

HDR Examination Policy and Procedure

1. Purpose

This policy and procedure describes the responsibilities of Higher Degree by Research (HDR) candidates, staff and external examiners regarding the examination process and the presentation and examination of theses.

It should be read in conjunction with the *Research and Research Training Policy Framework*, its associated policies and the *HDR Supervision Policy*.

2. Scope

This policy applies to theses submitted by candidates enrolled in HDR programs at the Institute. Coursework that is included as a formal assessment requirement as part a component of or adjunct to the research training, meets the academic governance and quality assurance requirements required of other coursework offered by the Institute.

3. Definitions

Term	Definition
Candidate	student enrolled in a Higher Degree by Research course.
the Code	<i>Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research</i> , Australian Government (2018)
associated policies	the associated policies to <i>Research and Research Training Policy Framework</i> and this procedure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible Conduct of Research Policy and Procedure; HDR Candidature Management and Support Policy.
Examination Committee (EC)	a sub-committee of the HDRC, comprised of at least three academic staff of MIT, appointed by the Academic Board on the recommendation of the Executive Dean, with the Chair to be appointed from the membership by Academic Board. Members should hold registration as a Principal Supervisor and hold a Research Doctorate (or other qualification equivalent to AQF Level 10), and have sufficient experience to be able to ensure rigour and quality within the examinations process. The EC will be appointed each year at the first meeting of Academic Board.
HDR Committee (HDRC)	provides leadership for the delivery of postgraduate research training and reports to the Academic Board via the Research Committee. It is responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overseeing rules, policies, and procedures for candidates; Overseeing the confirmation and thesis assessment processes; Monitoring candidate performance; Promoting quality research training environment and outcomes; and

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 1 of 14

Term	Definition
	Overseeing new and reviewing current HDR programs.

4. Policy

4.1.1 This document is to be read in conjunction with the MIT's Awards and Courses Policy and Procedure.

4.1.2. The Institute ensures that processes are in place to ensure that Higher Degree by Research theses:

- meet the requirements of an AQF level 9 qualification;
- uphold the fundamental principles of quality and integrity in scholarly work;
- align with the Institute's reputation and principles of integrity and academic freedom;
- make an original contribution to the knowledge in one or more specific research discipline areas;
- be connected with the extant literature;
- are a coherent and integrated body of work; and
- the candidate, supervisors, examiners and administrators have a clear understanding on the expected format and presentation of HDR theses and HDR examination processes and requirements.

This ensures that 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).

4.1.3. The award of Higher Degree by Research is granted only following an independent assessment of the research thesis.

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

- successfully undertaken supervised study;
- completed a program of research, research training and independent study;
- made an original 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.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

4.1.5. Candidates should also consult the Institute’s *Responsible Conduct of Research Policy and Procedure* 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 has been obtained;
- falsification of data, including changing records;
- plagiarism, including self-plagiarism;
- misleading or false attribution of authorship;
- failure to abide by Institute policy and procedural requirements for research (e.g. ethical compliance in respect of human or animal research ethics).

4.2. The Thesis

4.2.1. Thesis format and requirements

4.2.2 A HDR thesis submitted for examination must be written in English including an accepted referencing system appropriate to the candidate’s discipline area.

4.2.3 A HDR thesis must not contain material which has been accepted for the award of any other research qualification at the Institute 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.

4.2.4 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.

4.2.5 A Masters Degree (Research) will normally be:

- a text of not more than 30,000 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.

4.2.6 Thesis word counts do not include appendices or references.

4.2.7 Candidates must submit for examination a PDF copy of their thesis.

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

4.3 Examination of Theses

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 3 of 14

The examination process requires:

- declaration regarding conflict of interest from the examiners;
- transparency throughout the process, with clear communication to all stakeholders involved;
- appropriate and clear guidance to be provided to examiners, including guidance in the examination of theses presented in different modes, with an Examiner's guideline sent to examiners reflecting examination policy at the Institute;
- timely outcomes;
- explicit and accessible examination criteria and categories of examination outcomes;
- explicit processes for managing divergent examination outcomes and allowing opportunity for appeal;
- that the candidate is kept informed of examination progress and any unavoidable delays.

4.3 The Board of Directors on advice from Academic Board determines the award of research degrees based on examination results and advice from examiners. Conferral certifies that the candidate has met the AQF and institution requirements for the award of the degree.

4.4 Professional and personal relationships between examiners, candidates and their supervisors/advisors, and relationships between examiners and the Institute, have the potential to introduce bias and thus compromise the independence of the examination, in fact or in perception. See *Staff Code of Conduct* in relation to conflict of interest. Examiners may not have engaged in a joint research project/publication with the supervision team in less than five years before they examine the thesis supervised by that academic. 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 HDRC will determine whether such a conflict results in ineligibility to serve as an examiner, or on the Examination Committee in respect of a particular candidate.

4.5 Avoiding conflicts of interest

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

4.5.2. 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 Chair, HDRC will determine whether such a conflict results in ineligibility to serve as an examiner.

4.5.3. All parties should consult the *ACGR Good Practice Guidelines for Disclosing and Managing Interests in Graduate Research* (2021) which aids in identifying major and minor types of conflict. See also *Staff Code of Conduct*. In relation to internal examiners, it is recognised that it may be challenging to exclude potential examiners on account of relationships with the principal supervisor, or some other member of a candidate's supervisory team in a relatively small institution. Where possible, internal examiners will be selected from the alternative MIT campus to the enrolment location of the student. The

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 4 of 14

Australian Council of Graduate Research notes several conditions which should be considered as major and thus exclude a potential internal examiner, are relevant to examination at MIT. This relates to co-authoring, grants, patents or co-supervision within the last five years. It is the Institute's position that a signed conflict of interest declaration from both the examiner and the supervisor, required by the Council of Graduate Research for minor conflicts, is appropriate. The Council of Graduate Research notes that these categories should be adapted to individual institutional conditions.

4.5.4. Where the HDRC 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.

4.6 Eligibility of Examiners

An individual may be appointed as an examiner where they:

- have an appropriate disciplinary and academic background of relevance to the thesis content;
- are recognised as an expert, and normally as an international expert, in the field or discipline of the thesis; and
- can provide evidence of recent research activity, as demonstrated by peer-reviewed publications output, receipt of research funding and/or research training activity.

An individual would normally be expected to hold a Research Doctorate Degree (or have research experience equivalent to an AQF Level 10 award) to be appointed as an examiner.

At least one examiner must be external to the Institute. Current adjuncts and honorary staff of the Institute are ineligible for the role as external examiner but may be appointed as an internal examiner. Previous staff of the Institute may be eligible as an external examiner if at least five years has elapsed since their employment, and it is clear that the staff member has not interacted with the candidate and/or work being examined.

Current or previous supervisors of the candidate are not to be appointed as examiners.

Consideration will be made of the balance of expertise amongst the examiners, and the independence of examiners. 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).

4.7 Nomination and number of Examiners

Theses submitted for all HDR programs require two examiners, of which at least one should be external to MIT, and at least one reserve examiner, who must be external. Where possible, internal examiners will be selected from the alternative Institute campus (Melbourne or Sydney) to the enrolment location of the student.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 5 of 14

The Principal Supervisor, in consultation with the Supervisory Panel, is responsible for nominating examiners. The reserve examiner need not be nominated prior to the initial examination process.

The Recommendation of Examiners form should be submitted for approval by the HDRC. The HDRC may consult with the Executive Dean and/or Head of School in considering such approvals.

4.8 Where approved examiners are unavailable or unresponsive to a request to examine, that examiner will be stood down and a reserve, appointed by the HDRC, will be substituted to help ensure a timely examination process.

The Institute reserves the right to appoint a reserve examiner 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 examiners' reports are divergent).

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

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 or other professional relationship); however, other than this, the candidate should not have any role in identifying or nominating prospective examiners. Detected participation of the candidate in the nomination process, contrary to this policy, may result in one or more examiners being stood down.

5. Procedure

5.1 To ensure consistency with the expectations of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and the Higher Education Standards (Threshold Framework) 2015 (HESF) research candidates, supervisors, examiners and administrators must have clear information about:

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

5.2 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;
- 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

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 6 of 14

- applied an advanced body of knowledge in a range of contexts.
- 5.3 Candidates should also consult the *Responsible Conduct of Research* Policy and Procedure 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 has been obtained;
 - falsification of data, including changing records;
 - plagiarism, including self-plagiarism;
 - misleading or false attribution of authorship;
 - failure to abide by Institute policy and procedural requirements for research (e.g. ethical compliance in respect of human or animal research ethics).

6. The Thesis requirements

- 6.1. A HDR thesis submitted for examination must be written in fluent, grammatically correct English, and be of a satisfactory standard of literary presentation, including competent use of an accepted referencing system appropriate to the candidate's discipline area.
- 6.2. A HDR thesis must not contain material which has been accepted for the award of any other qualification at the Institute 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.
- 6.3 The thesis component will normally be formatted on A4 international standard paper with mirrored margins set to inside at 3.18 cm and outside to 2.54 cm. Pages may be printed on one or both sides. Line spacing should be set to 1.5 (if using Harvard style) or double (if using APA style). Theses submission should ordinarily be made in PDF format unless approval is sought from the HDRC before submission. The title page of every volume (or the cover of every multimedia item submitted) will give the following information in the order listed:
- the full title of the thesis;
 - the subtitle (if any);
 - the full name of the author;
 - the qualification for which the thesis is submitted;
 - the name of the institution to which the thesis is submitted (Melbourne Institute of Technology);
 - the month and year when the thesis was originally submitted for examination, and the month and year when the thesis was accepted for the award of degree;
 - *optional: the School in which the program of research and study was undertaken;
 - *optional: the names of the Supervisory Panel.
- 6.4 The thesis must be presented in the following order:
- title page;
 - abstract of not more than two A4 pages. This will provide a synopsis of the thesis, and clearly state the nature and scope of the research undertaken, and the contribution made to the knowledge of the subject;

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 7 of 14



- acknowledgments (to include acknowledgement of funding);
 - a signed declaration of authorship and originality of thesis (declaration);
 - a copyright statement;
 - table of contents;
 - table of tables and figures and other captioned content;
 - table of publications and presentations arising from and/or relevant to the thesis work;
 - if applicable, a signed declaration of the candidate's statement of contribution to any jointly-published work and a statement of the direct contribution of work by others that is included within the thesis;
 - main text;
 - references;
 - appendices which should be labelled e.g. Appendix A, Appendix B etc.
- 6.5 The preferred typescripts are Times New Roman 12, Arial 11 or Calibri 12 or another font of similar size and appearance.
- 6.6 Ordinarily, page numbering is in the footer as follows:
- title page - no page number;
 - front matter - small Roman numerals commencing at I; and
 - main text and end matter - Arabic numerals commencing at 1.
- 6.7 Non-print materials which are an integral part of the thesis, but which cannot be bound in the forms prescribed above, must be submitted for deposit in the Library in a manner as prescribed by the Institute librarian (or nominee).
- 6.8 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.
- 6.9 A Masters Degree (Research) will normally be:
- a text of not more than 30,000 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.
- 6.10 Additionally:
- Thesis word counts do not include appendices or references;
 - candidates must submit for examination a PDF copy of their thesis;
 - the thesis presented by a candidate for examination shall conform with the requirements of this section unless otherwise agreed by the HDRC.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 8 of 14

6.11 Use of Proof-reading services

Professional proof-reading services may be engaged. Where candidates are seeking to employ professional editors, they 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 candidates themselves. The Institute follows the best practice guidelines recommended by the Australian Council of Graduate Research for engaging proofz-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 in writing from the Principal Supervisor, prior to engaging professional proof-reading services.

6.12 Acknowledgements

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

- acknowledgement of any financial support, including any support provided by the Australian Government;
- 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.

7. Examination process

See Graduate Research Good Practice Principles, as released by the Australian Council of Graduate Research.

7.1. To be eligible to submit a thesis for examination a candidate must:

- be currently enrolled in a Higher Degree by Research program;
- have been enrolled for at least one and a half year full-time or part-time equivalent, noting that such minimum time would occur only in the rare case that a student had been admitted with advanced standing of one trimester, being the discipline-based coursework units;
- have completed the requirements of candidature (see *Admission Policy and Procedure*); and
- have approval from the Principal Supervisor and the Head of School or nominee to submit the thesis.

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

7.3 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

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 9 of 14

other relevant approvals. A thesis will not be released for examination without these materials in place.

- 7.4 A candidate will submit a thesis for examination with the endorsement of the Supervisory Panel and Head of School, as demonstrated by the signatures on the Release of Thesis form.
- 7.5 Once the thesis has been submitted for examination, the candidate is recorded as having a “TD” Grade for unit MR604 that 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.
- 7.6 Resubmission of a thesis with post-examination revisions must occur within the timeframe designated by HDRC. Where the candidate requires further time to undertake post-examination revisions, a special case for consideration may be addressed to the HDRC.
- 7.7 The School will send theses to the nominated examiners within a timely period.
- 7.8 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. The Institute will make every effort to achieve a timely examination outcome.
- 7.9 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.
- 7.10 Examiners are required to nominate 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 (as recommended by the Chair of the Examination Committee), 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 able to be undertaken independently by the candidate); or
 - The thesis should be **PASSED subject to major corrections** made to the satisfaction of the Examination Committee, 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. To support the decision of the Examinations Committee, any examiner who required that corrections be made should certify that the corrections have been made to their satisfaction. (These actions should be undertaken with ongoing input from the Supervisory Panel); or

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 10 of 14

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

Following receipt of the examiners' reports, the Examination Committee shall consider the reports, and determine the outcome for the student. If the examiners' reports are in conflict, the EC may choose to seek a report from an additional examiner. Ultimately, the EC must determine the outcome, being one of the five outcomes listed above.

7.11 A candidate who receives, from the Examination Committee, an outcome of either PASSED subject to major corrections, or DEFERRED may be required to re-enrol for maximum period of one study period. The candidate is responsible for meeting the tuition fee for the extra period of enrolment.

8. Post-examination

8.1 The Chair, EC, is responsible for reviewing the Examiners' Reports. The Chair may confirm the outcome recommended by the examiners if these are identical, but refer the Reports to the EC for further consideration if there is any divergence of opinion between the examiners. The Chair, EC should communicate this to the HDRC.

Where the Chair, EC refers the report to the EC, the EC may recommend an outcome which differs from the recommendation of the examiners. The Chair, EC should notify the HDRC.

Where a confirmed recommendation is that thesis examination be *DEFERRED* or that the thesis be passed subject to corrections, the EC must oversee the candidate completion plan and timeline for re-submission or correction of the thesis. The Chair, EC should notify the HDRC, whose responsibility is to inform the candidate.

Where the EC requests that the thesis be sent to a third examiner, the EC will advise the School to send the thesis to the reserve examiner. The EC will advise the Principal Supervisor of this action, but the candidate is not to be informed of this.

The Chair, HDRC is responsible for:

- reviewing for approval the recommended outcome from the Examination Committee (EC); and
- communicating the outcome to the Principal Supervisor and the candidate; and
- Ultimately approving referral of a recommended outcome of completion of the degree to the Chair, Academic Board.

8.2 Where corrections or revisions are required, the candidate is responsible for preparing a revised thesis, together with a corrections summary to respond to the examiners' comments. In responding to revisions, the candidate should clearly indicate any

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 11 of 14

amendments made, and a rationale for adopting (or not adopting) the recommendations provided in the examiners' report. 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. Corrected theses are submitted to the EC for completion of a results recommendation and confirmation that the thesis is ready for a recommendation of award.

8.3. Where a candidate receives a result of *DEFERRED*, when the thesis is re-submitted the Principal Supervisor is required to submit a covering page to the EC, 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).

Where an examination outcome of *DEFERRED* is confirmed by the EC, the following will apply:

- where the original thesis examiner/s have indicated a willingness to re-examine, they will normally be invited to 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; the replacement examiners will be notified that the thesis is being submitted for re-examination;
- the re-examiners will receive the Institute's advice to the candidate for the revision of the thesis, including the original examiners' reports and an integrated list of revisions as agreed to by the candidate and the supervisor and approved by the EC; and a comprehensive statement from the candidate outlining the substantive changes that have been made to the thesis, and a concise defense 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;

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.

8.4 The EC may request an oral defence where the candidate may be required to:

- conduct an oral presentation explaining the thesis findings, context, and contribution to the research discipline; and/or
- participate in an interview to confirm that all revisions have been completed to the satisfaction of the EC.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 12 of 14

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

9. Thesis Summaries

The Candidate must submit two thesis summaries:

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

Summaries must be submitted to the EC for approval.

The Candidate must submit a library copy (PDF), which will be added to the thesis collection. On occasions, where an industry partner requires confidentiality of some information contained in the thesis, a redacted version of the thesis, prepared by the Candidate, should be submitted alongside the full version, with confidential or third-party material for which there is no permission to reproduce removed or “redacted”. Redacted material can be replaced with a statement such as “This material has been removed by the author of this thesis for copyright reasons”. In such a case, the redacted version will be available for access through the Library, and the full version retained by the Library for archival purposes.

10. Appeals

10.1 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 HDRC, within 28 days of date of issue of the decision. If the candidate or supervisor can demonstrate that due process was not followed or that new evidence is available, they may lodge an additional internal appeal with the Executive Dean.

10.2 With regard to matters relating to academic assessment, a candidate who has reasonable grounds for dissatisfaction with any formal decision may appeal. See *Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure*.

11. Responsibilities

11.1. Examiners have responsibility to:

- familiarise themselves with the requirements of the Institute’s examinations process and AQF expectations 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;

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 13 of 14

- provide a clear recommendation to the School with respect to the category of examination outcome, and support this with a written report providing evidence for the decision;
- respond to requests from the HDRC; and
- protect the copyright of the thesis.

11.2 Candidates and supervisors acknowledge 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.

11.3 Theses will be kept permanently both electronically and hard copy. See *Records Management Policy and Procedure*.

Supporting documents and References

Australian Government (2018), *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research*.

Australian Government, *The National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007 (Updated 2018)*.

Australian Government, *The Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes 8th edition (2013)*.

Australian National Data Service, *Guide to Data sharing considerations for Human Research Ethics Committees (2018)*.

ACGR Good Practice Guidelines for Disclosing and Managing Interests in Graduate Research (2021)

Australian Qualifications Framework

MIT:

Academic Freedom and Responsibility Policy

Intellectual Property Policy and Procedure

HDR Candidature Management and Support Policy

HDR Supervision Policy

Records Management Policy and Procedure

Research and Research Training Policy Framework

Responsible Conduct of Research Policy and Procedure

Warning: uncontrolled when printed

Original Issue	19 July 2021
Reviewed by Policy Committee	03 June 2021 & 07 April 2022
Approved by the Academic Board	24 June 2021
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BOD)	07 July 2021 & 06 May 2022
Current version	06 May 2022
Review Date:	05 May 2027
	Page 14 of 14