

RUB Research Degrees Framework 2015

Abbreviations

AAC	Academic Appeals Committee
AB	Academic Board
APRC	Academic Planning and Resources Committee
CAC	College Academic Committee
CRC	College Research Committee
CS	Co-Supervisor
DAA	Dean of Academic Affairs
DRER	Department of Research and External Relations
DRIL	Dean of Research and Industrial Linkages
DSA	Dean of Student Affairs
HDR	Higher Degree Research
IAC	Institute Academic Committee
IP	Intellectual Property
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
OVC	Office of the Vice Chancellor
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
PQC	Programmes and Quality Committee
PS	Principal Supervisor
RIC	Research and Innovation Committee
RDC	Research Degrees Committee
RGoB	Royal Government of Bhutan
RUB	Royal University of Bhutan
UC	University Council
VC	Vice Chancellor
WAL	Wheel of Academic Law

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	2
Table of Contents	3
Chapter 1: Overview	7
1.1. Mandates.....	7
1.2. Purpose	7
1.3. Scope.....	7
1.4. Alignment with Other Policies, Rules and Regulations	8
Chapter 2: Expectations of Research Degrees	9
2.1. Overview	9
2.2. Specific Expectations of the University's Research Degrees	9
Chapter 3: Administration of Research Degrees	11
3.1. Overview	11
3.2. University Council	11
3.3. Academic Board.....	11
3.4. Academic Planning and Resources Committee.....	11
3.5. Research and Innovation Committee.....	12
3.6. Research Degrees Committee.....	12
3.7. Academic Appeals Committee	12
3.8. Office of the Vice Chancellor.....	13
3.9. Institute Academic Committee	13
3.10. College Research Committee (CRC)	13
3.11. College Director	14
3.13 Programme Management.....	14
3.14 Supervisors, Confirmation Panels, and Thesis Committees	14
4 General Structure of Research Degree Programmes	16
4.1 Overview.....	16
4.2 Awards.....	16
4.3 Credit Ratings for Research Degrees	16
4.4 Modes of study	18
4.5 Coursework Modules	18
4.6 Research Proposal Module	20
4.7 Research/Dissertation Modules.....	21
4.8 Programme Management	22

5	Rules for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)	27
5.1	Overview	27
5.2	Admission	27
5.3	Supervision	31
5.4	Confirmation of Candidature	31
5.5	Conditions of Candidature	31
5.6	Exit Pathways	33
5.7	Examination	33
6	Rules for Research Master's Degrees	35
6.1	Overview	35
6.2	Admission	35
6.3	Supervision	36
6.4	Confirmation of Candidature	36
6.5	Conditions of Candidature	36
6.6	Exit Pathways	37
6.7	Examination	38
7	Supervision	39
7.1	Overview	39
7.2	Policy	39
7.3	Registration of Research Degree Supervisors	41
7.4	Appointment of Supervisors	45
7.5	General Responsibilities of All Supervisors	46
7.6	Supervisors of International Students	48
7.7	Responsibilities of Principal and Co-Supervisors	48
7.8	Change of Supervision Arrangements	50
8	Admissions and Enrollment	51
8.1	Overview	51
8.2	General Requirements for Admission	51
8.3	Components of the Research Degree Programme Application	51
8.4	Preliminary Research Proposal	52
8.5	Minimum Competency Standards	52
8.6	Application Processing	53
8.7	International Students	53
8.8	Enrollment	53
9	Confirmation of Candidature	55

9.1	Overview.....	55
9.2	Specific Aims of Confirmation.....	55
9.3	Confirmation Process.....	55
9.4	Non-Compliance with Confirmation of Candidature	57
9.5	Appeals.....	57
9.6	Formation of Thesis Committee	57
10	Candidature Matters.....	58
10.1	Overview.....	58
10.2	Roles and Responsibilities of the Student/Candidate	58
10.3	Confirmation Panel / Thesis Committee	59
10.4	Progress Reporting During Candidature.....	61
10.5	Studying as an Internal Student	62
10.6	Studying as an External Student.....	62
10.7	Enrollment in Additional Coursework Modules	62
10.8	Change of Mode/Status of Study.....	62
10.9	Change in Dissertation Title / Research Topic	63
10.10	Fieldwork and Research Overseas.....	63
10.11	Publishing.....	64
10.12	Variations in Candidature	64
10.13	Dismissal for Academic Reasons	67
11	Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct	70
11.1	Overview.....	70
11.2	Scope	70
11.3	Purpose of the Policy	71
11.4	Definitions	71
11.5	Responsibilities of the University.....	75
11.6	Responsibilities of the University Academic Staff.....	75
11.7	Responsibilities and Rights of Students	76
11.8	Penalties for Plagiarism or Academic Misconduct	78
11.9	Processes for Handling Allegations of Plagiarism or Academic Misconduct	79
11.10	Decision	81
11.11	Appeals.....	83
11.12	Examples	83
12	Dissertation Preparation, Submission, and Examination	86
12.1	Overview.....	86

12.2	<i>Dissertation Expectations</i>	86
12.3	<i>Process</i>	86
12.4	<i>General Guidelines for Dissertation Preparation</i>	87
12.5	<i>Internal Examination (Oral Defense)</i>	89
12.6	<i>External Examination</i>	92
12.7	<i>Final Submission</i>	95
13	Student Support	98
13.1	<i>Overview</i>	98
13.2	<i>Minimum Facilities</i>	98
13.3	<i>Student Resources and Induction</i>	98
13.4	<i>Disputes between Students and Supervisors</i>	99
13.5	<i>Grievance Procedures</i>	99
14	Tuition, Scholarships, and Funding	101
14.1	<i>Overview</i>	101
14.2	<i>Tuition and Funding for Research Degree Programmes</i>	101
14.3	<i>Employment Whilst on Scholarship</i>	101
14.4	<i>Extensions of Scholarships</i>	102
14.5	<i>Suspension of Scholarship</i>	102
15	Planning, Approval, and Monitoring of Research Degree Programmes	103
15.1	<i>Overview</i>	103
15.2	<i>Design of Research Degree Programmes</i>	103
15.3	<i>Planning Approval for a New Programme</i>	103
15.4	<i>Validation of a New Programme and the Adoption of an Existing Programme</i>	109
15.5	<i>Annual Monitoring of Programmes</i>	119
15.6	<i>Quality Criteria</i>	121
15.7	<i>Review of Programmes in Operation</i>	126
15.8	<i>Changes to Programmes</i>	129
	Definitions	132
	Acknowledgements and References	133

Chapter 1: Overview

1.1. Mandates

- 1.1.1. As per the Royal Charter of the Royal University of Bhutan, Article 2, one of the objectives of the University shall be “to promote and conduct research, to contribute to the creation of knowledge in an international context, and to promote the transfer of knowledge relevant to Bhutan.”
- 1.1.2. As per the Tertiary Education Policy of the Kingdom of Bhutan, 2010, “A strategic objective for Bhutan shall be to increase research, innovation and the use of new knowledge in all aspects of the country’s work; to improve the system for the dissemination of information and the provision of relevant information to persons in need of that information; and to develop a culture of enquiry and investigation in the society. It must be the responsibility of the education system at all levels to encourage a culture of curiosity and enquiry among the students and, at the tertiary level, a culture in which research and analysis are not only encouraged, but expected as an integral part of the institution’s programme.”
- 1.1.3. As per the terms of the Research Degrees Committee, approved by the Academic Board of the University (see the Wheel of Academic Law), one of the functions of the RDC shall be to “devise a research degrees framework”.

1.2. Purpose

- 1.2.1. The Framework aims to detail the processes of development, implementation, and monitoring of all research based postgraduate study in the University.
- 1.2.2. The Framework defines the roles and responsibilities of administrators, faculty, and students with respect to the official policies, procedures, and structures of the University governing all aspects of research degrees.
- 1.2.3. The Framework incorporates or refers to the Research Policy Handbook and the Wheel of Academic Law to clarify sections relevant to research degrees.

1.3. Scope

- 1.3.1. All PhD degrees awarded at the University are research degrees. The University does not offer non-research PhD degrees at this time. Within the University’s PhD programmes:
 - 1.3.1.1. At least 85% of the total student time and effort is dedicated to research activities, including direct student work on a student’s own project leading to a dissertation, plus effort in modules related to research training; and
 - 1.3.1.2. At least 75% of the total student time and effort is dedicated to direct work on his/her own project leading to a dissertation.
- 1.3.2. Any Master’s degree programme within the University that meets all of the following criteria is a programme that awards research degrees (Research Master’s degree, or Master’s by Research degree).
 - 1.3.2.1. At least two-third (67%) of the total student time and effort is dedicated to research activities, including direct student work on his/her own project plus effort in taught modules related to research training.
- 1.3.3. Student time and effort are measured by credit ratings as described in Section 4.3 of RDF for the purpose of determining whether a programme meets the definition of a research degree programme.

1.4. Alignment with Other Policies, Rules and Regulations

- 1.4.1. The policies outlined herein are subject to approval by the Academic Board.
- 1.4.2. These policies in general shall not supersede any existing policies set by the University Council or Academic Board unless explicitly stated as such and approved.
 - 1.4.2.1. In developing the RDF, as agreed by the 27th Academic Board meeting in January, 2013, RDC shall take over all aspects of programmes leading to the award of research degrees, in lieu of the PQC. Consequently, Sections B8 (The Postgraduate Modular Framework), E (Planning Process), and F (Approval and Review of programmes) of the Wheel of Academic Law (2011), and subsections therein, shall not apply. Therefore, the sections (related to the planning, approval, functioning, management, and monitoring of *taught* academic programmes), are superseded by the corresponding sections given herein relating to *research* degrees, and the PQC is not expected to administer research degrees.
- 1.4.3. These policies shall not supersede any laws, policies, or regulations set by the RGoB or its lawfully appointed bodies, including but not limited to the Tertiary Education Policy of Bhutan and the Bhutan Qualifications Framework.

Chapter 2: Expectations of Research Degrees

2.1. Overview

- 2.1.1. The Royal University of Bhutan aims to be Bhutan's leading research institution and it expects higher degree research to contribute greatly toward this. The minimum requirements of graduates in Bhutan are governed by the Bhutan Qualifications Framework (2012) as set by the Bhutan Accreditation Council on a mandate from the Tertiary Education Policy of Bhutan (2010). These are directly replicated here in 2.2. Beyond those requirements, this Chapter also outlines the University's own expectations of research degree award programmes, and who should undertake them (2.3).

2.2. Specific Expectations of the University's Research Degrees

2.2.1. PhD degree

- 2.2.1.1. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is conferred on candidates who have demonstrated to the satisfaction of their department or school substantial scholarship, high attainment in a particular field of knowledge, often leading to the creation of new knowledge or redefining existing knowledge, and ability to do independent investigation and present the results of such research. They must satisfy the general requirements for advanced degrees as well as the Programme requirements specified by their departments, such as a requirement for publication.
- 2.2.1.2. A PhD is for people who:
- 2.2.1.2.1. Want to follow their interest in an area of research, to focus on this for several years and make an important contribution to the development of their field of study.
 - 2.2.1.2.2. Plan to pursue a career in academia, industry or government working largely in an intellectual, academic, and planning capacity that will typically involve continued research as well as the potential for mentoring others in their research activities.
 - 2.2.1.2.3. Are motivated and who have the support to complete a large-scale research project over several years.
 - 2.2.1.2.4. Successfully completed a Masters by Research (or equivalent).
- 2.2.1.3. PhD degree programmes comprise independent research and writing on a research question or questions leading to a dissertation for examination, along with some coursework and research training as applicable to a particular programme. The research may be undertaken in any Colleges/Institutes of the University, or between Colleges/Institutes of the University depending upon availability of supervisors and facilities. The dissertation investigation, preparation and writing are supervised by a Principal Supervisor and Co-Supervisors (whose numbers are determined by the Principal Supervisor based on need). Other faculty with current active interest and expertise in the subject area may also supervise the candidate's research. To qualify for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy a candidate will submit a dissertation for examination.
- 2.2.1.4. PhD degree programmes require a minimum period of full-time candidature of three years (or up to six years part-time), with at least 75% of the effort dedicated towards individual dissertation research.

2.2.2. Research Master's degree

- 2.2.2.1. A Research Master's degree is considered a research training award and if the dissertation resulting from it is of sufficient quality it may be the basis for an application for a PhD. A Master with Research dissertation should exhibit a thorough understanding of the field investigated,

display competence in the chosen field through judicious selection and application of methods to yield fruitful results, demonstrate the capacity to evaluate these results and present well written work.

2.2.2.2. A Research Master's degree is for people who:

2.2.2.2.1. Want to continue studies beyond a Bachelor's degree, with greater focus on developing their capacity for innovative, independent research, critical thinking, time and project management and problem-solving.

2.2.2.2.2. Have, or can develop, excellent skills of collecting, organizing, evaluating and presenting data.

2.2.2.2.3. Pursue a career in academia, industry, or government that involves sustained independent work, and where research is a key focus but a PhD is not specifically required.

2.2.2.2.4. Want to pursue a PhD degree in the future.

2.2.2.3. Research Master's degree programmes comprise research-informed coursework and training relevant to a general field of study, along with independent research and writing on a research question or questions leading to a dissertation for examination. The research may be undertaken in any Colleges/Institutes of the University, or between Colleges/Institutes of the University depending upon availability of supervisors and facilities. The dissertation investigation, preparation and writing are supervised by Principal Supervisors and Co-Supervisors. Other faculty with current active interest and expertise in the subject area may also supervise the candidate's research. To qualify for the award of the degree of Master by Research a candidate will submit a dissertation for examination.

2.2.2.4. Research Master's degree programmes require a minimum period of full-time candidature of one and a half years (or three years part-time), with at least 60% of the effort dedicated towards individual dissertation research.

Chapter 3: Administration of Research Degrees

3.1. Overview

3.1.1. Research at the University occurs within the context of numerous administrative structures serving a variety of purposes such as governance and management, setting and enforcement of standards, ensuring quality, and providing support to researchers. The University's highest body is the University Council, which delegates executive management of the University to the Vice Chancellor and all academic matters, including research, to the Academic Board, which comprises several committees responsible for its different functions. The Department of Research and External Relations at the Office of the Vice Chancellor provides the linkage between the Academic Board's policies and the research activities occurring at individual Colleges. Within Colleges, research is managed by Directors, Deans of Research and Industrial Linkages, and Research Center Coordinators with the approval and monitoring of College Research Committees. Research degrees are governed primarily by the Research Degrees Committee of the Academic Board. For each approved research degree programme, there exists a Programme Committee and Programme Leader based in the concerned College.

3.2. University Council

3.2.1. The University Council is the supreme governing body of the Royal University of Bhutan, subject to the provision of the Royal Charter (Statutes of the Royal University of Bhutan, Article 3). The University Council determines the educational character of the University, lays down policies and provides directions and support for efficient functioning of the University, and approves the work plan, budget estimates and the accounts for the University on an annual basis. The University Council delegates the management of the University to the Vice Chancellor, and the academic authority to the Academic Board.

3.3. Academic Board

3.3.1. The Academic Board is the primary academic authority of the University responsible for academic affairs, including academic standards, research, scholarship, teaching and courses at the University. (Statutes of the Royal University of Bhutan, Article 6). The primary functions that fall within the remit of the Academic Board include the following: determining the award structure of the University, programmes and quality, library and IT provision within the University, assessment and examinations, admission and registration of students, resources and planning, student support systems, programme operation and management, research, research degrees, and scholarships. The Academic Board appoints members to several committees relevant to research degrees, including the Academic Planning and Resources Committee, the Research and Innovations Committee, the Research Degrees Committee, and the Academic Appeals Committee. Moreover, each Institute Academic Committee and Programme Board of Examiners reports to the Academic Board.

3.4. Academic Planning and Resources Committee

3.4.1. The purpose of the APRC is to review and integrate academic and resource planning in support of the University's objectives. It brings together the Vice-Chancellor's responsibilities for the management of the University's resources for which he/she is responsible to the University Council, and the responsibility of the Academic Board for the academic functions of the University. The Committee considers and acts upon the proposals for the allocation of resources. It prepares the University's Strategic Plan and the Annual Corporate Plan derived from it, and exercises delegated powers on behalf of the Academic Board in this matter. Insofar as resources are concerned, all the Committees of the Academic Board, including those related to research, are subject to the guidance of this Committee. The APRC is the starting point and final authority on making recommendations to the Academic Board

regarding consideration and approval of proposals for planning new programmes from member colleges or proposing the need for new programmes to member colleges.

3.5. Research and Innovation Committee

- 3.5.1. The Research and Innovation Committee promotes research and innovation within the University and its associated professions. It effectively governs the conduct of all research activities within the University or research undertaken with University resources, including any research done by faculty, students, and other University personnel. The University's Research Policy Handbook is formulated and maintained by the RIC, covering all aspects of research at the University. While the structures, procedures, policies and standards with respect to research degrees are covered in this framework, when students undertake research activities, matters pertaining to the conduct of that work and University-wide standards are covered by *ZHIB 'TSHOL: RUB Research Policies*. The full terms of reference for the RIC are given in the *ZHIB 'TSHOL: RUB Research Policies*.

3.6. Research Degrees Committee

- 3.6.1. Purpose and Function – The Committee serves as the guarantor of standards of quality in respect of the registration, progress and examination of students registered for research degrees. The Committee is responsible for the implementation and development of all academic quality assurance systems governing the registration, monitoring and examination of research degrees. In particular the Committee shall:
- 3.6.1.1. Set policies and standards with respect to research degrees, and maintain them in the Research Degrees Framework along with accompanying Procedures.
 - 3.6.1.2. Monitor all aspects of research degrees.
 - 3.6.1.3. Approve nominations of examiners and make recommendations to the Academic Board.
- 3.6.2. Membership
- 3.6.2.1. Chair: Pro Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or such other person as is appointed by the Academic Board.
 - 3.6.2.2. Members: [Members will be appointed based on their ability to contribute to the research degree awarding process and will normally have experience of research degree supervision and examining.]
 - 3.6.2.2.1. Director of Research.
 - 3.6.2.2.2. One member appointed by and from the Academic Board.
 - 3.6.2.2.3. Four members appointed by the Academic Board. [These shall be members of staff with experience in supervising research students, preferably to completion.]
 - 3.6.2.2.4. Two external members appointed by the Academic Board from outside of the University, with experience of supervising research students.
 - 3.6.2.2.5. One research student [This requirement is deferred, and may be reinstituted in the future].

3.7. Academic Appeals Committee

- 3.7.1. Status as per WAL A7.5 – The 1st Academic Board Meeting in July 2004 endorsed the constitution of this Committee, but agreed to establish this Committee in the future.

- 3.7.2. The Academic Appeals Committee acts to make independent considerations of student's progress upon request for reconsideration of results or decisions made by a Board of Examiners. Where research degrees are concerned, appeals related to academic/coursework components are considered by the Academic Appeals Committee. Appeals related to research matters are handled by the structures detailed herein and in the Research policies handbook. The full terms of reference for the AAC are given in the Wheel of Academic Law, Section A7.5.

3.8. Office of the Vice Chancellor

- 3.8.1. Vice Chancellor – As per the Royal Charter (Statutes of the Royal University of Bhutan, Article 4), The VC is the Executive Head of the University, responsible for the organization, management, and discipline of the University, subject to the general control and direction of the University Council. In terms of research, the VC provides strategic direction to the University and encourages the development of a vibrant research environment. The VC also explores new avenues for enhancement of research at the University and supports the establishment of external research linkages.
- 3.8.2. Pro Vice Chancellor (Planning and Research) – In relation to research and innovation, the PVC may provide guidance towards the University's research mission and support the enhancement of research activities at the University. The PVC also serves on the Academic Board, and the APRC, as well as chairing the RIC and the RDC.
- 3.8.3. Department of Research and External Relations (DRER) – The DRER at the OVC is responsible for coordinating and consolidating research activities within the University. Headed by the Director for Research and External Relations, the Department serves as the Secretariat for the RIC and the RDC, identifying research needs at the University and initiating appropriate means for addressing them. In doing so, the Department receives support from various research committees, DRILs, centers and individuals. DRER and the committees are also responsible for developing and implementing research policies, guidelines, procedures, and infrastructure for research. The Department provides the stimulus for and facilitates research across the University, for example, by exploring funding opportunities, publishing the Bhutan Journal of Research and Development, by facilitating dissemination of research findings, and by promoting capacity building and networking across the University. Specifically, it looks after the functioning of CRCs, research centers, and research degrees through its Research Services division. The Department also maintains centralized records about research activities at the University.

3.9. Institute Academic Committee

- 3.9.1. Each College has an Institute/College Academic committee that serves as the highest academic body in the College, in effect acting as the representative of the University's Academic Board. The purpose of the Committee is to serve as the guarantor of academic standards and quality in respect to the design, delivery, development and promotion of best practice in curricula, programmes, general educational matters and research within the Institute. It is responsible for implementation of the University academic quality assurance policies and procedures covering the development and the monitoring of taught programmes, learning and teaching, and the academic support of students within the institutes. Most of its functions related to research are delegated to the College Research Committee in the institute. However, where management is concerned, it is in charge of managing all programmes leading to University awards, including research degrees. The full terms of reference for the IAC/CAC are given in the Wheel of Academic Law, Section A7.6.

3.10. College Research Committee (CRC)

- 3.10.1. Each college coordinates its research activities through the College Research Committee. Although programme and student management for research degrees and is done according to the same norms as other programmes (and administered overall by the RDC), the research activities carried out by all researchers in a college, including students, are under the jurisdiction of the College Research

Committee. Research degree students must seek approval for and regularly report on their research to their CRC as required. The full terms of reference for the CRC are given in the RPH, Section 2.10.

3.11. College Director

- 3.11.1. The Director is responsible for the quality of work carried out by his or her staff and for the standard of work achieved in the programmes for which the College is responsible, and for allocating the resources necessary to support the implementation of those programmes. The Director fulfils these functions, *inter alia*, by taking responsibility for the recruitment, retention, and academic development of the staff in terms of their research, scholarly and professional activities.
- 3.11.2. The Director must ensure that competent research degree supervision and facilities are available within the College for research degree programmes implemented there.
- 3.11.3. The Director must also ensure provision of the resources to teach coursework modules in the way that has been agreed. This will require:

3.12 Dean of Research and Industrial Linkages (DRIL)

- 3.12.1 DRIL serves as the central driving force behind research activities at the College. DRIL is the focal person for all research guidance, support and administration functions at a College, including quality assurance, monitoring, and reporting. The DRIL has oversight of CRCs, research centers, faculty research, and external linkages. He/She also facilitates the proper conduct of student research, including the research components of research degree programs. Specifically, the DRIL facilitates the development and implementation of research degree programmes in the College; develops research capacity and capabilities of the College through periodic professional development programmes; serve in College Research Committees and exercise oversight authority on the conduct of research in the College, including student research; and serves as the focal person for handling grievances or dealing with academic or research misconduct.

3.13 Programme Management

- 3.13.1 Every degree programme is managed by a Programme Committee that is responsible for the effective conduct, organization, resource management, and development of the programme. The Programme Committee is the main point of contact for all matters related to research degree students' admission and enrollment, candidature, progress monitoring, and examination. The Committee is convened by a Programme Leader, normally nominated by the Institute Academic Committee, to provide the academic and organizational leadership for the programme and chair the Programme Committee.

3.14 Supervisors, Confirmation Panels, and Thesis Committees

- 3.14.1 Every research degree student is supervised from enrollment to final submission of the dissertation by a Principal and Co-Supervisor who take primary responsibility for the progress of the student's dissertation work. Early in the course, students must undergo confirmation of candidature to ensure that they are prepared for and capable of undertaking the remainder of the course, particularly the research component. Confirmation is done through examination by the Confirmation Panel, consisting of the Principal and Co-Supervisors and two to three additional members. Upon successful confirmation, the Panel takes on more of a guidance and progress monitoring role and becomes the candidate's Thesis Committee. The Thesis Committee is responsible for advising and evaluating the candidate's research progress. Once the student is ready, the Committee members serve as internal examiners of the candidate's dissertation and ensure that it is up to

Programme and University standards and ready for external examination. Upon successful external examination, the Thesis Committee is responsible for endorsing the final submission of the dissertation.

4 General Structure of Research Degree Programmes

4.1 Overview

- 4.1.1 Research degree programmes at the University include the PhD degree and Master's degrees with significant research components. The taught and research components of the programmes will all be weighed and assessed proportionally to their significance in the programme and the amount of student effort required for each component. This involves organizing the programme into coursework and research modules with appropriate credit weights and assessment schemes as described herein. Coursework modules follow the standard University guidelines for taught modules, while research modules exist solely to provide the appropriate weight to research components of a programme. The structure of a programme follows the guidelines given here and is managed by a Programme Committee and Programme Leader.

4.2 Awards

- 4.2.1 A research degree programme of study may lead to the award of:
 - 4.2.1.1 PhD degree – Doctor of Philosophy
 - 4.2.1.2 Master's degree – Any programme leading to the awarding of a Master's degree involving a substantial research component as described above, regardless of whether it is categorized as MA, MSc, MEd, MBA, or any other Master's degree, may be a research Master's degree.
- 4.2.2 The full award shall include the title of the award and the subject name e.g. Master of Arts (MA) in English, or Master of Sciences (MSc) in Computer Science, except in the case of MEd where the full title shall be Master of Education. Students completing modules that do not meet the requirements for an award shall be issued with academic transcripts to record their performance in the modules they have undertaken.
- 4.2.3 Although the awards of the University are generally not classified, the Research Degrees Committee may grant a PhD award "with distinction" in the case of exceptionally high quality dissertation work completed.

4.3 Credit Ratings for Research Degrees

- 4.3.1 As per the Bhutan Qualifications Framework section on Credit and Academic Load, credit is the quantitative measure that represents the volume of learning or academic load to attain the set learning outcomes. Academic load is a quantitative measure of all learning activities required to achieve a defined set of learning outcomes. These activities include lecture, tutorial, seminar, practical, self-study, retrieval of information, research, fieldwork, and preparing for and sitting of examinations. Ten hours of notional student learning time is valued as one credit. The uniformity in meaning and understanding of the definitions of credit and academic load facilitates the comparability of the various national qualifications frameworks, eases student mobility, supports curriculum development and simplifies recognition at the international level. The credits will be awarded based on the amount of time and effort a learner invests in carrying out the activities and for demonstrating the understanding, application and creation of knowledge.

- 4.3.2 As per the Wheel of Academic Law (2011), University taught programmes follow the BQF credit definitions, but research degree programmes are not specifically credit rated. However, for the following purposes, research degree programmes shall also track and apportion student time and effort according to credits:
- 4.3.2.1 To help maintain uniformity across the University's academic offerings.
 - 4.3.2.2 To provide a common understanding of how student time and student effort should be spent.
 - 4.3.2.3 To enable the calculation of cumulative/aggregate marks based on the relative weights of different components of the programme (coursework modules, confirmation of candidature, research work, and dissertation examination).
- 4.3.3 Full-time research degree programmes will typically require 60 credits per regular semester, with a semester-long postgraduate module typically meriting 15 credits. Depending on the requirements of different research degree programmes approved at the University, it may be possible to exceed or go below 60 credits per semester.
- 4.3.3.1 Where appropriate, undergraduate modules of 12 credits (for example honours programme) may be selectively adapted by research degree programmes and granted 15 credits. The programme documents should then clearly demonstrate the additional effort/quality expected from the postgraduate students to merit the extra credit rating.
- 4.3.4 Research Master's degree programmes shall require and be rated at a minimum of 180 credits (subject to the criteria set in Section 1.3.2) and 1.5 years (3 semesters) of full-time effort, while PhD programmes shall require and be rated at a minimum of 360 credits and 3 years (6 semesters) of full-time effort, excluding inter-semester break work. Depending on the requirements of different research degree programmes approved at the University, exceeding 180 and 360 credits, respectively, may be expected.
- 4.3.5 Research work done full-time during regular breaks between semesters shall be rated at 30 credits (2 months) for the winter break and 15 credits (1 month) for the summer break. Research works done after the final regular semester, by extension as necessary, shall be rated at 45 credits for every three month extension. Research work done after external examination, in response to RDC requirements for additional work, shall not be credited.
- 4.3.6 Marks are assigned to every block of credit as per the specific requirements of different research degree programmes.
- 4.3.6.1 Research Master's degrees shall be fully marked and culminate in a final overall percentage reflected on the transcript. For the calculation of a student's final percentage, the marks for each block of credit are cumulated according to the relative weight/size of each block. Depending on a Programme's particular structure and requirements, it may be possible for all the dissertation work to be assessed as a single large block, with the marks coming from the internal and external examination of the dissertation.

- 4.3.6.2 PhD degrees shall have marked and unmarked components. All coursework, including research training modules, shall have percentage marks assigned and culminate in a coursework overall percentage reflected on the transcript. The research work shall not be marked but shall be evaluated in a regular manner based on progress, and in a summative manner based the outcomes of the internal and external examination on a pass/fail basis.

4.4 Modes of study

- 4.4.1 The Research Degrees Framework is designed to facilitate student choice and to allow students to pursue postgraduate study full-time or part-time while still in employment. It is therefore intended that the modules may be available in ways that allow part-time study. Thus, the modules may be offered:
 - 4.4.1.1 By full-time study during term time
 - 4.4.1.2 In normal working hours during the weekdays
 - 4.4.1.3 In the evening or on weekends
 - 4.4.1.4 In concentrated blocks of full-time study during extended breaks, such as winter school
 - 4.4.1.5 Mixed-mode that includes distance learning (for some components only)

4.5 Coursework Modules

- 4.5.1 A coursework module is a self-contained, taught part of a research degree programme with separate aims, pre-requisites, syllabus, and assessment scheme. A coursework module follows the Module Descriptor structure specified in the Wheel of Academic Law (Section B4).
- 4.5.2 A coursework module consists of a piece of curriculum that is assessed and leads to an assessment included in the students' final transcript. It should be sufficiently large to allow real development and learning within the module, e.g. a tenth of a year's work. It may be taught by a number of staff with required expertise but one person teaching the same module must coordinate.
- 4.5.3 Each module will be located in a specific College department that will have the ultimate responsibility for the successful operation of the module. That department is responsible for the quality of the teaching of that module and for the provision of resources for it. Responsibility for the quality of delivery of the module extends to the appointment of the module coordinator and of the staff responsible for teaching the module. Responsibility for the standard of the module and responsibility for the appointment of staff should not preclude mutually advantageous arrangements for the sharing of teaching but the responsibility for the module must not be in doubt. Each module will be located in a specific College that will have the ultimate responsibility for the successful operation of the module.
- 4.5.4 A module may contribute to more than one programme. For example, a College may have an advanced research methods module or a research ethics / responsible conduct module common to all the research degree programmes offered at the College.

- 4.5.5 Similar to modules from other postgraduate programmes, a standard coursework module in the Research Degrees Framework typically comprises 15 credit points or multiples thereof. Although the postgraduate module is larger than an undergraduate module, it may contain fewer contact teaching hours and require more independent effort.
- 4.5.6 A key feature of coursework modules in research degree programmes is that they follow the paradigm of research-informed teaching. Subject content and knowledge that would be important for a higher degree in a particular field should still be delivered in a research-focused way. This means that instructors and students should consider the source of the content, how it was originally discovered and how it has evolved, the underlying assumptions. A critical analysis of all course content would be typical. It is expected that teaching and learning materials be based mostly on primary literature such as journal articles, and be updated constantly to reflect the latest developments in a field.
- 4.5.7 The Module Coordinator – The effective operation of a coursework module rests with the module coordinator, whose duties are as follows:
 - 4.5.7.1 To advise the Head of Department / School on the staffing and other resources needed for the module.
 - 4.5.7.2 To ensure that the teaching and assessment of the module complies with the approved module descriptor.
 - 4.5.7.3 To maintain the currency of the curriculum content.
 - 4.5.7.4 In the first week, to provide students with the curriculum, reading lists and assessment schedules.
 - 4.5.7.5 To be responsible for the assessment of the module including the co-ordination of marking and the preparation of examination papers.
 - 4.5.7.6 To provide the programme leader well in advance of the Board of Examiners with the marks of students who have studied that module.
 - 4.5.7.7 To evaluate the operation of the module and contribute to the evaluation of the programmes of which the module forms a part.
- 4.5.8 Regulations for Assessment, Progression and Awards
 - 4.5.8.1 These regulations must be read in conjunction with the University's assessment regulations for coursework modules as set out in the Wheel of Academic Law.
 - 4.5.8.2 Student performance on a module is assessed by continuous coursework, formal examination or both. The relative weighting of these components varies from module to module, and will be set out in the module descriptors and will reflect the nature and aims of the module. Students will be informed in writing at the beginning of a module of the assessment structure, number of pieces of programme work required, and submission deadlines.
 - 4.5.8.3 The marks and descriptors for the marks will follow the University's general assessment regulations as set out in the Wheel of Academic Law.

- 4.5.8.4 To pass a module a student must have registered on the module within the period of registration, have obtained an overall mark of 50% and not less than 50% in each of the prescribed assessment components (see the Wheel of Academic Law).
- 4.5.8.5 If a student fails a module, he or she may be offered a reassessment for that module. Progression to the next semester is not possible if there was a failure in more than one coursework module in any given semester.
- 4.5.8.6 The maximum period of registration for full-time students is one year beyond the normal course duration; for part-time students it is two years. A student may cease to be registered for a postgraduate award if he or she:
 - 4.5.8.6.1 Accumulates three or more failures on any taught module (s) whether or not these have been later redeemed through re-assessment.
 - 4.5.8.6.2 Fails to register on any module in two successive semesters without prior approval (unless enrolled on a dissertation).
 - 4.5.8.6.3 Is granted a degree award.
 - 4.5.8.6.4 Fails to have the dissertation proposal approved.
- 4.5.8.7 The relationship of the numerical marks to descriptions of performance is as described in the Wheel of Academic Law.

4.6 Research Proposal Module

- 4.6.1 Every research degree programme shall have a Research Proposal module in the first semester of the course dedicated to finalizing the research proposal and preparing it for confirmation of candidature. The module is assessed by the Confirmation Panel. It may weigh 15 or 30 credits. Each Programme shall specify such a module generally aligned with the following guideline. It may follow the standard coursework Module Descriptor, but is expected functionally to comprise mostly independent student effort.
- 4.6.2 The research proposal module aims to:
 - 4.6.2.1 Develop research planning skills, including independent inquiry.
 - 4.6.2.2 Produce a coherent and logically argued piece of writing that demonstrates competence in research designing and planning, and the ability to operate independently.
 - 4.6.2.3 Address issues of research design, methodology, ethics and theoretical arguments.
 - 4.6.2.4 Provide a framework for students to prepare for specializing in an area of study.
 - 4.6.2.5 Ensure that a student has a research question at a level commensurate to the degree programme he/she is enrolled in, and methodology appropriate to the research question.

- 4.6.3 On successful completion, as verified by a Confirmation Panel, a candidate should:
- 4.6.3.1 Have a fully developed research plan.
 - 4.6.3.2 Know how to design and plan an ethically acceptable research project in one area of their field of study. The candidate should be able to select from different methodologies, methods and forms of analysis to produce a suitable research design, and justify the design.
 - 4.6.3.3 Have formulated a question relevant to their field of study that will be justified by extensive background work and literature review.
 - 4.6.3.4 Be prepared to undertake original project work: either by conducting an empirical investigation, where there is an emphasis on primary data collection, interpretation, presentation, analysis and evaluation; or by conducting a desk study, where there is an emphasis on a wide range of, and careful synthesis and critical evaluation of, the source material.
 - 4.6.3.5 Be able to discuss the ethical dimensions of their research and obtain appropriate ethical approval if needed.
 - 4.6.3.6 Present and justify an outline of his/her plan to the Confirmation Panel in writing and orally.
 - 4.6.3.7 Present the written research proposal for CRC approval.

4.7 Research/Dissertation Modules

- 4.7.1 The research component of research degree programmes is done on a largely independent basis under the guidance of the Thesis Committee and within the guidelines for each Programme. To maintain minimum standards and expectations for student efforts into their research, the research shall be officially credited within the framework of research modules.
- 4.7.2 Research shall be allocated credit weight and may be divided into modules as necessary for each Programme requirements, in multiples of 15 credits. Full-time research work during a semester is typically 60 credits.
- 4.7.3 Research modules do not follow the Module Descriptor that is standard for coursework modules. Rather, they exist primarily to specify credit weight and assessment criteria. They are numbered at the 600 level for Master's programmes and at the 700 level for PhD programmes. They are numbered sequentially from 1 up to 99 (depending on how long a particular student takes to complete his/her course). For example, the first 15 credit module of research a PhD candidate enrolls in is RES701 (or equivalent code). It is not expected that every research degree student's enrollment within a cohort be synchronized, due to differing circumstances such as opting in/out of inter-semester break enrollment, taking suspension of candidature, or extending candidature.
- 4.7.4 The final number of research modules / credits that each candidate accumulates is variable (but above the minimum required for a Programme), depending on the actual effort put in by a candidate beyond the semester beginning and end dates, including credits accumulated during inter-semester breaks and during extensions of candidature.

- 4.7.5 Assessment of research modules may occur in two different ways depending on the needs of individual Programmes:
- 4.7.5.1 Marks may be assigned to the blocks of work done between every Thesis Committee meeting. The Thesis Committee, after each six-month progress reporting meeting with the candidate (typically at the end of a regular semester), may assign marks to the block of research work done since the last meeting, weighed according to all the research credits accumulated (typically 60 credits for the work done during the semester plus credits as appropriate for inter-semester work done since the last meeting). Credits accumulated after the final Thesis Committee meeting and prior to submission for external examination are assigned to the dissertation. The weight of the marks assigned to the dissertation, as assessed by the dissertation examination, shall be a minimum of 60 for Master's programmes and 120 for PhD programmes.
 - 4.7.5.2 Progress on Master's research work during candidature may be assessed purely on a Pass/Fail basis by the Thesis Committee, with no specific marks assigned. Instead, all the credits accumulated on research modules after the Confirmation may be totaled as one large block and assigned a single percentage mark based on assessment by dissertation examination.
 - 4.7.5.3 Specific percentage marks for any blocks of credit are not maintained for research work towards PhD degrees. Credits are recorded for the purpose of ensuring enough time and effort have been expended towards the dissertation work. Blocks of credit are evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis, and a fail mark would indicate that those credits are not accumulated towards fulfillment of the requirements of the degree award.
- 4.7.6 Accumulation of credits ceases once a dissertation is submitted for external examination. After external examination, if the RDC requires additional work to be done on the dissertation, credits shall continue to accumulate on the extra work unless otherwise specified by the RDC.
- 4.7.7 For any purpose where a research module may need to be assigned a "Module Coordinator", it shall be the Principal Supervisor.

4.8 Programme Management

- 4.8.1 The Programme – A Programme is usually based in an academic department or other section of a College that provides administrative support, a focus for student interaction, the source of information, and easy contact between the Programme Leader and students. In most cases this 'department' will also look after most of the modules in the programme, but there will generally be some modules that are taught by specialist staff from outside that department.
- 4.8.2 Programme Leader
- 4.8.2.1 A Programme Leader will normally be nominated by the Institute/College Academic Committee. A Programme Leader is accountable in day-to-day operational terms to the Head of College or

Head of Department / School; and will normally hold office for a full cycle of the Programme, and possibly longer.

4.8.2.2 The appointment of the subsidiary office-bearers, such as tutors, is at the discretion of the Head of Department. In the case of very large or complex programmes it may be appropriate to appoint an assistant Programme Leader.

4.8.2.3 The Programme Leader will provide the academic and organizational leadership for the programme and will chair the Programme Committee. A Programme Leader can expect the full support and co-operation of the Head of Department/School and Heads of other contributing departments but should recognize that a Head will have to balance a range of departmental demands and priorities in allocating staff and resources.

4.8.2.4 A Programme Leader's responsibilities are:

4.8.2.4.1 As Convener of the Programme Committee to ensure the effective organization and conduct of the programme within agreed policies and regulations; to monitor the operation of the programme on an ongoing basis, and to co-ordinate its annual evaluation.

4.8.2.4.2 To lead the academic development of the programme.

4.8.2.4.3 To negotiate with the Head(s) of Department(s) the allocation of appropriate staff for teaching and other duties required by the programme.

4.8.2.4.4 To co-ordinate any necessary interaction with professional and external validating bodies through the appropriate internal mechanisms.

4.8.2.4.5 To select students for admissions.

4.8.2.4.6 To keep in close touch with the academic welfare and progress of students in the programme, and to be closely aware of students' views about the programme.

4.8.2.4.7 To coordinate all the assessments, to agree on an assessment schedule in consultation with the module coordinators, to ensure that examination papers are dispatched to the external examiner, to ensure that the responses are addressed, and to present student marks to the main Board of Examiners.

4.8.2.4.8 To take executive action as agreed by the Programme Committee.

4.8.2.4.9 To report to the College Director such matters related to research degrees as may be relevant.

4.8.3 Programme Committee

4.8.3.1 The Programme Committee shall be appointed by the Institute Academic Committee and shall consist of:

- 4.8.3.1.1 The Programme Leader (Chair)
- 4.8.3.1.2 The Head of host Department
- 4.8.3.1.3 The Heads of contributing departments (or their nominees)
- 4.8.3.1.4 Staff with specified responsibilities (admissions, year, field supervision, projects, etc)
- 4.8.3.1.5 Exceptionally, external membership may be proposed where directly relevant to the operation of the Programme.

4.8.3.2 The Committee will be responsible for the effective conduct, organization and development of the programme, including:

- 4.8.3.2.1 Ensuring the appointment of tutors as required (module, year, admissions, placement, etc.) in consultation with the appropriate Head(s) of Department(s).
- 4.8.3.2.2 Ensuring the appointment of Principal Supervisors, Co-Supervisors, and the rest of the Thesis Committee.
- 4.8.3.2.3 Ensuring appropriate levels of staff and resources through recommendations to, and negotiations with, Heads of contributing Departments.
- 4.8.3.2.4 Ensuring that the mechanisms of operation, including programme / year / module time tabling, teaching rooms, access to specialist facilities, etc., are organized and effective.
- 4.8.3.2.5 The coordination of teaching assessment and other inputs, and the approval of assessment schedules.
- 4.8.3.2.6 Monitoring of student research conduct, including compliance with all CRC requirements.
- 4.8.3.2.7 The implementation of policies for monitoring student progress.
- 4.8.3.2.8 Facilitating the conduct of dissertation examinations.
- 4.8.3.2.9 Annual reporting to the RDC on all aspects of the Programme.

4.8.3.3 The Committee will be responsible for the overall academic health of the programme and for its regular evaluation including:

- 4.8.3.3.1 The continuing critical review of the aims, objectives and development of the programme.

- 4.8.3.3.2 The establishment and maintenance of the academic standard of the programme.
- 4.8.3.3.3 Ensuring that the views of students on the programme are known and taken into account.
- 4.8.3.3.4 Review of academic regulations, admissions policy and assessment methods.
- 4.8.3.3.5 Development of teaching methods and teaching material.
- 4.8.3.3.6 Development of research infrastructure and supervision capacity.
- 4.8.3.4 The committee will be responsible for the formal submission of the necessary documentation for the approval, accreditation or assessment of programme via the Institute Academic Committee to the RDC.
- 4.8.4 Student-Staff Consultation Processes
 - 4.8.4.1 Students have an important role in their own educational process. They have a view of the overall programme and they experience its detailed effects and operation on themselves in a way that no single member of staff can experience. The University is seeking to make them more reflective and self aware, and a prime way is to involve them in the operation and in improving the effectiveness of their own education. Amongst the means that can be very effective is the establishment for each batch of research degree students (combined, across all programmes), of a programme guide or a guidance committee. Such a structure can help to ensure an adequate and effective opportunity for discussion between students and staff, in a context that allows wide student participation. The nature and extent of student interaction and feedback is one of the issues covered in the Annual Programme Report.
 - 4.8.4.2 Its composition should generally include more students than staff. A student representative from each batch should normally convene the group and solicit staff to serve as guide(s) within the first month of the start of the courses for that batch. Its terms of reference are to consider any matters related to the programme or academic environment and to report or make recommendations, as felt necessary, to the Programme Committee.
 - 4.8.4.3 It is important that students do not perceive meetings of the group as only for dealing with student problems and complaints accumulated since the last meeting; such matters should be dealt with when they occur, through the Programme Leader or other appropriate staff. This then allows meetings of the group to be used for constructive discussion of the programme in general, of the demands of the programme on students, and of possible improvements.
- 4.8.5 Where a review or other information identifies an operational weakness in a particular module or curriculum component, the sequence for remedying the weakness should be as follows:

- 4.8.5.1 The Programme Leader speaks to the member of staff teaching the problem module to see if the quality of delivery can be improved.
- 4.8.5.2 If this proves ineffective, and if the module is taught within the department, then the matter should be referred to the Head of Department who has the final academic responsibility for the quality of the module, for the staff and for the overall operation of the programme.
- 4.8.5.3 If the module is taught in another department, then the Programme Leader should refer the matter to his or her own Head of Department who has managerial responsibility for the programme. It will then be raised with the Head responsible in management terms (academic and resources) for the teaching of the module.
- 4.8.5.4 Where the above are all ineffective, an application should be made to the Head of College for re-allocation of staff duties or possible disciplinary action.

5 Rules for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

5.1 Overview

- 5.1.1 This Chapter describes the basic structure and regulations for the University's PhD degree. Students are admitted on a probationary basis and must have their candidature confirmed early in the course. Candidature is conditional on regular progress as monitored every six months. PhD programmes are supervised from start to finish, though candidates must organize their research efforts themselves and make significant individual effort. Once completed, a dissertation is examined both internally and externally. The "Three-year PhD programme" refers to the full-time equivalent variant of the PhD programme that comprises a dissertation research program with limited coursework and no preparatory year. The part-time equivalent of the three-year PhD programme is six years. The "Four-year PhD programme" includes a foundation year for students needing extra grounding in a discipline and basic research training prior to undertaking dissertation work. The part-time equivalent of the four-year PhD programme is eight years.

5.2 Admission

- 5.2.1 The final decision for admission of a candidate to a PhD programme is made by the RDC upon recommendation by the relevant Programme Committee.
- 5.2.2 Admission to candidature in either the three-year or the four-year PhD program may be approved by the RDC only when the relevant Programme Committee has:
 - 5.2.2.1 Certified that the necessary facilities and appropriate support for the applicant undertaking his or her proposed PhD training and/or research are available; and
 - 5.2.2.2 Nominated an appropriate Principal Supervisor and Co-Supervisor(s).
- 5.2.3 The Three Year Programme
 - 5.2.3.1 Any applicant for admission to candidature for the three-year PhD program shall be a graduate of the University or of any other institution recognized by the RDC for this purpose.
 - 5.2.3.2 The RDC may, on the recommendation of the Programme Committee concerned, admit to candidature for the three-year PhD program an applicant who holds or has fulfilled all the requirements for:
 - 5.2.3.2.1 The degree of Master, provided that the applicant has shown potential for research demonstrated by a research project or resulting dissertation/thesis comprising typically 25% or more of the Masters program, or
 - 5.2.3.2.2 The degree of Bachelor with honors and has shown potential for research demonstrated by a research project or resulting honors thesis, as well as a minimum of two years of additional professional experience that has involved additional research activities.

5.2.3.3 In special circumstances with the approval of the RDC, upon provision of a strong, clear and substantiated case from Programme Committee, an applicant who does not satisfy the Master or Bachelor with Honours requirements may be admitted to candidature in the three-year PhD programme if evidence of acceptable research experience, exhibited in concrete research outputs, is produced. Such a candidate will be required to complete a probationary period of candidature as described in Section 5.2.4 below.

5.2.3.3.1 “Concrete Research Outputs” covers published journal articles and/or books or substantive research reports, where the applicant has clearly specified his or her contribution to any jointly authored product, and which have been sighted by the Programme Committee and the nominated Principal Supervisor.

5.2.3.4 Every applicant for admission to candidature for the three-year PhD program shall:

5.2.3.4.1 Produce documented evidence of capacity to undertake work at the PhD level. This would typically include prior academic records, academic and professional recommendations, and a demonstration of actual ability through the passing of a special examination. Additional discipline-specific requirements are defined in each Programme document.

5.2.3.4.2 Meet the University-minimum competency requirements.

5.2.3.4.3 Meet any additional Programme-specific requirements.

5.2.3.4.4 Submit to the RDC a proposed program of research to be undertaken in a nominated College of the University and approved by the Programme Committee.

5.2.3.5 On admission to candidature the candidate shall pursue a course of advanced study and research on the approved topic for a period of three years. In the case of a full-time student the normal maximum period of candidature shall be three years (six years for part-time candidates), while the normal minimum period of candidature shall be not less than two years (four years for part-time candidates).

5.2.4 Probationary Period

5.2.4.1 The Committee will normally accept a candidate directly into the three-year PhD program on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding 12 months full-time equivalent. Before completion of the probationary period, the Committee shall seek a Confirmation of Candidature report from the Confirmation of Candidature Panel as to how the candidature should proceed.

5.2.4.2 Where a candidate has been accepted on probationary candidature under Section 5.2.3.3 above, the candidature shall, upon confirmation of acceptance, be deemed to have commenced from the date of the probationary admission.

5.2.5 Alternative Admission Pathways

5.2.5.1 Transfer from another institution

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

5.2.5.2 Upgrade from Research Masters

5.2.5.2.1 Students who are currently enrolled in a Masters degree at the University (and have been so enrolled for at least 12 months full-time equivalent) and are undertaking research which in the view of the Principal Supervisor, is approaching PhD standard, may apply to be upgraded into the three-year PhD program. In such cases, the Principal Supervisor shall forward to the RDC through the relevant Programme Committee a request for upgrade along with any supporting evidence.

5.2.5.2.2 The Committee will wish to see either explicit evidence of refereed research publications by the student or reviews of at least two thesis chapters before considering a request to upgrade from Masters to PhD. The reviews shall be carried out by two reviewers, one who may be internal and one who must be external to the University. Each reviewer should have a doctoral degree or equivalent. Any application for an upgrade with evidence attached must be endorsed by the Principal Supervisor and Programme Committee and be forwarded to RDC, following one year equivalent full-time candidature and not exceeding 18 months full-time candidature, to ensure enough candidature is left to continue on into the PhD. The Committee will determine, in consultation with the Principal Supervisor, the appropriate period of PhD candidature, should the upgrade be approved.

5.2.5.3 Doctoral Foundation Year (Four-Year PhD Program)

5.2.5.3.1 The Four-Year PhD Program may be available for specific programmes as specified in the respective

programme documents. Students will be required to demonstrate their anticipated capacity to pay full tuition fees for four years.

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

5.2.5.3.2.1 Holds a degree considered by the RDC to be equivalent to a honors Bachelor's degree from the University, or any Master's degree and satisfies the minimum University competencies criteria.

5.2.5.3.2.2 Requires additional research training and experience in order to be fully prepared to undertake the thesis research component and/or requires additional training in disciplines other than those studied in his or her previous degrees, prior to commencing the thesis research component.

5.2.5.33 Those admitted to the four-year PhD programme will be required to complete a Doctoral Foundation year of preparation, as described below and in the relevant programme document, before being permitted to progress into the three-year PhD programme'.

5.3 Supervision

- 5.3.1 The University's PhD degrees are supervised degrees and the research and preparation of the thesis must be carried out under the guidance of at least two Supervisors appointed by the RDC on the recommendation of the appropriate Programme Committee. Supervisors must be listed on the University's Register of Research Degree Supervisors, maintained by the RDC.

5.4 Confirmation of Candidature

- 5.4.1 Confirmation of candidature, as described in Chapter 9, represents the formal completion of the probationary phase of a Doctoral student's candidature. The confirmation process attempts to assess formally the extent to which students are 'on track' during the early period of their candidature and consequently, whether or not their candidature should be extended. In this sense, the policy comprises an integral part of the University's quality assurance processes. Confirmation is done by a Confirmation Panel at the end of the Research Proposal module. Upon successful completion, the "student" becomes a "candidate" and the Confirmation Panel become's the candidate's Thesis Committee.

5.5 Conditions of Candidature

5.5.1 The Three-Year PhD Program

- 5.5.1.1 Candidates for the PhD degree will undertake advanced study and research. In all cases, the student shall present for examination a thesis in a form approved by the RDC. Other coursework requirements are specified in the relevant Programme document.
- 5.5.1.2 Approximately every six calendar months, full time equivalent, from the date of admission to candidature the candidate and Principal Supervisor shall submit to the Programme Committee a report setting out details of the course of study and research and the candidate's progress over the previous six month period. The report will elaborate upon the broad outline of the proposal submitted prior to admission to candidature and shall give reasons for any departures from the original proposal. This may typically be done at the end of each regular semester, after a Thesis Committee meeting.
- 5.5.1.3 The candidate will be required by the Principal Supervisor and the Programme Committee to formally undergo a Confirmation of Candidature process as outlined in Chapter 9.
- 5.5.1.4 In special cases, the Programme Committee, on the advice of the Principal Supervisor, may grant leave of absence from the course of study and research and the period of such leave shall not be counted as part of the prescribed term of candidature.
- 5.5.1.5 The candidate shall pursue the course wholly under the control of the University.

- 5.5.1.6 On the recommendation of the Programme Committee, the RDC may permit a candidate to pursue the course away from the University if the Committee is satisfied that:
- 5.5.1.6.1 The candidate will have access to the required facilities.
 - 5.5.1.6.2 A local Supervisor resident or working in the same locality as the candidate can be appointed by the RDC, unless the Programme Committee recommends otherwise.
- 5.5.1.7 Each PhD candidate is required to consult regularly with their Principal Supervisor. This may be either in person or using ICT, including video. The nature and extent of such consultation will be determined by the Supervisors and the Programme Committee after consultation with the candidate prior to the commencement of each period of candidature.
- 5.5.1.8 A candidate may be required to attend lectures and seminars and perform practical work to a satisfactory standard in subjects prescribed by the Programme Committee. No candidate may enroll in any unit or units without the consent of the Principal Supervisor and the approval of the Programme Committee. If the Principal Supervisor certifies that a module is a requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy such modules may not be credited to another degree. If however, such a module is not a requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, it may be used for credit transfer to another degree that the candidate may pursue at another time.
- 5.5.1.9 The candidate shall be given an official notification of any examination result obtained for a unit in which that candidate is permitted to enroll.
- 5.5.1.10 The candidate will not be permitted to enroll in another course concurrently with enrollment in either the three-year or four-year PhD program.

5.5.2 The Four Year program

- 5.5.2.1 On the recommendation of the relevant Programme Committee, a candidate may complete the whole or part of the program of study for the Doctoral Foundation year outside the University provided that the candidate shall attend the University when required by the Programme Committee and, in any case, for a period or periods of not less than 14 days during the Doctoral Foundation year.
- 5.5.2.2 The Doctoral Foundation year shall normally be completed within 12 months of full-time study.
- 5.5.2.3 The content of the first year of the 4 year PhD will be the equivalent of 120 credits, full-time equivalent, including:
- 5.5.2.3.1 A program of study prescribed by the Programme Committee of supervised research and submission of

a research report or dissertation at a minimum of 10,000 words.

5.5.2.3.2 Any coursework unit, other research or disciplinary training recommended by the relevant Programme Committee and approved by the RDC.

5.5.2.3.3 An academic literacy and research skills unit.

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

5.5.2.4.1 The minimum level of pass to be attained by the candidate in any coursework unit undertaken during the Doctoral Foundation Year shall be Pass. The minimum level of pass in the research component of the Doctoral Foundation year shall be Pass + 10%. The overall average of all components undertaken in the Doctoral Foundation year must be a minimum of Pass + 10%.

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

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

5.6 Exit Pathways

5.6.1 A candidate may be awarded the degree of PhD upon successful completion of all course requirements.

5.6.2 A candidate may exit prematurely who meets the following:

5.6.2.1 Minimum pass requirements, as specified in the Programme document, for all components of the Doctoral Foundation year shall be permitted to progress to candidature in the three-year PhD program.

5.6.2.2 Completion of 120 credits equivalent in the Foundation year at pass level i.e. less than a Pass+10% level, may be awarded a post-graduate diploma.

5.6.2.3 Completion of 60 credits equivalent in the Foundation year at pass level i.e. less than Pass+10% level, may be awarded a post-graduate certificate.

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

5.7 Examination

- 5.7.1 The University's PhD degrees are conferred after a two-part examination process involving an internal public presentation and oral defense and external examination done confidentially. Specific information about the dissertation requirements and examination processes are given in Chapter 12. The result of the final PhD examination will be presented at a subsequent meeting of the Programme Board of Examiners.

6 Rules for Research Master's Degrees

6.1 Overview

- 6.1.1 This Chapter describes the basic structure and regulations for the University's Research Master's degrees. Students are admitted on a probationary basis and must have their candidature confirmed early in the course. Candidature is conditional on regular progress as monitored every six months. Research Master's programmes are supervised from start to finish, though candidates must organize their research efforts themselves and make significant individual effort. Once completed, a dissertation is examined both internally and externally.
- 6.1.2 The University awards various degrees of Master by Research. Any programme leading to the awarding of a Master's degree involving a substantial research component as described above, regardless of whether it is categorized as MA, MSc, MEd, MBA, or any other Master's degree, may be a research Master's degree. The M Phil designation is allowed but not required to indicate research degrees. The full award shall include the title of the award and the subject name eg. Master of Arts (MA) in English, or Master of Sciences (MSc) in Computer Science, except in the case of MEd where the full title shall be Master of Education.

6.2 Admission

- 6.2.1 To be eligible for admission applicants must qualify under one of the following:
 - 6.2.1.1 Have completed the requirements for the degree of Bachelor with Honours of the University in an appropriate field of study.
 - 6.2.1.2 Have completed the requirements for the degree of Bachelor (without honours) with additional equivalent combination of qualifications and experience as laid down for degrees of Master by Research as detailed in the appropriate Programme document.
 - 6.2.1.3 Have completed a 2 year Diploma course and demonstrated a plethora of professional experiences (min. 10 years) that would have satisfied the criteria for the award of Bachelor with Honours.
 - 6.2.1.4 Be a graduate of another institution whose qualifications in the opinion of the RDC are equivalent to those prescribed above and who has demonstrated appropriate research ability and experience.
- 6.2.2 Candidates must meet any additional admission requirements laid down for each degree of Master by Research as detailed in the relevant Programme document.
- 6.2.3 Meet the University's minimum competencies requirement for Master's degrees.
- 6.2.4 Probationary Period
 - 6.2.4.1 The RDC will normally require a student to complete a probationary period not exceeding six months for full-time students and 12 months for part-time students. Before completion of the probationary period, the RDC shall seek a Confirmation of Candidature report from the Confirmation of Candidature Panel as to how the candidature should proceed.
- 6.2.5 Period of Candidature

6.2.5.1 Unless otherwise specified in the Programme document for an individual degree of Master by Research, the period of candidature shall be:

6.2.5.1.1 Two years as a full-time student; or

6.2.5.1.2 Four years as a part-time student.

6.2.5.2 The minimum period of candidature shall be not less than 1.5 years full time (or part-time equivalent).

6.2.6 Transfer from Another Institution

6.2.6.1 An applicant who has been a student in a Research Master's degree programme in another institution may be admitted to a degree of Master by Research in this University. The RDC shall decide, on recommendation of the Programme Committee, what period of the candidature completed in the other institution shall be counted as part of the period of candidature in the University, provided that not more than half of the maximum period of candidature shall be allowed.

6.3 Supervision

6.3.1 The University's Master by Research degrees are supervised degrees and the research and preparation of the thesis must be carried out under the guidance of at least two Supervisors appointed by the RDC on the recommendation of the appropriate Programme Committee. Supervisors must be listed on the University's Register of Research Degree Supervisors, maintained by the RDC.

6.4 Confirmation of Candidature

6.4.1 Confirmation of candidature, as described in Chapter 9, represents the formal completion of the probationary phase of a Master's student's candidature. The confirmation process attempts to assess formally the extent to which students are 'on track' during the early period of their candidature and consequently, whether or not their candidature should be extended. In this sense, the policy comprises an integral part of the University's quality assurance processes. Confirmation is done by a Confirmation Panel at the end of the Research Proposal module. Upon successful completion, the "student" becomes a "candidate" and the Confirmation Panel become's the candidate's Thesis Committee.

6.5 Conditions of Candidature

- 6.5.1 Candidates for the Degree of Master by Research will undertake advanced study and research. In all cases, the student shall present for examination a thesis in a form approved by the RDC. Other coursework requirements are specified in the relevant Programme document for each individual degree of Master by Research.
- 6.5.2 Approximately every six calendar months, full time equivalent, from the date of admission the student and Principal Supervisor shall submit to the Programme Committee a report setting out details of the course of study and research and the student's progress over the previous 6 month period. The report will elaborate upon the broad outline of the proposal submitted prior to admission and shall give

reasons for any departures from the original proposal. This may typically be done at the end of each regular semester, after a Thesis Committee meeting.

- 6.5.3 The student will be required by the Principal Supervisor and the Programme Committee to formally undergo a Confirmation of Candidature process as outlined in Chapter 9.
- 6.5.4 In special cases, the Programme Committee, on the advice of the Principal Supervisor, may grant leave of absence from the course of study and research and the period of leave shall not be counted as part of the prescribed term of candidature.
- 6.5.5 The student shall pursue the course wholly under the control of the University.
- 6.5.6 On the recommendation of the Programme Committee, the RDC may permit a student to pursue the course away from the University if the RDC is satisfied that:
 - 6.5.6.1 The student will have access to the required facilities.
 - 6.5.6.2 Arrangements can be made for regular consultation with the Supervisor/s and/or in some cases a Supervisor working in the same locality as the student can be appointed by the RDC upon recommendation of the Programme Committee.
- 6.5.7 Each student is required to consult regularly with his/her Supervisor. This may be either in person or using ICT, including video. The nature and extent of such consultation will be determined by the Supervisors and the Programme Committee after consultation with the candidate prior to the commencement of each period of candidature.
- 6.5.8 A student may be required to attend lectures and seminars and perform practical work to a satisfactory standard in subjects prescribed by the Programme Committee through which the student is enrolled. No student may enroll in any unit or units without the consent of the Principal Supervisor and the approval of the RDC. If the Principal Supervisor certifies that a unit is a requirement for the degree of Master by Research such units may not be credited to another degree. If however, such a unit is not a requirement for the degree of Master by Research, it may be used for credit transfer to another degree that the candidate may pursue at another time.
- 6.5.9 The student shall be given an official notification of any examination result obtained for a unit in which that student is permitted to enroll.
- 6.5.10 The student will not be permitted to enroll in another course concurrently with enrollment in the degree of Master by Research.

6.6 Exit Pathways

- 6.6.1 A candidate may be awarded the degree of Master by Research upon successful completion of all course requirements.
- 6.6.2 A candidate may be upgraded to a PhD programme as specified above. Students who are undertaking research which, in the view of the Principal Supervisor, is approaching PhD standard, may apply to be upgraded into the three-year PhD program. In such cases, the Principal Supervisor shall forward to the RDC, through the relevant Programme Committee, a request for upgrade along with any

supporting evidence. The RDC will wish to see either explicit evidence of refereed research publications by the student or reviews of at least two thesis chapters before considering a request to upgrade from Master to PhD. The reviews shall be carried out by two reviewers, one who may be internal and one who must be external to the University. Each reviewer should have a doctoral degree or equivalent. Any application for an upgrade with evidence attached must be endorsed by the Principal Supervisor and Programme Committee and forwarded to the RDC, following one year equivalent full-time candidature and not exceeding 18 months full-time candidature, to ensure enough candidature is left to continue on into the PhD. The RDC will determine the appropriate period of PhD candidature, should the upgrade be approved.

6.6.3 A candidate may exit prematurely who meets the following:

6.6.3.1 Completion of 120 credits equivalent in the first year at pass level i.e. less than a Pass+10% level, may be awarded a post-graduate diploma.

6.6.3.2 Completion of 60 credits equivalent in the first year at pass level i.e. less than Pass+10% level, may be awarded a post-graduate certificate.

6.6.4 If a student's Principal Supervisor or the relevant Programme Committee submits a report of unsatisfactory progress to the RDC, or if the student fails to satisfactorily complete prescribed coursework, the RDC shall invite the student to 'show cause' why their candidature should not be terminated. If the student does not respond to the invitation by the stated date or the student's response is deemed unsatisfactory by the RDC, candidature shall be terminated.

6.7 Examination

6.7.1 The University's Master by Research degrees are conferred after a two-part examination process involving an internal public presentation and oral defense and external examination done confidentially. Specific information about the dissertation requirements and examination processes are given in Chapter 12.

7 Supervision

7.1 Overview

- 7.1.1 The University's research degrees are supervised degrees and the research and preparation of the thesis must be carried out under the guidance of at least two Supervisors. In this Chapter, some procedural matters are discussed and the specific work of the Principal and Co-Supervisor is identified. What Principal Supervisors and Co-Supervisors do must be read in conjunction with any other responsibilities of staff specified by the University.

7.2 Policy

- 7.2.1 All research degree candidates should have two Supervisors appointed by the RDC on the recommendation of the appropriate Programme Committee. Supervisors must be listed on the University's Register of Research Degree Supervisors, maintained by the RDC. The Supervisors shall be provisionally appointed at the time of enrollment. When the candidate is up for confirmation, the appointment may be reviewed by the Programme Committee in the light of the detailed research proposal.
- 7.2.2 Except under exceptional circumstances, the Programme Committee shall nominate a minimum of two Supervisors for each applicant. One Supervisor shall be nominated as Principal Supervisor and the remaining as Co-Supervisor(s).
- 7.2.3 Principal Supervisors must normally be members of the University's academic staff and would normally be registered Supervisors. Principal Supervisors must have PhDs if they are supervising doctoral students. Master's degree students may be supervised by a PhD holder or a Master's holder who has demonstrated significant research and supervision capacity.
- 7.2.4 For off-campus students, a suitable on-site Supervisor, who has agreed to act as such, should be nominated as the Co-Supervisor, where possible.
- 7.2.5 The nomination of Supervisors will include an estimate of the expected percentage input from each Supervisor.
- 7.2.6 In exceptional circumstances where multiple Supervisors are thought to be impractical, the Programme Committee will forward a report to the RDC detailing the reasons why co-supervision is not practical and indicating what procedures will be put in place to handle Supervisory duties where the nominated Supervisor becomes unavailable for any reason. However, in cases where the exceptional circumstances have arisen due to lack of sufficient University expertise, serious consideration must be given to appointing a Co-Supervisor from outside the University with expertise in the student's proposed research area.
- 7.2.7 Where a University supervisor is not available to undertake the Principal Supervisor's role, the Programme Committee may seek approval from the RDC to appoint an appropriately qualified Emeritus Professor, or an adjunct appointment as Principal Supervisor. A Principal Supervisor so appointed will be required to enter into a contract with the University to undertake all of the duties and obligations specified for Principal Supervisors by completing and signing a Principal Supervisor Agreement.

- 7.2.8 In cases where an applicant's Principal Supervisor departs the University for reasons other than official leave, and no other staff member is suitably qualified or possesses the appropriate expertise to take on the role of Principal Supervisor, the RDC will immediately consider a recommendation from the Programme Committee for the appointment of a suitably qualified individual from another institution to fulfill the role of Principal Supervisor. A Principal Supervisor so appointed will be required to complete and sign a Principal Supervisor Agreement.
- 7.2.9 The RDC, on the joint recommendation of the Programme Committee and DRIL, may recommend termination of candidature if it is satisfied that the University can no longer provide appropriate supervision for the student. In such circumstances, the University will provide any necessary administrative assistance to the student to facilitate his or her transfer to another institution. This shall not be used as a disciplinary measure in cases of lack of student progress or as a solution for problems arising from unsatisfactory relationships between Supervisor(s) and the student.
- 7.2.10 The Principal Supervisor shall present to the Programme Committee the required reports on the student's work. If the Programme Committee receives a report that the student's work is unsatisfactory it may resolve that the student be invited to "show cause" why the candidature should not be terminated. In cases of dispute between any Supervisor and a student, due consideration will be given to the views of both parties. The following specific instances must be noted:
- 7.2.10.1 Where a Supervisor has made every effort to get a student's work up to expected standards and these efforts have not yielded the desired effect due to insufficient student commitment, capacity and/or effort, the Supervisor has the right to withdraw from the Supervisory role. A report detailing the grounds for this decision, signed by the Programme Committee, must be sent to the student and to the RDC. The student shall also have the right to submit a report, detailing his or her perspective, to the RDC. The Programme Committee would then be expected to make a recommendation as to how to proceed from this point. If the Supervisor involved is also a member of the Programme Committee, then the relevant DRIL shall sign the report to the student and to the RDC and shall make the recommendation regarding how to proceed from this point.
- 7.2.10.2 Where a student has made every effort to reconcile his/her work to meet expectations of his/her Principal Supervisor or Co-Supervisor but this effort has not yielded the desired effect because of an unsatisfactory Supervisor-student relationship, the student has the right to request a change of Principal Supervisor (or any Co-Supervisor if required). The student should submit a request, detailing the grounds for making it, to the Programme Committee who will consult on the request and forward it to the RDC, accompanied by a nomination of an alternative Supervisor. The affected Supervisor shall also have the right to submit a report, detailing his or her perspective, to the RDC.
- 7.2.11 The Principal Supervisor is in large measure responsible for ensuring that the high standard of the degree is maintained. It is expected that the Principal Supervisor will maintain close consultation with all Co-Supervisors and with the student throughout the period of candidature. The Supervisor shall carry out the responsibilities in accordance with the following rules:

- 7.2.11.1 The Principal Supervisor shall make the student aware of all necessary rules and regulations for satisfactory progression.
- 7.2.11.2 The Principal Supervisor shall ensure that the research topic chosen by the student is at an appropriate academic level and is likely, if successfully completed, to be worthy of publication.
- 7.2.11.3 The Principal Supervisor shall make recommendations to the Programme Committee for any additional course work that may be required.
- 7.2.11.4 The Principal Supervisor shall advise the student on the quality of early drafts of the thesis, but the thesis finally presented shall be substantially the independent work of the student.
- 7.2.11.5 The Principal Supervisor in consultation with any Co-Supervisors must complete the required report forms for each student in each year of candidature and discuss these reports with the student and Programme Committee.
- 7.2.11.6 The periodic reports submitted shall provide enough detail to enable the RDC to assess the progress of the student and the likelihood of completion of candidature within the prescribed time.
- 7.2.11.7 If, after provision of feedback and guidance and subsequent allowance of a suitable period for the student to improve their work, the Principal Supervisor becomes firmly of the opinion that the student is not making satisfactory progress the Principal Supervisor, after consultation with Co-Supervisor(s) and the Programme Committee, shall recommend to the RDC that the student be invited to "show cause" why the candidature should not be terminated.

7.3 Registration of Research Degree Supervisors

- 7.3.1 The University recognizes that quality supervision is fundamental to providing a high quality research training experience, leading to successful learning outcomes and timely completions for higher degree research (HDR) students. The University is obligated to ensure the delivery of quality supervision to each student and the timely completion of research degrees of the highest standard. This policy outlines a process for establishing and maintaining a register of (a) experienced and skilled supervisors and (b) new supervisors who do not yet meet all criteria for full registration. The purpose of the register is to recognize, encourage, support, and develop good supervisory practice.
- 7.3.2 All supervisors of HDR students will be recorded on the Register of Supervisors. No HDR student can be supervised by anyone who is not on the Register of Supervisors.
- 7.3.3 To be eligible for entry into the Register, supervisors must meet certain criteria. The Register will provide for two categories of supervisor – Principal Supervisors and Co-Supervisors.
- 7.3.4 To be registered as a Principal Supervisor of HDR students, all of the following criteria must be satisfied:

- 7.3.4.1 Be a member of academic staff (including adjunct and emeritus staff) of the University.
 - 7.3.4.2 Be a productive researcher as demonstrated by scholarly outputs. This requires demonstration of current and active involvement in research appropriate to the field of study by both of the following:
 - 7.3.4.2.1 Publications in the field of study in the last three years (including the preparation of substantive research report(s)/creative work(s)/patent(s)).
 - 7.3.4.2.2 Successful supervisory experience – This requires having co-supervised at least one HDR student to successful completion.
 - 7.3.4.3 Have obtained a Research Masters or Research Doctorate degree in order to supervise a Masters candidate, and have obtained a Research Doctorate degree in order to supervise a doctoral candidate, or otherwise to have demonstrated competency or experience to supervise at that level, as determined by the Programme Committee.
 - 7.3.4.4 Have agreed to supervise Research Degree students in accordance with the University's Research Degrees Framework.
- 7.3.5 To be registered as a Co-Supervisor:
- 7.3.5.1 Be a member of academic staff (including adjunct and emeritus staff) of the University OR the proposed co-supervisor must be considered to be an appropriate person by the Programme Committee and DRIL on a case by case basis.
 - 7.3.5.2 Be a productive researcher as demonstrated by scholarly outputs. This requires demonstration of current and active involvement in research appropriate to the field of study by publications in the field of study in the last three years (including the preparation of substantive research report(s)/creative work(s)/patent(s)).
 - 7.3.5.3 Have obtained a Research Masters or Research Doctorate degree in order to supervise a Masters candidate, and have obtained a Research Doctorate degree in order to supervise a doctoral candidate, or otherwise to have demonstrated competency or experience to supervise at that level, as determined by the Programme Committee.
 - 7.3.5.4 Have agreed to supervise Research Degree students in accordance with the University's Research Degrees Framework. Supervisors who have not previously supervised research degree candidates to successful completion may be required by the RDC to attend training provided by the University.
- 7.3.6 Supervisory Roles
- 7.3.6.1 A supervisory team usually comprises a Principal Supervisor, who contributes more than 50% of the supervision, together with one or more Co-supervisors.

7.3.6.2 Under some circumstances the team will comprise a Principal Supervisor, who contributes less than 50% of the supervision, together with one or more Co-supervisors.

7.3.6.3 Principal Supervisors :

- 7.3.6.3.1 Must be registered at the Principal Supervisor Level.
- 7.3.6.3.2 Are usually the main point of contact for the HDR student academically and administratively.
- 7.3.6.3.3 Bear the prime responsibility for the timely and successful completion of the student's candidature.
- 7.3.6.3.4 Mentor, as appropriate, the co-supervisor in their supervisory role.
- 7.3.6.3.5 Where the Principal Supervisor contributes less than 50% of the supervision they will provide extra mentoring to the co-supervisor in their expanded supervisory role.

7.3.6.4 Co-Supervisors:

- 7.3.6.4.1 May be registered at either the Principal or Co supervisor Levels.
- 7.3.6.4.2 Are usually the secondary point of contact for the HDR student academically and administratively and provide support to the Principal Supervisor and the student.
- 7.3.6.4.3 May provide specifically required expertise.
- 7.3.6.4.4 Usually provide less than 50% of the supervisory workload.
- 7.3.6.4.5 Where the Co-supervisor contributes more than 50% of the supervisory workload, they will be expected to be mentored, as appropriate, by the Principal Supervisor in the conduct of the supervision process.

7.3.7 The Registration Process

7.3.7.1 Staff who wish to be registered should complete an Application for Registration form (available from the Research Services website) and submit it to their DRIL to sign and forward to the RDC. DRILs should consider qualifications, supervision experience and current research activity before endorsing applications.

7.3.7.2 Staff who do not have previous experience of supervision should be encouraged by DRILs to gain experience by acting as co-supervisors with an experienced colleague. Staff should also simultaneously be encouraged to develop and maintain good supervisory skills and knowledge of the University's Research Degrees policies and guidelines by such means as attendance at relevant workshops/seminars offered by the College/University, or attendance

at appropriate conferences/workshops external to the University, or participation in established online programs. They should also be conversant with the responsibilities of students and supervisors as outlined in throughout this document.

7.3.7.3 Where staff have not yet supervised a candidate to completion, such staff may be registered as co-supervisors provided that they have demonstrated research backgrounds. It is expected that they supervise as part of an experienced team. DRILs are expected to mentor these staff to ensure that they become established supervisors. Following successful graduation of a co-supervised HDR student, a Co-supervisor is eligible to apply for registration as a Principal Supervisor. Applications will be administered by DRER's Research Services, overseen by the RDC. The Register will be maintained in Research Services and shared with Colleges.

7.3.7.4 With a view to increase supervision capacity, in lieu of sufficient supervision experience to qualify as either a Co- or Principal Supervisor, potential supervisors can complete necessary supervision training as specified by the RDC and subsequently become registered supervisors.

7.3.8 Extenuating Circumstances/Special Cases

7.3.8.1 Periods of Leave – In the case of a Principal Supervisor going on leave from the University (for periods exceeding 3 months), the Co-supervisor may be appointed as Principal Supervisor for the period of leave. However, where the Co-supervisor does not meet the necessary criteria, the Programme Committee will need to make a special case to the RDC.

7.3.8.2 Resignation/Retirement – In special cases where the Principal Supervisor has left the University, the Co-supervisor may be appointed as Principal Supervisor. However, where the Co-supervisor does not meet the necessary criteria, the Programme Committee will need to make a special case to the RDC.

7.3.8.3 Supervisory Teams – In situations where Programmes lack the capacity to appoint Principal Supervisors to cover greater than 50% of the supervisory workload and where Co-supervisors are available, Heads of Schools may appoint a Principal Supervisor at a less than 50% workload. In these circumstances the Co-supervisor(s) must have completed supervisory training, have co-supervised a research degree student for at least one year and there must be mentoring available within the supervisory team.

7.3.9 Review Process

7.3.9.1 Colleges will be required to review continuation of staff on the register as part of the annual performance review.

7.3.10 De-registration

7.3.10.1 Programme Committees or the IAC may recommend deregistration of supervisors on any of the following grounds:

- 7.3.10.1.1 The supervisor leaves the University or ceases honorary or equivalent appointment.
- 7.3.10.1.2 The supervisor fails to meet the registration criteria.
- 7.3.10.1.3 The supervisor is guilty of academic misconduct at the University or another university or research institution.

7.4 Appointment of Supervisors

- 7.4.1 It is the responsibility of the Programme Committee to ensure that supervision and facilities are available for a student from commencement of candidature. This should be done in collaboration with DRIL.
- 7.4.2 For PhD programmes, a student is accepted only if an appropriate Principal Supervisor (PS) and Co-Supervisor (CS), who have agreed to provide supervision, can be appointed. Identification of appropriate PS and CS may occur during the application process but verification by the DRIL is required. PS and CS will agree where they have space in their teaching load and where they are confident that they can guide the student through to success. For Master's degree programmes, the appointment of Supervisors should follow the guidelines specified in the respective programme document.
- 7.4.3 PS and CS workload and maximum number of research students supervised should follow certain guidelines, as per the University's HR Policy. Generally, the total supervision workload should not exceed 6 "units" where each PS supervision counts as 1 unit and each CS supervision counts as 0.33 units.
- 7.4.4 Co-Supervisors external to RUB must be appointed in an adjunct capacity. It is also the responsibility of the Programme Committee to ensure that, where necessary, appropriate replacement Supervisors are appointed using the Change of Supervisor form and verified by the Programme Committee. While students may suggest certain Supervisors for consideration on application, the Programme Committee is ultimately responsible for their appointment. To be appointed, the Principal Supervisors must have a research award at a higher level than the award being supervised and be on the University's Supervision Register.
- 7.4.5 For each candidate at least two Supervisors will normally be appointed, one of whom will be designated Principal Supervisor who will normally be available to supervise for the duration of the research. Together, the Principal Supervisor and Co-Supervisor should cover the requirements of the HDR research proposed. The PS should sign a Principal Supervisor Agreement with the Programme Committee. The Co-Supervisor, should sign a Co-Supervisor Agreement with the Programme Committee.
- 7.4.6 The PS, in consultation with the candidate, should select a thesis committee of 2-3 additional people to support progress monitoring for the candidate (the committee should be appointed with a thesis committee form). The candidate should submit a [Progress Report Form] every six months including minutes of the most recent committee meeting.
- 7.4.7 Where a University Supervisor is not available to undertake the Principal Supervisor's role, the Programme Committee may seek approval from the Research Degrees Committee to appoint an appropriately qualified Emeritus Professor as Principal Supervisor. A Principal Supervisor so appointed will be required first to

apply to the relevant College for adjunct status and sign a Principal Supervisor Agreement with the University. An adjunct appointment may act as a Co-Supervisor; then, the Co-Supervisor Agreement needs to be completed. Directors of Colleges/Institutes and all such external Supervisors (who will be appointed as Principal Supervisor) need to be familiar with the Honorary Appointment Policy and the Honorary Appointments Procedures.

7.5 General Responsibilities of All Supervisors

- 7.5.1 In addition to the standard teaching/learning responsibilities as University faculty, it is the responsibility of all Supervisors to:
 - 7.5.1.1 Be familiar with the rules governing candidature, and the standards for the degree.
 - 7.5.1.2 Be familiar with current research in the disciplinary/professional areas relevant to the topic of the supervised research.
 - 7.5.1.3 Be sensitive to the professional/training and learning needs of the student including sensitivity to disabilities (physical, learning etc).
 - 7.5.1.4 Maintain effective, regular contact with the student. Early in the candidature, the Supervisors and students should agree to the means by which contact will be maintained, and the frequency and nature of contact (see above).
 - 7.5.1.5 Request written work from the student in consultation with the other Supervisor/s on a regular basis and provide appropriate feedback. Supervisors should request written work from the student starting early in the candidature. Co-Supervisors should meet wherever possible prior to providing feedback on the student's work. Feedback should critically and constructively comment within three weeks on the drafts of such writing and the dissertation sections and chapters.
 - 7.5.1.6 Advise the student and other Supervisor of any modifications to the schedule of work, meeting times, etc.
 - 7.5.1.7 Ensure the student follows ethical practices as laid down in the RPH.
 - 7.5.1.8 Be alert to personal problems that may beset the candidate, without being unduly intrusive, and be acquainted with the student services systems in the University.
 - 7.5.1.9 Be prepared to relinquish supervision if, in the opinion of the Programme committee, it would be in the best interests of successful candidature.
 - 7.5.1.10 Cooperate with the Programme Committee in the necessity of finding alternative supervision. If alternative supervision is imminent, the outgoing Supervisor should make all records on supervision of the candidate and of progress in the candidature available to any appointed alternative or additional Supervisors.
 - 7.5.1.11 Make a plan with the student and the other Supervisor/s on the nature of any inspections of research apparatus, field trials or field

sites that may subsequently be used to evaluate and monitor the student's progress.

- 7.5.1.12 Ensure that the student is aware of the consequences of inadequate progress or of standards below that generally expected; identify the problems in consultation with the student and the other Supervisor/s, and suggest ways of addressing them.
- 7.5.1.13 Report as early as possible to the Thesis Committee and Programme Committee, cases where the student is at risk of not meeting the course requirements. This can be done on the progress reports and/or by separate communication. Intervention strategies will be put in place where 'at risk' students are identified.
- 7.5.1.14 Ensure that the student is trained in safe working practices relevant to the field of research.
- 7.5.1.15 Encourage the candidate to prepare papers for publication or presentation at conferences during the course of candidature.
- 7.5.1.16 Ensure that a fair agreement, accounting for relative contributions of quality and quantity, is reached between the candidate and the Supervisors concerning authorship of publications and acknowledgment of contributions during and after candidature.
- 7.5.1.17 Ensure that candidates receive quality supervision by at least:
 - 7.5.1.17.1 Respecting the rights of the students as well as those of other Supervisors who may be involved with the student's research.
 - 7.5.1.17.2 Acceding to reasonable requests by their students.
 - 7.5.1.17.3 Treating all students under their supervision equitably, with due attention to health and safety, ethics, and intellectual property.
 - 7.5.1.17.4 Making clear to students the names and responsibilities of their assigned Supervisors.
 - 7.5.1.17.5 Being sensitive to special needs of gender, culture and language without prejudicing the academic requirements of the award.
 - 7.5.1.17.6 Ensuring that Supervisors are familiar with regulations governing candidature and standards acceptable for the award.
 - 7.5.1.17.7 Meeting regularly with students and each other to discuss the progress of the candidate's research program, and regularly report upon such progress to relevant committees.
 - 7.5.1.17.8 Monitoring progress of students in addition to providing timely quality feedback.

- 7.5.1.17.9 Making clear to students the grievance/complaints, dispute resolution, and appeals processes (see Section 13.5).

7.6 Supervisors of International Students

- 7.6.1 Supervisors should communicate to international students the members of staff designated to be their official point of contact when issues or critical incidents arise that need resolution, both within the College and at the OVC.
- 7.6.2 Supervisors need to be aware of restrictions that apply to extending, withdrawing or suspending a student's candidature, as doing so may affect the student's visa conditions.

7.7 Responsibilities of Principal and Co-Supervisors

- 7.7.1 It is expected that the Principal Supervisor will maintain close consultation with the student and Co-Supervisors throughout the period of candidature. The Co-Supervisor, who may be a member of the same or a different College with similar or overlapping research interests, has an important supportive role to play and should be present at all meetings arranged between the students and the Principal Supervisor.
- 7.7.2 The Principal and Co-Supervisor are in a teaching role with the HDR student. Such matters as the importance of plagiarism and how it is avoided cannot be assumed. Similarly HDR student may need to be guided to a tutor for citation and referencing class/course, particularly if the HDR student is enrolled in a Masters with Research Award. Ultimately, the quality of the output of the student reflects on the Supervisors.
- 7.7.3 Particular roles of the Principal Supervisor are to:
 - 7.7.3.1 Guide the student towards effective conduct of the research and candidature, by discussing with the candidate:
 - 7.7.3.1.1 The nature and standard of research appropriate to the degree.
 - 7.7.3.1.2 The choice of an appropriate research topic and research question/hypothesis.
 - 7.7.3.1.3 The time, assistance, funds and material resources available for the research, and means for acquiring these.
 - 7.7.3.1.4 The planning of an effective program for research, analysis, writing and preparation.
 - 7.7.3.2 Ensure the PhD student undertakes the Confirmation of Candidature process in accordance with the current Confirmation of Candidature Policy for Doctoral Students (see the Research website).
 - 7.7.3.3 In consultation with the candidate, agree on the workload of supervision & advising workload.

- 7.7.3.4 Maintain effective, regular contact with the Co-Supervisor(s) to monitor the student's progress and coordinate communication with the student.
- 7.7.3.5 Maintain effective, regular contact with the Co-Supervisor(s) to monitor the student's progress and coordinate communication with the student.
- 7.7.3.6 Maintain communication with the Programme Committee, Thesis Committee, and the DRIL on the student's work and progress.
- 7.7.3.7 Keep records of the student's work, accounts of progress, and problems in candidature adequate for another Supervisor to take over supervision if necessary.
- 7.7.3.8 In consultation with the candidate and the Co-Supervisor/s and the Programme Committee, consider the availability of a field of examiners at least three months before the dissertation is submitted. The credentials of suitable examiners will be verified and approved by the RDC.
- 7.7.3.9 Comment promptly and constructively on the final draft of the dissertation in consultation with the Co-Supervisor/s and, at the time of submission, certify that the dissertation is properly presented, conforms to regulations, and is fit for examination (see Chapter 12). If necessary, the PS should advise the candidate where further work is needed at the submission stage, without forbidding the candidate to submit the dissertation. This report will be available to the candidate but not to the appointed examiners.

7.7.4 Particular roles of the Co-Supervisor are to:

- 7.7.4.1 Maintain an agreed level of communication with the candidate and the Principal Supervisor.
- 7.7.4.2 Provide support for the candidate and Principal Supervisor through input on the effective conduct of the candidature, such as:
 - 7.7.4.2.1 The planning of an effective program for research, analysis, writing and dissertation preparation.
 - 7.7.4.2.2 The time, assistance, funds and material resources available for the research, and means for acquiring these.
 - 7.7.4.2.3 The provision of complementary academic expertise, such as specialized knowledge of a particular technique or sub-area of study.
- 7.7.4.3 Read the work of the student and consult with the PS and agree on what feedback is appropriate and what improvements are needed (if any).
- 7.7.4.4 Take over as PS in case the PS leaves the College (by extended leave, resignation, termination, or other long-term absence) and oversee the appointment of a new Co-Supervisor in agreement with the candidate and propose the change to CRC for approval.

7.8 Change of Supervision Arrangements

- 7.8.1 Reasons why supervision may change during HDR candidature include: resignation, retirement of a Supervisor or a Supervisor going on extended leave.
 - 7.8.1.1 In the case of an actual or anticipated PS extended absence, the candidate and the Programme Committee should determine the feasibility of continuing with the same PS. Generally, in case of more than 3 months continuous absence and when regular contact with the student is not possible, the candidate, Programme Committee, and Co-Supervisor should make relevant arrangements for someone else to act as PS temporarily or take over permanently. Practically, when any PS absence prevents a candidate from progressing properly, then the Programme Committee should consider asking the PS to permanently give up the Supervisory position. In any circumstance where contact with the PS has not been possible for longer than a month, the candidate or CS should approach the Programme Committee who should intervene and replace PS if necessary.
 - 7.8.1.2 A Co-Supervisor may also need to be changed due to extended absence. The general guidelines are the same as those for a PS change due to extended absence, and should be agreed with the Programme Committee.
- 7.8.2 The Co-Supervisor may take over the role as PS as stated above. If the appointed Co-Supervisor is not able to provide the required level of supervision, then the Programme Committee will attempt to provide an alternative Supervisor from within the University. If this is not possible, the University will attempt to recruit the services of a suitably qualified person from another institution or assist in changing candidature to another University.
- 7.8.3 If a student desires a change of supervision, it is usual for the student to discuss the request with his/her Principal Supervisor in the first instance. If this cannot be done, the situation should be discussed with the Programme Committee. While the University will try to accommodate students' wishes, it is not always possible to do so. Allocation of Supervisors remains the responsibility of the Programme Committee.
- 7.8.4 Where a change of Supervisor is required, a Change of Supervision Form, signed by the newly appointed Supervisors and the Programme Committee, should be submitted to the Research Degrees Committee at OVC.

8 Admissions and Enrollment

8.1 Overview

- 8.1.1 This Chapter details the University-wide standards and processes for admissions into its research degree programmes. Admitting degree programmes are responsible for handling prospective student applications and reviewing them for quality against University and Programme minimum standards. Decisions about graduate admissions at the University ultimately rest with the RDC. This policy sets forth the general eligibility requirements for admission to graduate study, along with the elements of the application process from receipt of the application up to the point of enrollment of the admitted student.

8.2 General Requirements for Admission

- 8.2.1 As stated in the Royal Charter of the University, admission of students to the University shall be on merit and irrespective of religion, origin, sex, sexual orientation, or race.
- 8.2.2 Applicants from colleges and universities of recognized standing who hold a Bachelor's degree or its equivalent, or are anticipating conferral of the degree prior to admission, are eligible to be considered for admission to graduate study at the University. The number of applicants who can be admitted for work in a particular Programme any time is limited by the College or Department and by the number of currently-enrolled students who continue their work in that Programme.
- 8.2.3 Applicants may only apply to one graduate programme in an academic year.
- 8.2.4 Prospective applicants will need to submit preliminary research proposals, so it is expected that they may contact Programme Committee members and/or potential supervisors to determine suitable topics for the proposed research.

8.3 Components of the Research Degree Programme Application

- 8.3.1 To be considered for graduate study at the University, an applicant must provide:
 - 8.3.1.1 A completed application.
 - 8.3.1.2 A non-refundable application fee.
 - 8.3.1.3 A statement of purpose describing the applicant's reasons for applying and selection of the particular degree programme.
 - 8.3.1.4 A preliminary research proposal (see 8.4 below).
 - 8.3.1.5 Reference reports – Applications require two referee reports for Master's programme applicants and three for PhD programme applicants. A referee report is a confidential personal recommendation on a candidate for admission.
 - 8.3.1.6 A transcript from every post-secondary school attended by the applicant (the applicant may submit copies at the time of the application but will need to provide officially verified originals prior to admission).

- 8.3.1.7 Demonstration of minimum competencies (see 8.5 below). This may involve submitting results from standardized tests.
- 8.3.1.8 Additional application documents (e.g., writing samples, portfolios, etc.) as required by the Programme.
- 8.3.2 The University reserves the right to investigate the authenticity, accuracy, and authorship of materials submitted, information provided and assertions made in connection with the application, and to require from the applicant additional information and authorizations to allow additional information to be obtained.
- 8.3.3 Application materials, once submitted as part of the application, become the property of the University. Copies are not provided back to the applicant, nor forwarded elsewhere outside the University.

8.4 Preliminary Research Proposal

- 8.4.1 Every application for a research degree programme should include a preliminary research proposal. It is expected that the research topic will change over time, but this is the applicant's first attempt to map out what he/she may want to research as part of their studies. Students will have the opportunity to focus and clarify their topics as they go through the Research Proposal module in their first semester, have discussions with their supervisors, and immerse themselves in systematic and comprehensive review of literature.
- 8.4.2 Choosing and developing a researchable topic and securing a tight fit between methodological framework and nature of the problem at hand involves a high level of conceptualization. This can be challenging work and at the preliminary stage, and it is not expected that a preliminary proposal would discuss these issues in much detail. However, it is requested that prospective students provide this preliminary description of their research topic as an attempt to assist them to narrow down the research question, what literature to search and read and what research methodology they should be considering as appropriate for their research. It also assists the University to find supervisors who have research interests related to the topic.
- 8.4.3 Precise guidelines for a preliminary research proposal should be provided by each Programme according to its specifications. Generally, proposed research should:
 - 8.4.3.1 Be of personal and/or professional interest to the applicant.
 - 8.4.3.2 Be within the applicant's competence to carry out.
 - 8.4.3.3 Be feasible.
 - 8.4.3.4 Be sufficiently specific and delimited.
 - 8.4.3.5 Be manageable.
 - 8.4.3.6 Have the potential to make a contribution to knowledge or practice in an appropriate field.

8.5 Minimum Competency Standards

- 8.5.1 The University requires that all applicants for research degrees demonstrate competency in English, research methods and analytical reasoning. The format for assessment of the competencies and minimum competency standards are specified

in each Programme Document. Programme-specific minimum standards must be at or above the University-wide minimum standards, except for programmes in which the dissertation will be written in a language other than English, in which case the English requirement may be waived.

8.6 Application Processing

- 8.6.1 A prospective student applies for admission directly to the relevant Programme Committee. Programme Committees review the applications and may proceed to shortlist and interview applicants. The Committee may then make its recommendations for admission to the RDC. All decisions regarding admission and financial aid/scholarships are made by the RDC, upon recommendations made to it by Programme Committees.
- 8.6.2 Admission is subject to verification of University admission requirements such as completion of the Bachelor's degree, official transcripts and competency scores, visa certification for international students, funding, etc.
- 8.6.3 RDC decisions are communicated to Programme Committees, who may then notify applicants. In no event should an admitting Programme Committee offer acceptance to an applicant until the RDC has authorized the admission.
- 8.6.4 If an admitted student declines an offer of admission, the admitting Programme should inform the RDC about the change immediately so that implications for an open slot or scholarship can be accounted for.
- 8.6.5 If an admitted student does not arrive on campus and register in a timely manner for the first semester of the programme, the Programme Committee will discontinue the student's enrollment and inform the RDC of the cancellation.
- 8.6.6 Once an admission cycle is completed, a Programme Committee should submit a report of the admissions to the RDC and the University Registrar.

8.7 International Students

- 8.7.1 In order to register as students, the University requires that all those who are not Bhutanese citizens or registered permanent residents must obtain and maintain an appropriate and valid visa status for their stay in the country
- 8.7.2 A Certificate of Eligibility is issued to an admitted student to apply for a student visa with the Department of Immigration, Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs.
- 8.7.3 Upon the acceptance of international students to the University, the Research Services division determines whether the University (or another sponsoring agency) must sponsor the visa to permit the student's entry into the country. If the visa is to be sponsored by the University, the Research Services division will forward the student's visa application and supporting documents to Immigration.
- 8.7.4 The student's enrollment shall be on hold until he/she arrives at the campus and completes an international student orientation.

8.8 Enrollment

- 8.8.1 Official enrollment records of research degree students are maintained within each College as per its norms for all its students.

- 8.8.2 Students should ensure that their enrollment status is current and valid during their candidature.

9 Confirmation of Candidature

9.1 Overview

- 9.1.1 Confirmation of candidature represents the formal completion of the probationary phase of a research degree student's candidature – upon successful completion, the student becomes a candidate for the degree. While a number of research degree students in the formative stage of their candidature have a strong sense of direction, are highly motivated and perform well, the progress of others may be problematic. The confirmation process attempts to assess formally the extent to which students are 'on track' during the early period of their candidature and consequently, whether or not their candidature should be extended. In this sense, the policy comprises an integral part of the University's quality assurance processes.

9.2 Specific Aims of Confirmation

- 9.2.1 The specific aims of the confirmation process are to:
 - 9.2.1.1 Identify early in students' candidature any support and guidance necessary for their proceeding successfully to the next major stage of their research.
 - 9.2.1.2 Assess progress to date and the academic preparedness of the candidate to complete their course.
 - 9.2.1.3 Provide an opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate written and other necessary research skills appropriate to the doctoral level of study.
 - 9.2.1.4 Achieve more timely and successful completions.

9.3 Confirmation Process

- 9.3.1 The Confirmation process will need to be explained to all new research degree students early in their Programme. At these sessions, students will need to receive information about the support available to them during their candidature. Importantly, they will need to know about the Confirmation process involving the required tasks to be completed in the given timeframe, the composition of the Confirmation Panel and how it will conduct its business, and acknowledge the role of Confirmation of Candidature as a major milestone in their research candidature. Panel members will be required to sign off when the student has undergone the induction process.
- 9.3.2 For Master's programmes and Doctoral programs of 3 years duration, student progress will be assessed at the end of the first semester for full-time students and at the end of the second semester for part-time students. For students in 4 year programs or professional doctorates that require coursework, assessment would normally be carried out at the end of the first semester after work on the thesis or portfolio has begun for full-time students and at the end of the second semester after work on the thesis or portfolio has begun for part-time students.
- 9.3.3 Confirmation typically occurs at the end of the first semester as the assessment for the Research Proposal module, though it includes additional requirements that

must be met. In order for candidature to be confirmed, the following tasks or milestones must normally be met by candidates. Candidates are required to have:

- 9.3.3.1 Presented a detailed research proposal for formal approval within the first semester of candidature for full-time students and within the first two semesters for part-time students.
- 9.3.3.2 Completed an annotated bibliography or literature review if not included in proposal.
- 9.3.3.3 Applied for ethics approval where relevant.
- 9.3.3.4 Passed safety course where required.
- 9.3.3.5 Completed successfully any required coursework units.
- 9.3.3.6 Completed other approved development activities needed – e.g. units in statistics, academic writing, intellectual property and electronic literacy including use of electronic databases.
- 9.3.3.7 Presented their progress to date at an interview with the Confirmation Panel (an interview without the presence of the Principal Supervisor will also be available to students).
- 9.3.4 These may need to be adapted according to specific Programme requirements. Any Programme specific requirements should be provided to the student early in their candidature.
- 9.3.5 A Confirmation Panel, an advisory body, will be set up for each candidate comprising:
 - 9.3.5.1 The Principal Supervisor
 - 9.3.5.2 The Co-Supervisor
 - 9.3.5.3 The Programme Leader or other Programme Committee nominee who will act as Chair
 - 9.3.5.4 One representative from the student's disciplinary area nominated by the Principal Supervisor or Programme Committee
 - 9.3.5.5 A representative who is there at the invitation of the student (optional)
- 9.3.6 Panels may co-opt additional expertise as required for each candidate.
- 9.3.7 The Confirmation Panel should be formed with the intention of continuing forward as the candidate's Thesis Committee (except for the Chair of the Panel). More specific guidelines for the membership of the Confirmation Panel / Thesis Committee are given in Section 10.3.
- 9.3.8 The Confirmation Panel will recommend one of the following:
 - 9.3.8.1 Candidature is confirmed (with possibly some conditions applying). The "student" is now a "candidate" for the research degree.
 - 9.3.8.2 Candidature is not confirmed on the basis that progress is unsatisfactory.

9.3.9 Only when candidature is formally confirmed, may the student progress to the next stage of their research.

9.3.10 Unsatisfactory Progress

9.3.10.1 Where progress is deemed by the Panel to be unsatisfactory, the student will be given the opportunity to respond to a 'show cause' letter from the Programme. Students must respond to Programme Committee within 21 days of receipt of the letter.

9.3.10.2 The RDC will review the show cause correspondence, will notify the student of the Committee's recommendation, and in the case of an unfavorable decision, inform the student of the appeal process.

9.3.10.3 The decision on unsatisfactory progress is final, barring the exercise of the right of appeal (see below).

9.4 Non-Compliance with Confirmation of Candidature

9.4.1 Students failing to comply by refusal to participate in, or refusal to sign off on, their confirmation of candidature will be deemed to have made unsatisfactory progress. The procedure followed will be the same as that under Unsatisfactory Progress above.

9.5 Appeals

9.5.1 Students will have the right of appeal to the Appeals Committee against any unfavorable recommendation of the RDC. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the RDC and the Appeals Committee within 14 days of the receipt of the advice of the unfavorable recommendation.

9.5.2 Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:

9.5.2.1 Procedural irregularities in the conduct of the Confirmation process.

9.5.2.2 Documentary evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of one or more of the members of the Confirmation Panel.

9.6 Formation of Thesis Committee

9.6.1 The successful confirmation of candidature for a doctoral candidate will lead to the formation of a Thesis Committee from the candidate's Confirmation Panel. All members of the Confirmation Panel, except for the Chair, will remain on as Thesis Committee members.

10 Candidature Matters

10.1 Overview

- 10.1.1 Once enrolled in a course, students should work with Supervisors to get themselves through Confirmation of Candidature. Candidature begins once a student has been confirmed as a candidate and lasts until the degree is awarded. This Chapter outlines how candidature should normally progress and policies on situations that may arise during candidature. During this time, the candidate should progress with his/her dissertation research with guidance of the Thesis Committee, and report the progress every six months. Variations to candidature initiated by the student, or dismissal for academic reasons, come under the purview of the Research Degrees Committee.

10.2 Roles and Responsibilities of the Student/Candidate

10.2.1 Induction and Contact with Supervisor/s

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

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

10.2.2 Confirmation of Candidature

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

10.2.3 Responsible conduct of research

- 10.2.3.1 Students are responsible for ensuring they are aware of the policies and procedures given in this framework, particularly the Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct Policy, as well as the Research Policies Handbook.

- 10.2.3.2 Students must abide by the conduct guidelines given herein and the Research Code of Conduct.

- 10.2.3.3 Students should make themselves aware of professional guidelines on research conduct within their particular field.

- 10.2.3.4 All research projects must be approved by a CRC.

10.2.4 Progress Reports and Re-Enrollment

- 10.2.4.1 Students must ensure that all administrative requirements of the University, such as re-enrolling each year, providing progress reports, and conforming to procedures for variations of conditions of candidature, are met.
- 10.2.4.2 Students are required to report on their progress every 6 months of candidature. The progress reports provide an opportunity to formally record progress and any issues or concerns that arise during candidature.
- 10.2.4.3 Where inadequate progress has occurred, the Supervisor and Programme Committee may request students to “show cause” why their candidature should not be terminated. The main reasons for a “show cause” letter being issued are the lack of response from a student in relation to submission of progress and re-enrollment forms to their Supervisors, or lack of evidence of adequate progress.

10.2.5 Fieldwork and Research Overseas

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

10.3 Confirmation Panel / Thesis Committee

10.3.1 Rationale

- 10.3.1.1 Submission of an approved dissertation to the RDC is required for degrees. The doctoral or research master’s dissertation is expected to be an original contribution to scholarship or scientific knowledge, to exemplify the highest standards of the discipline, and to be of lasting value to the intellectual community. Every dissertation is read and approved by members of the University faculty to ensure that standards for quality are met. Standards for the professional presentation of master’s and doctoral work have been established by the RDC. The University faculty responsible for quality assurance for those standards are brought together to form the Confirmation Panel for a candidate, and then progress to become the Thesis Committee upon successful confirmation. Ultimately, the Committee members serve as the internal readers and examiners for a student’s dissertation. The Committee members also serve as final readers after the thesis has been externally examined and sign the completed work.

10.3.2 Functions

- 10.3.2.1 Confirm a student’s candidature (as the Confirmation Panel).
- 10.3.2.2 Guide and monitor the progress of a research degree candidate, informally as required and formally through biannual progress reporting meetings with the candidate.

10.3.2.3 Examine a candidate's written dissertation and oral defense prior to external examination.

10.3.2.4 Certify the final submitted dissertation.

10.3.3 Members

10.3.3.1 The Thesis Committee composition, as proposed by the Principal Supervisor (in consultation with the student) and agreed to by the prospective members, is endorsed by the Programme Leader. This must be on file with RDC at the time of confirmation. All subsequent changes to the Committee must be approved by the Programme Committee. The Thesis Committee must conform to University requirements at the time of degree conferral.

10.3.3.2 Since the Thesis Committee starts out as the Confirmation Panel, the basic guidelines for membership are as dictated previously. In general, the Thesis Committee consists of the PS, CS, and, typically, two other members. The Committee must have at least three members and may not have more than five members. At least one member must be from the student's major department. Normally, all Committee members are members of the University faculty or are of emeritus status. The student's Programme Leader may, in some cases, approve the appointment of a member who is not a current or emeritus member of the University faculty, if that person is particularly well qualified to consult on the dissertation topic and holds a PhD or equivalent degree. Former University faculty may thus, on occasion, serve on a Thesis Committee. A non-University faculty member (including former University faculty members) may replace only one of three required members of Thesis Committees. If the Committee has four or five members, at least three members (comprising the majority) must be current or emeritus members of the University faculty. Not more than one member may be an emeritus faculty.

10.3.3.3 Prospective Committee members in the following categories may be approved without submission of a *curriculum vitae*: current or former University faculty holding a Ph.D., visiting professor, visiting associate professor, visiting assistant professor, or senior University officer who holds a Ph.D. but does not have an academic appointment.

10.3.3.4 A *curriculum vita* is required for prospective committee members in the following categories: senior research associate, senior lecturer, consulting professor, consulting associate professor, consulting assistant professor, acting professor, acting associate professor, acting assistant professor, senior fellow of a research center, members of the professoriate at other Universities, distinguished scholars who may currently hold no academic title. The *curriculum vita* should include a summary of education, professional experience, publications, and academic or other honors.

10.3.3.5 Principal Supervisors, in consultation with students, may petition to add, change, or remove members of the Committee. The resulting committee must conform to University requirements.

10.4 Progress Reporting During Candidature

- 10.4.1 The progress of all research degree students is monitored formally as specified in each programme document and according to the minimum requirements given herein. Progress is reported every six months of candidature to the concerned Programme Committee.
- 10.4.2 This typically happens at the end of each regular semester through a thesis committee meeting with each student. During the meeting, the student presents his/her research work and also reports on training progress such as performance in coursework. The committee provides its feedback. The student's progress and committee feedback are recorded, discussed with the student, and submitted by the Principal Supervisor to the Programme Committee. The student may also make a private addendum to the report if he/she wishes.
- 10.4.3 For programmes that assess progress on research components of the degree through continuous assessment, the progress reports may include the thesis committee's marks for that period of student research activity that was reported on at the meeting.
- 10.4.4 This formal process does not mean that students and supervisors should not otherwise be in regular contact or wait until the report is prepared before raising issues with each other. Programme Committees include summarized/compiled student progress information annually as part of the Programme's annual interim report to the RDC.
- 10.4.5 Progress reports provide an opportunity to record progress and any concerns that affect or impede submission of a completed dissertation by the required date. The reports are completed after a thesis committee meeting, and minutes of the meeting are attached, along with any other supporting documentation as deemed appropriate. These reports are reviewed by the Programme Committee who contacts Supervisors if problems that require immediate resolution are indicated on the report. The DRILs are also advised in matters relating to research progress. Supervisors are required to indicate what intervention strategies have been put in place. Completed reports are kept in the relevant student file with the College's appropriate post-graduate Programme Leader.
- 10.4.6 Submitting regular progress reports is a requirement of the University and doing so must be taken seriously. Both the Principal Supervisor and student have the opportunity to make comment. The reports will be referred to when applications for extensions or suspensions are submitted.
- 10.4.7 Lack of progress has specific consequences. If the Programme Committee receives a report from the Principal Supervisor, who, following consultation with Co-supervisor(s), recommends that the student's work is unsatisfactory, the Committee may resolve that the student be invited to 'show cause' why their candidature should not be terminated. In cases of dispute between any supervisor and a student, due consideration will be given to the views of both parties. Final recommendations for student termination are reviewed by the RDC.
- 10.4.8 Within six months of the projected submission of a PhD dissertation (or four months for a Master's thesis), students are sent a 'Submission Date Drawing Near' letter from the Programme Committee to express the hope that good progress is being made on dissertation writing and that they will be able to submit their dissertation for examination by the due date. The letter also requests that students

inform the Programme Committee immediately if unforeseen circumstances will prevent a timely completion.

- 10.4.9 If the dissertation is not submitted on the due date, a student will be asked to explain this. If no satisfactory response is received, a 'Show Cause' process will be initiated.

10.5 Studying as an Internal Student

- 10.5.1 Internal students (students attending the College campus on a regular basis) have the benefit of direct access to many support services and information. They must also be aware of and follow all behavioral norms that apply to the rest of the College community.
- 10.5.2 Some Colleges have compulsory attendance requirements at meetings or training sessions. In other cases these may be discretionary. Students should discuss these matters with their Principal Supervisor as part of their orientation/induction.

10.6 Studying as an External Student

- 10.6.1 Studying as an external student has its own challenges, notably the distance between a student and their supervisors. Usually external study also means that the award is being undertaken part-time. There are pressures on time and inevitable pressures on family and relationships when studying from home. It is the responsibility of students to maintain regular contact with the University and their supervisors.
- 10.6.2 Requirements to attend residential schools vary between courses and Colleges. It is the responsibility of students to check if modules have compulsory or mandatory requirements to attend a residential school. External PhD students are free to negotiate appropriate periods of attendance with their supervisors.
- 10.6.3 Students should ensure that they spend periods of time in "face-to-face" consultation as agreed upon with their supervisors. Students should also arrange to get continued access to facilities (online, for example) prior to going on distance mode.
- 10.6.4 Supervisors are encouraged to keep reasonable track of their students, especially if a student has not been regular in initiating contact.

10.7 Enrollment in Additional Coursework Modules

- 10.7.1 If their Supervisors agree, students may attend, at no additional cost, informal lectures or tuition in an advanced module (or modules) of coursework offered at their College. Permission of the Coordinator of the module concerned, agreement of the Dean of Academic Affairs of the College, and agreement of the Programme Committee are required.
- 10.7.2 The optionally enrolled modules are recorded as 'non-degree' coursework on the student's academic record. These may be important for the student to gain additional necessary training, but will not be given any credit weight in the final marks calculation.

10.8 Change of Mode/Status of Study

10.8.1 During candidature it is possible for students to change their mode/status of study. This relates to:

10.8.1.1 Changing from internal to external candidature or *vice versa*.

10.8.1.2 Changing from full-time candidature to part-time, or *vice versa*.

10.8.2 After gaining written endorsement from their Principal Supervisor, students must notify the Programme Committee in writing. The application will then be considered by the Committee.

10.8.2.1 The Committee should ensure certain conditions are fulfilled, particularly in the case of internal to external changes. For example, the Committee should consider whether the candidate has fulfilled minimum requirements and has obtained the minimum skills necessary to continue more independently (e.g. language, technical). The Committee should also consider whether the candidate has ensured they will be able to avail all the facilities and resources they need off-campus to progress adequately. The Committee may call the PS to clarify the recommendation for the change in status. The Committee should keep the IAC informed of such changes.

10.8.3 Note for students on scholarship – Nearly all scholarships relate to full-time internal study. A check with the Programme Committee as well as with Research Services is advisable to ensure that proposed changes do not contradict the conditions of the scholarship. In most cases it is possible to arrange to continue scholarship support as usual while away on fieldwork.

10.9 Change in Dissertation Title / Research Topic

10.9.1 It is common for the direction/focus of the research to change during the initial period of PhD candidature (prior to the Confirmation of Candidature). If a change of direction of research has the approval of a student's Supervisors and Programme Committee, and does not require a change of supervision arrangements or it is unlikely there will be a subsequent application for an extension of period of candidature, then approval from the Research Degrees Committee is not required.

10.9.2 If, however, there is a substantial change in the direction of the research, and/or a change of Supervisor, and/or a likelihood that the proposed change will lead to a subsequent application for an extension of the period of candidature, then the RDC's permission is required. In this case, a student must write an explanatory letter and have it endorsed by their Principal Supervisor and Programme Committee before submitting it to the Research Degrees Committee. Any changes to be made in title/topic should be completed at least six months prior to the date of submission of a PhD dissertation (or four prior for a Master's thesis).

10.10 Fieldwork and Research Overseas

10.10.1 Candidates sometimes need to spend a period (or periods) of time away from their usual place of residence/study, for fieldwork or other research activities. Colleges/Institutes are responsible for setting guidelines for minimum periods of fieldwork or research overseas.

- 10.10.2 Certain insurance (travel/health) and travel risk requirements must be met before a person is able to study overseas. Students should seek assistance from their Principal Supervisor to ensure that the correct procedures are followed.

10.11 Publishing

- 10.11.1 Students who publish whilst enrolled at the University contribute to the University's research performance. If the student publishes work based on research done while he/she was a University student, during or subsequent to completion of their research at the University, they should advise their Supervisor and RDC. These publications must indicate affiliation with the College and the University.
- 10.11.2 The Principal Supervisor must discuss with their students the publications and authorship provision of the University's Code of Conduct for Research as part of their induction.
- 10.11.3 University staff and students will attribute the contribution of all participants in accordance with the provisions of that Code and the University's Intellectual Property policy.
- 10.11.4 Attribution or assignment of principal authorship is to be determined by negotiation. It is the responsibility of all the researchers to ensure the authorship hierarchy is in accord with the contributions made and as specified in the University's Code of Conduct under Publications.
- 10.11.5 Permission to publish research results where there is joint Intellectual Property ownership requires the consent of all parties to the IP Agreement.
- 10.11.6 Where a dispute arises it may be dealt with in accordance with the Dispute Resolution and Grievance Procedures, Section 13.5.

10.12 Variations in Candidature

- 10.12.1 The University requires timely completion within the period of candidature, so supervisors and students should work together to ensure completion occurs in the time allotted. However, problems may arise that require changes to candidature. The options available include (1) extending candidature, (2) suspending candidature or (3) withdrawing from candidature. The final authority on variations to candidature is the RDC.
- 10.12.2 Applications for extension or suspension of candidature are not automatically approved. Well justified arguments with supporting evidence, are required.
- 10.12.3 Extension of Candidature
- 10.12.3.1 Extensions to candidature are not encouraged, but may be allowed, on a case-by-case basis.
- 10.12.3.2 Extension applications must be filed a minimum of 3 months prior to the due date for submission of the dissertation.
- 10.12.3.3 Requests for extensions are normally considered for a period of three months full time equivalent candidature, and will not be approved by the RDC unless extenuating circumstances prevail over which students have no control.

10.12.3.4 Further extension beyond the initial time will only be awarded where students are able to demonstrate that substantial progress towards submission of their thesis has been made since their last extension and that without additional time, they would endure hardship and be unable to complete the thesis. Typically, a total of two blocks of 3-month extensions (total of six months full-time equivalent) may be allowed.

10.12.3.5 After examination of a Dissertation is completed and if the RDC recommendation is for further thesis work and re-examination, terms of extension beyond those given herein may be specified at the discretion of the RDC for the completion of the work, including the terms of scholarship or funding, if any, during the extension period. Such extensions based on post-examination recommendations by the RDC shall not be credit rated.

10.12.3.6 Applications for extensions to candidature must include:

10.12.3.6.1 A strong case that is endorsed by the Principal Supervisor and Programme Committee.

10.12.3.6.2 A statement from the Supervisor which includes an evaluation of student progress to date and anticipated outcome of the extension if granted.

10.12.3.6.3 A time schedule detailing activities from the start of the extension to submission.

10.12.3.7 The application must then be forwarded to the RDC. During the time period that the application is under consideration, the applicant must proceed according to previously arranged plans and deadlines, and not assume that the application will be approved. The RDC shall notify the applicant of its decision within 1 month of receipt of the application.

10.12.4 Suspension of Candidature

10.12.4.1 Candidates are expected to pursue their research programs without interruption and are expected to regard the completion of their degree as a major priority throughout their candidature. However, the University recognizes that circumstances sometimes occur which disrupt or halt a student's progress toward completion, and, in those circumstances, it may be sensible to consider suspending candidature until the problems are solved. Suspension means putting candidature 'on hold' for a period of time. During periods of suspension HDR students are not expected to work on their research projects.

10.12.4.2 If students wish to suspend candidature, they should first discuss the circumstances with their Principal Supervisor and Thesis Committee. If a suspension is needed, the request, endorsed by the Principal Supervisor, should be submitted to the Programme Committee for approval. A medical certificate should be provided for suspensions related to periods of ill health; a letter from an employer should be provided for suspensions related to changes in work demands.

- 10.12.4.3 The minimum period of suspension that will be approved is 30 days full-time equivalent and the maximum period of suspension that will be approved at any one time is 12 months, unless specified in the relevant course rules.
- 10.12.4.4 Students wishing to suspend while undertaking coursework modules will be required to suspend on a per-semester basis. A suspension of candidature may not be taken in the first six months of enrolment in the course. This applies to both full-time and part-time candidates. Candidates are not permitted to apply for a suspension once they have reached the maximum submission date for their candidature.
- 10.12.4.5 Wherever possible, requests for suspension must be made in advance; retrospective suspension requests will not be approved unless compelling grounds are provided (e.g. involvement in a serious accident, illness or bereavement of a close family member or, unanticipated employer demands), appropriate documentary evidence is provided, and the application has been supported by both Principal Supervisor and the DRIL. Students must be clear that there may be adverse consequences with respect to payments of scholarship funds.
- 10.12.4.6 In order to return from suspension of candidature, students must reenroll with the relevant Programme Committee.
- 10.12.4.7 International Students
- 10.12.4.7.1 International students who hold a student visa are required to undertake full-time candidature under the terms of their student visa.
- 10.12.4.7.2 International students can apply for suspension of candidature on the grounds of compassionate or compelling circumstances. Compassionate or compelling circumstances may include: serious illness or injury; pregnancy; involvement in a serious accident; or illness or bereavement of close family members. Supporting documentation in the form of medical certificates, statements from College staff, or other appropriate documentation must be attached to the suspension application. Applications will need to also be approved by the Programme Committee.
- 10.12.4.7.3 If no supporting documents are provided or the leave is granted for circumstances other than those mentioned above, the University must inform the Department of Immigration that the student has ceased studies. This will result in the cancellation of the student's Confirmation of Enrollment (CoE) and student visa. The student will then need to obtain a new CoE from DRIL.
- 10.12.4.7.4 Retrospective suspension of candidature will not be approved except under unanticipated circumstances and where compassionate or compelling circumstances can be established.

10.12.4.7.5 Students must depart Bhutan within fourteen days of the commencement of their period of suspension, unless they are unable to travel for medical reasons.

10.12.5 Withdrawal of candidature

10.12.5.1 Withdrawal means voluntarily terminating candidature. It is a drastic step but in some cases may be necessary. Students and Supervisors should note that a student cannot withdraw retrospectively i.e. it cannot be backdated beyond the current teaching period. Suspension is a less drastic alternative. Taking time away from study can provide students with the option to sort out difficulties and return to the research project later.

10.13 Dismissal for Academic Reasons

10.13.1 The principal conditions for continued enrollment of a research degree student are the timely and satisfactory completion of the University and Programme requirements for the degree. The guidelines that follow specify procedures for dismissal of students who are not meeting these conditions for fulfillment of minimum progress requirements. In such cases, Programme Committee will:

10.13.1.1 Where possible and as early as possible, warn the student, in writing, of the situation and deficiency, along with a detailed explanation of the reason for the warning.

10.13.1.2 Consider extenuating circumstances communicated by the student.

10.13.1.3 Decide the question of dismissal by majority vote of the committee (with at least three faculty members participating in the committee's deliberation), and communicate the decision to the student in writing.

10.13.1.4 Place a summary of the Programme Committee's discussions, votes, and decisions in the student's file.

10.13.1.5 Provide students the opportunity to examine their files, if requested.

10.13.1.6 Provide students with information on their rights to appeal.

10.13.2 Additional guidelines for different stages of candidacy

10.13.2.1 Before candidacy

10.13.2.1.1 The Programme Committee may vote to dismiss a student who is not making minimum progress or completing requirements in a timely and satisfactory way before review for admission to candidacy. Before considering dismissal, the committee should communicate with the student (which may include a meeting with the student) concerning his or her academic performance and how to correct deficiencies, where such deficiencies are deemed correctable.

10.13.2.2 At the confirmation of candidacy

10.13.2.2.1 In a review for admission to candidacy, if the Confirmation Panel recommends that the student not be admitted to candidacy after the candidate's final attempt, the vote results in the dismissal of the student from the programme barring the appeals process.

10.13.2.3 During candidacy

10.13.2.3.1 When a student admitted to candidacy is not making minimum progress or not completing university, department, or program requirements in a timely and satisfactory manner, the student's Principal Supervisor, the Programme Committee, and other relevant faculty should meet with the student. A written summary of these discussions shall be sent to the student and the Principal Supervisor and added to the student's department file. The summary should specify the student's academic deficiencies, the steps necessary to correct them (if deemed correctable), and the period of time that is allowed for their correction (normally three months). At the end of the warning period, the Programme Committee should review the student's progress and notify the student of its proposed actions. If the student has corrected the deficiencies, he or she should be notified in writing that the warning has been lifted.

10.13.2.3.2 If the deficiencies are not deemed correctable by the Programme Committee (for example, the failure of a required course or examination, or a pattern of unsatisfactory performance) or if, at the end of the warning period, the student has not in the view of the committee corrected the deficiencies, the committee may initiate proceedings for dismissal. The student shall be notified, in writing, that the case of dismissal will be considered at an impending committee meeting. The student has the right to be invited to attend a portion of the scheduled meeting to present his or her own case; a student may also make this case to the committee in writing.

10.13.2.3.3 After full discussion at the Programme Committee meeting, the committee, without the student present, shall review the case and vote on the issue of dismissal. The student shall be sent a written summary of the discussion, including the committee's decision and the reasons for it. The student may submit a written request for reconsideration. The Committee's response to the request for reconsideration shall be made in writing; it may decline to reconsider its decision. The decision for termination is then forwarded to the RDC.

- 10.13.3 A Programme Committee's recommendation for dismissal for academic reasons is reviewed by the RDC for final decision. If the RDC recommends dismissal, the student is terminated barring any appeal.
- 10.13.4 Candidates have the right of appeal against any unfavorable decision of the RDC and will be invited to submit a report to the Appeals Committee of the Academic Board detailing any concerns they may have about the examination process. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Appeals Committee within four weeks of receiving the advice of the unfavorable outcome. The formal appeal, recommendation, all examiners' reports, candidate responses and any other relevant material shall then be referred to the Appeals Committee for review and final decision.
- 10.13.5 Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
- 10.13.5.1 Procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination.
 - 10.13.5.2 Documentary evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of one or more examiners.
- 10.13.6 The Appeals Committee will not consider any appeal where the candidate simply rejects the academic assessments of his or her work or where the candidate complains about inadequacy of supervision or other problems arising during the course of the candidature (problems encountered during candidature should be handled by grievance procedures at the appropriate time).

11 Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct

11.1 Overview

- 11.1.1 Good scholarship requires building on and incorporating the work of others. This use must be appropriately acknowledged. Whenever the thoughts, words, drawings, designs, statistical data, computer programs, performances or creative works of others are used, either by direct quotation, by paraphrasing or by the use of another's ideas, the author and the source must be clearly identified through the use of proper referencing. This acknowledgment of the contributions of others is not solely a matter of honesty. In the case of student work, it also shows the extent to which the student has consulted appropriate references and source materials during preparation of their work for submission. It thus plays a very positive role in academic assessment, by demonstrating how well the student has taken into account work already done in the relevant field. Good scholarship also requires accurate primary and secondary information or data.
- 11.1.2 Plagiarism and the falsification of information or data are dishonest practices that contravene academic values of respect for knowledge, scholarship and scholars. These practices can destroy the value of research conducted, including those portions produced honestly, and the reputations of the perpetrators. The University views with the greatest concern the actions of those who act dishonestly or improperly in connection with their academic work and imposes strict penalties on those students who are found to contravene the University Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct policy. This Chapter describes the types of misconduct that are in violation of University policies and the actions taken in response to such violations. To avoid plagiarism and other academic misconduct, it is important for students to understand how to attribute the work and ideas they use to their proper sources, and to adhere to the guidelines set out in the University's Research Code of Conduct.

11.2 Scope

- 11.2.1 This policy governs plagiarism and academic misconduct arising in respect of the preparation or examination of theses, dissertations, or creative works undertaken by research degree students and graduates (former students), whilst enrolled as students at the University, excluding the coursework components of their research degree programmes.
- 11.2.2 This policy applies within the University and must also be incorporated into all agreements with other institutions, national and international, with which the University has any partnership arrangement involving the supervision and examination of the University's research degree programmes.
- 11.2.3 This policy does not apply to:
 - 11.2.3.1 Behavioral misconduct, as defined elsewhere in each College's Student Behavioural Misconduct Rules.
 - 11.2.3.2 Plagiarism and academic misconduct arising in respect of coursework undertaken by research degree students. This is dealt with by the Wheel of Academic Law.

- 11.2.3.3 Any research misconduct by a student not specifically covered by this Policy, which is instead dealt with by the Research Misconduct policy of the Research Policies Handbook.

11.3 Purpose of the Policy

- 11.3.1 To identify the responsibilities of the University and of individual staff and the rights and responsibilities of students with regard to the prevention and detection of plagiarism and academic misconduct in higher degree research programs.
- 11.3.2 To outline procedures to be applied consistently in the investigation and resolution of cases of alleged plagiarism and academic misconduct whilst ensuring procedural fairness for students.
- 11.3.3 To provide advice for academic staff on the prevention and detection of plagiarism and academic misconduct.
- 11.3.4 To provide advice to students on ways to avoid plagiarism and academic misconduct.

11.4 Definitions

- 11.4.1 Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to the following:
 - 11.4.1.1 Plagiarism or assisting someone else to commit plagiarism.
 - 11.4.1.2 Research dishonesty as outlined in the University's Research Policies Handbook.
 - 11.4.1.3 Cheating, acting dishonestly or otherwise attempting to gain an unfair advantage in an examination or any other assessment task, or collusion with or assisting someone else to do so.
 - 11.4.1.4 Submitting, as a new work, an assessment task previously produced and assessed for another unit or award, without appropriate acknowledgment and without the prior permission of the current Module Tutor.
 - 11.4.1.5 Misrepresenting, fabricating or falsifying information or data.
 - 11.4.1.6 Using information in breach of a duty of confidentiality.
 - 11.4.1.7 Omitting reference to the relevant published work of others for the purpose of claiming personal discovery of new information.
 - 11.4.1.8 Claiming joint authorship with other authors without their permission.
 - 11.4.1.9 Attributing work to others who have not contributed to the research.
 - 11.4.1.10 Failing to acknowledge work primarily produced by a collaborator.
 - 11.4.1.11 Interfering with any research-related property of another person, including the apparatus, reagents, biological materials, written notes, data, hardware, software, or any other substance or device used or

produced in the conduct of research, or assisting someone else to do so.

11.4.1.12 Failing to comply with University policies, rules or codes of ethics, or those of relevant professional and statutory registration societies and agencies, while completing assessment tasks or undertaking studies.

11.4.1.13 Making improper use of copyright material.

11.4.2 Behavioral Misconduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

11.4.2.1 Failure to comply with University rules or policies.

11.4.2.2 Providing information known to be false.

11.4.2.3 Forgery, alteration, or misuse of any University document, record, or instrument of identification.

11.4.2.4 Conduct prejudicial to the reputation, good order and governance of the University.

11.4.2.5 Abuse, threats, intimidation, harassment, coercion, deceitful or other conduct (whether by physical, verbal or by electronic means) that:

11.4.2.5.1 Threatens or endangers the health, freedom or safety of any person.

11.4.2.5.2 Obstructs a University member in performance of their duties

11.4.2.5.3 Interferes with teaching, research or related activity, the ability of University members to pursue their studies, examinations, official meetings, graduations, or other proceedings of the University.

11.4.2.6 Attempted or actual endangerment of, or damage to, or wrongful dealing with any persons and/or their property, University or public property, including any act of hazing arising from initiation, affiliation, or continued membership of any group or organization.

11.4.2.7 Failure to comply with reasonable directions of staff (including safety and security staff) or officers of the public emergency services acting in performance of their duties or failure to identify oneself to these persons when requested to do so.

11.4.2.8 Unauthorized possession, duplication or use of keys and/or access cards to any University premises or unauthorized entry to or use of University premises.

11.4.2.9 Unlawful use, possession, cultivation or distribution of narcotic or other dangerous drugs.

11.4.2.10 Illegal or unauthorized possession or use of firearms, ammunition, explosives, other weapons, or dangerous chemicals on University premises.

11.4.2.11 Disorderly or indecent conduct; breach of peace; or aiding, abetting or procuring another person to breach the peace on University premises or at activities (including excursions) sponsored by, or participated in, by the University.

11.4.2.12 Influencing or attempting to influence another person to commit an act of academic or Behavioral Misconduct.

11.4.2.13 Theft or other abuse of University computer time or facilities, including but not limited to:

11.4.2.13.1 Unauthorized entry into a file.

11.4.2.13.2 Unauthorized transfer of, or change to, a file.

11.4.2.13.3 Unauthorized use of another individual's identification and password.

11.4.2.13.4 Use of computing facilities to interfere with the work of another student, or staff; use of computing facilities to send obscene or abusive messages; use of computing facilities to interfere with normal operation of the University's computing systems.

11.4.2.14 Interference with the application of these Rules including but not limited to:

11.4.2.14.1 Falsification, distortion, or misrepresentation of information before an investigation or hearing.

11.4.2.14.2 Disruption to, or interference with, the orderly conduct of an investigation or hearing.

11.4.2.14.3 Attempting to discourage an individual's proper participation in an investigation or hearing, or use of, the student conduct rules.

11.4.2.14.4 Attempting to influence the impartiality of an investigating or appeals officer, or member of a student disciplinary committee prior to, or during the course of, the hearing.

11.4.2.14.5 Harassment or intimidation of an investigating or appeals officer or member of the student disciplinary committee prior to, during, or after an investigation or hearing.

11.4.2.15 Divulging any confidential information relating to any University intellectual property.

11.4.2.16 Conduct which involves acts or threats of violence, harassment, intimidation or discrimination.

11.4.2.17 Any form of criminal activity not otherwise specified in these Rules.

11.4.3 Central Plagiarism / Academic Misconduct File means a database, maintained by the Research Services division, where the records of investigations of allegations of plagiarism and other misconduct are stored. For any student, these records will be

deleted ten years after graduation from the University. Access to this file is restricted to the following people or their delegates: Vice Chancellor and Pro-Vice Chancellors, RDC, DRER, College Directors, Deans, University lawyers and any University Council representative.

- 11.4.4 Collusion means unauthorized collaboration. It involves working with others without the permission of the Module Tutor to produce work that is then presented as work completed independently by the student.
- 11.4.5 Graduate means a former student who has attained an award at the University. Unless otherwise stated, a graduate is in the same position as a student for the purposes of this policy.
- 11.4.6 Intentional plagiarism is an act of plagiarism that arises from an intention to deceive.
- 11.4.7 Legitimate collaboration means any constructive educational and intellectual practice that aims to facilitate research outcomes through interaction between students.
- 11.4.8 Plagiarism is intentionally or unintentionally using the work of other persons, copying (in whole or in part) the work or data of other persons, or paraphrasing closely or presenting substantial extracts from written, printed, electronic or other media in a student's written, oral, electronic or online work without due acknowledgment. Plagiarism involves giving the impression that a student has thought, written or produced something that has, in fact, been taken from another.
- 11.4.9 Statement of Authorship Form means a *pro forma* plagiarism declaration to be included by the student as part of every task submitted for assessment or examination. The specific content of this declaration will require the student to affirm:
 - 11.4.9.1 That the student has read the University Policy on Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct, and any guidelines on avoiding plagiarism provided by the University.
 - 11.4.9.2 That the work being submitted is the student's own work, that all sources have been acknowledged in the work, that the information contains no plagiarism, and that the information provided is not knowingly inaccurate; and
 - 11.4.9.3 That, unless explicit provision has been made and written permission obtained from the supervisor, the work or any version of it has not been previously submitted for assessment in any other unit or award offered by the University, its partner institutions or other institutions.
- 11.4.10 The Examples section at the end of this chapter lists examples of plagiarism and academic misconduct practices, which constitute major infringements of the University's academic values and policies.
- 11.4.11 Staff means the staff retained by the University, associates, honorary and emeritus staff, and employees of contractors engaged by the University.
- 11.4.12 Student means a person who is enrolled in a University research degree programme, and includes a student of a course taught by another higher education

provider for which the University has accepted by contract a quality assurance responsibility.

11.4.13 Student Support means the Research Services office, and other student support services provided by the University and each College.

11.4.14 Supervisor means the Principal Supervisor of a student enrolled in an award requiring an original research thesis, dissertation, or creative work. In lieu of the Principal Supervisor, this could also refer to the Co-Supervisor.

11.4.15 Unintentional plagiarism is an act of plagiarism that arises from lack of knowledge or understanding of the concept of plagiarism, or lack of preparation, skill or care.

11.5 Responsibilities of the University

11.5.1 The University has an obligation to:

11.5.1.1 Set in place and publicize to all academic staff and students the University's policies and procedures relating to plagiarism and academic misconduct.

11.5.1.2 Inform all parties of their rights and responsibilities.

11.5.1.3 Ensure that the policies and procedures are implemented consistently.

11.5.1.4 Advise students on how to avoid plagiarism and academic misconduct.

11.5.1.5 Advise staff on how to minimize opportunities for plagiarism and academic misconduct, and how to detect instances of plagiarism and academic misconduct.

11.5.1.6 Provide students with adequate opportunity to respond to allegations of plagiarism and academic misconduct.

11.5.1.7 Provide a process for students to appeal decisions arising from allegations of plagiarism and academic misconduct.

11.5.1.8 Maintain the Central Plagiarism/Academic Misconduct File, allowing only limited access as specified.

11.5.2 The RDC is responsible for the implementation of this policy.

11.5.3 In this policy, if the staff member who raises the allegation of plagiarism or academic misconduct has a role on the RDC, or has a role in the implementation of this policy, that staff member will step aside.

11.6 Responsibilities of the University Academic Staff

11.6.1 Supervisors have a responsibility to:

11.6.1.1 Know the policies and procedures of the University with respect to academic honesty, including plagiarism and academic misconduct, collusion, and legitimate collaboration, and to apply them consistently.

- 11.6.1.2 Explain to students both good scholarly practice and the concepts of plagiarism and academic misconduct and play a role in assisting the University to discharge the responsibilities listed above.
- 11.6.1.3 Ensure that adequate information is provided to students about referencing requirements and academic conventions for the use of others' work, as appropriate for the discipline.
- 11.6.1.4 Take all reasonable steps to ensure that information presented is reliable.
- 11.6.1.5 Inform students of any rules or policies which require students to identify their use of the work of others and provide for the satisfactory storage of original information or data collected as part of their research work.
- 11.6.1.6 Inform students of obligations regarding acknowledgment of collaborative work.
- 11.6.1.7 Provide students with early notification or fair warning if they believe any individual may be at risk of breaching guidelines relating to plagiarism, academic misconduct, collusion and collaboration, and reliability of information.
- 11.6.1.8 Give clear feedback about referencing and information management problems.
- 11.6.1.9 Refer students to sources of advice on academic research and writing.
- 11.6.1.10 Ensure that allegations of plagiarism or academic misconduct are based on firm evidence.
- 11.6.1.11 Report cases in which there is evidence of plagiarism or academic misconduct to the RDC and to the relevant Deans and Director.
- 11.6.1.12 Check for plagiarism in student drafts, using computer assisted and/or manual methods.
- 11.6.1.13 Inform students of the obligations implicit in the obligation to provide the candidate's Certification when submitting a thesis for marking.

11.7 Responsibilities and Rights of Students

11.7.1 Students have a responsibility and obligation to:

- 11.7.1.1 Read, understand and respect this policy.
- 11.7.1.2 Familiarize themselves with research and referencing conventions for their discipline.
- 11.7.1.3 Avoid all acts which could be considered plagiarism or academic misconduct.
- 11.7.1.4 Take all reasonable steps to ensure that information presented is reliable.

- 11.7.1.5 Seek assistance from appropriate sources and support services on becoming aware that they need more knowledge and skills.
- 11.7.1.6 Provide the Candidate's Certification when submitting a thesis for marking.
- 11.7.1.7 Meet the requirements of rules or policies which require students to identify their use of the work of others and provide for the satisfactory storage of original information or data collected as part of their research work.

11.7.2 Students should:

- 11.7.2.1 Be informed of the policies of the University with respect to academic honesty including plagiarism and academic misconduct, collusion, legitimate collaboration and reliability of information.
- 11.7.2.2 Be provided with clear guidelines on academic styles required for their theses, dissertations, or creative works.
- 11.7.2.3 Receive practical comments which assist them to review their work.
- 11.7.2.4 Expect clear guidelines relating to all aspects of legitimate collaboration.
- 11.7.2.5 Expect early notification or fair warning in the case where a supervisor believes a student may be at risk of breaching guidelines relating to plagiarism or academic misconduct.
- 11.7.2.6 Participate in appropriate learning experiences designed to improve competency in writing and study skills, understanding of the requirements of legitimate collaboration, and development of personal attributes, in particular, ethical behavior.
- 11.7.2.7 Expect consistent interpretation of this policy.
- 11.7.2.8 Be aware that a thesis, dissertation or creative work will not be marked unless the Candidate's Certification has been received.

11.7.3 Where an allegation of plagiarism or academic misconduct has been made, the student shall be advised in writing of:

- 11.7.3.1 The nature of the allegation.
- 11.7.3.2 The right to present a case in writing or orally to the RDC.
- 11.7.3.3 In the case of an allegation of plagiarism, the fact that the signed Statement of Authorship Form, submitted with the alleged plagiarized work, has been retained as evidence for the investigation.
- 11.7.3.4 The student support available.
- 11.7.3.5 The fact that upon completion of the investigation by the RDC in relation to the case, the student will receive a written statement as to the outcome of the investigation and the decision as to the penalty, if any, to be applied.

11.7.4 The student will also be provided with a copy of these Rules.

11.8 Penalties for Plagiarism or Academic Misconduct

- 11.8.1 If the RDC determines that the allegation of plagiarism or academic misconduct, or both, is not supported by the evidence, the RDC must dismiss the allegation.
- 11.8.2 If the RDC determines that unintentional plagiarism, minor academic misconduct, or both occurred, one or more of the following actions must be taken at the discretion of the RDC:
 - 11.8.2.1 Give a warning or reprimand to the student.
 - 11.8.2.2 Arrange counseling for the student to prevent further occurrences.
 - 11.8.2.3 If the allegation was raised during the primary examination process, the student will be required to revise and resubmit the work for examination, taking care to correct all cases of unintentional plagiarism detected. The student will be advised that this exercise may require additional data collection and analysis; the reading of, and reference to, additional literature; and a careful search of the whole work for further instances of inadequate scholarship, including the unattributed paraphrasing of text.
 - 11.8.2.4 If the allegation was raised prior to submission of the work for examination, the student will be instructed to rectify any instances of inadequate data or information, or of poor scholarship.
- 11.8.3 If the RDC determines that intentional plagiarism, academic misconduct, or both occurred, but the RDC determines that mitigating circumstances exist, the student will be required to redo or revise and resubmit the work, taking care to avoid the problems detected. The student will be advised that this exercise may require additional data collection and analysis; the reading of, and reference to, additional literature; and a careful search of the whole work for further instances of inadequate scholarship.
- 11.8.4 If the RDC determines that intentional plagiarism, repeated cases of plagiarism, or academic misconduct occurred, and that mitigating circumstances do not exist or are not persuasive so that the case merits a severe penalty, the RDC may impose one or more of the following penalties:
 - 11.8.4.1 If the allegation was raised during the examination phase, the student will be deemed to have failed the degree in which they are enrolled.
 - 11.8.4.2 If the allegation was raised during the process of research, a recommendation that the student's candidature be terminated will be forwarded to the Academic Board.
- 11.8.5 Any penalty imposed after determination of intentional plagiarism, repeated cases of plagiarism, or academic misconduct, will debar the student from enrolling in a University research higher degree for a period not less than ten years.
- 11.8.6 If it is determined by the RDC that, in relation to a graduate of the University, plagiarism or academic misconduct has occurred whilst the graduate was a student at the University, the RDC may impose one or more of the following penalties:
 - 11.8.6.1 In the case of a finding of unintentional plagiarism or academic misconduct, either of the following:

11.8.6.1.1 A warning or reprimand to the graduate.

11.8.6.1.2 A requirement that the graduate re-enroll, rewrite and resubmit the thesis.

11.8.6.2 In the case of a finding of intentional plagiarism or serious academic misconduct the matter will be referred to Academic Board with a recommendation that the award should be rescinded.

11.9 Processes for Handling Allegations of Plagiarism or Academic Misconduct

11.9.1 Principles – Overarching principles for judging a case of alleged plagiarism or academic misconduct:

11.9.1.1 Each case will be treated on its merits.

11.9.1.2 In the case of plagiarism, the intent to deceive, the extent of the plagiarism, and the student's history in regard to plagiarism and/or academic misconduct, will be the principal criteria.

11.9.1.3 In the case of academic misconduct, the nature of the misconduct and the student's history in regard to plagiarism and/or academic misconduct, will be the principal criteria.

11.9.1.4 The RDC will be kept informed at all stages in the process, from the establishment of a *prima facie* case, through investigation, to decision and outcome. College Directors, Coordinators of Research Centers, and Supervisors of the student, against whom allegations of plagiarism or academic misconduct have been made, will be informed on a similar basis.

11.9.1.5 Investigations under this policy and advice to the student of the outcomes of the investigation will be dealt with in as timely a manner as possible. The response from the University at each stage should be within 20 calendar days. Students will be given 20 calendar days to respond to the allegations at each stage.

11.9.1.6 The processes for handling allegations against former students (graduates) are the same as those for current students.

11.9.2 Detection

11.9.2.1 If a member of staff, an examiner or a fellow student has reason to suspect plagiarism or academic misconduct, that person must inform the DRIL at the earliest opportunity. The DRIL will investigate whether there is any evidence to support the suspicion.

11.9.2.2 If the evidence is detected in the first instance by a person other than the supervisor or examiner, that person must inform the supervisor at the earliest opportunity.

11.9.3 Allegation

11.9.3.1 Responsibility for managing allegations of plagiarism or academic misconduct resides with the RDC.

- 11.9.3.2 When a suspicion of plagiarism or academic misconduct arises, and there is some evidence to support the allegation, the supervisor shall present a written report detailing that evidence to the DRIL. When such a report is received, the DRIL will decide whether or not there is a *prima facie* case for plagiarism or academic misconduct. DRILs may raise the initial allegation of plagiarism themselves. In all cases, DRIL should keep detailed notes and make reports available to the IAC and CRC.
- 11.9.4 Notification – If a *prima facie* case of plagiarism or academic misconduct is found to exist, the DRIL will notify the student in writing, to be sent by recorded delivery wherever possible, of:
 - 11.9.4.1 The allegation
 - 11.9.4.2 The student's rights
 - 11.9.4.3 The student support available
- 11.9.5 Accompanying documents – The written advice to the student will be accompanied by:
 - 11.9.5.1 A copy of this policy.
 - 11.9.5.2 In the case of plagiarism, a copy of relevant sections of the written work with the allegedly plagiarized passages identified.
 - 11.9.5.3 In the case of academic misconduct, a report stating instances detected with supporting documentary evidence.
 - 11.9.5.4 A copy of any other documentary evidence used to support the claim of plagiarism or academic misconduct, or both, whether arising from an electronic detection system or otherwise.
- 11.9.6 Invitation to Respond – The student shall be invited to respond to the allegation within 20 calendar days of the date on the letter of advice. The student will be informed that the response should be directed to the DRIL.
- 11.9.7 Record of Investigation – A record of the investigation will be kept and will be noted in the Central Plagiarism/Academic Misconduct File. Any written response from the student will form part of the record of the investigation. In the case of any other response an accurate written record of the discussion must be made and dated by the Chair of the RDC as soon as possible after the event.
- 11.9.8 Support Person – The student may invite a support person to any meeting. The support person may provide the student with advice, but may not act as an advocate or make direct comment to the meeting without the permission of the Chair of the RDC.
- 11.9.9 Further Information – The Chair of the RDC may seek such further information or advice on the substance of the allegation as is deemed necessary from academic staff other than the supervisor. Such information or advice will be made formally in writing and sent to the student for response.
- 11.9.10 Action Pending Determination – If the allegation occurs during the examination phase, the examination process will be suspended until the allegation is resolved. Examiners will not be advised of the suspension. If the allegation occurs during the

research or creative phase, the student will be allowed to continue with their work pending completion of the investigation.

11.10 Decision

11.10.1 When the student's response has been received, or where no response has been received after 20 calendar days, the DRIL will decide whether or not the evidence is sufficient to support a finding of plagiarism, academic misconduct, or both. If the DRIL decides that the allegation of plagiarism or academic misconduct is not substantiated, the allegation must be dismissed. If the DRIL determines that a *prima facie* case exists, the matter is referred to the RDC for investigation. The RDC will determine:

11.10.1.1 If plagiarism or academic misconduct did indeed occur.

11.10.1.2 In the case of plagiarism whether the plagiarism was intentional or unintentional.

11.10.1.3 Whether mitigating circumstances exist.

11.10.2 Prior Instances – Where the RDC determines that plagiarism, academic misconduct, or both has occurred, the Chair of the RDC will consult the Central Plagiarism/Academic Misconduct File for prior instances of plagiarism or academic misconduct by the student before determining the course of action. Existence of prior instances shall be cause for discounting any suggested mitigating circumstances and imposing a harsher penalty.

11.10.3 Action by the RDC – As a consequence of the decisions made above, RDC shall follow one of three possible courses of action:

11.10.3.1 Conclude that plagiarism or academic misconduct did not occur, and dismiss the case.

11.10.3.2 Conclude that unintentional plagiarism, minor academic misconduct, or both occurred, and apply a penalty chosen from Section 11.8.2 above for minor cases.

11.10.3.3 Conclude that intentional plagiarism, academic misconduct, or both occurred but that mitigating circumstances exist and that action should be taken as per Section 11.8.3 above.

11.10.3.4 Conclude that intentional plagiarism, repeated cases of plagiarism, or academic misconduct occurred, that mitigating circumstances do not exist or are not persuasive, that the case merits a severe penalty according to Section 11.8.4, and the case should be referred to the Academic Board.

11.10.4 Action by the Academic Board – Where the case is referred to the Academic Board, the Chair of the RDC will provide all documentation on the case to the Board. The student will also be provided with a copy of those materials, and be given further opportunity to answer the allegation. The Academic Board will review all aspects of the case with the Chair of the RDC, and will impose one of four possible courses of action:

11.10.4.1 Conclude that the allegation of plagiarism or academic misconduct, or both is not substantiated and dismiss the allegation.

11.10.4.2 Conclude that unintentional plagiarism, minor academic misconduct, or both occurred, that warrants action under Section 11.8.2 above for minor cases, and advise the Chair of the RDC accordingly.

11.10.4.3 Conclude that intentional plagiarism, academic misconduct, or both occurred, but that mitigating circumstances exist such that the case can be dealt with under Section 11.8.3 above and cause the appropriate administrative steps to be taken to enforce the relevant penalty.

11.10.4.4 Conclude that intentional plagiarism, repeated cases of plagiarism, or academic misconduct occurred, that mitigating circumstances do not exist or are not persuasive, that the case merits a severe penalty, such that the case can be dealt with under Section 11.8.4 above, and cause the appropriate administrative steps to be taken to enforce the relevant penalty. In the case of a graduate, the decision shall be to rescind the degree award.

11.10.5 Determination and Notification – As a consequence of any decision made, the decision maker will advise all relevant parties. In the case where a penalty is applied the student will be advised at this time of the right to, and procedures for, appeal.

11.10.6 Record Keeping

11.10.6.1 At each stage of the investigation, records should be gathered of all relevant documentation including:

11.10.6.1.1 The piece of work in which the alleged plagiarism or academic misconduct occurs.

11.10.6.1.2 Records of meetings and/or telephone conversations with the student, which records should be made as soon as possible after the event and should be signed and dated by the person making the record.

11.10.6.1.3 Copies of relevant laboratory notebooks or other research records prepared by the student.

11.10.6.1.4 Examiners' reports.

11.10.6.1.5 Progress reports.

11.10.6.1.6 Copies of correspondence whether or not in electronic form.

11.10.6.2 College administrative staff will establish a case file with the Research Services division.

11.10.7 Central Plagiarism/Academic Misconduct File – At the end of the matter, whatever decision is reached, records referred to above and a record of the final decision will be deposited in the Central Plagiarism/Academic Misconduct File maintained by the Research Services division.

11.10.8 Annual Report – At the end of each academic year the Research Services division will submit a report to the RDC listing by College, the number of investigations that

were carried out and reporting whether, for each investigation, the ultimate decision was made by the RDC or the Academic Board and the nature of the penalty.

11.11 Appeals

11.11.1 A student who wishes to appeal against a decision made by the RDC or Academic Board may submit a final appeal to the Academic Appeals Committee of the Academic Board. The Committee will consider all information relevant to the case and the appeal lodged by the student, and will decide one of the following:

11.11.1.1 The allegation is not substantiated.

11.11.1.2 The RDC should investigate further or reconsider its decision (based on suggestions provided by the Appeals Committee).

11.11.1.3 The decision is upheld.

11.11.2 The decision of the Appeals Committee will be final.

11.11.3 As with any other University decision and only after all other avenues have been exhausted, a student may file a complaint, relating solely to the process and procedures of reaching the final decision, with a University Council representative.

11.12 Examples

11.12.1 The following practices constitute examples of *plagiarism* and are major infringements of the University's academic values and policies. This list should be considered as representative and not as exhaustive of possible practices.

11.12.1.1 Direct quotations of text are used and the source has been acknowledged, but the quotes are closely paraphrased or summarized by the student in the content of any assessment task (may be intentional or unintentional plagiarism; referred to as 'sham paraphrasing').

11.12.1.2 Direct quotations of text are not used, but are closely paraphrased or summarized by the student in the content of any assessment task and the source of the material is not acknowledged either by footnoting or other simple reference within the text or bibliography of the paper (may be intentional or unintentional plagiarism; referred to as 'illicit paraphrasing').

11.12.1.3 Paragraphs, sentences, a single sentence or significant parts of a sentence are copied directly into the content of any assessment task by the student but are not enclosed in quotation marks and the source has not been appropriately cited and listed in a footnote or bibliography (may be intentional or unintentional plagiarism; referred to as 'verbatim copying').

11.12.1.4 Paragraphs, sentences, a single sentence or significant parts of a sentence are copied directly into the content of any assessment task by the student but are not enclosed in quotation marks, the source is cited and listed in a footnote or bibliography but there is no indication that the passage is being quoted (may be intentional or unintentional plagiarism; referred to as 'unidentified quotation').

- 11.12.1.5 An idea or information which appears elsewhere in any form is represented in any assessment task as the student's own, without reference being made to the author of that idea or the source of the information (may be intentional or unintentional plagiarism; a form of 'purloining').
- 11.12.1.5.1 Some examples of this are books, journals, newspaper or magazine articles, television programs, material downloaded from an Internet site, computer stored data and software, lecture notes, video or audio tapes, material downloaded from a CD-ROM.
- 11.12.1.6 Portions of the content of any assessment task have been copied, cut and pasted, or closely paraphrased from the work of other students, staff, or other person, but submitted under the student's own name (may be intentional or unintentional plagiarism; a form of 'purloining').
- 11.12.1.7 The student submits, as a new work, an assessment task he or she previously produced and had assessed for another unit or award, without appropriate acknowledgment of the fact and without the prior permission of the current Module Coordinator/Supervisor (may be intentional or unintentional plagiarism, referred to as 'recycling').
- 11.12.1.8 The student knowingly and voluntarily produces or contributes content for an assessment task with the intent of assisting another student to plagiarize, that is, acting as a 'ghostwriter' (academic misconduct with intention to assist plagiarizing).
- 11.12.1.9 The content of any assessment task has been written by someone other than the student, but the work, which may have been edited, is submitted without acknowledgment, under the student's own name (this includes procuring and submitting work that may be available through various Internet websites offering to produce essays and other documents which may be used or purchased with specific intent of passing the work off as the student's own intellectual work) (intentional plagiarism, referred to as 'use of a ghostwriter').
- 11.12.1.10 The inclusion, without due acknowledgment, of diagrams, charts, maps, flowcharts, photographs, tables, or other creative works originated by others (intentional plagiarism; a form of 'purloining').
- 11.12.1.11 The content of any assessment task has been written by someone other than the student, but the work, which may have been edited, is submitted under the student's own name and this content has been obtained by the student from the other person without their knowledge (intentional plagiarism; a form of 'purloining').
- 11.12.1.12 The content of any assessment task has been written by someone other than the student, but the work, which may have been edited, is submitted under the student's own name and this content has been obtained by the student from the original source using inappropriate social, emotional or physical pressures (intentional plagiarism; a form of 'bullying').

11.12.2 The following practices constitute examples of *academic misconduct* and are major infringements of the University's academic values and policies. This list should be considered as representative and not as exhaustive of possible practices.

11.12.2.1 Falsification of data: Data falsification may range from the fabrication of data to selective reporting of data. Falsification covers the omission of data as well as the modification of data.

11.12.2.2 Abuse of confidentiality: This includes the use or release of information given to one under the understanding of confidentiality. Examples include taking ideas from documents to which access was given, under rules of confidentiality, such as in the reviewing of grant proposals, award applications, manuscripts submitted for publication, scholarly prizes or journals.

11.12.2.3 Violations of rules and regulations concerning the conduct of research: Examples include violations of governmental or University regulations dealing with protection of human subjects, use of dangerous or hazardous substances (biological, chemical, physical).

11.12.2.4 Misrepresentations in publication: This form of misconduct involves the publishing or public circulation of material intended to mislead the readers. Examples include misrepresenting data (particularly its origins) or adding or deleting the names of other authors without the latter's consent.

11.12.2.5 Violations of Research-related Property Rights: Examples include the deliberate taking or destroying the research related property of others, such as data, research papers, notebooks, equipment, or supplies.

12 Dissertation Preparation, Submission, and Examination

12.1 Overview

12.1.1 Completion of a satisfactory dissertation is a University requirement for conferral of a research degree. The policy and procedures for presentation, examination and approval of the dissertation are included here. The dissertation is expected to be an original contribution to scholarship or scientific knowledge, to exemplify the highest standards of the discipline, and to be of lasting value to the intellectual community. Every dissertation is read and approved by University faculty to ensure that standards for Programme and University quality are met. The examination is a two part process, involving internal examination by the Thesis Committee via oral defense of the work by the candidate, and external examination of the written dissertation confidentially by external examiners. Successful candidates must then submit the final work conforming to University guidelines and ultimately endorsed by the Thesis Committee. Once the final dissertation is accepted by the RDC, the degree award may be conferred.

12.2 Dissertation Expectations

12.2.1 All University dissertations are evaluated based on the following criteria, in addition to each Programme's specific requirements, to be communicated in detail to examiners.

12.2.1.1 The dissertation is a substantially original contribution to the knowledge of the subject concerned.

12.2.1.2 The dissertation affords evidence of originality by the discovery of new facts.

12.2.1.3 The dissertation affords evidence of originality by the exercising of independent critical ability.

12.2.1.4 The dissertation is satisfactory as regards literary presentation.

12.2.1.5 A substantial amount of material in the dissertation is suitable for publication.

12.2.2 The difference between a Research Master's dissertation and PhD dissertation is largely one of depth and extent of contribution to original knowledge.

12.3 Process

12.3.1 The student and Principal Supervisor identify a date and time for the internal examination based on the perceived readiness of the candidate and the outcome of the most recent thesis committee meeting. The student should be nearing completion of the dissertation writing. The dissertation should be prepared for submission according to the University guidelines (see below).

12.3.2 The relevant Programme Committee approves the dissertation schedule and ensures the appointment of an out-of-department University Chair. The Committee should not require the student to solicit the out-of-department Chair, although the student may participate in selecting and contacting potential chairs. The Programme Committee reviews the composition of the Thesis committee for compliance with University requirements.

- 12.3.3 The student submits the dissertation to the examiners and advertises the dissertation presentation publically (college-wide) at least 21 days prior to the examination date.
- 12.3.4 The Programme Committee reviews the student status:
 - 12.3.4.1 Will the student be registered in the term the oral examination is to be taken?
 - 12.3.4.2 Does the student have valid candidacy?
 - 12.3.4.3 Has the student submitted all necessary progress reports and supporting documents, if any?
- 12.3.5 The Programme Committee prepares all necessary paperwork for the Chair and other examiners.
- 12.3.6 The internal examination is conducted and if successful (and once any changes have been made as recommended by the examiners), the programme committee forwards the dissertation, along with a list of potential external examiners, to the RDC for external examination.
- 12.3.7 The RDC conducts the external examination and notifies the student of the outcome. If successful, the student may consider the degree provisionally awarded and may prepare the final version for approval by the thesis committee and final submission to the University for recording. The degree may then be conferred according to normal conferral schedules.

12.4 General Guidelines for Dissertation Preparation

- 12.4.1 A University thesis should be substantially an original contribution to the subject concerned. PhD dissertations should not exceed 100,000 words for non-science subjects and for 50,000 words for scientific subjects, exclusive of appendices. Word limits for Master's theses are half those for PhD dissertations. The style should generally be journal-article format (see below). The Research Degrees Committee may specify a template for facilitating conformity with the University style guide. These guidelines may be superseded by guidelines given in validated Programme documents.
- 12.4.2 Where the thesis contains supporting articles and/or papers which have been authored jointly, the candidate is required to indicate the extent and nature of their own and others' contributions. The nature and extent of the candidate's input must be precisely expressed for each paper at the end of the Statement of Originality (to the extent of identifying which figures or text are the candidate's original works). The nature and extent of the intellectual input by others must be explained clearly and acknowledged in the Statement of Contribution by Others. Where publications of others have been used, these must be stated, and clear and appropriate acknowledgment must be made to the other authors. The name of the principal author must be clearly stated.
- 12.4.3 Two statements shall appear at the end of each chapter, the Statement of Contribution by Others, and the Statement of Originality. These must be signed by the candidate and the Principal Supervisor, who must certify that all co-authors have given their consent for having their work included in the thesis and that they accept the student's contribution as indicated in the Statement of Originality. In addition, the thesis should present an integrated body of work.

12.4.4 Dissertations must be in English. Exceptions to permit dissertations in a language other than English are granted as specified in a validated Programme document. Otherwise, approval for writing a dissertation in another language is normally granted only in cases where the other language or literature in that language is also the subject of the discipline. Dissertations written in another language must include an additional English abstract and extended summary in English (usually 15-20 pages in length).

12.4.5 Dissertations must conform to the structure of journal-article-format theses

12.4.5.1 Fore-section needs to include:

- 12.4.5.1.1 Title page showing the title of the thesis, the full name of the candidate together with their prior degrees and other qualifications indicating the awarding institutions, and the date when submitted for the degree.
- 12.4.5.1.2 Declaration – A statement signed by the candidate certifying that the work has not been and is not being submitted for any other degree to this or any other university. The candidate will also certify that all help received in preparing the thesis and all sources used, are duly acknowledged. The declaration must include a Statement of Originality and Statement of Contribution by Others, where specific work included in the text involved effort by others.
- 12.4.5.1.3 Certifications – Statements of final reading and approval by the Thesis Committee members (Final Submission only, after external examination).
- 12.4.5.1.4 Acknowledgements (optional)
- 12.4.5.1.5 Table of contents indicating clearly how the thesis is structured and how the journal articles are organized.
- 12.4.5.1.6 Tables, diagrams and abbreviations where appropriate.
- 12.4.5.1.7 An abstract or summary of approximately 300-400 words.

12.4.5.2 The body of the thesis then follows, with pages numbered consecutively, containing:

- 12.4.5.2.1 The first section of the body of the thesis should be an Introduction which should make clear the aims and focus of the study, identify its significance, and set the frame and sequence for each of the papers that follow. Its maximum length should correspond to guidelines set by the respective Programme.
- 12.4.5.2.2 A number of chapters, which may be written in the format of a self-contained journal article, will follow. These need not have been submitted to any journal. Where chapters have been adopted from the author's

published articles, they should be indicated as such, and the style should be modified as necessary to integrate with the rest of the work. All chapters should maintain a consistent format, even if adopted from different journal articles.

12.4.5.2.3 Chapters of the thesis and self-contained articles need to be integrated and therefore need to flow cogently from one to another. It needs to be made clear how the chapters are linked and how they contribute to each other.

12.4.5.2.4 The final chapter should provide integrative Conclusions, drawing together all the work described in the journal-article-format parts of the thesis and relating this back to the issues raised in the Introduction.

12.4.5.2.5 A single consolidated list of references for all chapters should be included.

12.4.5.3 The appendix contains:

12.4.5.3.1 Author's appendices as he/she sees fit.

12.4.5.3.2 License terms (Final Submission only, after examination).

12.5 Internal Examination (Oral Defense)

12.5.1 Passing a University oral examination is a requirement for research degrees. A defense of the dissertation is presented upon completion of a substantial portion of the dissertation prior to a pre-final draft (the draft of the work completed should be available for the examining committee in advance of the examination). The examination is intended to verify that the research represents the candidate's own contribution to knowledge, and to test his or her understanding of the research. General questions pertaining to the field as a whole, but beyond the scope of the dissertation itself, may also be included. The examination is also intended to help the candidate ensure his/her dissertation is at a sufficiently mature state as to be ready for external, final examination. The examination is conducted as a presentation followed by an oral defense.

12.5.2 The candidate's presentation shall be open to College members as well as the general public. Immediately following the presentation, an oral examination in defense of the work will be conducted, open only to the examiners.

12.5.3 The examiners are the Thesis Committee with the addition of a Chairperson from outside the candidate's Department.

12.5.4 Out-of-Department Chairperson

12.5.4.1 The Chairperson of a University oral examination is appointed for this examination only, to represent the interests of the University for a fair and rigorous process as described above.

- 12.5.4.2 The Chair must be a member of the University faculty, and may be a Professor Emeritus. He/She may not be from the candidate's Department.
- 12.5.4.3 Responsibility for appointing the out-of-department oral examination Chair rests with the candidate's Programme Committee which may choose to solicit the advice of the Principal Supervisor in the process of selecting and contacting potential Chairs. The Programme Committee should not require the student to solicit the out-of-department Chair, although the student may participate in selecting and contacting potential Chairs.
- 12.5.4.4 The responsibilities of the Chair of an oral examination are to:
- 12.5.4.4.1 Serve as an impartial representative of the academic standards of the University.
 - 12.5.4.4.2 Ensure that the examination is conducted within University and Programme guidelines and keep examiners aware of both sets of rules.
 - 12.5.4.4.3 Ensure that the candidate is asked challenging but fair questions (the Chair may participate in the questioning).
 - 12.5.4.4.4 Confirm that one or more members of the examining committee will provide the candidate adequate evaluation after the examination.
 - 12.5.4.4.5 Assess the candidate's performance and readiness for external examination.
 - 12.5.4.4.6 Report the examination results to the relevant Programme Committee within three days of the examination.
 - 12.5.4.4.7 In the event of a candidate's failure, the Chair should submit a written evaluation of the student's performance to the candidate, the Programme Leader, and the RDC within three days of the examination.

12.5.5 Scheduling the Oral Examination

- 12.5.5.1 The examination may be scheduled at any time at least one year after candidacy has been confirmed, unless otherwise specified by Programme policy.
- 12.5.5.2 Students must be registered in the term in which the University oral examination is taken. The period between the last day of final exams of one term and the day prior to the first day of the following term is considered an extension of the earlier term. Candidacy must also be valid.
- 12.5.5.3 The Oral Examination must be announced publically a minimum of 21 days in advance, which means it should be scheduled and approved by the Programme Committee prior to that. Once the schedule has

been set, the composition of the Thesis Committee and the selection of the Chair cannot be changed. Scheduling the examination involves specifying the:

12.5.5.3.1 Date, time, and location of the examination

12.5.5.3.2 Title of dissertation

12.5.5.3.3 Composition of the committee and the Chair

12.5.5.4 If a member cannot attend the scheduled examination, the examination is rescheduled.

12.5.5.5 With the agreement of the Primary Supervisor, candidate, and Programme Committee, a member of the University oral examination committee may participate by telephone or video conferencing. If the conferencing technology fails and the examiner cannot participate, the committee may fail to reach its quorum. In this case, the examination must be rescheduled.

12.5.6 Conducting the examination and reporting the results

12.5.6.1 The examination should be conducted according to the Programme's stated practices, although it should not exceed three hours in length in total, with the public presentation not to exceed one hour.

12.5.6.2 The specific responsibilities of the examiners are to:

12.5.6.2.1 Ask challenging questions.

12.5.6.2.2 Follow the University and Programme guidelines for oral examinations.

12.5.6.2.3 Assess the candidate's performance and readiness for external examination.

12.5.6.3 At the conclusion of the examination the candidate should be asked to leave so that the examiners can confer in private. After the discussion, examiners complete their assessments and submit their marks to the Chair.

12.5.6.4 Once all the marks have been reported to the Chair, the Chair tallies the marks and records the results of the examination and within three hours of the examination, returns the marks to the Programme Committee for recording. The Chair may then report the results to the candidate. Within 3 days of the Programme Committee getting the results, the results are endorsed. Any deviation from University policy or procedures should be reported by the Chair to the DRIL's office for review.

12.5.6.5 If the candidate has passed the oral examination, the thesis committee may certify that the dissertation is ready for external examination.

12.5.6.6 If corrections or modifications are required, the Programme Committee adds conditions and a timeline/format for meeting the

conditions. The Committee should request the Thesis Committee to monitor progress and compliance with the conditions. Only then, the Thesis Committee will certify the draft is ready for external examination.

- 12.5.6.7 If examiners vote to fail a student, they should remain convened to formulate a recommendation for the Programme Committee. The examiners may recommend the length of time that should intervene before the student retakes the examination and conditions to be met before it may be retaken. Only one retake is possible.
- 12.5.6.8 If the examiners votes to fail a student, the committee Chair sends within five days a written evaluation of the candidate's performance to the Programme Committee and the student. Within 14 days and after review of the examiners' evaluation and recommendation, the Programme Leader must send the student a written statement indicating the final action of the Programme.
- 12.5.6.9 The examiners also have the option of recommending that the student not be permitted to repeat the oral examination, but only if this action has been preceded by a written warning to the student from the Programme Committee that the student has not been making satisfactory progress. In effect, this is a recommendation that the Programme Committee should terminate the candidate. If the candidate is to be terminated, the guidelines for dismissal of research degree students must be followed.

12.6 External Examination

12.6.1 Examination process

- 12.6.1.1 On successful completion of the internal examination, the Programme Committee shall submit the thesis to the RDC along with a pool of potential external examiners. On receiving a thesis, RDC shall appoint:
 - 12.6.1.1.1 Two examiners for a Master's thesis, at least one of whom shall normally be external to the University (special cases can be made to the RDC) plus one reserve examiner. A pool of at least four potential examiners from which the two plus reserve are selected must have been assembled through consultation between the Principal Supervisor, the student and all current Co-Supervisors.
 - 12.6.1.1.2 Three examiners for a PhD dissertation, at least two of whom shall normally be external to the University (special cases can be made to the RDC) plus one reserve examiner. A pool of at least six potential examiners from which the three plus reserve are selected must have been assembled through consultation between the Principal Supervisor, the student and all current Co-Supervisors.

- 12.6.1.2 The student will not be given any indication of the final set of examiners that have been appointed. The Programme Committee, or Principal Supervisor as appropriate, will be expected to obtain written or emailed consent from each potential examiner, excepting the reserve, to examine the thesis within one month of receipt of a Master's thesis, or two months of receipt of a PhD dissertation. The RDC is to be advised as to whether each examiner has had experience supervising and examining higher degree research students. In cases where a thesis has been permitted to exceed the normal word limit, examiners shall be informed of this fact so they may consider it when making their decision to examine.
- 12.6.1.3 If an additional examiner/adjudicator is required during the examination process, the choice will be made from the original pool of examiners, unless otherwise instructed by the RDC, or on request from the Programme Committee to the RDC.
- 12.6.1.4 No person who has been a Principal Supervisor or Co-Supervisor of the student shall be appointed as an examiner. No person who could be perceived as having a conflict of interest which could potentially influence the examination process will be approved as an examiner.
- 12.6.1.5 Each examiner shall make a separate written report on the merits of the thesis, or the critical explanation and creative work if the award is undertaken in creative practice, but thereafter may be required to consult with the other examiners and report to the RDC. Each examiner will be reminded to provide his/her report within one month of receipt of a Master's thesis (two months for a PhD dissertation). However, if an examiner fails to provide his/her report, after appropriate reminders, within a maximum of two months for a Master's thesis or three months for a PhD dissertation, the RDC, after consultation with the relevant Programme Committee, may notify the examiner that his/her services are no longer required and the reserve examiner may then be activated as a replacement.
- 12.6.1.6 For a degree in creative practice to be awarded, both the critical explanation of the work and the creative work itself must be deemed by examiners to be of pass standard.

12.6.2 Thesis examination outcomes

- 12.6.2.1 Taking into account the recommendations of the examiners, the RDC may:
- 12.6.2.1.1 Recommend that the degree be awarded.
 - 12.6.2.1.2 Recommend that the degree be awarded conditional upon the making of such amendments as the RDC deems appropriate.
 - 12.6.2.1.3 Request the examiners to consult and report to the RDC.
 - 12.6.2.1.4 Appoint an additional examiner or examiners and consider additional examination reports.

- 12.6.2.1.5 Appoint an external adjudicator who shall consider and report to the RDC upon the thesis and any supporting papers invited or requested by the RDC and the reports of the examiners.
- 12.6.2.1.6 Require the candidate to additionally sit for such written, oral or practical examinations as the RDC may prescribe.
- 12.6.2.1.7 Permit a candidate to revise the thesis for re-examination if, in the opinion of the Committee the work is of sufficient merit to warrant this concession.
- 12.6.2.1.8 Recommend that the degree be not awarded.

12.6.2.2 A student awarded the degree subject to amendments shall complete the amendments within 30 days for minor amendments and 90 days for major amendments. These will be made to the satisfaction of both the relevant Programme Committee and the student's Thesis Committee, which must ultimately certify the final dissertation.

12.6.2.3 A student permitted to revise a thesis for re-examination shall complete the revision within six months (or as alternatively recommended by the RDC) under the supervision of a Principal Supervisor or Supervisors endorsed by the Programme Committee.

12.6.2.4 A student who has revised a thesis and who fails the re-examination shall not be eligible for any further examination.

12.6.2.5 An external adjudicator will only be appointed by the Committee if the examiners are unable to come to a consensus recommendation. If the adjudicator recommends that the candidate's thesis be revised and resubmitted, then the adjudicator will serve as the sole examiner for the resubmitted thesis.

12.6.2.6 A research degree student may be awarded the degree *with distinction* in cases where the examiners, unanimously and independently, agree that the thesis is of *exceptional quality* in every respect and can be awarded without requirement for more than minor editorial amendment. The RDC may determine additional criteria and mechanisms for recognizing exceptional work.

12.6.3 Process upon recommendation of degree not be awarded

12.6.3.1 Where any examination, adjudication or consultation report is received by the RDC, on which basis the RDC is considering recommending that the student *not* be awarded the degree, the student and his/her Principal Supervisor shall be notified in writing of the content of that report and may within 30 days lodge a response limited to the academic and substantive matters raised in the report. The Committee shall take into account the submissions of the Principal Supervisor and/or student in determining whether the degree be awarded.

12.6.4 Appeals against a recommendation of degree not be awarded

- 12.6.4.1 Students have the right of appeal against an unfavorable examination outcome and will be invited to submit a report to the AAC of the Academic Board detailing any concerns they may have about the examination process. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Academic Board within four weeks of receiving the advice of the unfavorable outcome. The formal appeal, recommendation, all examiners' reports, student responses and any other relevant material shall then be referred to the Appeals Committee for review and final decision.
- 12.6.4.2 Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
- 12.6.4.2.1 Procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination; and/or
 - 12.6.4.2.2 Documentary evidence of prejudice or bias by one or more examiners.
- 12.6.4.3 The Appeals Committee will not consider any appeal where the student simply rejects the academic assessments of his/her work or where the student complains about inadequacy of supervision or other problems arising during the course of the student's research program (problems encountered during candidature should be handled by grievance procedures at the appropriate time).
- 12.6.4.4 Any member of the Appeals Committee involved in making the RDC recommendations will absent him/herself from all discussions of the appeal. If the Appeals Committee sends a formal recommendation of fail, thereby upholding the procedural fairness of the RDC's recommendation, to the Academic Board, these same individuals shall absent themselves from the Board meeting during discussion of the recommendation. There shall be no appeal against the final decision of the Appeals Committee.
- 12.6.4.5 The final appeal to the Appeals Committee does not affect the right of a student to seek a review (but not a further appeal) of the examination process by the University Council.

12.7 Final Submission

- 12.7.1 Once the candidate has been recommended for the degree award, he/she must submit the final approved and bound version of the dissertation for retention with the University as his/her officially completed work. No degree may be conferred, and no provisional award certificates provided, until this has been completed. Substantive changes may not be made to the content of the final submission in comparison to the version submitted for external examination, unless such amendments were specifically recommended by the RDC.
- 12.7.2 Two copies of the final approved and bound version, conforming to University specifications (each with original signatures) are retained by the University. One remains with RDC, one remains with the College library. An electronic copy must also be submitted for digital archiving. The digital copy must be an exact replica of the print versions, along with scanned signature pages inserted wherever appropriate.

12.7.3 The dissertation is considered finally approved once it is signed by the thesis committee members. The Certifications page contains signed statements of final reading and approval, indicating that the dissertation is complete. One of the thesis committee members must be indicated on the page as the final certifier (see below). Both the official College and University logos should be indicated.

12.7.4 Certificate of Final Reading

12.7.4.1 The PS reads the final dissertation in detail and signs on the Certifications page to indicate that Programme and University specifications, described below, have been met.

12.7.4.1.1 All suggested changes have been taken into account and incorporated into the manuscript where appropriate.

12.7.4.1.2 If the manuscript includes joint group research, the student's contribution is clearly explained in an introduction.

12.7.4.1.3 Format complies with University requirements.

12.7.4.1.4 If previously published materials are included in the dissertation, publication sources are indicated, written permission has been obtained for copyrighted materials, and all of the dissertation format requirements have been met.

12.7.4.1.5 The dissertation is ready-for-publication in appearance and ready for binding and archiving.

12.7.5 Publication Agreement and License

12.7.5.1 The dissertation author must sign the University Thesis and Dissertation Publication License upon final submission. By accepting the terms of this agreement, the author grants the University a non-exclusive, worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable right to reproduce, distribute, display and transmit the dissertation. The agreement remains with the RDC and is not replicated within the dissertation.

12.7.5.2 The University will make full dissertation available online, as well as through third-party search engines and distributors.

12.7.5.3 The author may additionally apply a Creative Commons license during final submission, which is included in the dissertation appendix.

12.7.5.4 Since the University will make dissertations publicly accessible in its libraries and in digital form readers may locate a dissertation and may wish to use parts of them in their own work (such as figures, tables, and other data reproduced by permission). Because the University leaves copyright of dissertations with the author, the author's permission for that reuse is necessary. By applying a Creative Commons license to their work, authors make clear to users the terms and conditions under which they may reuse the material, obviating the need for them to contact the authors directly. Applying a Creative Commons license does not take away any rights from authors; rather, it makes clear to readers of the work what kind of reuse is permitted.

12.7.5.5 An "Attribution Non-Commercial" Creative Commons license is recommended, because it encourages open access and collaboration in the scholarly process.

12.7.6 Printing and digital specifications

12.7.6.1 The final printed dissertation must be on high-quality acid-free paper and hard-bound according to University style as communicated by the Research Services division at DRER.

12.7.6.2 The digital version must be an exact replica of the printed copy except for the hard-bound cover, but including scanned versions of the signed pages. Digital specifications and guidelines are maintained with Research Services.

12.7.7 Delayed release (embargo)

12.7.7.1 An author has the option to delay the release of a dissertation online outside of the University library and networks. Release delay options are: 6 months, 1 year, or 2 years. Under an embargo, the dissertation will be available to University authorized library users, but not to readers outside the University.

12.7.7.2 The embargo option may be appropriate for an author who has a patent application in process or wants to delay access to the dissertation for a limited amount of time in order to pursue commercial interests or other publication.

12.7.7.3 Embargoes may be lifted early at the request of the author.

13 Student Support

13.1 Overview

- 13.1.1 Programme management should ensure that adequate student support is available for research degree students. This includes provision of minimum facilities, student resources and orientation, and means for addressing grievances. University-wide support services for research degree students are provided by the Research Services division. Within each College, support services for students are made available through the office of the Dean of Student Affairs, and students should be made aware of the services available during their orientation.

13.2 Minimum Facilities

- 13.2.1 The provision of minimum facilities for research degree students is intended to provide a high quality and productive education environment with the greatest opportunity for quality outcomes and experience. The minimum facilities available to students should include adequate workspace, computing facilities, and library access, and should be specified in each Programme document.
- 13.2.2 Programmes that are unable to comply with the provision of the minimum standards in full are required to document annually what additional provision needs to be available or what actions are being taken to comply with the policy. This documentation is to be collected as part of the review process administered by the RDC.
- 13.2.3 Where additional resources/facilities above the minimum are available within a Programme or Department, students are to be supplied with written information detailing policies regarding access to and the distribution of such funds/facilities.
- 13.2.4 Part time and/or off campus students must be provided with suitable work facilities for their research when on campus, and appropriate access to research funds, on a *pro rata* basis.
- 13.2.5 The facilities provided and the conduct of the programme must comply with the University's policies on occupational health and safety.

13.3 Student Resources and Induction

- 13.3.1 A College-based awareness programme should be available for all research degree students. The awareness programme will advise students, in an orientation and in writing, of the relevant policies, practices and procedures concerning the conduct of research and a research degree. The orientation/induction may include substantial self-guided or on-line portions. Participation in such an orientation is mandatory for all students within the first two months of commencement of candidature in the interests of quality and safety.
- 13.3.2 Postgraduate student representation should be available on all relevant College policy-making bodies and student groups.
- 13.3.3 Students are to be provided with student handbooks other appropriate documents such as the University's research policies upon commencement of candidature. The latest versions are typically available at the Research Services website.

13.4 Disputes between Students and Supervisors

- 13.4.1 Due to the unique nature of research degree programmes, the University shall implement protocols beyond the widely applicable student grievance procedures to cover relationships between students and supervisors. Such relationships can vary widely and sometimes disputes occur.
- 13.4.2 It is suggested that students and supervisors try to discuss their issues and come to an agreed solution. If this does not produce the desired result, there are sources of assistance available. The office of the Dean of Student Affairs is charged with advocating on the behalf of students in cases of disputes between students and supervisors. If the DSA is involved in the dispute, then another advocate may be appointed, such as the Head of another Department / School.
- 13.4.3 A dispute may arise when either a student or supervisor calls into question the work undertaken by another student or supervisor. Where the dispute relates to research activities then the Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct provisions given herein and the Research Misconduct provisions in the University's Research Policies shall be followed. If desired by the student, the office of the Dean of Student Affairs may advocate on the student's behalf in such cases. For all other cases, either party may request independent mediation.
- 13.4.4 If needed, the Research Services division may be called in to provide independent mediation.

13.5 Grievance Procedures

- 13.5.1 Grievance procedures need to be understood by candidates and supervisors. The procedures available to research degree candidates are intended to prevent deterioration, to the point of jeopardizing successful completion by the candidate.
- 13.5.2 A grievance can be notified by:
 - 13.5.2.1 A candidate
 - 13.5.2.2 The Supervisor/s
 - 13.5.2.3 Thesis Committee
 - 13.5.2.4 College managers (Director, Deans, Programme Management)
 - 13.5.2.5 Fellow students or other relevant College staff
 - 13.5.2.6 Affected research subjects or community members
- 13.5.3 In the first instance the complainant should speak to the other parties, describing the cause(s) for dissatisfaction, and seek informal resolution.
- 13.5.4 Failing resolution informally, the complainant should notify the other parties in writing with a copy to the Director who may seek independent mediation. If any form of misconduct is alleged, it must be investigated by DRIL.
- 13.5.5 All parties should agree to arrangements for mediation. All parties to the mediation may be accompanied by a representative from a staff or student association as appropriate.

- 13.5.6 The outcome of mediation shall be notified in writing to all parties to the mediation and to Research Services who must ensure that all correspondence is recorded.
- 13.5.7 In the case of unsuccessful mediation, the organizer of the mediation will act as arbitrator or may delegate arbitration of the dispute to the RDC. The parties retain the right of appeal to the Academic Appeals Committee. The AAC will determine its own procedures to hear an appeal and for dealing with it. The complainant will have the right to representation.

14 Tuition, Scholarships, and Funding

14.1 Overview

- 14.1.1 Enrolled postgraduate students at the University are charged tuition as set for each programme. This covers the students' enrollment, but not necessarily funding for their specific research activities, which may require additional support. This Chapter covers the University's tuition policies for research degree students, as well as issues pertaining to scholarships.

14.2 Tuition and Funding for Research Degree Programmes

- 14.2.1 All research degree programmes require tuition to be paid to the host colleges along with overhead cost charges withheld at the University level as per standard practices common to all University programmes. The tuition rate for full-time and part-time enrollment is set annually by the Academic Board.
- 14.2.2 Tuition is charged semester-wise for every regular semester of enrollment. Tuition will also be required at a proportional level during extensions of candidature.
- 14.2.3 Tuition is no longer charged after the semester in which a dissertation is submitted for external examination. However, there may be tuition charges, at proportional rates as set by the RDC, for additional work required by students if such is the recommendation after external examination.
- 14.2.4 The primary responsibility for securing tuition and research funding rests with students. Research degree programmes may be funded from a variety of sources including private (self), University, government, industry, organizations, or individual sources. The types of funding available may cover tuition fees, living expenses, conference attendance, short-term attachment to another organization, and research support including materials and travel. Students must demonstrate secured funding on a yearly basis (covering all costs, including research funding) in order to progress to the next year.
- 14.2.5 Several types of funding may be provided by the University. University fellowships, research assistantships, and teaching assistantships are offered primarily to doctoral students. In some cases, Research Master's students also may receive fellowships and assistantships. In addition, outside agencies may provide fellowships to graduate students. Students without fellowships or assistantships, and those whose funding does not cover all of their costs, may need to use student loans, savings, other personal assets, a spouse's earnings, or parental support to meet their educational expenses. Graduate financial support by the University is largely based on the recommendations of Programme Committees.
- 14.2.6 Research degree students are eligible to apply for project-specific funding from University-wide or College-based competitive research grants.

14.3 Employment Whilst on Scholarship

- 14.3.1 Scholarship recipients are only permitted to undertake a limited amount of paid employment. The employment must not interfere with their study and progress. Usually there is an agreement made between the HDR student and the Principal Supervisor. Candidates must keep their Principal Supervisor, DRIL, and Thesis Committee fully informed of any paid and/or unpaid work commitments.

- 14.3.2 For any programme in the full-time mode of study, extracurricular activities and work commitments should not normally exceed 240 hours per year during normal business hours (excluding annual leave. Work hours shall not normally exceed 10 hours in any one week. The number of hours of paid work undertaken, and the nature of this work must be reported on in each biannual progress report.
- 14.3.3 The Principal Supervisor and Co-Supervisor will inform the student of any problems perceived to arise from the level of extra-curricular activities and work. Should progress be deemed unsatisfactory the student will be required to reduce the level of paid and/or unpaid extra-curricular activities to a level endorsed by the Principal Supervisor and the Co-Supervisor and approved by the College Director.
- 14.3.4 For any programme in the full-time mode of study, students should not normally work more than 240 hours per year, but the Supervisor may give approval for up to 360 hours (for example by working during holidays)'. If a student wishes to undertake more than 360 hours per annum, or more than ten hours in any one week during normal business hours, a request must be made to the RDC and include comments from the Supervisor. The written approval from the Director, Research and External Studies must be obtained prior to the extra work commencing. Details of activities which temporarily interfere with the capacity to devote 35 hours per week to the research project must be recorded in the student's progress report.

14.4 Extensions of Scholarships

- 14.4.1 Scholarship extensions are not automatic but are at the discretion of the scholarship sponsor/coordinator. For scholarships funded by the University, a strong case, with supporting evidence indicating how final submission of the dissertation will not be possible without the extension, needs to be made to the Research Degrees Committee. All applications will be considered in accordance with the current University policy regarding extensions.
- 14.4.2 Requests for extensions are considered for a three month period only. They will not be recommended unless extenuating circumstances prevail and supporting documentation is provided. The extension application will require endorsement by the Programme Committee. The application must be accompanied by an academic timetable to show how completion will be accomplished.

14.5 Suspension of Scholarship

- 14.5.1 A suspension of scholarship occurs when the student, for one reason or another, needs time away from the research and wishes to take up the research at a later date.
- 14.5.2 During a period of approved suspension the scholarship holder is not entitled to receive any benefits from their scholarship.
- 14.5.3 The scholarship will be suspended for any period of time when the student is on an approved suspension of candidature, unless the suspended time is covered by annual, medical, maternity or other leave entitlements specified in the conditions of award of the scholarship.
- 14.5.4 Enrollment and scholarships must be suspended simultaneously for periods of suspension not covered by leave provisions of the scholarship.

15 Planning, Approval, and Monitoring of Research Degree Programmes

15.1 Overview

15.1.1 Research degree programmes are distinct from taught programmes at the University and are governed by separate structures, policies, and procedures as laid out throughout this Framework. The planning and approval of research degree programmes is done by the APRC in conjunction with the RDC. This Chapter outlines the procedures and criteria for initiating and reviewing programmes. The procedures are generally similar to those for taught programmes, which come under the purview of the PQC. The RDC regularly monitors the functioning of active programmes annually and reviews programmes comprehensively every five years or as otherwise necessary.

15.2 Design of Research Degree Programmes

15.2.1 A “Programme” is defined as the collection of modules, research plan, and dissertation that a student completes. Particular programmes will be designed and developed to lead to specified awards. Each such programme will need to be approved.

15.2.2 A programme of study can be designed for one or more of the following:

15.2.2.1 To develop areas of study relevant to the professions, employment/industrial sector or academic discipline in which the student is currently engaged.

15.2.2.2 To update the knowledge of those engaged in a field especially where the discipline at undergraduate level is subject to expansion or change.

15.2.2.3 To act as a re-orientation in areas new to the student or in areas not directly related to the scope of the student's first degree.

15.2.2.4 To provide an analytical in-depth treatment of an area beyond their first degree level in the same area.

15.2.2.5 To synthesize and integrate a number of disciplines or subjects.

15.2.2.6 To develop applied studies or to extend an area of study that cannot be pursued adequately at undergraduate level.

15.2.2.7 To build the capacity to increase research, innovation and the use of new knowledge in all aspects of the country's work

15.2.2.8 To develop a culture of enquiry and investigation in the society.

15.3 Planning Approval for a New Programme

15.3.1 Introduction

15.3.1.1 Proposals for new programmes are normally initiated by the member Colleges. However, the Academic Planning and Resources Committee may also propose for consideration by member colleges, new programmes that may be seen necessary and relevant to the overall objectives of the University.

- 15.3.1.2 Before a new programme can enroll students, it must receive both planning approval through the planning process of the Academic Planning and Resources Committee (APRC), and the academic approval process through the Research Degrees Committee (RDC).
- 15.3.2 Criteria – The criteria against which the proposal for planning approval for a new programme will be judged are as given below. A fuller elaboration of these headings is given in Section 15.3.8 “Justification for Initiating and Continuing a Programme”
 - 15.3.2.1 The need for the programme
 - 15.3.2.2 The demand for the programme
 - 15.3.2.3 The University’s overall strategy
 - 15.3.2.4 Resources
- 15.3.3 Outcomes – The intended outcomes of the Academic Planning and Resources Committee’s consideration of the planning proposal are:
 - 15.3.3.1 Approve the incorporation of the proposed programmes in the University’s forward Academic Plan, as a programme which helps to fulfill the University’s obligation to provide relevant and good quality programmes.
 - 15.3.3.2 Approve the proposed student numbers.
 - 15.3.3.3 Approve the further development of the proposal to the stage where it can be submitted to the RDC
 - 15.3.3.4 Agree to the incorporation of the resource requests in the University’s budget proposals.
- 15.3.4 Overall APRC procedures and timeframe for approval
 - 15.3.4.1 The APRC should receive for consideration and approval, proposals for planning a new programme in June and November, two years in advance of the intended date of commencement of the programme.
 - 15.3.4.1.1 This will ensure that a programme is launched with adequate preparation (resource and logistics). RDC’s approval of a programme for validation shall ensure that this planning period is strictly adhered to so that colleges have ample time for preparation of documents and acquisition of resources.
 - 15.3.4.1.2 The University’s validation of a programme is a peer reviewed process that seeks quality of provision, relevance and standards. Inadequacies in any of these areas are reported by the panel either as conditions to be met before the start of the programme or as recommendations. These, therefore, require the college to work on the programme in preparedness for commencement. This demands time and resources. In order to meet such requirements:

15.3.4.1.2.1 A gap of a full semester should be kept between the time of validation of a programme and its commencement i.e. a programme that is validated in the autumn semester cannot start earlier than the following autumn semester. This will apply to programmes where resources (both material and teaching staff) for the programme's implementation are in place.

15.3.4.1.2.2 A gap of two full semesters should be kept between the time of validation of a programme and its commencement i.e. a programme that is validated in the autumn semester cannot start earlier than the spring semester of the following year. This will apply to programmes where resources (both material and teaching staff) acquisition and other related support are uncertain.

15.3.4.2 In accepting a programme for incorporation into the University Plan, the APCR will normally give an indication to the initiators of the proposal of the likely resource constraints within which the programme must be developed, and so arrive at an understanding, albeit tentative, on the extent to which the University will be able to meet the programme's resource expectations as and when the programme starts.

15.3.4.3 The completed University plan, including all the new programmes supported by the APCR, is then submitted to the Academic Board for approval and onward transmission to the University Council.

15.3.5 Proposal Documentation – The documentation should include the following elements:

15.3.5.1 A statement of the programme (refer Programme Definition below).

15.3.5.2 A justification of the programme (refer Justification for Initiating and Continuing a Programme, below). This must be accompanied by evidence, or summaries of the evidence with reference to published documents containing the full evidence.

15.3.5.3 A statement of the resource needs for the programme (refer Resource Support for the Programme, below).

15.3.5.4 The proposed student numbers that it is intended to admit to the programme over its first five years, and minimum cohort sizes.

15.3.5.5 If the proposed programme is already running in some form, or if this new programme is replacing an existing programme then an evaluative report of the old programme or the last annual monitoring report on its operation should be included.

- 15.3.5.6 A statement from the Head of the College to confirm that the proposal has the explicit support of the College and that the calculation of resources have involved the Head of the Library and the Head of the IT section, and indicating the person responsible for the development of the programmes, the department or section of the Institute in which the programme is to be based.
- 15.3.6 Adoption of Existing Programmes – For the adoption of existing programmes, the Colleges/Institutes should submit an executive summary of the programme indicating the resources acquired and the resources required to the APRC for information, concurrent to the submission of the programme details for validation to the RDC.
- 15.3.7 Programme Definition – A programme is defined by the sum of the following topics:
- 15.3.7.1 The name of the College.
 - 15.3.7.2 The name of the programme and the award or awards to which it leads.
 - 15.3.7.3 The duration and mode of study.
 - 15.3.7.4 The campus at which the programme is offered.
 - 15.3.7.5 The award granting body, and/or accrediting body for the programme.
 - 15.3.7.6 A general statement that sets out the broad purpose and intention of the programme; an outline of related career opportunities might also be provided.
 - 15.3.7.7 The specific objectives of the programme; these are the specific attributes which the students should be able to demonstrate at the end of the programme as a result of their learning.
 - 15.3.7.8 The entrance requirements to the programme and the progression criteria, i.e. the minimum criteria, expressed in terms of subjects, credits and grades, for proceeding to the next stage or year of the programme.
 - 15.3.7.9 The programme's capacity for supervision – A statement of the supervision capacity required for the Programme and how the required capacity will be met for five years.
 - 15.3.7.10 The programme's approach to learning and teaching – A statement of the teaching and learning strategy for the programme which outlines the balance between lecturer-centered and learner-centered approaches including research-informed teaching, which addresses the needs of full time, part-time young/mature, internal/external learners, which takes account of use of ICT such as video conference or the web. The teaching and learning strategy should be designed to allow the fulfillment of the general objectives of the programme. The teaching approach should be consistent with the teaching method specified in the module descriptor forms.

- 15.3.7.11 The assessment approach – This should explain how the assessment contributes to the learning process and how it gives students the opportunities to demonstrate the achievement of the aims and objectives of the programme. The assessment approach should be consistent with the methods of assessment specified in the module descriptor forms. The requirements to be fulfilled for the granting of the award.
- 15.3.7.12 The curriculum structure – This should set out the modules and credits required to be completed in each year or stage of the programme, the pre and co-requisites. The core coursework modules, research proposal module, and credit structure for research modules should be clearly delineated. This should include a list of the coursework modules that compose the programme, as well as the minimum research requirements that will be credited through research modules.
- 15.3.7.13 The date at which the documentation was written or last amended and the authority for the issuing of that version of the programme.
- 15.3.8 Justification for initiating and continuing a programme – For the University to offer a programme there must be a clear justification for that programme. This is relevant at the start of a programme, and on the occasions when the University reviews the operation of a programme. The operation of a programme is not a self-evident justification for its continuation, there must be evidence initially that the programme will serve a justifiable purpose, and at the time of review there must be evidence that the programme has indeed fulfilled that purpose. The Justification requires the following elements to be addressed:
- 15.3.8.1 The purpose or philosophy of the programme – The programme definition will give a brief formal set of aims. This document will set out in more detail what is exactly in the minds of the originators or promoters that the programme will seek to achieve. In the case of an existing programme, this section can set out what the programme was intended to do and what in reality it has achieved. E.g. in the case of a Geography degree, what type of geography is intended to be studied.
- 15.3.8.2 The need for a new programme and the continuing need for an existing programme. Some of the issues that need to be addressed are:
- 15.3.8.2.1 Does the programme address Bhutan's economic, development and educational needs?
 - 15.3.8.2.2 Does the programme meet identified training needs, nationally or locally?
 - 15.3.8.2.3 Has there been a market analysis to show the need for the programme?
 - 15.3.8.2.4 Is there a need for the programme in terms of demand from employers? (The evidence to support the need for a programme needs to be quantitative and specific)

- 15.3.8.2.5 Is there evidence from past graduates as to the value and relevance of the programme?
- 15.3.8.3 The demand for the programme
 - 15.3.8.3.1 What is the evidence of student demand for the programme? Is there evidence from similar programmes?
 - 15.3.8.3.2 Is there demographic evidence of sufficient students with the required entrance requirements to justify the programme and the planned form of delivery?
 - 15.3.8.3.3 How does the planned intake number relate to the demand (and the need)?
- 15.3.8.4 The University's overall strategy
 - 15.3.8.4.1 Does the programme fit well within the University's overall Strategic Plan, which itself will be related to the country's development plan?
 - 15.3.8.4.2 Is the proposed programme consistent with the planned development of the University? E.g. in terms of the nature of the education to be provided, the balance of curriculum provision, the level and the mode of study
- 15.3.8.5 Resources
 - 15.3.8.5.1 Is the level of resources needed to develop the programme clearly identified and can it be met, or be expected to be met, by the University within its overall development plan?
 - 15.3.8.5.2 Does the University have access to the necessary staff, both in number and qualifications, and to other resources to support the programme?
- 15.3.8.6 Planned Student Numbers – What are the planned student numbers and how will they build up over the next five years?
- 15.3.8.7 Resource needs – Are there additional resource needs?
- 15.3.9 Resource support for the programme – The resources, which will be used to support the programme, should be specified according to the headings below. A distinction should be made between those resources in place, and those still to be obtained.
 - 15.3.9.1 Overall staff support
 - 15.3.9.1.1 Present establishment and grades of teaching, technical and general staff in the contributing departments.
 - 15.3.9.1.2 Grade and subject area of additional posts, those previously agreed and any now requested, with justification.

- 15.3.9.1.3 Academic staff teaching contact hours, and supervision workload, generated by each year of the programme and in total.
- 15.3.9.2 Accommodation
 - 15.3.9.2.1 Tabulation of the contributing departments' accommodation including staff rooms and specialized areas.
 - 15.3.9.2.2 Additional demands of general teaching accommodation created by the programme.
 - 15.3.9.2.3 Any essential, new specialist accommodation required by the programme, as previously agreed or now requested.
- 15.3.9.3 Equipment
 - 15.3.9.3.1 List of major equipment items available to support the programme.
 - 15.3.9.3.2 Additional major equipment items needed, as previously agreed or now requested.
- 15.3.9.4 General expenses – List of departmental allocations for general expenses and equipment maintenance in current and previous two years
- 15.3.9.5 Library support
 - 15.3.9.5.1 List of journals and periodicals relevant to the programme currently held by the library.
 - 15.3.9.5.2 Additional library expenditure needed to support the programme, both initial and recurrent, as previously agreed or now requested.
- 15.3.9.6 Computing support
 - 15.3.9.6.1 List of computing facilities, software, etc. available to the programme.
 - 15.3.9.6.2 Any additional computing expenditure required, as previously agreed or now requested.
- 15.3.9.7 Other support facilities – Other facilities which will directly support the programme, particularly to meet research resource requirements.
- 15.3.9.8 Any additional facilities needed and when it is projected they will need to be available.

15.4 Validation of a New Programme and the Adoption of an Existing Programme

15.4.1 Introduction

- 15.4.1.1 The University is responsible to many interest groups (students, external assessment bodies, funding agencies, employers, and the

general community) for the quality, standard and relevance of its programmes. This responsibility rests with each individual and group according to function and task. Ultimate responsibility within the University rests with the University Council, and is discharged by the Academic Board and the University Senior Management Team.

15.4.1.2 To fulfill its responsibilities to the community for the quality, standard and relevance of its research degree programmes, the Academic Board has set up policies and procedures that embody good practice and has established a RDC to carry them out. All programmes leading to an award of the University are subject to validation, periodic review and annual monitoring. These measures are in addition to other basic elements of quality assurance.

15.4.1.3 Validation is the term used to describe the process that leads to the final decision to approve (or not to approve) a programme.

15.4.1.4 This section focuses on the systems which deal with the quality of programmes, but additionally the University has policies and procedures which ensure quality in other aspects of the University's work such as staff appointment, staff development, student services, resource allocation, research, which in their turn contribute to the quality and standard of the University's programmes.

15.4.2 Aims of Validation

15.4.2.1 The overall aim of the University's validation system is to establish that the quality, standards and relevance of the programme fulfill the University mission, and are consistent with the programme's own claims. The presentation and quality of the validation submission document is not an end point of validation, it is an instrument to help the panel achieve a decision. The process is also intended to:

15.4.2.1.1 Challenge and stimulate staff by questioning aspects of the proposed programme.

15.4.2.1.2 Encourage staff in the development of research capacity, new areas of curriculum and new teaching methods, and in areas of scholarly staff activity which will help to develop and improve the programme.

15.4.2.1.3 Inform and advise staff of good practice elsewhere regarding research supervision and of new developments in curriculum and teaching methods as well as research training.

15.4.2.2 The validation process will address:

15.4.2.2.1 The rationale and coherence, separately and collectively, of:

15.4.2.2.1.1 The admission requirements

15.4.2.2.1.2 The aims and objectives

15.4.2.2.1.3 The research mission / focus of the programme

15.4.2.2.1.4 The curriculum

15.4.2.2.1.5 The content

15.4.2.2.1.6 The teaching/learning activities

15.4.2.2.1.7 The assessment methods and regulations

15.4.2.2.2 The extent to which the aims of the programme seek to address the employer demand and the student demand for the programme.

15.4.2.2.3 The adequacy of staff (especially supervision capacity) and resource support, both current and planned, and any resource implications for the University over and above the previously agreed levels.

15.4.2.2.4 The quality and experience of academic staff who will teach the programme and supervise research students, together with any staff development plans and intended staff appointments.

15.4.2.2.5 The relationship with the University's policies and regulations, and with any published principles, regulations and guidelines of any professional or licensing body.

15.4.3 The Process

15.4.3.1 The validation process normally has five main steps after planning approval is applied for and granted by the APRC.

15.4.3.1.1 The full RDC meets to consider the proposal.

15.4.3.1.2 A panel is appointed and it considers the proposal in more detail.

15.4.3.1.3 The panel visits the College and discusses the proposal.

15.4.3.1.4 The report of the panel meeting is taken to the RDC.

15.4.3.1.5 A recommendation by the RDC goes to the Academic Board.

15.4.3.2 After planning approval is granted the planning committee should proceed to develop the programme, with documentation along the lines set out in Section 15.4.4.

15.4.3.3 The next stage is for one copy of unbound but complete documentation to be submitted via the Secretary of the RDC to the Chair of the APRC.

15.4.3.4 The Chair has the responsibility for deciding on the basis of the documentation, knowledge of the staff, and of the general University situation whether there is an acceptable basis for the validation of the proposed programme for the APRC to meet. The Chair will need to judge whether the documentary evidence will allow a considered

judgment to be reached on the academic merit of the proposed programme. Further, the following will be considered:

- 15.4.3.4.1 Hidden issues, especially resource issues which have not yet been fully addressed, or which need to be resolved before the validation proceeds.
- 15.4.3.4.2 Whether the staff has thought through all the issues raised by the introduction of the programme.
- 15.4.3.4.3 The need for an experienced member of staff to visit the College and to advise the staff on the further development of the documented proposal.
- 15.4.3.5 The RDC will receive a fully documented proposal at a full meeting of the Committee. The purpose of this meeting is to:
 - 15.4.3.5.1 Determine whether the document will provide a sufficient basis on which to proceed to a meeting with the staff of the college proposing the programme; and it may in consequence ask for more documented information or it may ask for a complete re-submission.
 - 15.4.3.5.2 Determine the primary issues that it would wish to have addressed.
 - 15.4.3.5.3 Determine the membership and the Chair of a panel that will examine the proposal in more detail. Normally proposals for external experts in the field will have been prepared by the Secretary in advance of the meeting.
- 15.4.3.6 The document is sent to the members of the panel appointed by the Committee and the panel will consider the proposal in more detail either through correspondence or in a meeting. The comments of the panel are conveyed to the College. These comments will generally identify the major issues to be discussed with staff on the visit to the College. The panel may require more information, e.g. an initial response to some of its queries, and should specify whether this should be provided prior to any visit or on the occasion of the proposed visit. The panel will also be provided with documents setting out the University policy in these areas.
- 15.4.3.7 The panel will visit the College. The structure of the visit is at the panel's discretion but it will normally last one complete day and during that period the panel will usually wish to:
 - 15.4.3.7.1 First meet privately to rehearse the main issues, to allocate duties amongst the panel members, especially to any external subject experts and to plan the day.
 - 15.4.3.7.2 Meet senior staff e.g. Director of the College as the person responsible for the allocation of resources

and/or Heads of Department to consider matters to do with resources and space.

- 15.4.3.7.3 Meet students on the predecessor to the proposed programme or to a similar one.
- 15.4.3.7.4 Visit the facilities, including laboratories, lecture rooms, staff rooms.
- 15.4.3.7.5 Meet the representatives of academic services e.g. ICT support Centre, the Library.
- 15.4.3.7.6 The main part of the day will be undertaken in a detailed discussion with the staff who have developed the proposal and who will be implementing it.
- 15.4.3.8 In the discussions the Chair should encourage participation from all members on both sides, disallow questions that are answered within the programme documentation, ensure that the full range of issues are covered, and maintain a relaxed but professional atmosphere.
- 15.4.3.9 Arising from the visit a report will be prepared by the secretary for the RDC Committee. The possible outcomes of the visit are recommendations that the programme:
 - 15.4.3.9.1 Be approved without conditions with a review planned to take place in five years as normal.
 - 15.4.3.9.2 Be approved without conditions with a review planned to take place in a period of less than five years.
 - 15.4.3.9.3 Be approved upon meeting specified conditions.
 - 15.4.3.9.4 Be not approved and the College be invited to reapply taking into account all the comments of the panel.
- 15.4.3.10 The report shall have:
 - 15.4.3.10.1 An executive summary setting out:
 - 15.4.3.10.1.1 Title of the programme(s)
 - 15.4.3.10.1.2 The decision including start date and period of approval
 - 15.4.3.10.1.3 Any conditions to be met
 - 15.4.3.10.1.4 Timing of the next review
 - 15.4.3.10.1.5 Any recommendations
 - 15.4.3.10.2 A logical and structured resume of the main issues arising from the discussion between the Panel and members of the programme team and which led to the Panel's decision and conclusions which should be given in full.

15.4.3.11 The RDC will receive the report and recommendations, and will then make a considered recommendation to the Academic Board.

15.4.4 Documentation needed for Validation of a Programme

15.4.4.1 Introduction – The heading and notes below suggest a comprehensive format for the preparation and presentation of a proposed new programme. Not all of this information may be necessary for every document or requested for inclusion by the Panel Chair when scrutinizing documentation before allowing validation to go ahead. However, if it is not supplied the Programme Committee should be prepared to answer questions on each of the areas at the event, and/or to supply documented information. Since this may prevent discussion of other more critical issues, and this can in turn have an impact on the outcome of the event, it is in the Programme Committee's interest to document fully relevant information.

15.4.4.2 Basic Information on the programme

15.4.4.2.1 The name of the College(s) where the Programme is to be based.

15.4.4.2.2 The name of the programme and the award or awards to which it leads.

15.4.4.2.3 The duration and mode of study.

15.4.4.3 Aims and Objectives of the Programme

15.4.4.3.1 A general statement that sets out the broad purpose and intention of the programme. The research, educational and vocational aims and objectives of the programme, expressed, to reflect knowledge and skills, the intellectual and imaginative development of the student, analytical and communication skills, etc. – What does the programme seek to achieve? What type of research does the program aim for? An outline of related career opportunities should also be provided.

15.4.4.3.2 This information will have been submitted at the stage when the programme gained planning approval. At this stage the validation will not re-explore the justification for the programme but will seek to determine the extent to which the curriculum and teaching methods now substantiates the earlier claims as to the purpose of the programme.

15.4.4.3.3 This section should also provide a justification of the level of award and of the title. E.g. what is it that makes this a PhD degree rather than a Master's degree, or a Master's degree rather than a Bachelor's degree, other than the simple duration of time?

15.4.4.3.4 The specific objectives of the programme should specify the attributes which the students will be able

to demonstrate at the end of the programme as a result of their training.

- 15.4.4.3.5 If the programme has nested awards then the aims and objectives specific to each award should be clearly identified.

15.4.4.4 Curricular Structure

- 15.4.4.4.1 This should set out the modules and credits to be completed in each semester or year of the programme. It should include a map of the programme structure showing the inter-relationship between modules, and the position of the modules by year and semester. The inter-relationships between modules should be identified and any specialization of the programme clearly presented. In a programme where the student is given a substantial degree of choice, the permitted programmes of study should be identified with a clear indication of compulsory modules and with regulations for the choice of options.

- 15.4.4.4.2 A description of the research components of the degree should be provided along with how they will be credit weighted and assessed.

- 15.4.4.4.3 A full description of the mode of study of the programme should be indicated, including the structure in terms of the attendance pattern of students (particularly for part-time programmes). For programmes with placements, components of the academic studies, placements and vacation periods should be clearly shown. Information should be given on the type of placements envisaged, the organizations which will provide them, and how it will be assessed. In addition, evidence of the likely availability of placements of a suitable standard should be provided, together with evidence that the objectives of the placement can be achieved.

- 15.4.4.5 Regulations – The document should have a minimum of the following regulations related to the programme:

- 15.4.4.5.1 The entrance requirements.

- 15.4.4.5.2 Full details of the assessment regulations setting out the progression criteria, i.e. the minimum criteria, expressed in terms of modules, credits and marks, for proceeding to the next stage or year of the programme, and the requirements to be fulfilled for granting of the award or awards. Information on the assessment in individual modules should not be given here, but the weighting of marks to different modules if it does not follow the University credit framework and assessment regulations should be explained.

15.4.4.6 Teaching, learning and assessment (for coursework modules)

15.4.4.6.1 A statement of the teaching and learning strategy for the programme which outlines the balance between lecturer-centered and learner-centered approaches including research-informed teaching, which addresses the needs of full time, part-time young/mature, internal/external learners, which takes account of use of ICT such as video conference or the web. The teaching and learning strategy should be designed to allow the fulfillment of the general objectives of the programme. The teaching approach should be consistent with the teaching methods specified in the module descriptors. The proposed teaching group size should be identified.

15.4.4.6.2 The assessment approach should explain how the assessment contributes to the learning process and how it gives students the opportunities to demonstrate the achievement of the aims and objectives of the programme. The assessment approach should be consistent with the methods of assessment specified in the module descriptors.

15.4.4.7 Justification for the programme – The justification of the programme should be rehearsed. This information will have been submitted at the stage when the programme gained planning approval. At this stage the validation will not re-explore the justification for the programme but will seek to determine the extent to which the curriculum and teaching methods now substantiates the earlier claims as to the purpose of the programme. A summary of the earlier more detailed justification will therefore suffice, setting out the need for the programme and the demand for it.

15.4.4.8 Planned Student Numbers – The planned student numbers for the next five years.

15.4.4.9 Programme Management – The role of the Programme Leader, the Programme Committee, the Head of Department / School, the Head of the College, the Institute Academic Committee and the relationship between these persons and bodies, and how the care and maintenance of the programme is undertaken. Student involvement of in the monitoring of the programme should also be included.

15.4.4.10 Critical Self-Appraisal of the existing Programme – Where a programme is already in operation and is seeking to be adopted to lead to a University award, the College should supply a critical self appraisal of the operation of the programme. Details of what such a report should include are set out in Section 15.7.3.

15.4.4.11 Academic Staff

15.4.4.11.1 The documentation should provide a description of the approach and policy of the College or the department towards the recruitment, development and evaluation of staff along with the particular staff

development needs associated with the programme and plans to meet these needs, especially in terms of research supervision capacity.

15.4.4.11.2 In addition, it should provide a list of the academic staff responsible for teaching the programme including grade, qualifications, experience, posts held, research, consultancy and related activities and publications.

15.4.4.12 Resource needs – The resources, which will be used to support the programme, should be specified according to the headings below. A distinction should be made between those resources in place, and those still to be obtained. Research support resources may differ depending on the types of research that different students end up undertaking.

15.4.4.12.1 Overall staff support

15.4.4.12.2 Accommodation

15.4.4.12.3 Equipment

15.4.4.12.4 General expenses

15.4.4.12.5 Library support

15.4.4.12.6 Computing support

15.4.4.12.7 Other support facilities

15.4.4.12.8 Capacity to accommodate special needs students

15.4.4.13 The Modules – A complete module descriptor for each coursework module included in the programme (Refer Wheel B4). Also, a brief description of the research components of the degree divided into research modules (with appropriate weights, but no content specified) and assessment schemes (whether by six-monthly progress reports and dissertation examination, or totally by dissertation examination).

15.4.5 Criteria for Selection of Chairs & Panel Members (Notes for Guidance)

15.4.5.1 Members are selected on the basis of their experience in a number of areas:

15.4.5.1.1 Experience in teaching on, or in running a programme similar to that being validated; similar by mode of study; similar by level; or similar by subject area.

15.4.5.1.2 Experience in being an academic – Most members of academic staff have taught and are therefore able to understand the issues of running and teaching a programme albeit not in their own discipline.

15.4.5.1.3 Competence in that discipline.

15.4.5.1.4 Experience in the professional practice of that subject.

- 15.4.5.1.5 Experience in the employment of graduates.
- 15.4.5.1.6 Experience in the exercise of assessing a programme.
- 15.4.5.1.7 Research expertise.
- 15.4.5.2 The selection of members is a question of balance amongst the above types of experience. In addition the selection of members should take account of the need to:
 - 15.4.5.2.1 Provide experience for staff not versed in programme operation and validation thus, there needs to be a balance between experienced and inexperienced members.
 - 15.4.5.2.2 Spread the work out to avoid overloading the same members or chairs or Institutes, but also to try to give chairs repeated responsibility and therefore increasing experience.
 - 15.4.5.2.3 Establish a panel large enough to carry out competently the functions of validation, but small enough to carry out that function expeditiously.
 - 15.4.5.2.4 Generally not have more than one person from a given Institute on a panel.
 - 15.4.5.2.5 Give some overlap in membership between panels looking at related programmes.
 - 15.4.5.2.6 Give continuity in membership with earlier validation events so that members' earlier experience of the programme can be put to good use.
 - 15.4.5.2.7 Provide an appropriate gender balance within the panel.
- 15.4.5.3 The Role of the Panel Secretary (Notes for Guidance) – The secretary to a validation panel acts as academic guide to the panel members in their work as logistics coordinator. The activities include the following:
 - 15.4.5.3.1 Identify the major policy issues that are likely to arise from a consideration of the programme and advise the Chair accordingly.
 - 15.4.5.3.2 Be aware of the outcomes of validation of similar events and seek to establish a consistent framework of decision making by the Committee through its panels.
 - 15.4.5.3.3 Arrange the logistics of the visit with members of the panel, the Programme Leader and Head of Department. Where a particular member is unable to attend the meeting: Advise the Chair of the RDC on replacement. Try to ensure dates and times are appropriate to individual panelists.

- 15.4.5.3.4 Send a copy of the programme to the Chair in advance. Discuss with the Chair the form of the meeting, including the need to view the facilities, to see the laboratory work and projects or examination papers, and which staff or students the panel should meet, etc.
- 15.4.5.3.5 For a laboratory-based programme – Arrange a visit by members to the laboratories and other facilities.
- 15.4.5.3.6 Upon confirmation of visit date, issue a formal invitation at least 14 days in advance enclosing such of the following as are relevant:
 - 15.4.5.3.6.1 Programme of the meeting
 - 15.4.5.3.6.2 Membership of the Panel
 - 15.4.5.3.6.3 Background paper
 - 15.4.5.3.6.4 Functions of internal validation/revalidation panel
 - 15.4.5.3.6.5 Relevant University policy/guideline paper(s)
 - 15.4.5.3.6.6 Programme validation/review document(s)
 - 15.4.5.3.6.7 Other supporting documents (including resources analysis and staff CV's), if any
 - 15.4.5.3.6.8 Request members to notify panel secretary or Chair (Chair to determine which) by a date (7 days before visit) of issues they would wish to raise at the visit
- 15.4.5.3.7 Ensure that the setting of the meeting room is appropriate.
- 15.4.5.3.8 Attend the panel meetings including student meetings and laboratory visits.

15.5 Annual Monitoring of Programmes

15.5.1 Introduction

15.5.1.1 The Annual Monitoring of programmes is a crucial part of the University's quality assurance mechanisms. It provides an opportunity and structure for:

- 15.5.1.1.1 The Programme Committee to critically review and improve the operation of a programme on the basis of available evidence.

15.5.1.1.2 The Institute Academic Committee to get to know the programmes for which it is responsible, to review their health and to ensure that good practice is shared and that remedial action is taken where this is necessary.

15.5.1.1.3 The RDC, on behalf of the Academic Board to fulfill its responsibility to ascertain the satisfactory operation of each programme, primarily by overseeing of the process operated by the colleges.

15.5.1.1.4 The RDC to assist the improvement of standards across the University by identifying and disseminating examples of good practice

15.5.1.2 Where there are two closely related programmes it is for the Institute Academic Committee to advise as to whether there should be one composite report or two separate reports on the operation of the programme(s) during the past year.

15.5.2 How the Annual Report is considered

15.5.2.1 The annual report of each programme should be considered at a special meeting of the Institute Academic Committee. The evaluation of the programmes should concentrate on three main areas:

15.5.2.1.1 Specific programme issues

15.5.2.1.2 General University issues

15.5.2.1.3 Examples of good practice, particularly in research

15.5.2.2 The RDC of the Academic Board will receive a report from these meetings and will audit the process.

15.5.3 Schedule

15.5.3.1 February – DRER writes to all Chairs of the Institute Academic Committees setting out the procedure for the annual monitoring report.

15.5.3.2 June – A report on each programme is submitted to the Chair of the Institute Academic Committee for review and consideration.

15.5.3.3 July – These reports are submitted to the RDC through the DRER. The RDC will then report to the Academic Board.

15.5.4 Content of Annual Report – The Programme Leader should provide a critical evaluation of the performance of the Programme during the past year. It should be based on evidence, and should use the following headings based on such evidence, as they consider necessary and appropriate. It should evaluate the Programme systematically against the Quality Criteria (15.6).

15.5.4.1 Action Plan (1 page maximum) – The Action Plan forms the core and summary of the annual report. It should consist of those issues that need to be addressed by the staff or the Academic Board in the coming year. It is recommended that the Programme team should

table the Action Plan at all of their meetings in order that progress with the issues can be debated.

- 15.5.4.2 Introduction & response to previous action plan (1 page maximum)
 - For each issue which was raised in the previous Action Plan, there should be a comment on what action has been taken and the results of this action. Any outstanding issues should appear in the new Action Plan and should be highlighted with an asterisk.
- 15.5.4.3 Aims and Purpose (1 page maximum) – This section will evaluate how well the Curriculum reflects the programme aims, matches the level of the award, and provides a balance of conceptual and transferable skills. The evaluation should include a discussion of any issues that should arise from the first destination statistics and programme based issues from student feedback and interaction.
- 15.5.4.4 Research, Curriculum, Teaching and Assessment (2 page maximum)
 - This section should consist of an evaluation of those relevant sections covered by the Quality Criteria. It should include issues, which arise from an analysis of student progression, student feedback, and any external reports on the programme. The report should highlight positive key developments in research and teaching.
- 15.5.4.5 Resources (1 page maximum) – This section should consist of an evaluation of staff, facilities and research resources.
- 15.5.4.6 Programme Organization (1 page maximum) – This section should consist of an evaluation of the programme organization and support to students.
- 15.5.4.7 Evidence (Appendices)
 - 15.5.4.7.1 Any external reports should be included in full. The responses to issues therein should be included in the main report.
 - 15.5.4.7.2 Some direct feedback from students.
 - 15.5.4.7.3 A list of the other sources of evidence on which the report has been based, e.g. other forms of student feedback, employers' views, etc. Where evidence is not included with the report it should be held in the department.
 - 15.5.4.7.4 Cohort statistics showing:
 - 15.5.4.7.4.1 Number of applicants, and the number admitted profiled by age, sex and nationality
 - 15.5.4.7.4.2 Student achievement rate for each year of the programme
 - 15.5.4.7.4.3 First destination of graduates classified by nature and place of employment

15.6 Quality Criteria

15.6.1 The primary topics to be addressed in any consideration of a programme whether for approval, review or adoption are the following.

15.6.2 Aims and Curricula

15.6.2.1 Curriculum, aims and objectives are explicit and known to staff and students.

15.6.2.2 Aims and objectives correspond to the nature and level of the programme, (Academic Programme Structure (B1 of the Wheel) sets out the general educational aims of a degree programme, but each programme will have its own specific aims), to the needs of students, society and the economy as determined by systematic investigation.

15.6.2.3 Specialist aims and objectives are consistent with institutional mission and aims.

15.6.2.4 Curricula accurately reflect declared aims and objectives and the needs identified.

15.6.2.5 Curricula provide an appropriate balance of research training, specialist content, general conceptual skills and personal transferable skills.

15.6.2.6 Curricula are up-to-date in terms of specialist developments.

15.6.3 Curriculum Design and Review

15.6.3.1 Programme is designed to meet the needs of the range of intended students, in terms of programme length, duration, mode of attendance, location, structure, sequence and options.

15.6.3.2 The design of the curriculum has taken full account of recent developments in the subject matter and in the teaching of the subject matter by reference amongst others, to:

15.6.3.2.1 Professional body requirements (e.g. in engineering the IEEE in USA, the Engineering Council in UK; in accountancy and business studies the ACCA)

15.6.3.2.2 The curriculum of reputable universities that offer programmes in the area,

15.6.3.2.3 Accreditation bodies (e.g. in UK the academic benchmark statements produced by the QAA, in USA by bodies such as ABET in engineering, curricula, through modern texts)

15.6.3.2.4 Curriculum support and development bodies [e.g. the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) in UK]

15.6.3.3 The design of the curriculum has taken full account of the needs of business, industry, commerce, and other end-users, and there is regular contact with such end users.

15.6.3.4 Appropriate provision is made for alternative curricular modes such as accreditation of prior learning, credit accumulation and transfer.

15.6.3.5 Programme design seeks to facilitate access for students with special needs.

15.6.4 Staff Resources

15.6.4.1 The staff form the backbone of an organization, more so in an academic environment. It is, therefore, of paramount importance that the staff members are highly motivated, proactive and committed.

15.6.4.2 The research supervision capacity is sufficient to maintain high quality supervision.

15.6.4.3 The teaching staff establishment is sufficient to deliver the curriculum, taking account of all staff responsibilities including teaching, programme development, preparation of material for delivery, marking, feedback to students, scholarly activities and contribution to the general operation of their Institute.

15.6.4.4 There is a stable group of staff with the responsibility for the delivery of the programmes; e.g. there is a group of staff, not necessarily from one department, who are expected to be in long term employment (either because they are Bhutanese or have made an evident long term commitment to this employment) and able to provide the core of the team taking responsibility for the development and the delivery of the programme.

15.6.4.5 The staff have the necessary balance of experience and expertise in the discipline or profession forming the basis of the programme, and in the approach to teaching appropriate to degree teaching.

15.6.4.6 The staff team, i.e. the group of staff with the overall responsibility for the teaching and delivery of the programme have academic qualifications appropriate to the programme. For example, X% with a Master's degree and X% with a PhD. These percentages are subject to modification and may be redefined at a later stage.

15.6.4.7 A well planned HRD plan is in place to develop staff qualifications, experience and skills in line with their expected academic duties.

15.6.4.8 The staff team includes a proportion of staff who have employment experience in the profession or subject that they practice. Ideally, for professional programmes, this should be 30%.

15.6.4.9 The programme makes provision for students to interact with practicing professionals in their subject or profession.

15.6.4.10 Within the staff team as a whole, there is research and scholarly activity, and this is being fostered. At least half of the staff should have evidence of scholarly publication within the last 3 years.

15.6.4.11 The staff team has undertaken staff development in learning-teaching and research methods.

15.6.4.12 The level of research and other scholarly activities is appropriate to the level of teaching.

- 15.6.4.13 There is adequate staff support in library, technical, administrative, and student support staff.
- 15.6.4.14 Staff resources are effectively deployed; duties allocated appropriate to qualifications, experience and aptitude, there is provision for review, consultation and redeployment.
- 15.6.4.15 There is a well-defined career progression for staff with well-defined and relevant criteria for promotion.
- 15.6.4.16 There are well-defined and effective mechanisms for the appointment, induction, deployment, development, reward and discipline of staff.
- 15.6.4.17 Staff development needs are systematically identified, in relation to individual aspirations, the curriculum and institutional requirements.
- 15.6.4.18 All staff, academic and support, regularly undertake appropriate staff development.

15.6.5 Teaching, Learning and Assessment

- 15.6.5.1 Teaching, learning and assessment reflect the aims of the curriculum.
- 15.6.5.2 Teaching-learning is significantly research-informed.
- 15.6.5.3 Teaching methods are varied, are appropriate to the stated objectives, and make effective use of facilities, equipment and aids.
- 15.6.5.4 Teaching encourages independent learning and 'deep' rather than surface learning, and this is reflected in the curriculum, the teaching methods and in the assessment methods used.
- 15.6.5.5 Teaching is well planned, prepared and effectively performed, taking account of the needs of all students.
- 15.6.5.6 Learning is enriched by appropriate reference to cross-curricular links, current research, business and industrial applications and development of generic skills such as communication and teamwork.
- 15.6.5.7 A range of assessment methods are used to serve diagnostic, formative and summative purposes.
- 15.6.5.8 The scope and weighting of assessment schemes are clear and known to all concerned.
- 15.6.5.9 Standards applied in assessment schemes are explicit and consistent across the curriculum.
- 15.6.5.10 Procedures are regularly applied to ensure that assessment schemes are valid, reliable and trustworthy.
- 15.6.5.11 Student progress is systematically recorded, monitored, and fed back to students.

15.6.6 Students' Work

- 15.6.6.1 Students' progress reports are regularly monitored and generally indicated adequate progress towards the research dissertation.
- 15.6.6.2 Coursework is regularly set and assessed and is at the appropriate level. The coursework should reflect the full range of curricular aims, including development of generic skills.
- 15.6.6.3 Students' performance and attitudes indicate a positive and successful learning experience.
- 15.6.6.4 Students' work gives evidence of in-depth rather than superficial learning.
- 15.6.6.5 Students' work is of publishable quality.

15.6.7 Facilities and Learning Resources

- 15.6.7.1 There are adequate facilities including practical and experimental facilities. The space available in laboratories is in line with tertiary education standards comparable to general educational standards elsewhere and in particular, according to the University's resource norms.
- 15.6.7.2 There are sufficient physical resources, including equipment, materials and information technology.
- 15.6.7.3 The equipment is up-to-date, readily available, well maintained and effectively deployed.
- 15.6.7.4 Library, audio-visual, computer and other academic services are adequate for the curriculum. For degree programmes this includes access to current journal runs of relevant journals.
- 15.6.7.5 Teaching accommodation is appropriate for the curriculum on offer and for the full range of students.
- 15.6.7.6 Ancillary facilities, staff accommodation, storage space, preparation rooms, amenity accommodation, etc., are adequate.
- 15.6.7.7 The physical environment is well maintained in terms of decor, cleanliness, repairs, and safety.
- 15.6.7.8 Accommodation is effectively deployed and imaginatively used as evidenced by suitable plans, schedules, timetables and control systems.

15.6.8 Programme Organization

- 15.6.8.1 There is a clearly defined group of staff that has responsibility for teaching and for the overall delivery of all aspects of the programme.
- 15.6.8.2 The programme is well managed.
- 15.6.8.3 The programme is periodically reviewed to assess its suitability and adjustments made as necessary.

- 15.6.8.4 There is an effective mechanism within the College for effective remedial measures to be taken when improvements in the programme are found necessary.
- 15.6.8.5 Research milestones, coursework and assessments are systematically scheduled and coordinated.
- 15.6.8.6 Feedback is regularly obtained from students, employers, and is analyzed and acted upon as appropriate.
- 15.6.8.7 Teaching programmes are clearly articulated, made known to students and regularly monitored.

15.6.9 Student Support

- 15.6.9.1 The need of all students for guidance and support is recognized and provision made for advice and assistance in curricular, vocational and personal domains.
- 15.6.9.2 Counseling Services are in place for students to seek advice on career choices, and consult trained persons for matters that affect them psychologically.
- 15.6.9.3 Among individual staff there is a general attitude of concern for the well being of students.

15.6.10 Standards

- 15.6.10.1 The programme has clearly identified external standards and benchmarks against which the standards of delivery of the programme can be measured, such as outputs of peer-reviewed publications of high quality. The standards may be evaluated in relation to a reputable University or to a recognized professional body. The nature of the relationship is such that the University or the professional body identified is prepared to relate the output standard of the RUB programme to its own standards. It is recognized that the University has a particular responsibility for fostering and encouraging such external relationships and liaisons.
- 15.6.10.2 Provision is made at the stage of the programme evaluation and/or review for some comparison with programmes outside Bhutan.

15.7 Review of Programmes in Operation

15.7.1 Introduction

- 15.7.1.1 The University is responsible to many interest groups (students, external assessment bodies, funding agencies, employers, and the general community) for the quality, standard and relevance of its programmes. This responsibility rests with each individual and group according to function and task. Ultimate responsibility within the University rests with the University Council, and is discharged by the Academic Board and the University Senior Management Team.
- 15.7.1.2 To fulfill its responsibilities to the community for the quality, standard and relevance of its programmes, the Academic Board has set up policies and procedures that embody good practice and has

established a RDC to carry them out. All programmes leading to an award of the University are subject to validation, periodic review and annual monitoring. These measures are in addition to other basic elements of quality assurance.

15.7.2 Aims of Programme Review

15.7.2.1 The nature of the process of programme review, and the consequent effort involved, will vary according to the volume and level of activity represented by a programme; although the rigor of the review is comparable for all programmes.

15.7.2.2 The review of a programme takes place when it has been in operation for a number of years (specified at the time of the previous validation), when there has been one or more outputs from the programme, and when the staff and the Institute have had actual experience in the operation of the programme. The purpose of the review is therefore different to that of initial validation. It is not to ascertain the likelihood of the programme achieving intended aims and standards. Rather, it is to ascertain:

15.7.2.2.1 The academic health and standard of the programme, especially with regards to quality research output.

15.7.2.2.2 How the programme has been operated and managed.

15.7.2.2.3 Progress and changes in the programme since its validation or last review.

15.7.2.2.4 The academic validity of proposed changes in the programme, and an assessment of the associated resource requirements.

15.7.2.2.5 The way in which the standard has been attained and how this has been recognized by other parties such as external examiners and professional bodies.

15.7.2.2.6 The way in which the programme has met the needs of the community including employers and students.

15.7.2.2.7 The extent to which all the previously expressed aspirations and ambitions have been fulfilled.

15.7.2.2.8 The extent to which the institute has been able to provide an environment in which the programme can flourish.

15.7.2.2.9 The continuing need for the programme, including the scale of student intake, and its effectiveness and efficiency in staff and resource terms.

15.7.2.3 The review should focus upon a living programme, its academic health and its relationship with the community. This focus of the review should allow a panel, together with the staff on the programme team, to discuss how, in the light of the staff's experience, the programme might develop in the future in order more fully to meet its

aims, the demands of the community and to ensure the ongoing maintenance of its standards.

15.7.2.4 It is almost inevitable that the analysis of the operation of the programme, carried out in preparation for its review will lead to a number of changes being proposed to the programme. The review will provide an opportunity to consider these changes.

15.7.3 Documentation for the Review of a Programme

15.7.3.1 The main element in the documentation prepared for programme review will be a report by the Programme Committee on the operation of the programme since it was last approved, based on a critical appraisal on various aspects including:

- 15.7.3.1.1 The extent to which the programme has achieved its aims and purpose - this will normally require an analysis of employer reaction and of graduate reaction to the programme and the views of the relevant advisory committee, and will also require the staff themselves to express a considered view on how and to what extent the explicit and implicit aims have been achieved.
- 15.7.3.1.2 The academic and professional standards achieved on the programme, including external recognition. The analysis of the position can be supported by reports from external examiners and professional bodies, impact factors from research publications, and statistics on admissions and awards.
- 15.7.3.1.3 The quality of the research outputs from Programme students and staff.
- 15.7.3.1.4 The quality and effectiveness of the teaching and learning methods.
- 15.7.3.1.5 The quality and experience of staff, with particular emphasis on recent activities which support the programme, including scholarly and professional activities and the development of curricula and teaching methods.
- 15.7.3.1.6 The value of the syllabuses and how current they are.
- 15.7.3.1.7 An analysis of how the programme overall has operated, the value and currency of the syllabuses, the problems encountered, what changes have been introduced to improve it, to remedy weaknesses and to capitalize on strengths.
- 15.7.3.1.8 The report should conclude with a list of actions which are required to be undertaken in light of the self-appraisal.

15.7.3.2 Supporting data – The self-appraisal report will need to be supported by data. The data will clearly depend on the nature of the programme but should include:

- 15.7.3.2.1 Statistics on admissions, enrollments, publications, and examination results.
- 15.7.3.2.2 An analysis of cohort progression for the past four years.
- 15.7.3.2.3 Data on initial graduate employment.
- 15.7.3.2.4 External examiners' reports, professional body reports, or consultant reports over the period since the last programme review together with the staff's responses to pertinent comments in those reports.
- 15.7.3.2.5 The most recent annual monitoring report.
- 15.7.3.2.6 The *curriculum vitae* of staff who teach on the programme.
- 15.7.3.2.7 A statement of the changes proposed in the revised programme, with a rationale, and a table comparing the existing and proposed programme structure.
- 15.7.3.2.8 A statement of the resource implications.
- 15.7.3.2.9 The programme definition, and a full set of the module descriptors, preferably in the form in which it is made available to students.

15.8 Changes to Programmes

15.8.1 Introduction – The successful approval of a programme based on detailed documentation should not be taken to mean that the programme must be operated in precisely the way defined in those documents for ever. The programme approval system carries with it the responsibility to develop the programme over a period in response to the developments in the subject or in acknowledged practice, to the experience of the programme team in operating the programme, and to the views of students and employers as to its effectiveness. The processes of annual monitoring and of periodic review have as their prime purpose, the improvement of the programme.

15.8.2 General Principles – The principles governing change are:

- 15.8.2.1 All changes must be justified.
- 15.8.2.2 All changes must be shown to be academically valid.
- 15.8.2.3 Consequential resource changes should be addressed.
- 15.8.2.4 All parties affected by the change should have an opportunity to comment.
- 15.8.2.5 The University must hold an accurate record of the programme in its approved form.

15.8.3 Minor Changes

- 15.8.3.1 Minor changes to programmes such as modifications to modules (as set out in the module descriptors) such as changes to the module title, content, teaching practices, modes of delivery, assessment, can be approved within the College provided an up to date record of the changes and the cohorts of students affected by those changes are recorded.
- 15.8.3.2 Such changes should be reported in the annual monitoring report
- 15.8.3.3 Such changes will be monitored by or on behalf of the RDC and may be referred back if the sum of repeated changes are seen to involve a major change or if the interested parties have not been consulted or if there are significant resource implications.

15.8.4 Major Changes

- 15.8.4.1 Major changes are those which affect the title of the programme, its awards, its philosophy, its aims and objectives, its management and its regulations, or its structure (including a change in the relative weights of the research and coursework components, how the research is assessed, or the proposed addition or removal of modules).
- 15.8.4.2 Any proposed major changes should be submitted to the Chair of the RDC. He/She may decide to refer them to the full RDC, or to set up a panel to discuss the proposals with the programme team or to approve them and seek retrospective approval for his action from the RDC, or he/she may decide that the changes are in effect not major and may be introduced without University level approval.
- 15.8.4.3 For all programmes, changes to regulations or structure that do not comply with the University general regulations and policy must be referred to the RDC.
- 15.8.4.4 Major changes to programmes that affect students already enrolled should be discussed with students and their views and consensus sought before changes are introduced.
- 15.8.4.5 Documentation to be submitted seeking approval for major changes should include the old version of the section of the programme document together with the revised version, indicating the changes and the arguments for the proposed change. If the changes affect other parts of the programme full documentation may be required.

15.8.5 Approval of Individual Programmes of Study

- 15.8.5.1 Research degree programmes should already have built-in flexibility for students to follow somewhat customized programmes of study designed to suit their particular needs, especially concerning the direction of their research. However, significant alterations to programmes of study for individual purposes, for example by following a unique set of modules for the coursework component, would require case-by-case consideration for approval by RDC, but is handled by these procedures depending on the circumstances.

15.8.5.2 Where the proposed programme of study is close to an existing degree programme, aspires to the aims of that programme, and where the award to which the student aspires is that of the programme, the proposal for the variation should be made by the student in consultation with the Programme Leader, prior to the student commencing study on the proposed variant programme. The responsibility for endorsing the individualized programme of study rests with the Institute Academic Committee, who make the recommendation to the RDC for final authorization.

15.8.5.3 Any such proposal must:

- 15.8.5.3.1 Indicate the level and the specific title of award proposed.
- 15.8.5.3.2 Demonstrate that it fulfills the aims for the approved programme of which it is a variant.
- 15.8.5.3.3 Include a statement of learning and career objectives.
- 15.8.5.3.4 Demonstrate the rationale for the combination of modules in relation to learning and/or career objectives.

Definitions

Co-researcher means an employee of RUB engaged in a research in partnership with an external researcher.

Collaborative Research and Services are defined as activities/projects that are provided in partnership with an external agency or agencies.

College is defined as any member College of the Royal University of Bhutan.

College Research Committee or CRC is the committee that is responsible for coordinating research and services at the college level. CRC is the College Research Committee responsible for all research and consultancy services at the college level.

Director (or Director General) is defined as the Head of a member college of RUB.

External Agency is defined as any individual, private/public/government agency or any other legal entity other than the University.

External Researcher means a researcher outside RUB.

Faculty is defined as member of the academic staff or academic support staff employed by the University under regular, contract, temporary or part-time services.

Host Institute means the institute in which the co-researcher is currently employed.

Institute is defined any member College of the Royal University of Bhutan.

Joint Research means: A research undertaken by a foreign organization or its employee in partnership with a RUB staff; A research undertaken by RUB in partnership with other agencies within Bhutan; A research undertaken in partnership by two or more RUB colleges.

Office of the Vice Chancellor or OVC is the University's central coordinating office.

Parent Institute means the university or college/faculty/school/organisation that currently employs the external researcher.

Research is defined as any work that the University or the faculty undertakes and which leads to creation/development of knowledge of various forms.

Research and Innovation Committee, or RIC, is a standing committee of the University Academic Board, responsible for university research.

Services are defined as any work that the University or the faculty undertakes and which contributes to community and to academic and professional organizations.

Trainee refers to anyone learning to be a researcher under an established researcher's supervision. This includes principally postgraduate students and postdoctoral fellows (postdocs), but may also include undergraduate and high school students working on research projects or junior research faculty, research scientists, and research staff.

University is defined as The Royal University of Bhutan.

University Research and Services are any research and services carried out by the faculty in his/her capacity as University faculty, irrespective of whether they involve the use of University resources and facilities or not. University Research and Services shall include, but not be limited to: Routine laboratory and other testing of materials, devices and products; Standard data analysis; Survey, including market and opinion survey; Field trials; Short courses; Professional expertise in any field and subject.

Acknowledgements and References

The Research Degrees Framework has been constructed with significant input from the higher degree policies of the University of New England, which represents a typical Australian model and with whom the Royal University of Bhutan enjoys close academic and professional relations. Certain elements have also been incorporated from the American model, exemplified by Stanford University. The following sources were consulted in the development of this framework.

In place of PQC, RDC is mentioned in the RUB Research Degrees Framework where large chunks of text from the *Wheel of Academic Law* have been extracted and used to avoid duplication of effort.

Research degree policies from:

- University of New England, Australia – <http://www.une.edu.au/research-services/pgstudy/>
- Stanford University, USA – <http://gap.stanford.edu/>

Policies of Bhutanese agencies:

- Constitution and laws of the Kingdom of Bhutan (2008) – <http://www.constitution.bt/>
- Royal Charter of the Royal University of Bhutan (2003) – <http://www.rub.edu.bt/index.php/the-royal-charter>
- The Wheel of Academic Law of the Royal University of Bhutan (2011) – <http://www.rub.edu.bt/regulation/>
- Tertiary Education Policy of the Kingdom of Bhutan (2010) – http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/upload/Bhutan/Bhutan_Tertiary_education_policy_2010.pdf
- Bhutan Qualifications Framework (2012) – www.education.gov.bt/documents/10156/373574/Inside+BQF