks among my peers  
Written comments for “Do you think that mandatory training during candidature will help you to get a job after graduation?”: The theory bears no relation to the practice. Supervisors do what they please; potential conflicts depending on days/times (with regard to scheduling); i think its important that supporting training be provided; I am not doing a PhD for reasons of career advancement or translatable skills.  
Written comments for “Is there anything that you would like to tell us”: Need more SDP session at Berwick please; No; It would be a great opportunity if I had the opportunity to follow a few postgraduate courses closely related to the research work. If we can get some internship opportunities during our candidature, that would increase the job opportunities immensely. I think this is far more important for international students; Not at this early stage; it would be better if some sessions include hands-on tasks; better if you can introduce research discussion (research groups); will be good to learn from others and share to experience but wont be able to attend sessions consistently; as Berwick campus grows it would be useful to have some or all sessions duplicated at Berwick campus; I am 80 years old and have had considerable research and presentation experience; I have already made a connection from the Induction session which is one of the aims of the Skills program | n = 1 | n = 27 as of the 12/11/2019  
average (̅x) of 9 from a possible score of 10 (very positive)  
̅x = 4.3 (5 = strongly agree)  
̅x = 4.1 (5 = strongly agree)  
̅x = 3.7 (5= strongly agree)  
No = 85%, responses below | n = 25 | n = 1 |
NVivo online course’s access codes distributed

Each year Federation University receives 50 free training places, as part of our licence agreement with QSR International (NVivo program). The GRS has been responsible for management of these places for last few years. In 2019 (as of Nov 26th), 34 places have been allocated by the GRS. Given that some of these allocations may have accessed the two training programs available for free use, we may have almost filled our allocation of 50 places at this time (this can only be determined by QSR and we are then informed when our allocation of free places has been exhausted).
There were 56 respondents to the 2019 HDR physical facilities survey (Mt Helen n = 33; Berwick n = 7; SMB n = 4; Camp St n = 2; Churchill n = 9; and Horsham n = zero). Of these respondents, 20 were from the School of Arts, 11 from the School of Education, 14 from the School of Health and Life Sciences, 3 from The Business School and 7 from the School of Nursing and Health Care Professionals.

Item 3 asked “If you had one wish regarding physical facilities on your campus for HDR candidates, what would it be? The response themes and open responses given for this item are outlined in Table 1. It is disturbing that some of these requests are for things that should already be available currently. For example, an Mt Helen based candidate from TBS requested 24 hr office access, SHaLS and TBS candidates wanted workstation access, SoA candidates asked for printer access, SHaLS and SoA candidates asked for more storage space. Such responses demonstrates that either minimum resources are not being provided or that schools are not making their candidates aware that such resources are available to them. The responses to this and other items indicate that while a new space has been mentioned, there appear to be issues with the workspaces and resources currently being provided to HDR candidates.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happy with what is provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with the physical facilities on my campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just want to say that the SMB library is amazing and I love it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The offices are fantastic already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am mostly working off campus and when I am on campus, I am based at CeRDI. I come to the main Mt Helen Campus to go to the Library. I haven't found anywhere to get a decent coffee... but i don't mind too much. I do love the gardens and bushland on campus. I can't say i have any strong wish for anything more than what's already provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain the Collaborative Research Centre in Australian History. It provides a fantastic [albeit boutique] learning environment under the stewardship of Prof. Keir Reeves and the other committed supervisors and the HDR students associated with the Centre are all committed to their respective research areas and supportive of their colleagues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to minimum resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proper desk and office space for nursing PhD students at Berwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hour Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More accessible printers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That it is near the education department and other education candidates so that I can have discussions with staff and students about education and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students were close to the Academics to provide support and a community feel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would to have a HDR hot desk area, so that we could drop in to use space when needed (Mt Helen, FBS)

Space - a largish desk and perhaps the ability to leave material here - maybe a locker or something

Opportunity to meet other students

a dedicated desk and computer station

More fresh air in the E building study space

A hdr room with hot desks you can book online

**Issues with current HDR spaces**

Walls which are sound proof

Quiet space with workstations next to a tea room for socialising

Not to have to have our desks in the stuffy E engineering building! It feels like a basement

A personal desk in a quiet area with storage for study & personal items, reliable IT equipment and printer access based on needs not enrolment status. Part-time students who do not live near Ballarat are not allocated a permanent desk while full-time students living in Ballarat who work from home are allocated a desk

A space to both work and relax in a professional, quiet, has a range of amenities and is secure

A quiet space

own personal area, not communal
desk and lounge space combined - replicate home environment

Separate office space

Storage space

A properly enclosed kitchenette separate from an open work area that allows for a little more food prep than microwaving. Such a kitchenette should include ventilation in the form of a rangehood or similar. This would isolate noise and smells from the study area.

more accessible for wheel chair users

Permanent private room/office so that phone calls, presentation rehearsals etc can be made without disturbing other students.

Office that is cleaned

Upgrade of current office with new office cabinets

Close proximity to supervisors/academic staff

**New resources or initiatives**

Communal lounge - comfortable discussion room

Group meetings for similar Research interests

A lounge space - tea, coffee - chat & HDR dedicated noticeboard

Lounge to read papers and talk to other HDR students in

Some space for stress buster activities like table tennis or pool

Coffee Kiosk

A comfortable area to chat and read.

Quality affordable food court (Berwick)

A private space with lockable storage facilities, access to, printer, photocopying, telephone and fax facilities

A comfortable area very close to our office area, that combined both relaxing and having informal discussions about our work with colleagues, so that this does not need to happen within the office space, or in the break room, which can be too public.

A communal IT space with powerful computers for use in research (current laptops provided struggle to perform the tasks needed)

I would have liked a desk to work from at the Uni, rather than just my old office. While it was not necessary to be at the uni, when I only had writing to do it would have been a nice change and help to feel connected. but no essential

Designated HDR space with desks, computers and an area for students to meet, mingle and collaborate.

A quiet study space where one can safely leave books and bags (unlike the library where it is unsafe to leave anything.

Area for collaborative work connected to the library

Meeting space with resources
Item 4 asked for 6 options to be ranked (see table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A flexible researcher space with suitable IT facilities (e.g. conferencing, presenting and meeting resources)</td>
<td>Number 1, with an average score of 4.36/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A space to enable collaborations to occur (e.g. internally, externally and globally)</td>
<td>Number 2, with an average score of 4.12/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A HDR social space (e.g. informal space to relax, eat, talk and meet other candidates)</td>
<td>Number 3, with an average score of 4.06/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bookable space with state of the art information technology resources</td>
<td>Number 4, with an average score of 3.55/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A space where HDR candidates and other researchers could run their own research forums</td>
<td>Number 5, with an average score of 2.96/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A space for HDR candidates to engage directly with industry</td>
<td>Number 6, with an average score of 2.29/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 5 asked “Was there something missed in the previous question that you would like to tell us about”. The following open ended responses were given for this item.

- A assigned space which students could use regularly instead of hot desking
- Need to have separate Skype meeting room just for HDR candidates so that they are not disrupting other students who are studying
- Food Vending Machines for after hours when the cafeteria is closed
- A place for HDR students to run their own shut up and write sessions
- Up to date IT equipment on individual allocated desks in a study area. My desk PC cannot handle some of my large data files without causing slow PC speeds. Updates to software can take 1 hour to install and waste my work time
- The space should offer both private and security
- More room for personal storage for things like equipment. At My Helen we gave 2 x small lockers, but clearly people can’t fit all of their field gear etc in them as the equipment is against walls with ‘do not touch’ signs
- I like to have time without interruption, so I usually study at home on my own computer where no one can interrupt me. If I had a space at uni where I could "hide away" where no one can find me, I would probably go out there more often.
- Desk space to conduct work - although I know this may not work for all students
- The redevelopment of P Building is very good
- Adequate storage space for personal/confidential material
- HDR candidates to get more support from librarians, online information to book 1:1 with an available librarian
- Yes, along with hot desks, bookable quiet spaces for HDR. At a Uni I was at previously, the library had small bookable offices that you could book for 1 to 8 hours. It is great!
• just personal space and a desk
• An office/study space where one can leave things safely to go and get a coffee, go to a meeting etc
• The La Trobe University ‘Research Commons’ in Bundoora is a good mode
• A space to have coffee and social connections is nice but if it's a small space where you can't open the windows please let's NOT have a microwave in there. People eating heated up lunches in a shared enclosed space is really off-putting because of the smells. It becomes kind of gross and invasive. I would just never use the space if it was like that. Rather sit outside with warm clothes on.
• Access with other university academics
• The CRCAH is important as it serves as it is a supportive environment and the ideal size to remain so. Researchers fortunate enough to be placed their have a real sense of pride and connection with Federation.
• It would be nice just to have somewhere to work - if not a desk of my own then somewhere I could book that was private
• Quiet space to write is most important as well as access to assistance as required
• Yes, a simple space that remains quiet for reading and working would be very easy to provide. It could have a collaborative space adjoined, but really there is nowhere to simply go and read a book without encountering insane noise levels from undergrads and without being interrupted by other grad students to socialise. A flexible research space is a little vague - but it should include quiet and comfortable space to read.
• Collective Writing space that has strict and scheduled focused sessions
• How about something simple like your own desk, phone and lockable cupboard in a quiet setting

Eighteen respondents gave advice that they would be interested in taking part in follow-up interviews.