

List of key amendments – HDR candidature policy suite

Item	Document name	Relevant section	Type of change
1	All documents	Multiple sections	Minor - Replacement of references to 'Senior/Joint senior supervisor' with the collective term 'Senior supervisor'.
2	HDR candidature policy	Whole document	Substantive - Amendment of candidature policy to contain high level principles; rules and operational details removed and inserted in the supporting documents.
3	HDR candidature procedure	current Candidature procedure – 3	Minor - Removal of section relating to compliance with the 'Needs Analysis' process – candidates and supervisors discuss and record research resource needs at supervision meetings and Milestone Review Panels have oversight of these requirements and can highlight issues.
4		3	Minor – Inserted option for HDR Coordinators to initiate a change of supervision, on behalf of a candidate or supervisor
5		4	Substantive – introduction of a requirement for doctoral candidates to produce one peer reviewed research output during candidature, as a hurdle for graduation – for PhD candidates commencing 2016 onwards.
6		4.1	Minor - Duration of candidature table (4.1) simplified
7		5	Minor - Use of EFTSL, rather than 'months into candidature', in relation to candidature calculation.
8		5.2	Minor - Replaced 'study mode' with 'study load'
9		5.3	Minor - The nomination of a 'Research commencement date' after candidate and supervisor discussion, at the time of admission, is proposed rather than a default date.
10		5.5	Minor – Included requirement for Dean, SGR approval of LOAs while candidate is on an approved extension beyond maximum duration; removed requirement for Dean, SGR approval of LOA prior to Confirmation of Candidature as this should be at the discretion of the school
11		5.6	Substantive - Period of available leave extended across all three types of parenting leave
12		current Candidature procedure – 7 and 8	Minor – Consolidation of sections in current procedure concerning re-admission processes into section 6 of the new procedure
13	current Candidature procedure – 9	Minor – Removal of section 9 relating to requirements for International students studying in Australia as was non-specific and did not provide any additional information to that already on the web	
14	HDR candidate progress management procedure	1.1	Minor – Renamed <i>Mid-candidature review</i> as <i>Second milestone review</i> ; renamed <i>Completion seminar</i> as <i>Third milestone review</i>
15		1.3	Minor – Included explicit statement that all candidates must develop a research plan/timeline in their first semester of enrolment. This is already undertaken in most schools.
16		1.4	Minor – Included explicit statement concerning an optimal timing for PhD submission and its relationship to the scheduling of the candidate milestone reviews
17		2.1	Minor - Clarified that milestone review panels have four members and that the Chair must have Category 1 supervisor registration.

Item #	Document name	Relevant section	Type of change
18	HDR candidate progress management procedure	2.2	Minor - Clarified that candidates have two attempts to achieve the milestones. A third attempt may be allowed if extenuating circumstances for the lack of progress have been identified by a Research Candidate Progress Committee
19		3.2	Substantive – Expansion of the window of opportunity for candidate milestone reviews – doctoral candidates now have a 0.5 EFTSL period in which to undertake each milestone and Masters by research candidates have a 3 month period for their milestones. These will be recorded on the RMIT student portal so that candidates can check milestone dates at any time.
20		4.2	Minor - Removal of exemptions from Mid-candidature review - the requests for review were too often based on presentation of a paper at a conference, and the candidate does not receive adequate feedback on the whole research project in these circumstances.
21		4.3	Minor – Inclusion of an opportunity for candidates being re-admitted for the purpose of examination to be able to apply for an exemption from the Third milestone review (Completion Seminar)
22		5.1	Substantive – Inclusion of at risk criteria from <i>Schedule 1 - Definition of unsatisfactory academic performance in a higher degree by research program</i> into the body of the procedure
23		6.3 & 6.4	Minor – Removal of the candidate’s supervisors from RCPC panel membership; clarification that the third member of an RCPC is an HDR Coordinator from another school in the College
24		6.6	Minor – Simplification of the RCPC process to include two outcomes; candidates who have already been placed at risk by the school, and who have not met the requirements of their CASP, will be referred to an RCPC
25		6.7 & 6.8	Substantive – Candidates found to have <i>established unsatisfactory academic progress</i> will be recommended for termination to the Dean, SGR for approval (not RMIT Research Committee); any case for termination will be reviewed by Assessment Support Unit (ARG) as per coursework process before the Dean makes a decision
26	HDR research training support procedure <i>formerly the Minimum resources policy</i>		Substantive - Research resources have been defined; responsibilities of Schools/Colleges and central units, including SGR have been explicitly stated
27			Substantive - Specific lists of resources have been replaced with a requirement to comply with regulatory standards and the <i>Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research</i> .
28			Minor - Information about appropriate review of sessions designed to meet academic or professional development needs has been incorporated.