

HDR Academic Progress Procedure

Contents

Purpose.....	1
Applicable governance instruments.....	2
Procedure	2
1. Monitoring academic progress.....	2
2. Requirement for regular, recorded supervision meetings.....	2
3. Research plan	3
4. Formal Academic Progress Reviews of Candidature	3
5. Confirmation of Candidature.....	3
6. Annual Review of Progress	6
7. Candidature Management Plan.....	8
8. Program transfer (Masters by Research Degree to Doctoral Degree)	10
9. Program transfer (Doctoral Degree to Masters by Research Degree)	11
10. GRC Milestone Reports.....	12
11. Extension of Candidature	12
12. Show cause and cancellation of enrolment	13
13. Show cause and termination of candidature	14
14. Review of academic decisions proceedings	16
Related procedures	17
Versions	17
Definitions	17
Schedule A: Academic Progress Milestone Requirements.....	18
Schedule B: Confirmation of Candidature Outcomes	21
Schedule C: Annual Academic Progress Review Outcomes	22
Schedule D: Candidature Management Plan Outcomes	23
Schedule E: Show Cause Flowchart	24

Purpose

This procedure documents the processes for supporting and managing academic progress of HDR candidature. It applies to candidates enrolled in the University's Higher Degree Research (HDR) courses, their supervisors and academic unit of enrolment

This procedure does not apply to undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs or higher doctoral degrees.

Applicable governance instruments

Instrument	Section	Principles
<u>Research Training Ordinance</u>		
<u>Research Training Policy</u>	3 Academic support, resources and intellectual climate	3.1 – 3.3
	4 Candidature progression, development, and completion	4.1 – 4.4
<u>Research Policy</u>	2 Responsible conduct of research	2.1 – 2.2
<u>Compliance Policy</u>	2 Conflict of interest	2.1
<u>People Policy</u>	2 Inclusion, diversity, and equity	2.2
<u>Data and Information Governance Policy</u>	1 Privacy	1.1
<i>Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act (2000)</i> <i>Higher Education Support Act (2003)</i> <i>Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standard)</i> <i>University of Tasmania Act (1992)</i> <u>The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2018)</u>		

Procedure

1. Monitoring academic progress

- 1.1. Academic progress will be measured against core candidature and project specific milestones.
- 1.2. Core candidature milestones will be tracked and signed off using the candidature management tool iGRad including:
 - a. bi-monthly meetings
 - b. the research plan
 - c. confirmation of candidature (CoC)
 - d. annual reviews of progress (ARP), and
 - e. thesis submission.
- 1.3. The primary supervisor and Graduate Research Coordinator (GRC) will make detailed notes of candidature progress when signing off candidature milestones in iGRad.

2. Requirement for regular, recorded supervision meetings

- 2.1. The supervisory team will monitor their candidates:
 - a. overall academic progress against agreed milestones (including documenting any intervention strategies to support students at risk of not making satisfactory academic progress), and
 - b. preparedness for formal academic progress reviews and submission for examination.
- 2.2. Meetings between a candidate and one or more members of the supervisory team will play a critical role in monitoring candidature.
- 2.3. A candidate and supervisory team will agree on a supervision meeting schedule which may be revised depending on a candidate's study load and stage of candidature.

- 2.4. At minimum, a candidate and supervisory team will meet formally at least once every two months.
- 2.5. A candidate and their supervisory team will keep a written record of the key points and agreed actions resulting from supervision meetings, using the Supervisor Meeting Record Template (or equivalent). This document will be circulated to all members of the supervisory team and held on file for reference.
- 2.6. Where the supervisory team determines a candidate has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance as reported during a candidate and supervisory team meeting, the primary supervisor may recommend to the relevant GRC in a candidate's academic unit of enrolment that a candidature management plan (CMP) be developed and implemented, in accordance with Section 7.

3. Research plan

- 3.1. The research plan is a dynamic document and will be update throughout candidature.
- 3.2. Within the first three months of candidature, a candidate in consultation with their supervisory team, will develop a draft research plan and save this plan to iGrad. The draft plan will conform to disciplinary norms and at a minimum include those elements listed in *Schedule A: Academic Progress Milestone Requirements*.
- 3.3. Once satisfied with the draft research plan, the primary supervisor will advise the GRC who will action the relevant milestone in iGrad.

4. Formal Academic Progress Reviews of Candidature

- 4.1. Timely, successful completion of academic progress review milestones will be a key lead indicator of successful HDR outcomes.
- 4.2. A candidate's academic progress will be formally assessed by the supervisory team and GRC at regular intervals throughout candidature in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*.
- 4.3. A candidate who has transferred to the University from another institution may apply for an exemption from formal progress milestones (such as CoC and/or ARP), where the equivalent has been successfully completed at the previous institution. Applications for exemption should occur at the time of application for admissions, and must:
 - a. be made in writing to the Dean (via GRO)
 - b. have written support from the candidate's supervisory team, and
 - c. include evidence from the previous institution of successful completion of the equivalent milestones.
- 4.4. Overdue CoC and ARP milestones will be monitored by GRO and the Dean, with reports available to Academic Units via iGrad.

5. Confirmation of Candidature

Preparing to meet CoC requirements

- 5.1. The purpose of CoC is to assess a candidate's academic preparedness, capacity and capability to successfully complete the HDR within the maximum degree period. That assessment will review evidence of satisfactory academic progress and a candidate's ability to:
 - a. develop a clearly defined research plan at the level acceptable for HDR candidature and appropriate for the research discipline

- b. write in English (and an approved Australian Indigenous Language, in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*, if relevant) at the HDR standard in a style and format appropriate for the discipline
 - c. concisely and coherently present their research in English at a public forum in a style and format appropriate for the discipline
 - d. constructively participate in peer review by receiving critique and defend their work
 - e. complete mandatory coursework to the required standard, and
 - f. meet any discipline specific requirements that have been documented within the first three months of candidature.
- 5.2. In order to have candidature confirmed, a candidate will fulfil the requirements to an appropriate disciplinary standard for their HDR as set out in *Schedule A: Academic Progress Milestone Requirements* and within the timeframes in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*.
- 5.3. Where individual disciplines require additional requirements to pass CoC, the GRC will ensure discipline specific guidance on those requirements are provided to candidates and their supervisory team in the first three (3) months of candidature.
- 5.4. A candidate will not progress to confirmation where the following compulsory induction requirements have not been satisfactorily completed:
- a. the HDR Induction MyLO module
 - b. Research Integrity at the University of Tasmania (RIEU101) MyLO module
 - c. Safety and Wellbeing Induction MyLO module, and
 - d. Human and/or Animal Research Ethics training MyLO module where applicable.

Confirmation due date

- 5.5. Unless Section 5.7 applies, CoC will occur within the timeframes in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*, regardless of whether a candidate is deemed by the supervisory team to be adequately prepared for that assessment. Inability to submit work on time for CoC and/or failure by a candidate to undertake the confirmation process by the due date does not qualify as grounds to delay CoC and may indicate that the candidate is at risk of not making satisfactory progress. In such cases the CoC meeting should be used to assess a candidate's capacity and capability to successfully complete the HDR within the maximum degree period as per Section 5.1 of this procedure.
- 5.6. A candidate may request to delay the CoC due date for reasons beyond their control, that are directly related to the conduct of their research project, and that are not of a personal nature, and may do so for up to:
- a. six (6) weeks (equivalent full-time) for a Masters by Research candidate, or
 - b. three (3) months (equivalent full-time) for a Doctoral candidate.
- 5.7. The request to delay CoC will be in writing, will have the support of the primary supervisor and will be considered by the Dean.

Preparing for the CoC meeting

- 5.8. At least two (2) weeks prior to the CoC milestone due by date:
- a. a candidate will complete their CoC Report in iGRad, including as attachments:
 - i. their revised research plan
 - ii. their substantial piece of written work

- iii. evidence of their understanding of their research ethics responsibilities and any ethical considerations, and/or ethics application, and/or approval (if relevant), and
 - iv. any other confirmation requirements as set out in the letter of offer.
- b. on behalf of the supervisory team, the primary supervisor will complete the Supervisor CoC Report in iGRad.
- 5.9. Once both supervisor and candidate forms have been received by the GRC, the GRC will appoint persons to the CoC Committee, with membership as per Section 5.12 of this procedure.
- 5.10. Before inviting the external CoC Committee member to attend the CoC meeting, the GRC will give the primary supervisor and candidate opportunity to provide the GRC with a written request to justify excluding from the CoC Committee any person external to the supervision team for that candidate's CoC.
- 5.11. The CoC Committee membership will include:
 - a. a Chair, who will be the candidate's GRC
 - b. all members of the supervisory team, and
 - c. one additional member external to the supervisory team, who will be an experienced registered supervisor from a College within the University, and
 - d. may include up to two additional subject-matter experts relevant to the research, who may be internal or external to the University.
- 5.12. The GRC must ensure there is no potential, perceived or actual conflict of interest within and between the committee members and a candidate.
- 5.13. In accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*, any support person present nominated by the candidate to be present at the CoC meeting will be nominated in advance in the candidate report submitted in iGRad.
- 5.14. The GRC will provide the CoC Committee with a candidate's CoC documentation for critical review to be completed prior to the CoC meeting.

Oral presentation

- 5.15. The GRC will ensure appropriate and timely opportunities for a candidate's oral presentation are scheduled. Where it is not possible or feasible to hold the presentation in person, a candidate may give the oral presentation remotely via video conferencing so long as audience questions can still be taken.
 - a. the duration of a candidate's oral presentation will normally be an hour, which includes at least 20 minutes for the oral presentation, additional question time and time for the review panel to discuss a candidate's work and agree on the main points for the milestone report, and on the feedback to be provided to a candidate.
 - b. a candidate will be provided with informal feedback immediately following their presentation.
 - c. the Chair will invite a candidate to provide confidential feedback on their candidature and supervision after the review presentation, without the supervisory team present. A candidate may also submit feedback on their supervisory experience in their iGRad CoC Report. Any record of feedback will remain confidential between a candidate, Chair and GRO, unless the candidate permits disclosure.

CoC meeting

- 5.16. As soon as possible, and no later than one week after the oral presentation, the GRC will convene the CoC meeting with a candidate and committee members in attendance. The meeting may occur in any format agreeable to those involved (including remotely via phone or video conferencing).
- 5.17. Where a member of the supervisory team is unable to attend the meeting, the GRC must be satisfied that all members of the supervisory team have been able to provide comments on a candidate's academic performance and progress.
- 5.18. The CoC committee must:
 - a. consider the criteria set out in Section 5.1 of this procedure
 - b. consider whether a candidate has fulfilled the confirmation requirements as set out in *Schedule A: Academic Progress Milestone Requirements*
 - c. provide detailed, written feedback to the candidate on their academic progress to date
 - d. review the Supervision Conflict of Interest Management Action Plan (if relevant), and
 - e. make a recommendation about a Confirmation Outcome, as set out in *Schedule B: Confirmation of Candidature Outcomes*.
- 5.19. The GRC will submit the GRC CoC Report in iGrad within one week of the confirmation meeting occurring, and include:
 - a. the names of committee members present
 - b. a summary of progress and issues discussed, and
 - c. the confirmation outcome.

CoC outcomes

- 5.20. A candidate who passes confirmation is regarded as having made satisfactory progress.
- 5.21. Where the CoC committee recommends a candidate be granted a three-month (full-time equivalent) extension to the confirmation period the GRC must provide details of the work outstanding, and the due date for the second CoC attempt. A candidate will be provided with appropriate support to prepare for a second CoC attempt under a Candidature Management Plan (CMP) in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance* and Section 7 of this procedure. CoC can only be repeated once.
- 5.22. Where the CoC committee recommends that a candidate apply to transfer their candidature to a Doctoral degree (Masters by Research candidates only), refer to Section 8.3 of this procedure.
- 5.23. Where the CoC committee recommends that a candidature be transferred to a Masters by Research degree (Doctoral candidates only), refer to Section 9.3 of this procedure.
- 5.24. Where the CoC committee recommends that candidature be terminated, refer to Part 6 of the *Research Training Ordinance* and Section 13 of this procedure.
- 5.25. GRO will notify a candidate of the CoC outcome.

6. Annual Review of Progress

Preparing for the annual review of progress meeting

- 6.1. ARPs assess the development of a candidate and satisfactory progress of candidature against agreed milestones and identify and address issues that may require additional attention, resources or other support.
- 6.2. Following successful CoC, academic progress of candidature will be formally reviewed at an ARP meeting every 12 calendar months of candidature, regardless of study load, until submission. The

review will be conducted by the Annual Review of Progress Committee (ARP Committee), whose membership will include:

- a. a Chair, who will be a candidate's GRC
- b. at least the primary supervisor, but preferably all members of the supervisory team, and
- c. other external members as deemed appropriate by the Chair in accordance with Section 6.8.

6.3. The ARP Committee must:

- a. consider a candidate's performance against the criteria in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*
- b. consider whether a candidate has fulfilled the progress requirements as set out in *Schedule A: Academic Progress Milestone Requirements*
- c. assess how a candidate is progressing in relation to disciplinary norms for a candidate at this stage of their research
- d. review the Supervision Conflict of Interest Management Action Plan (if relevant), and
- e. make a recommendation about a progress outcome, as set out in *Schedule C: Annual Academic Progress Review Outcomes*.

6.4. At least 2 weeks prior to the ARP milestone due by date:

- a. a candidate must complete their Annual Review Report in iGRad, and
- b. on behalf of the supervisory team, the primary supervisor will complete the Supervisor Annual Review Report in iGRad.

6.5. Following submission of both candidate and supervisor reports, the GRC will consider the review of progress reports and may send the report(s) back to a candidate and/or primary supervisor to provide additional information, if required. Once satisfied with the review of progress reports the GRC will share the reports with the ARP Committee members.

6.6. In accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*, where a candidate wishes to have a support person present at the ARP meeting, this person must be nominated in advance in the candidate report submitted in iGRad.

6.7. Where a member of the supervisory team is unable to attend the meeting, the GRC must be satisfied that all members of the supervisory team have been able to provide comments on a candidate's academic performance and progress.

6.8. Where the supervisory team and/or the GRC wish other parties (such as the HoAU or an expert in the research area) to attend an ARP meeting, the GRC will advise the candidate as early as possible to provide them with an opportunity to give a reason why the other parties should not attend.

ARP meeting

6.9. The GRC will convene and chair the ARP meeting on or before the milestone due date listed in iGRad. The meeting may occur in any format agreeable to those involved (including remotely via phone or video conferencing).

6.10. The GRC will submit the GRC Annual Review of Progress Report in iGRad within one week of the annual review of progress meeting occurring, and include:

- a. the names of committee members present
- b. a summary of progress and issues discussed, and
- c. the confirmation outcome.

ARP outcomes

- 6.11. Where a candidate has demonstrated satisfactory academic progress, candidature is to continue.
- 6.12. Where the ARP determines that a candidate has not made satisfactory academic progress and a CMP is to be implemented, refer to the *Research Training Ordinance* and Section 7 of this procedure.
- 6.13. Where the ARP determines and inadequacy in research infrastructure and/or resources (including the supervisory team relationship), any proposed changes to research infrastructure and/or resources must be approved by the HoAU.
- 6.14. Where the ARP identifies that a candidate will not submit their thesis within the maximum degree period, a candidate must apply for a candidature extension in accordance Section 11 of this procedure.
- 6.15. Where the ARP determines that a candidate has not made satisfactory academic progress and candidature is to be converted to a Masters by Research (Doctoral candidates only), refer to Section 9 of this procedure.
- 6.16. Where the ARP recommends that candidature be terminated, refer to Part 6 of the *Research Training Ordinance*.

7. Candidature Management Plan

- 7.1. The University will ensure that any additional action and support required by a candidate to maintain satisfactory academic progress is provided effectively and in a timely manner by requiring the supervisory team and candidate to develop and implement a Candidature Management Plan (CMP).
- 7.2. A CMP is designed to assist a candidate and supervisory team to identify and work to overcome problems encountered at any time during candidature by closely monitoring the candidature.
- 7.3. Where there is concern with a candidate's progress, a CMP is initiated by the GRC on advice from the candidate's primary supervisor, HoAU, or the Dean:
 - a. following an unsatisfactory a bi-monthly review meeting, as per Section 2.6 of this procedure
 - b. following an unsatisfactory CoC or ARP
 - c. where there is documented evidence of failure by a candidate to consistently produce to the required standard work requested for review by their supervisors
 - d. where there are circumstances beyond a candidate's control that impede their academic progress
 - e. where a candidate applies for an extension beyond the maximum degree period of candidature in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*, or
 - f. at a candidate's own request.
- 7.4. Once a CMP is initiated, the GRC will organise a face to face meeting (either in person or using video conferencing technology) with a candidate and the supervisory team to:
 - a. identify and discuss factors contributing to concerns about a candidate's academic progress, and
 - b. negotiate the terms, milestones and requirements of the CMP.

- 7.5. In consultation with the supervisory team, a candidate must produce a detailed plan of the milestones to be achieved in the next three months of their candidature (full-time equivalent) for inclusion in the CMP.
- 7.6. The primary supervisor reviews the CMP drafted by a candidate and:
 - a. if satisfied with the CMP, endorses the CMP and forwards it to the GRC, or
 - b. if unsatisfied with the CMP, the primary supervisor will ask a candidate to revise and re-submit the Plan.
- 7.7. The primary supervisor and candidate will seek advice from the GRC as required.
- 7.8. The GRC will review the CMP to ensure it is a realistic and acceptable plan to assist a candidate to identify and work towards overcoming problems that they are encountering:
 - a. if satisfied with the CMP, the GRC will forward the endorsed plan to GRO, or
 - b. if not satisfied with the CMP, the GRC may request that a candidate and primary supervisor review and revise the plan.
- 7.9. The CMP will be documented on a candidate's record and the iGrad action dates will be updated to match the agreed CMP.
- 7.10. While a CMP is in place, a candidate must meet with the primary supervisor fortnightly and with the whole supervisory team and GRC monthly to review candidature progression against the agreed milestones.
- 7.11. The GRC will record progress notes of monthly milestone meetings in iGrad where appropriate.
- 7.12. Where the CMP is mandated as part of a CoC extension, candidature progression against agreed CMP milestones will be formally assessed by the CoC Committee at the second CoC attempt along with their fulfilment of the requirements for CoC. In such cases the outcomes of the assessment will be in accordance with *Schedule B: Confirmation of Candidature Outcomes*.
- 7.13. In all other cases and at the conclusion of the CMP, separate reports of candidature progression against the CMP milestones will be prepared by the candidate and supervisory team and provided to the GRC.
- 7.14. The GRC will review the reports and evidence provided by the candidate and primary supervisor, provide a summary report of progress against the agreement milestones in the CMP and make a recommendation to the Dean (via GRO) as set out in *Schedule D: Candidature Management Plan Outcomes*.
- 7.15. Where candidature progression against the agreed CMP milestones has been satisfactory, a candidate's record will be updated and GRO will formally notify the candidate that the CMP has been completed satisfactorily.
- 7.16. Where a candidate's progress has not been satisfactory, and where:
 - a. the GRC recommends that candidature be transferred to a Masters program (Doctoral candidates only), refer to Section 9.3 of this procedure, or
 - b. the GRC recommends that candidature be terminated, refer to Part 6 of the *Research Training Ordinance* and Section 13 of this procedure.
- 7.17. Where a candidate refuses to engage in the implementation of a CMP under this section, the candidate will be required to show cause in accordance with Section 12 or 13 of this procedure.

8. Program transfer (Masters by Research Degree to Doctoral Degree)

- 8.1. A Masters by Research candidate may request to transfer their candidature to a Doctoral Degree in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance* by submitting the [Transfer from Masters to PhD](#) form, and include all supporting documentation as required.
- 8.2. A candidate must check their scholarship conditions of award and, if applicable, provide evidence that the sponsor and/or stipend provider has agreed to continue providing support following the transfer (see *HDR Research Training Program & Other Scholarships Procedure*).
- 8.3. In preparing an application to transfer candidature to a Doctoral Degree:
A candidate must meet the following criteria:
 - a. has passed confirmation of candidature at the Masters by Research level
 - b. has completed no more than 75% (1.5 years EFTSL) of their Masters by Research degree
 - c. has demonstrated the capability to conduct research at the doctoral level as evidenced in:
 - i. a substantial piece of creative and systematic work to advance the research project, and
 - ii. a revised research project and research plan that has been assessed to be of doctoral standards for that discipline.

The basis for this assessment is:

 - iii. an independent evaluation of the research completed at the time of the application by a reviewer external to the supervisory team and GRC, or
 - iv. the presentation (e.g. exhibition or performance), or publication (released or in press) of a piece of peer reviewed research completed during candidature.

The academic unit will declare that:

 - d. there are appropriate resources available for the proposed Doctoral research project and the supervisors are eligible and available to supervise a candidate at the proposed degree level, and
 - e. the research project and any remaining coursework can be completed within the remaining maximum degree period for the Doctoral degree.
- 8.4. The GRC will arrange for the independent evaluation (through submission of a written report) of a candidate's work as set out in Section 8.3.c.
- 8.5. The application will be endorsed by the primary supervisor, GRC, HoAU, and where a stipend or tuition fee scholarship is involved, the ADR.
- 8.6. If the transfer request involves a change in research topic and/or a citizen of a sanctioned country, refer to the *HDR Candidature Management and Enrolment Variation Procedure*.
- 8.7. A request to transfer candidature to a Doctoral degree will be considered by the Dean. The Dean may request additional information to support the application prior to making a decision.
- 8.8. A candidate will be notified in writing of the outcome of their application to their University email account.
- 8.9. Where the application is successful:
 - a. a candidate's enrolment details will be updated to reflect the new enrolment
 - b. a candidate's scholarship will be extended in accordance with the *HDR Research Training Program & Other Scholarships Procedure* (where relevant), and
 - c. where a transfer request is for an onshore international candidate, they will be issued with a new letter of offer and International Compliance will issue a new confirmation of enrolment

(eCoE) to enable a candidate to update their visa. Candidate's must note that additional fees may apply, including Overseas Health Cover and/or tuition fees.

- 8.10. Where an application is unsuccessful, a candidate may request a review of the decision in accordance with the *Review of Academic Decisions Procedure*.

9. Program transfer (Doctoral Degree to Masters by Research Degree)

- 9.1. A Doctoral candidate may request to transfer their candidature to a Masters by Research by submitting the [Transfer from PhD to Masters](#) form, and include all supporting documentation as required.
- 9.2. If, at the time of the transfer request, a candidate has already exceeded the maximum degree period for a Masters by Research, in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*, a candidature extension request of no more than six months (full-time equivalent) must also be submitted in accordance with Section 11 of this procedure. No additional extensions to candidature beyond this date will be considered.
- 9.3. If a recommendation to transfer from a Doctoral degree to a Masters by Research degree arises from the outcome of a CoC, ARP or CMP:
- a. the GRC must provide the reasons for that recommendation for inclusion in the application to transfer candidature and
 - b. a CMP must be put in place in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance* and Section 7 of this procedure.
- 9.4. A voluntary application (Section 9.1) or recommendation to transfer (Section 9.3) to a Masters by Research degree must be endorsed by the primary supervisor, GRC, HoAU, and where a stipend or tuition fee scholarship is involved, the ADR.
- 9.5. If the transfer request involves a change in research topic and/or a citizen of a sanctioned country, refer to the *HDR Candidature Management and Enrolment Variation Procedure*.
- 9.6. A request to transfer candidature to a Masters by Research degree must be approved by the Dean. The Dean may request additional information to support the application prior to making a decision.
- 9.7. A candidate will be notified in writing of the outcome of their application to their University email account.
- 9.8. Where a request is approved:
- a. a candidate's enrolment details will be updated to reflect the new enrolment
 - b. a candidate's scholarship will be reduced in accordance with the *HDR Research Training Program & Other Scholarships Procedure* (where relevant), and
 - c. where a transfer request is for an onshore international candidate, they will be issued with a new letter of offer and International Compliance will issue a new confirmation of enrolment (eCoE) to enable to candidate to update their visa.
 - i. If an International candidate fails to accept the new letter of offer within 5 working days, the offer will lapse, the candidate will remain enrolled in the Doctoral degree.
 - ii. Where the transfer request arose from the outcome of a CoC, ARP, or CMP and a candidate is not making satisfactory progress, the Dean may commence termination proceedings in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*.
- 9.9. The date of commencement in the new degree will be backdated to the date a Candidate enrolled in the degree from which they are transferring.

- 9.10. Where a candidate does not complete the requirements to transfer candidature under this section, and the transfer was recommended as a result of a CoC, ARP, or CMP a candidate will be required to show cause in accordance with Section 12 or 13 of this procedure.

10. GRC Milestone Reports

- 10.1. Where a candidate who is approaching the final eighth of their maximum degree period, that is:
- 1 years and 9 months for Masters by Research candidates, or
 - 3 years and 6 months for Doctoral candidates,
- heightened monitoring and support will be initiated via Milestone Progress Reports to the GRC.
- 10.2. The format of this report from a candidate is at the academic unit's discretion, and the GRC having reviewed the progress report, will action this milestone in iGRad.
- 10.3. Where a report provides evidence that a candidate is not making satisfactory progress and is unlikely to submit their thesis by the maximum degree period, the GRC may initiative a CMP in accordance with Section 7 of this procedure.

11. Extension of Candidature

- 11.1. A candidate may apply for an extension to the maximum degree period where the thesis submission date cannot be met due to matters that are beyond the control of the candidate, are directly related to the conduct of their research project and are not of a personal nature.
- 11.2. A candidate may request an extension of candidature within their last three (3) months of candidature by submitting the [Extend Candidature](#) form, and must include:
- a detailed completion plan, and
 - a candidature management plan, in accordance with Section 7 of this procedure.
- 11.3. Candidature extension requests must be endorsed by the primary supervisor, GRC, HoAU, and where a tuition fee scholarship is involved, the ADR.
- 11.4. Approval of an extension to candidature will be subject to strict conditions, including monthly progress reports to the GRC. Failure to adhere to these conditions may result in the cancellation of a candidate's enrolment in accordance with *Research Training Ordinance*.
- 11.5. Where a candidature extension is approved for an onshore international candidate:
- a candidate will be notified in writing of the additional tuition fee liability, and
 - International Compliance will be notified to issue a new eCoE as set out in *Extension of CoE Procedure*.
- 11.6. An extension of candidature will normally only be approved for a period no longer than:
- six (6) calendar weeks for PhD by Prior Publication candidates
 - three (3) calendar months for Masters by Research candidates, and
 - six (6) calendar months for Doctoral candidates.
- 11.7. A request to extend candidature must be approved by the Dean. The Dean may request additional information to support the application prior to making a decision.
- 11.8. A candidate will be notified in writing of the outcome of their application to their University email account.
- 11.9. Where the application is successful:
- a candidate's enrolment details will be updated to reflect the extension of enrolment

- b. a candidate's tuition fee scholarship will be extended in accordance with the *HDR Research Training Program & Other Scholarships Procedure* (where approved), and
 - c. an onshore international candidate will contact International Compliance who are responsible for issuing an updated confirmation of enrolment (eCoE) to enable a candidate to update their visa. Candidate's must note that additional fees may apply, including Overseas Health Cover and/or tuition fees.
- 11.10. Where the application is unsuccessful, a candidate may request a review of the decision in accordance with the *Review of Academic Decisions Procedure*.

12. Show cause and cancellation of enrolment

- 12.1. In accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*, enrolment may be cancelled where:
- a. a candidate has engaged in any other academic course of study leading to a qualification that is not an essential part of their higher degree by research, and has failed to withdraw from that course upon request from the University
 - b. a candidate requests leave that exceeds the limits/conditions, and has failed to withdraw from their study program upon request from the University
 - c. a candidate who is not on approved leave, and has not engaged with their studies for a period of three months and the University has exhausted all reasonable options to contact the candidate
 - d. a candidate who is on approved leave for a period greater than 24 months, and if candidature continued, that candidature would no longer satisfy the requirements for the research program
 - e. a candidate's project and/or supervision team no longer exists, and where resetting candidature cannot be agreed upon, and where the candidate has failed to withdraw from their studies upon request from the University
 - f. a candidate fails to submit their thesis for examination or re-examination within the maximum degree period (including any approved extensions), or
 - g. a candidate fails to submit their corrected thesis for review within the timeframe granted (including any extensions).
- 12.2. Where a candidate's enrolment is at risk of being cancelled a request to Show Cause (Cancellation) will be initiated to provide a final opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate to the University why their enrolment should continue. It should be viewed as a chance to:
- a. pause and reflect on whether and how a candidature can be refocused, and
 - b. provide a pathway to completion or be supported to make a respectful departure from the degree.
- 12.3. A show cause (cancellation) process will be initiated by GRO. Refer to *Schedule E: Show Cause Flowchart*.
- 12.4. On receiving show cause (cancellation) direction from GRO, the GRC must consult with stakeholders relevant to the candidature and provide a response back to GRO within five (5) working days on the academic unit's position.
- 12.5. Where an academic unit does not support the Show Cause (Cancellation), the GRC will provide a rationale for why and how candidature could continue.
- 12.6. The Dean will review the Show Cause (Cancellation) documentation and determine to either:
- a. proceed with a request to a candidate to show cause, or
 - b. refer the matter back to the HoAU with recommended intervention/mitigation strategies.

- 12.7. Where Section 12.6.a applies, a candidate will be advised in writing and requested to show cause why their enrolment should not be cancelled. The letter must include the reasons for recommending cancellation. A candidate will be invited to make a written submission in response to the show cause notice within 10 working days.
- 12.8. The letter will normally present two options for a candidate to consider within the nominated timeframe:
- respond to the Show Cause (Cancellation), or
 - withdraw without prejudice from their HDR program.
- 12.9. The Show Cause (Cancellation) letter will be sent via email to a candidate's UTAS email address.
- 12.10. Where a candidate:
- does not respond to the Show Cause (Cancellation) letter, a candidate's enrolment is cancelled, and they are advised in writing of the outcome
 - chooses to withdraw without prejudice, they must notify the Dean in writing within the nominated timeframe. A candidate will be withdrawn from their HDR program and advised in writing once the withdrawal has been finalised, or
 - chooses to respond to the Show Cause (Cancellation) letter, they must do so in writing to the Dean within the nominated timeframe. The response must:
 - systematically address the points raised in the Show Cause letter
 - provide any documentation requested, and
 - demonstrate their capacity to complete their research degree in a timely manner by presenting a clear and compelling completion plan with milestones and timelines.
- 12.11. Following submission of the written response, a candidate will be invited to attend a meeting with the Dean (or delegate) to discuss their candidature and Show Cause (Cancellation) response.
- 12.12. The Dean will consider all evidence and make a final determination as to whether a candidate's enrolment will be cancelled.
- 12.13. Where the Dean recommends that candidature is to continue:
- a candidate will be notified by email of the outcome and any conditions imposed by the Dean
 - a candidate must accept all conditions in writing within five (5) working days, and
 - failure to accept these conditions within the nominated time frame will result in a candidate's enrolment being cancelled.
- 12.14. Where the Dean recommends that enrolment is cancelled, a candidate will be notified by email of the outcome in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*.

13. Show cause and termination of candidature

- 13.1. Candidature may be terminated in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*, where a candidate has failed to:
- comply with a material condition of candidature imposed by the Dean in the Letter of Offer
 - comply with a procedural or administrative requirement of candidature as documented in University ordinances, policies and procedures
 - pass Confirmation of Candidature, or
 - make satisfactory academic progress as documented in either an Annual Review of Progress or a CMP.

- 13.2. Where candidature has been recommended for termination, a candidate will be given a final opportunity, through a Show Cause (Termination) process, to demonstrate to the University that there are mitigating circumstances for consideration, and/or that they have a detailed, feasible and supported plan to complete their research degree.
- 13.3. A request for a candidate to Show Cause (Termination) will be considered by a Show Cause Committee (SCC), consisting of:
- a. the Dean (Chair), and
 - b. an Associate Dean Research (or deputy) from a different College to the candidate, and
 - c. one or two registered supervisors (Level D or E) from a different Academic Unit to the candidate.
- 13.4. A Show Cause (Termination) process will be initiated by GRO, providing to the academic unit the ordinance/procedure section under which termination of candidature is recommended. Refer to Schedule E: Show Cause Flowchart.
- 13.5. On receiving a Show Cause (Termination) direction from GRO, the GRC will consult with stakeholders relevant to the candidature and provide a response back to GRO within five (5) working days on the academic unit's position supporting/not supporting of the termination recommendation. At a minimum, this submission should include:
- a. a candidature background and supporting evidence for the academic unit's position
 - b. academic statements on candidature progression from the supervisory team and GRC
 - c. relevant supporting documentation, and
 - d. endorsement from the HoAU.
- 13.6. GRO will conduct a preliminary assessment of the submitted documentation to ensure it is complete and forwards it to the SCC.
- 13.7. The SCC will review the documentation (either in person or via circular) provided by the academic unit and makes a recommendation to either:
- a. proceed to a show cause hearing, or
 - b. not to proceed to a show cause hearing.
- 13.8. Where the SCC does not support a show cause hearing:
- a. the relevant ADR will meet with a candidate to discuss the outcome and associated changes to candidature management, and
 - b. refer the case back to the HoAU providing an assessment of the evidence and mitigating circumstances. This assessment will include new conditions and/or intervention/mitigation strategies to be placed on candidature management.
- 13.9. Where the SCC supports the recommendation to proceed to a show cause hearing, candidature will be suspended, and a candidate will be advised in writing and requested to show cause why their candidature should not be terminated. The Show Cause (Termination) letter will be sent via email to a candidate's UTAS email address and must include:
- a. the ordinance/procedure section under which a candidate is being asked to Show Cause (Termination)
 - b. a copy of the *Research Training Ordinance* and this procedure
 - c. the reason/s why a candidate is being asked to Show Cause (Termination)
 - d. clear instructions regarding what a candidate must do to respond, and
 - e. clear instructions regarding available support.

- 13.10. A candidate has 15 working days to respond to the show cause letter.
- 13.11. Where a candidate, within the nominated timeframe:
- a. does not respond to the Show Cause (Termination) letter, a candidate's candidature is terminated, and they are advised in writing of the outcome
 - b. chooses to respond to the Show Cause (Termination) letter, they must do so in writing to the Dean. The response must:
 - i. provide any documentation requested in the letter
 - ii. systematically address the points raised in the Show Cause (Termination) letter, and provide any documented evidence in support of their response
 - iii. an explanation of the barriers to satisfactory progress that they have been experiencing and how they have been overcome, and
 - iv. demonstrate their capacity to complete their research degree in a timely manner by presenting a clear and compelling completion plan with milestones and timelines.
- 13.12. Following submission of the written response, the SCC members will review and consider the evidence and if required, identify whether further investigation is required.
- 13.13. Once satisfied with the evidence brief, and normally within ten (10) working days of receiving the written response or the date by which requested further information is received, a candidate will be notified in writing of the Show Cause hearing, including timelines, instructions, and student support and counselling services. Candidates may elect to bring a support person to the hearing consistent with Section 23.2 of the *Research Training Ordinance* and must provide the name of that person to the Chair no less than three (3) working days prior to the hearing.
- 13.14. Within ten (10) working days of the show cause hearing and after considering all the evidence provided to them the SCC will make a final determination on the matter.
- 13.15. Where the SCC determination is that candidature is to continue:
- a. a candidate will be notified by email of any conditions imposed by the Dean
 - b. a candidate must accept all conditions in writing within five (5) working days, and
 - c. failure to accept these conditions within the nominated time frame will result in candidature being terminated.
- 13.16. Where the SCC determination is that candidature be terminated, that decision will be actioned in accordance with the *Research Training Ordinance*.
- 13.17. A candidate will be notified of the outcome in writing within five (5) working days of the determination being finalised. The letter must contain information regarding the reasons for the decision, the University review of academic decision process and student counselling support services.

14. Review of academic decisions proceedings

- 14.1. For review of decisions, refer to the *Review of Academic Decisions Procedure*.

Related procedures

HDR Candidature Management & Enrolment Variation Procedure

HDR Supervision & Academic Support Procedure

HDR Research Training Program & Other Scholarships Procedure

Reviews of Academic Decisions Procedure

Extension of CoE Procedure

Management of Research Data Procedure

Versions

Version	Action	Approval Authority	Responsible Officer/s	Approval Date
1	Approved	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)	Dean of Graduate Research	3 Dec 2020

Definitions

[academic unit](#) | [academic unit of enrolment](#) | [candidate](#) | [candidature](#) | [Confirmation of Candidature](#) | [degree period](#) | [head of academic unit](#) | [higher degree by research](#) | [iGRad](#) | [primary supervisor](#) | [research project](#)

Schedule A: Academic Progress Milestone Requirements

Milestone Requirements	Confirmation of Candidature	Annual Reviews of Progress
<p>Successful Oral Presentation and peer review</p> <p>A satisfactory public oral presentation on the candidate's research appropriate to the discipline and level of study, presented to an academic audience in the Academic Unit of Enrolment (or other equivalent academic group) in a way that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrates the candidate's oral competence, presentation skills and the ability to respond to questions about the research project; and provides an opportunity for peer review of the merit and integrity of the proposed research project. <p>The candidate is expected to take and respond to questions and constructive criticism from review panel members and the wider audience.</p> <p>All members of the supervisory team are expected to attend this presentation.</p>	Yes	Optional
<p>An updated research plan or completion plan that contains:</p> <p>an outline of the research project for the duration of candidature with key components of the project detailed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the working title of the thesis methods and/or methodology of the (proposed) research outline of the research and/or scholarly and creative activity to be conducted the likely significance and impact of the research and original contribution that is expected to be made publication strategy that explicitly considered authorship consideration of how IP will be managed, including ownership, potential for commercialisation and protection against theft consideration of and a management strategy for mitigating risks associated with foreign interference evidence of their understanding of their responsibilities to conduct research within the University's responsible conduct of research framework budgetary requirements and access to infrastructure how the research will be presented for examination according to the norms and standards of the discipline, including where necessary, a plan for recording digitally additional integral elements of work to be examined any periods, locations, purpose and description of fieldwork, lab work etc periods of attendance at a partner institution/organisation (if applicable) an indicative plan for the production of research outputs based on the research candidate training needs additional to any mandatory coursework to support good progress and successful graduate outcomes, and 	Yes – Research Plan attached to iGRad CoC Report	Yes – Completion Plan attached to iGRad Annual Review Report

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the entire timetable and forward plan for a candidate's HDR including a set of milestones to be agreed with the supervisory team. 		
<p>Evidence of Ethics and Biosafety (if required) requirements</p> <p>Where a research project is dependent on research activities involving human participants, their data or tissue, genetic material or animals, a candidate must provide, at minimum, a careful presentation of all the foreseeable issues likely to be encountered in obtaining ethical clearance to undertake those research activities, as set out in relevant University's Policy and Procedure.</p> <p>Where a pilot study is required prior to full ethics approval being sought then a draft ethics application for that stage of the study should be provided.</p> <p>Where approvals from the Human Research Ethics Committee(s) or the Animal Ethics Committee has been received, full documentation of the received approval(s) should be provided to the Confirmation Committee prior to Confirmation of Candidature.</p> <p>Candidates must not commence research activities involving human participants or animals until the required approvals have been obtained by their primary supervisor.</p>	Yes	Yes – approval no. only
<p>Data Management Plan</p> <p>Candidates must provide a data management plan describing how they will collect, organise, manage, store, secure, back up, preserve, and share their research data in line with the <i>Management of Research Data Procedure</i>.</p> <p>The data management plan can be included as an appendix to the Research Plan.</p>	Yes	Yes (updated)
<p>Piece of substantial written work</p> <p>A candidate must submit a satisfactory written component, of sufficient length to provide evidence that they have the ability to write in English at HDR standard (within the relevant discipline). The written component must be work undertaken after enrolment in the HDR at the University, relevant to the thesis and should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> presented in a format and style as determined by the requirements of the discipline and following advice from the supervisory team and, be correctly referenced; and accepted by Peer Review (at a minimum through the Confirmation Committee) as a piece of work appropriate to the discipline. 	Yes – Attached to iGRad CoC Report	NA
<p>Progress of Thesis/Exegesis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> draft chapters of the thesis, and/or draft or published papers and/or draft portfolio of work (creative arts) deemed appropriate for the discipline 	Yes – Draft Thesis Structure	Yes – Attached to iGRad Annual Review Report
<p>Supervisor-Candidate Meetings</p> <p>A minimum number of mandatory meetings with all members of the supervisory team over the past 12 calendar months.</p>	Yes MRes – three Doctoral – five	Yes Five meetings per annum

<p>Mandatory Coursework Requirements</p> <p><u>Confirmation of Candidature</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctoral degree candidates: Completion of at least 50% of the Graduate Certificate in Research, including XGR501 and either XGR502 or one elective unit. • Masters by Research candidates: Completion of XGR501 and enrolment in one other unit from the course schedule. • Professional Doctorates: Completion of at least 50% of coursework as specified in the course and unit handbook, including XGR501. <p><u>Annual Review of Progress</u></p> <p>Completion of all coursework requirements (by second year ARP).</p>	<p>Yes – Minimum Coursework Requirements</p>	<p>Yes – All Coursework Requirements</p>
<p>Any Additional Criteria</p> <p>Any other requirements the Academic Unit deems necessary, including additional meetings, presentations or training required by the academic unit of enrolment or as specified in the letter of offer.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Schedule B: Confirmation of Candidature Outcomes

A	The candidate has met all confirmation of candidature requirements and demonstrated satisfactory academic performance.
	Outcome: The candidature is confirmed and if the candidate is a scholarship holder, the continuation of the scholarship is also confirmed.
B	The candidate has not met all confirmation of candidature requirements and/or has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance.
	Outcome: The confirmation of candidature period is extended for a single period of no longer than three months equivalent full-time enrolment. The confirmation committee must make clear the work required to pass confirmation, and a Candidature Management Plan is implemented. At the conclusion of the extension period a new recommendation will be made. If the candidate is a scholarship holder, the scholarship continues to the end of the extension period.
C (Doctoral candidates only)	The candidate has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance at the level required for a Doctoral degree.
	Outcome: The candidature for a Doctoral degree be converted to candidature at the level of a Masters by Research degree and if the candidate is a scholarship holder, subject to the conditions of the award, the tenure of that scholarship be converted to the duration appropriate for a Masters by Research degree.
D (Masters by Research candidates only)	The Masters by Research candidate and has met all confirmation of candidature requirements and demonstrated satisfactory academic performance and have been assessed as having the capacity and capability to undertake research at the level required for a Doctoral degree.
	Outcome: The candidate may apply to have their candidature transferred to a Doctoral degree and if the candidate is a scholarship holder, the end date of the scholarship be extended in line with the conditions of that scholarship.
E	The candidate has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance at the level required for the Higher Degree by Research and has been given a reasonable opportunity to rectify this failure.
	Outcome: Termination of candidature recommended in accordance with the <i>Research Training Ordinance</i> , and the candidate is not permitted to continue candidature.

Schedule C: Annual Academic Progress Review Outcomes

A	The candidate has demonstrated satisfactory academic performance and no significant problems have arisen. The candidate is expected to complete within the maximum degree period.
	Outcome: Candidature to continue.
B	The candidate has demonstrated satisfactory academic performance; however, issues have been identified that may delay submission of the thesis. The candidate and supervisory team have discussed these issues and strategies are in place to enable completion within the maximum degree period and documented in the annual review report.
	Outcome: Candidature to continue.
C	The candidate has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance.
	Outcome: Candidature to continue subject to conditions and implementation of a Candidature Management Plan.
D	The candidate's expected thesis submission date exceeds the maximum permitted candidature expiry date (an application for extension of candidature is required four weeks in advance of the maximum expiry date).
	Outcome: Candidature to continue subject to conditions and implementation of a Candidature Management Plan in accordance with this procedure and the <i>Research Training Ordinance</i> .
E (Doctoral candidates only)	The candidate has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance and has been given a reasonable opportunity to rectify this failure.
	Outcome: Candidature to be transferred from the Doctoral degree to Masters by Research degree and a candidature management plan to be implemented in accordance with this procedure and the <i>Research Training Ordinance</i> .
F	The candidate has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance and/or progress and has been given a reasonable opportunity to rectify this failure.
	Outcome: Termination of candidature recommended in accordance with the <i>Research Training Ordinance</i> .

Schedule D: Candidature Management Plan Outcomes

A	The candidate is making good progress against agreed milestones and no significant problems have arisen. The candidate is expected to complete within the maximum degree period.
	Outcome: Candidature to continue. candidature management plan to be discontinued.
B	The candidate has completed a three-month period on a candidature management plan. The candidate's progress has improved; however closer supervision is still required.
	Outcome: Candidature to continue subject to conditions and implementation of the candidature management plan for a further three-month period.
C (Doctoral candidates only)	The candidate has completed at least one three-month period on a candidature management plan. The candidate has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance and/or progress against agreed milestones at the level required for a Doctoral degree and has been given a reasonable opportunity to rectify this failure.
	Outcome: Candidature to be transferred from the Doctoral degree to a Masters by Research degree.
D	The candidate has completed at least one three-month period on a candidature management plan. The candidate has failed to demonstrate satisfactory academic performance and/or progress against agreed milestones at the level required for the Higher Degree by Research they are enrolled in and has been given a reasonable opportunity to rectify the failure.
	Outcome: Termination of candidature recommended in accordance with the <i>Research Training Ordinance</i> .

Schedule E: Show Cause Flowchart

