



Higher Degrees by Research (HDR) Academic Progress procedure

Section 1 - Preamble

(1) This Procedure is effective from 1 October 2020.

Section 2 - Purpose

(2) To outline the requirements for academic progress for higher degree by research (HDR) students.

Section 3 - Scope

(3) This Procedure applies to students enrolled in Higher Degrees by Research (HDR) courses. It does not apply to degrees by coursework or higher doctoral degrees.

Section 4 - Policy

(4) This Procedure is pursuant to the [Higher Degrees by Research \(HDR\) policy](#).

Section 5 - Procedure

(5) Before their candidature can be confirmed, HDR students will satisfactorily complete:

- a. the HDR induction arranged by the Graduate Research Academy
- b. research integrity and, if required, human and animal ethics training
- c. the mandatory coursework unit/s required by their faculty or institute
- d. the HDR Respectful Behaviour training
- e. Students will also receive information on research budget management and engage with the Individual Learning Plan, including the research plan.

(6) Before their candidature is confirmed, it is recommended that students complete:

- a. resilience and mental health awareness training
- b. training in project management techniques and time management.

(7) The mandatory coursework unit/s must be satisfactorily completed as soon as possible after commencement. The Faculty or Institute HDR Coordinator may extend this deadline after confirmation only for compassionate or compelling circumstances and confirmation is conditional until the unit is passed.

(8) Where a student achieves a mark of 40-49% for their mandatory coursework unit/s, the student will be referred to

the Academic Unit HDR Coordinator to arrange further assessment. In this case:

- a. the student will be advised in writing that further assessment is their final opportunity to succeed and if they do not pass the unit/s, their candidature will not be confirmed
- b. further assessment must be completed within six weeks of the requirements being provided to the student
- c. the student will receive support from:
 - i. the HDR Coordinator to understand the reasons for failing, the implications of failure and to develop a plan for passing the unit
 - ii. the Unit Chair of the unit they failed
- d. if the unit is passed, the maximum mark that a student can receive is 50%.

Confirmation of candidature

(9) Students (except for those identified in Table 1: Academic progress requirements for specified masters degrees) will undertake a confirmation of candidature in accordance with a process approved by the Pro Vice-Chancellor Researcher Development. Confirmation is required for students to continue in the course.

Table 1: Academic progress requirements for specified master's degrees

Degree	Requirements for confirmation	Transfer to doctoral degree permitted
Master of Science (Research) (pipelining)	Confirmation not required	No
Master of Philosophy (Electromaterials) - offered jointly with University of Wollongong	Confirmation required	No
Master of Philosophy - offered by the School of Medicine	Confirmation required	No
Master of Surgical Research	Confirmation required	No

(10) Confirmation of candidature for students completing an HDR course on the basis of prior publications will be completed within 4 months of commencement or 8 months for part-time students.

(11) Doctoral students' first attempt at confirmation of candidature must be finalised within 12 months of commencement for full-time or 18 months for part-time candidature. Master's students' first attempt at confirmation of candidature will be completed within six months of commencement for full-time or 12 months part-time.

(12) The confirmation of candidature written document must be accompanied by a report from mandated software for detecting breaches of academic integrity.

(13) The outcomes of confirmation of candidature are decided by the confirmation panel and may be that:

- a. Outcome 1: candidature is confirmed
- b. Outcome 2: candidature is confirmed conditional upon the student making minor amendments to the confirmation documents to the satisfaction of the panel chair within a set deadline
- c. Outcome 3: candidature is not confirmed but the student is given an opportunity to revise their work.
 - i. Outcome 3.1: candidature is not confirmed but the student is given an opportunity to revise their confirmation document only and submit to the panel within three months equivalent full-time of the written notification of the outcome of the first confirmation process
 - ii. Outcome 3.2: candidature is not confirmed but the student is given an opportunity to revise their work and undertake a second confirmation process, including the confirmation document and presentation

within three months equivalent full-time of the written notification of the outcome of the first confirmation process

d. Outcome 4: candidature is not confirmed (only applicable once 13c has been applied).

(14) The student should receive the outcome report from the confirmation panel within one week of the confirmation of candidature taking place.

(15) Students whose candidature is not confirmed and receive Outcome 3.1 or 3.2 will be provided a Progress Support Panel according to clauses 33-35 and Section 7 - Progress Support Panel Standards.

(16) Confirmation of candidature can only be re-attempted once.

(17) Where candidature is not confirmed after a second attempt, the confirmation panel determines that the student has made unsatisfactory academic progress and recommends to the responsible decision maker to decide whether:

- a. a doctoral student be transferred to master's candidature; or
- b. the student's enrolment be terminated:
 - i. for a minimum of twelve months of being formally advised of the termination; or
 - ii. with no right of re-admission to the course.

(18) A student may request an extension to the confirmation due date of up to three months equivalent full-time. Where a master's student intends to apply to transfer to doctoral candidature, a student may request an extension to the confirmation due date of up to six months equivalent full-time. The request must be in writing, must have the support of the principal or executive supervisor and be approved by the Head of Academic Unit or nominee.

(19) Where a student does not undertake the confirmation process by the due date and an extension is not granted, a Progress Support Panel should be put in place according to clause 33-35 and Section 7 - Progress Support Panel Standards.

(20) Where a master's student's candidature is confirmed and the student later transfers to doctoral candidature, they must complete confirmation of candidature at doctoral level.

Extension of candidature

(21) Applications for extension of candidature will be made according to the processes stipulated by the Graduate Research Academy. An extension will be approved only when the student, supported by their principal or executive supervisor and responsible decision maker, provides evidence that they have already made substantial progress toward completion and have set out an achievable plan for completion within the requested extension period.

(22) An initial extension to candidature of no more than six months equivalent full-time may be approved. A further extension of up to six months equivalent full-time candidature may be approved in exceptional circumstances as declared by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Research. No further extensions will be granted after this.

Transfer between research degrees

(23) Students can apply to transfer between research degrees before submission of their thesis according to the processes stipulated by the Graduate Research Academy, subject to the clauses below. The responsible decision maker or their nominee will consider the application, including whether the student is making satisfactory academic progress, supervision is available and the project is suitable for the degree. The responsible decision maker or their nominee will decide whether to approve the application.

(24) Where a student transfers between HDR courses, the time spent in the initial HDR course(s) is counted towards

the maximum duration of the new HDR course.

(25) Master's students, except as specified in clause 26, may apply to transfer to a doctoral degree:

- a. at any time where they meet the requirements for admission specified in the [Higher Degrees by Research \(HDR\) Admission, Selection and Enrolment procedure](#) and the project is suitable; or
- b. where
 - i. they have been enrolled for one year equivalent full-time
 - ii. have demonstrated the ability to undertake research at doctoral level; and
 - iii. have prepared a substantial written report, which may be the document prepared for confirmation of candidature.

(26) Students enrolled in a master's degree specified in Table 1: Academic progress requirements for specified master's degrees may not apply to transfer to a doctoral degree.

(27) Where a student applies to transfer from a master's degree to a doctoral degree and they are from a country listed under the autonomous sanctions requirements, a new risk assessment must be carried out using the appropriate form. The change must be approved by the Pro Vice-Chancellor Researcher Development and, where required, the relevant Commonwealth Government department/s.

(28) Where a student applies to transfer from a master's to a doctoral degree, the transfer application may be considered at the same time as the confirmation of candidature.

Reviews of progress

(29) The principal or executive supervisor will monitor, assess and record the student's progress against their research plan at least every six months, including documenting any intervention strategies to support students at risk of not making satisfactory academic progress. The principal or executive supervisor will report any concerns about the student's progress to the Head of Academic Unit or nominee.

(30) The faculty/institute in which the student is enrolled will review the student's progress annually.

(31) For full-time students, the confirmation of candidature is the first annual progress review.

(32) The faculty/institute may require reviews of progress whenever they are concerned that the student is at risk of not making satisfactory progress.

Students who are at risk of not making satisfactory progress

(33) The faculty/institute will identify and assist students who are at risk of not making satisfactory progress including students who identify themselves as experiencing significant difficulties that may adversely affect their progress.

(34) When a student is at risk of not making satisfactory progress, the faculty/institute will:

- a. arrange team support and if necessary establish a Progress Support Panel and follow the guidelines approved by the Pro Vice-Chancellor Researcher Development; or
- b. where a student has not completed their confirmation of candidature at the first attempt (Outcome 3.1 or 3.2), the second confirmation process and outcomes will replace the progress support process and outcomes.

(35) The Progress Support Panel will decide the outcomes of the progress support process, which may include:

- a. resumption of normal candidature

- b. an extended period of reporting by the student and supervisor in addition to the normal annual review cycle
- c. a recommendation to the responsible decision maker or their nominee that the student's progress is unsatisfactory and that
 - i. a doctoral student be transferred to master's candidature, or
 - ii. the student's enrolment be terminated:
 - for a minimum of twelve months of being formally advised of the termination, after which the student may apply to be re-admitted; or
 - with no right of re-admission to the course.

Termination of enrolment or transfer from doctoral to master's candidature

(36) The responsible decision maker or their nominee may:

- a. endorse the recommendation made in accordance with clause 15 or 35c and decide that it should be implemented (the 'proposed decision'); or
- b. not endorse the recommendation, in which case the matter is referred back to the Progress Support Panel or second confirmation panel for further consideration.

(37) Within 10 working days of receiving the Progress Support Panel or second confirmation panel report, the responsible decision maker or their nominee must notify the student in writing of:

- a. the faculty/institute's proposed decision under clause 35
- b. the student's right to have the proposed decision reviewed
- c. the requirement for the student to respond in writing to the responsible decision maker or their nominee to accept or not accept the proposed decision
- d. the process for having the proposed decision reviewed where the student does not accept it, and
- e. appropriate support services available to the student.

(38) Within 10 working days of the date of notification of the proposed decision, the student must respond in writing to the responsible decision maker or their nominee to either:

- a. accept the proposed decision, or
- b. indicate that they do not accept the proposed decision and would like it to be reviewed. They must provide a written submission with the reasons and documentary evidence in English to show why it should not be implemented.

(39) Any student who uses the HDR review process to make a frivolous or vexatious submission or who lies or deliberately misleads in relation to a submission may be subject to disciplinary proceedings according to [Regulation 4.1\(1\) - General Misconduct](#).

(40) From the date that the student receives the notification of the proposed decision until the decision is made the student will not pursue their research or receive supervision. The student will remain enrolled and maintain access to University support services and email.

(41) Where the student notifies the responsible decision maker that they accept the proposed decision, the responsible decision maker confirms the decision in writing to the student and the Graduate Research Academy, and it is implemented by the Graduate Research Academy as soon as practicable.

(42) Where the student does not respond within 10 working days specified in clause 38, they will be deemed to have accepted the proposed decision. The responsible decision maker will confirm the decision in writing to the student and

it will be implemented by the Graduate Research Academy as soon as practicable.

Late review submissions

(43) A student may apply in writing to the responsible decision maker or their nominee to provide a late review submission on the grounds that exceptional circumstances outside the student's control have prevented the student from applying within the normal timeframe. Failure to thoroughly check email is not an exceptional circumstance. Deakin International will be consulted when international students ask to submit late applications.

(44) The responsible decision maker will decide that there were:

- a. exceptional circumstances, in which case the faculty or institute will review the student's application in accordance with this Procedure or
- b. no exceptional circumstances, in which case the student and, where relevant, Deakin International, is informed in writing within five working days of the faculty or institute's decision and the reasons for that decision.

The decision is not appealable.

Review proceedings

(45) Within 15 working days of receiving a student's written notification that they do not accept the proposed decision, an HDR Academic Progress Committee will meet to consider the student's review case.

(46) The HDR Academic Progress Committee will consist of:

- a. The Pro Vice-Chancellor Researcher Development or nominee who will be the Chair.
- b. An academic member of the Research and Research Training Committee, not from the faculty or Academic Unit of the student.
- c. An HDR Coordinator, not from the faculty or Academic Unit of the student.

The Chair will nominate the other members of the committee.

(47) Where it could be perceived that there is a conflict of interest for the Pro Vice-Chancellor Researcher Development, the Chair, Research and Research Training Committee will nominate an alternative Chair of the HDR Academic Progress Committee.

(48) All staff involved in an HDR Academic Progress Committee hearing shall comply with and are bound by the provisions of legislation including the [Privacy and Data Protection Act 2014 \(Vic\)](#), the [Health Records Act 2001 \(Vic\)](#) and must also comply with the University's [Code of Conduct](#), and policies and procedures including the [Diversity and Inclusion policy](#) and [Conflict of Interest procedure](#).

(49) The Secretary of the HDR Academic Progress Committee will notify the student and the responsible decision maker of the date, time and place of the hearing at least ten working days prior to the meeting date.

(50) The faculty/institute will be provided with the student's review submission and may respond in writing to the points made in the submission. This response must be received by the Secretary of the HDR Academic Progress Committee at least seven working days prior to the hearing date and will be provided to the student according to the process in clause 52.

(51) The student has the right to attend the review hearing and address the Committee. The student must notify the Secretary of the HDR Academic Progress Committee at least seven working days prior to the hearing date if they wish to attend the hearing.

(52) At least five working days prior to the hearing date, the Secretary of the HDR Academic Progress Committee must

provide the student, the faculty/institute and the HDR Academic Progress Committee members with copies of relevant documents for consideration. At this time, the Secretary must also notify the Committee members, the student and the faculty/institute of the final membership of the HDR Academic Progress Committee to hear and determine the matter.

(53) At the review hearing:

- a. The HDR Academic Progress Committee has the authority to take written submissions or hear from any persons it deems appropriate.
- b. The HDR Academic Progress Committee first considers the student's written submission, relevant faculty/institute documentation and any other relevant information and evidence.
- c. If the student attends the hearing, they may be accompanied by a person of their choice, who is not a practising lawyer.
- d. The student and their support person are then invited into the hearing and the student is given the opportunity to explain and provide reasons why the faculty/institute's proposed decision should not be made.
- e. The members of the HDR Academic Progress Committee may question the student. Where the support person has expertise likely to assist the Committee on procedural, technical or factual matters or if the student requires reasonable adjustments, the Committee will allow the support person to speak on the student's behalf if the need arises.
- f. The HDR Academic Progress Committee will request a nominee(s) from the faculty/institute to address the Committee. The student will be given the opportunity to be present during this time. Members of the Committee, the student and the nominee may question each other.
- g. The HDR Academic Progress Committee may adjourn a hearing at any time but, wherever possible, the same Committee must continue to hear and consider the case at a later time. If it is not possible for the Committee to reconvene in person, the matter will be determined by circulation.
- h. The HDR Academic Progress Committee is not bound to make a decision at the time of a hearing and may take any additional reasonable time it requires to consider its decision, but should take no longer than 10 working days.
- i. All proceedings of the HDR Academic Progress Committee are confidential.

Review decision

(54) A decision of the HDR Academic Progress Committee is reached in private, by simple majority with the Chair having the casting vote. The HDR Academic Progress Committee may decide to:

- a. confirm and implement the proposed decision, or
- b. vary the proposed decision, and it may determine certain conditions which must be met by the student and/or faculty/institute, or
- c. withdraw the proposed decision.

(55) The HDR Academic Progress Committee must notify the student, faculty/institute, the Graduate Research Academy and, in the case of international students, Deakin International, in writing within five working days of:

- a. the decision and reasons for decision, and
- b. the right of appeal to the University Appeals Committee within 20 working days of the date on which the notice of the decision could reasonably have been received.

(56) If the HDR Academic Progress Committee has determined to withdraw the proposed decision, the student will be permitted to remain in candidature and resume their research. Time elapsed during the process of the review will be added to the length of candidature.

(57) Where candidature is to continue, the faculty/institute is expected to make suitable arrangements to support the student's research. The responsible decision maker will advise the Chair of the HDR Academic Progress Committee of the proposed arrangements to support the student, including:

- a. supervision arrangements
- b. processes established to improve the student's academic progress or to assist the student to comply with the regulations relevant to the student's work for the degree
- c. processes established to monitor the student's ongoing progress.

(58) The HDR Academic Progress Committee's decision, together with the reasons for it, is reported in confidence to the Research and Research Training Committee.

Appeals

(59) A student may appeal a decision of the HDR Academic Progress Committee to the University Appeals Committee. A student can appeal on the following grounds:

- a. there was a misapplication of procedures resulting in some disadvantage to the student
- b. there is new mitigating evidence which the student was not reasonably able to present at the review stage, which, had it been available, may have affected the decision.

(60) The completed application for appeal must be lodged in writing within 20 working days of being notified of the outcome of the hearing as required by the [Student Appeals procedure](#).

Records and reporting

(61) A written record of the Progress Support Panel report and recommendation, and the decision of the HDR Academic Progress Committee will be stored confidentially on relevant faculty/institute records and central records held by the Graduate Research Academy. In the case of the University Appeals Committee, a report is also provided to the Academic Board.

(62) All reporting must be anonymous and confidential.

(63) All documentation associated with proceedings, except the documentation provided to the above areas, shall be collected by the Secretary at the end of a hearing and disposed of securely.

Section 6 - Confirmation of Candidature Standards

HDR confirmation

(64) The confirmation process described in this Section relates to doctoral and master's programs (excluding programs identified in clause 9).

Confirmation requirements

(65) Students, except those enrolled in the Doctor of Psychology, must satisfy the following requirements:

- a. present to a confirmation panel a written document which comprises draft chapters on the introduction, literature and methodology appropriate to the discipline. It must contain at least:
 - i. a critical review of recent work in the field
 - ii. an updated research proposal and/or research questions
 - iii. a statement about the status of any relevant ethics approvals and/or intellectual property agreements,

including ownership, location and storage of data

- iv. if the project involves human research, a statement about compliance with Victorian and Commonwealth privacy law, including management of identifiable data
 - v. an updated plan of research, including progress made to date
 - vi. an updated timetable for completion of the thesis
 - vii. a statement of the resources and facilities required to complete the project within the appropriate candidature period
 - viii. a plan setting out the publications expected to be produced during candidature
- b. the Confirmation of Candidature report must be accompanied by a report from mandated software for detecting breaches of academic integrity
 - c. deliver an oral presentation and verbal defence of the research proposal to the confirmation panel
 - d. complete compulsory training in research integrity
 - e. complete compulsory Deakin Research induction.

(66) In the case of creative arts disciplines, the student will present to the panel for endorsement a proposal on an integrated format appropriate for a thesis of this nature. In the confirmation process a weighting will be given to the written dissertation/exegesis and the creative work. The faculty or institute will provide specific details to students on requirements.

(67) Faculties or institutes will determine the specific requirements of oral presentations and written submissions.

(68) Doctor of Psychology students must satisfy the following requirements:

- a. deliver an oral presentation and verbal defence of the research proposal to a meeting of a confirmation panel and other staff and students, accompanied by a one-page written summary of the hypotheses, method and proposed analyses for their thesis. The School of Psychology will determine the specific requirements of oral presentations and written submissions.
- b. present for examination a complete set of introductory chapters. Students will:
 - i. present the bound chapters to the Professional Programs Officer
 - ii. achieve a distinction standard
- c. complete compulsory training in research integrity as determined by Deakin Research.

(69) Doctor of Psychology students may be given an opportunity to make minor revisions to the examination chapters if initially unsuccessful.

Composition of confirmation panel

(70) The confirmation panel composition will be determined by the Head of Academic Unit or nominee and will typically include:

- a. the Head of Academic Unit or Associate Head of Academic Unit (Research) or nominee
- b. Academic Unit HDR coordinator
- c. principal or executive supervisor and co-supervisor
- d. associate supervisor(s)
- e. one or two senior researchers and
- f. an active researcher from outside the Academic Unit.

(71) The panel will appoint a Chair, who will be the Head of Academic or Associate Head of Academic Unit (Research) or nominee. Faculties and institutes may modify the composition to suite discipline-specific requirements.

Responsibilities of faculties and institutes

(72) Faculties and institutes, or the School of Psychology in the case of the Doctor of Psychology, will:

- a. ensure that staff and students adhere to University guidelines and minimum requirements
- b. communicate in writing to students any specific requirements, including:
 - i. additional discipline-specific requirements
 - ii. objectives, timelines and process of confirmation
 - iii. the consequences and procedures if candidature is not confirmed
- c. determine whether the thesis is examinable according to Deakin's usual processes.

Process of confirmation

(73) The Chair of the confirmation panel, or the Chair of the thesis units for the Doctor of Psychology, will advise students in writing of the membership of the panel, the date of their presentation and the details of the format of their presentation.

(74) Following the presentation, the student will leave the room and the panel will determine an outcome under clause 13 following the presentation and consideration of the written submission (and advise the Head of Academic Unit of the outcome if they were not a member of the panel).

(75) The Chair of the confirmation panel will write to the student to inform them of the outcome and reason for decision and include a copy of the panel report. The student is required to acknowledge receipt of the report to the Chair. The faculty or institute will keep a copy of the documentation and the student's acknowledgement in the student's file.

(76) The Chair of the confirmation panel will also provide a copy of the report and outcome to Deakin Research.

Process of second confirmation (Outcome 3.1 and 3.2)

(77) Where candidature is not confirmed (Outcome 3.2) but the student is given an opportunity to undertake a second confirmation process (oral presentation and written document) or just revise their written document (Outcome 3.1), the confirmation panel will document any aspects of the student's work that it considers were inadequate in the first confirmation. The confirmation panel must also advise the student of the possible consequences of unsuccessful confirmation.

(78) The student will normally be required to either undergo a second confirmation process (Outcome 3.2) or Outcome 3.1 within three months equivalent full-time. The confirmation panel will ensure appropriate academic support for the student to prepare for the second confirmation attempt (Outcome 3.1 or 3.2). A Progress Support Panel should be set up for those receiving Outcome 3.1 or 3.2.

(79) The student must repeat the confirmation process (Outcome 3.1 and 3.2) and must address the confirmation panel's comments in the second confirmation attempt whether it be a written submission (Outcome 3.1) or it includes the presentation (Outcome 3.2).

(80) Where a student receives Outcome 3.1 the student should address the confirmation panel's comment and submit the written document again only. Where possible, the confirmation panel members should be the same as at the first confirmation.

(81) Where a student receives Outcome 3.2 the student should address the confirmation panel's comment and the process of confirmation should be held according to clauses 70 - 74 and will be repeated. Where possible, the confirmation panel members should be the same as at the first confirmation.

Section 7 - Progress Support Panel Standards

Progress Support Panel

(82) A Progress Support Panel will be appointed for any student who is considered to be at risk of not making satisfactory progress.

(83) The panel is established by the Associate Dean (Research) or faculty/institute HDR Coordinator and typically includes:

- a. the current supervisors
- b. the Associate Head of Academic Unit (Research) or the HDR Coordinator or nominee, and
- c. an experienced researcher from a related area (who could be from a different Academic Unit).

Notification of the student

(84) The Associate Dean (Research) or faculty/institute HDR Coordinator must notify the student in writing that:

- a. their progress is considered to be at risk of not being satisfactory
- b. a Progress Support Panel has been appointed to assist them to achieve satisfactory progress
- c. if progress is determined to be unsatisfactory at the end of the process then the Panel may recommend the student's transfer to a master's degree (for doctoral students) or termination of enrolment for a minimum of twelve months of being formally advised of the termination or with no right of re-admission to the course
- d. the student and supervisor(s) must meet with the panel.

Initial meeting of the Progress Support Panel

(85) At the initial meeting with the student, the Progress Support Panel will:

- a. review the student's work
- b. identify appropriate support that can be provided. This may include:
 - i. identifying support to be offered to assist the student (for example, skills development workshops in writing, research methods, statistical analysis)
 - ii. continuing to work with current supervisors and/or appointment of one or more additional supervisors
- c. specify the tasks that need to be completed within a specified timeframe in order to establish satisfactory progress, including the date for the end of the intervention process
- d. specify any further progress management review meetings with the student and supervisor(s)
- e. specify written reports required by the panel and the deadlines for these reports.

(86) The student will be provided with an opportunity to raise any concerns about the tasks and targets set and the required timeframe.

(87) The panel will make the final determination of the requirements that the student must meet and the support that will be provided.

(88) A written record of the meeting will be provided to the student and supervisor(s) within five working days of the initial meeting. The record must set out in sufficient detail the prescribed requirements, the expected support for the student, frequency of meetings with supervisors or other staff, written records to be kept of meetings and the timeframe in which the student must meet them.

Monitoring progress

(89) The panel will monitor the student's progress according to the agreed timetable for progress and may meet with the student where appropriate.

Reporting of outcomes

(90) Within 10 working days after the end date for the intervention process, the Progress Support Panel will meet with the student and determine the outcome of the process.

(91) Outcomes of the progress support process and the reasons for the decision must be communicated in writing within five working days to the student.

Section 8 - Definitions

(92) For the purpose of this Procedure:

- a. Academic Unit: as defined in the [Research Conduct policy](#).
- b. confirmation of candidature: confirmation of candidature is a process of evaluation and feedback on an HDR student's progress, research question and project plan, as described in this procedure.
- c. equivalent full-time: elapsed time where a student studies full-time, excluding approved intermission and including annual leave. For those enrolled part-time, equivalent full-time is twice as long as for full-time students.
- d. Head of Academic Unit nominee: a senior member of Academic staff who is qualified as a principal supervisor and who has been nominated by the Head of Academic Unit.
- e. higher degrees by research (HDR): as defined in the [Higher Degrees by Research \(HDR\) policy](#).
- f. Progress Support Panel: a panel established by a faculty or institute to support students who have been identified as at risk of not making satisfactory progress in their research studies and who are at risk of not completing their degree within the prescribed time limit.
- g. research plan: a plan for the student's candidature detailing progress milestones and key research events developed early in candidature and reviewed at least annually.
- h. satisfactory academic progress: where a student continues to satisfactorily complete required progress milestones and key research events for their candidature by the deadlines outlined in the research plan and it is expected that they will submit their thesis for examination by the allowed course duration. Milestones include satisfactory completion of confirmation of candidature and supervisor, Academic Unit or faculty/institute reviews.
- i. unsatisfactory academic progress: where a student does not meet the requirements of satisfactory academic progress after a progress support panel process or second confirmation.
- j. responsible decision maker: the Faculty Executive Dean or nominee for HDR students enrolled in a faculty, or the Pro Vice-Chancellor Researcher Development or nominee for HDR students enrolled in an institute that reports to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Research.

Status and Details

Status	Current
Effective Date	1st October 2020
Review Date	7th May 2024
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Approval Date	23rd September 2020
Expiry Date	To Be Advised
Responsible Executive	Julie Owens Deputy Vice-Chancellor Research +61 3 522 73486
Implementation Officer	Matthew Clarke Pro Vice-Chancellor Researcher Development +61 3 924 43979
Enquiries Contact	Graduate Research Academy +61 3 924 68268