

Doctor of Philosophy Rules

1 INTERPRETATION

- i. In these Rules “the Committee” shall mean “the Higher Degrees Committee”.
- ii. “PhD Course” refers to the three to four-year full-time equivalent program of guided reading and research that comprises a 100% thesis research with no preparatory year. The part-time equivalent of the PhD course is six years.
- iii. 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 Head of Faculty/School and principal supervisor.
- iv. Faculty is intended to mean an academic department to which students may enrol to study in a major division of knowledge; such a department may alternatively be known as School or Centre.

2 ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Admission to candidature in PhD course may be approved by the Committee only when the relevant Dean of the Faculty has:

- i. certified in writing that the necessary facilities and appropriate support for the applicant undertaking his or her proposed PhD training and/or research are available; *and*
- ii. nominated in writing an appropriate principal supervisor and co-supervisor(s) in accordance with Rule 3. In the event that the nominated principal supervisor becomes unavailable due to transfers, resignation, etc., the Dean of the Faculty/School should have alternate supervisor available.

In cases where the candidate is expected to write the thesis in a language other than the medium of his or her bachelor's degree, the student is expected to prove by certificates or by other means he or she possesses an advanced command of that language.

2.1 The PhD Course

- i. Any applicant for admission to candidature for the PhD course shall be a graduate, or shall have fulfilled all the requirements for admission to a degree of the University or of any other institution recognised by the Committee for this purpose, and shall satisfy the requirements of Rule 2.1(ii) and Rule 2.1(iii).
- ii. The Committee may on the recommendation of the Dean of the Faculty concerned admit to candidature for the PhD course an applicant who holds or has fulfilled all the requirements for:
 - a. the degree of Masters, provided that the applicant has shown potential for research demonstrated by a research project or resulting dissertation/thesis comprising typically 1 year of the Masters course, *or*
 - b. the degree of Bachelor with first class Honours or second class Honours in the First Division, or equivalent, provided that the applicant has shown potential for research demonstrated by a research project or resulting dissertation/thesis comprising typically 1 year of the Bachelors course.

In special circumstances with the approval of the Committee, upon provision of a strong, clear and substantiated case from the Dean of Faculty, an applicant who does not satisfy the requirements of 2.1(ii)(a) or 2.1(ii)(b) may be admitted to candidature in the PhD course 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 Rule 2.2(i).

- iii. Every applicant for admission to candidature for the PhD course shall:
 - a. produce documented evidence of capacity to undertake work at the PhD level. The Committee may require as evidence the passing of a special examination; and
 - b. submit to the Committee a proposal of research to be undertaken in a nominated Faculty of the University and approved by the Dean of the Faculty; and
 - c. satisfies the language requirements stipulated for admission to Higher Degrees.
- iv. On admission to candidature the candidate shall pursue a program of advanced study and research on the approved topic for a period of three years. Notwithstanding what other policies may state,

for a full-time student the normal maximum period of candidature shall be four years (eight years for part-time candidates), while the normal minimum period of candidature shall be not less than three years (six to eight years for part-time candidates).

2.2 Probationary Period

- i. The Committee will normally accept a candidate directly into the PhD course 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 Dean of the Faculty as to how the candidature should proceed.
- ii. Where a candidate has been accepted on probationary candidature under Rule 2.2(i), the candidature shall, upon confirmation of acceptance, be deemed to have commenced from the date of the probationary admission.

2.3 Alternative Admission Pathways

2.3.1 Transfer from another institution

An applicant who has been a candidate for a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in another institution may be admitted to candidature for the PhD course in this University. The Committee shall decide, on recommendation of the Dean of the Faculty, 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 specified in Rule 2.1(iv) shall be so allowed.

2.3.2 Upgrade from Research Masters

Students whose qualifications do not satisfy the admission requirements of Rule 2.1 and who are currently enrolled in a Masters degree that would satisfy Rule 2.1(ii)(a) (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 to the PhD course. In such cases, the principal supervisor shall forward to the Committee through the relevant Dean of Faculty a request for upgrade along with any supporting evidence.

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 of whom may be internal and one of whom 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 Dean of the Faculty and forwarded to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), following one-year equivalent full-time candidature and not exceeding 18 to 24 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. In the case of approval being granted not more than 1 to 2 year (depending on the course duration) of candidature shall be so allowed.

3 CONDITIONS OF CANDIDATURE

3.1 The PhD Course

- i. Every SIX calendar months, full time equivalent, from the date of admission to candidature the candidate and principal supervisor shall submit to the 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 as required under Rule 2.1 (iii) and shall give reasons for any departures from the original proposal.
- ii. The candidate will be required by the principal supervisor and the Dean of the Faculty to formally undergo a Confirmation of Candidature process. This process is outlined under Rule 4.1.2.
- iii. In special cases, the 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.
- iv. The candidate shall pursue the course wholly under the control of the University.
- v. On the recommendation of the Dean of the supervising/enrolled Faculty, the Committee may permit a candidate to pursue the course away from the University if the Committee is satisfied that:
 - a. the candidate will have access to the required facilities; and
 - b. a local supervisor(s) resident or working in the same locality as the candidate can be appointed by the Committee, unless the Dean of the supervising Faculty recommends otherwise.

Each PhD candidate shall be required to consult regularly with their 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 Dean of the Faculty after consultation with the candidate prior to the commencement of each semester of candidature.

- vi. A candidate may be required to attend lectures and seminars and perform practical work to a satisfactory standard in subjects prescribed by the Committee. No candidate may enrol in any subject or subjects without the consent of the principal supervisor and the approval of the Committee. If the principal supervisor certifies that a subject is a requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy such subjects may not be credited to another degree. If, however, such a subject is not a requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, it may be credited to another degree.

4 SUPERVISION

- i. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy is a supervised degree and the research and preparation of the thesis must be carried out under the guidance of at least two Supervisors appointed by the Committee on the recommendation of the appropriate Dean of the Faculty. Supervisors must be listed on the Register of Research Higher Degree Supervisors. The supervisors shall be provisionally appointed at the time the Committee decides that the applicant can be admitted to candidature. Within 12 months the appointment of supervisors may be reviewed by the Committee in the light of the detailed research proposal and student feedback
- ii. Under exceptional circumstances the Dean of the Faculty may nominate one supervisor stating in detail the circumstances of such a nomination. The committee shall decide on the validity of such a nomination and approve it.
- iii. Except under exceptional circumstances, the Dean of the Faculty 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).
 - a. Principal supervisors must normally be members of the University's academic staff and possess a doctorate degree.
 - b. Co-supervisors should have appropriate expertise and experience in the required field as determined by the Faculty and the Committee
 - c. For external candidates, a suitable on-site supervisor, who has agreed to act as such, should be nominated, where appropriate, as the co-supervisor.
 - d. The nomination of supervisors will include an estimate of the expected percentage input from each supervisor. {Note: There must be a form developed for this purpose }

- e. Where an MNU supervisor is not available to undertake the principal supervisor's role, the Dean of the Faculty may seek approval from the Committee to appoint a suitably qualified individual who possess a doctorate degree, 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.
- iv. Under exceptional circumstances where an applicant's principal supervisor departs the University or withdraws from the supervision, and no other staff member is suitably qualified or possesses the appropriate expertise to take on the role of principal supervisor, the Chair of the Committee will immediately consider a recommendation from the Dean of the Faculty for the appointment of a suitably qualified individual externally to fulfill the role of principal supervisor. A principal supervisor so appointed will be required to complete and sign a contract with the University.
- v. The principal supervisor shall present to the Committee the required reports on the candidate's work (see Rule 4.1.3). If the Committee receives a report that the candidate's work is unsatisfactory it may resolve that the candidate be invited to "show cause" why the candidature should not be terminated. In cases of dispute between any supervisor and a candidate, due consideration will be given to the views of both parties. The following specific instances must be noted:
 - a. Where a supervisor has made every effort to get a PhD candidate's work up to expected standards and these efforts have not yielded the desired effect due to insufficient student commitment 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 Dean of the Faculty, must be sent to the candidate and to the Committee. The candidate shall also have the right to submit a report, detailing his or her perspective, to the Committee. The Dean of the Faculty would then be expected to make a recommendation as to how to proceed from this point. If the supervisor involved is also the Dean of the Faculty, then the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs) shall sign the report to the candidate and to the Committee and shall make the recommendation regarding how to proceed from this point.
 - b. Where a candidate has made every effort to reconcile his or her work to meet expectations of their principal supervisor or co-supervisor but this effort has not yielded the desired effect because of an unsatisfactory supervisor-candidate relationship, the candidate has the right to request a change of principal supervisor (or any co-supervisor if required). The candidate should submit a request, detailing the grounds for making it, to the Dean of the Faculty who will consult on the request and forward it to the Committee, accompanied by

a nomination of an alternative supervisor. If the supervisor involved is also the Dean of the Faculty, then the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs) shall consult on the request and forward it to the Committee. The affected supervisor shall also have the right to submit a report, detailing his or her perspective, to the Committee.

4.1 Role of the Student

4.1.1 Induction and contact with supervisors

Once students have formally accepted the offer of candidature and registered, they must contact their nominated principal supervisor and arrange a suitable time to discuss the formal induction process offered in their Faculty. Supervisors will be required to sign off when the student has undergone the induction process.

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

4.1.2 Confirmation of candidature

The University requires all doctoral candidates to undertake a formal Confirmation of Candidature process. The confirmation process will be explained at the induction sessions for new doctoral 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 the relevant policy documents - Confirmation of Candidature Policy and Procedures (<https://rc.mnu.edu.mv/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Doctoral-Confirmation-of-Candidature-Policy-and-Procedures-Nov-2020.pdf>) and MNU PhD Proposal Defence Process (<https://rc.mnu.edu.mv/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/MNU-PhD-Proposal-defense-Process-Nov-2020.pdf>).

For doctoral courses, student progress will be assessed at 3 months after registration for full-time students and at the 6-month period for part-time students.

4.1.3 Progress reports and re-registration

Students must ensure that all administrative requirements of the University, such as re-registering each term, providing progress reports, and conforming to procedures for variations of conditions of candidature, are met.

Students are required to report on their progress every 3 months of candidature to the Dean of the Faculty. The progress reports provide an opportunity to formally record progress and any issues or concerns that arise during candidature.

Where inadequate progress has occurred the supervisor and Dean of the Faculty may recommend to the Committee that a student be requested 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-registration forms to their supervisors, or lack of evidence of adequate progress.

4.1.4 Fieldwork and research overseas

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. Arrangements for travel are dealt with through Faculties and students should seek assistance from their principal supervisor in ensuring that the correct procedures are followed. It is the responsibility of the student to make sure all the necessary approvals are finalized before commencing with the research.

4.1.5 Notifying leave of absence from campus

The student shall inform the principal supervisor in writing if the student needs to travel off-campus for any research-related or other purposes.

4.2 Role of the Principal Supervisor

- i. 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:
 - a. The principal supervisor shall ensure that the research topic chosen by the candidate is at an appropriate academic level and is likely, if successfully completed, to be worthy of publication.
 - b. The principal supervisor shall make recommendations to the Committee for any additional coursework that may be required in terms of Rule 3.1.(vi).

- c. The principal supervisor shall advise the candidate on the quality of early drafts of the thesis, but the thesis finally presented shall be substantially the independent work of the candidate.
- d. The principal supervisor in consultation with any co-supervisors must complete the required report forms for each candidate in each year of candidature and discuss these reports with the candidate and Dean of the Faculty.
- e. The periodic reports submitted in terms of Rule 4(v) & Rule 4.1.3 shall provide enough detail to enable the Committee to assess the progress of the candidate and the likelihood of completion of candidature within the prescribed time.
- f. If, after provision of feedback and guidance and subsequent allowance of a suitable period for the candidate to improve their work, the principal supervisor becomes firmly of the opinion that the candidate is not making satisfactory progress the principal supervisor, after consultation with co-supervisor(s) and the Dean of the Faculty, shall recommend to the Committee that the candidate be invited to "show cause" as to why the candidature should not be terminated. This recommendation may incorporate the suggestion that the candidate be admitted to candidature in an appropriate master's degree.
- g. The principal supervisor shall inform the student via email any leave of absence.

4.3 Show Cause Procedure

All candidates as well as all individuals undertaking a supervisory role for the PhD will be familiar with the responsibilities associated with PhD supervisors and PhD candidates, the PhD examination procedures and procedures for handling any difficulties that might arise during supervision, and the consequences of failing in their obligations. These responsibilities are outlined in documents available on the MNU website. {Ensure that these are there before this policy is amended}

5 EXAMINATION PROCESS

5.1 Submission Requirements

- i. On completion of the course of advanced study and research, the candidate shall present for examination a thesis in a form approved by the Committee embodying the results of the candidate's work which shall be substantially an original contribution to the subject concerned.
- ii. The thesis, exclusive of any appendices, shall in no case exceed 100 000 words in total or 60,000 words in total when accompanied by a corpus of creative work. There may be special instances

where, with the permission of the Committee on recommendation of the principal supervisor, the thesis may exceed these limits. In special cases, with the permission of the Committee on the recommendation of the principal supervisor, the thesis may be written or presented, at least in part, in a multi-media format.

- iii. The candidate shall state generally in the preface of the thesis and where appropriate, the sources from which the information is derived, the extent to which the candidate has made use of the work of others and the portion of the work which is claimed as original.
 - a. The candidate may not present as the thesis any work that has been the basis of the award of a degree at this or another university, but will not be precluded from incorporating such in the thesis provided that, in presenting the thesis, the candidate clearly indicates the part of the work which has been so incorporated.
 - b. The candidate shall upon submission of the thesis, make arrangements for all original data to be retained in an area of safe storage for a period of not less than five years from the date of submission. The data stored must be in a form that would, at a minimum, permit replication of all analyses reported in the thesis.
- iv. The candidate shall submit to the Secretariat of the Higher Degrees Committee a copy of the thesis in a digital format approved by the Committee. If the thesis has multi-media or creative practice components approved according to Rule 5.1(ii), four copies of such components must also be submitted along with clear instructions as to their usage as well as a listing of computer hardware, software and other requirements needed by examiners and other readers of the work. All multi-media or creative practice components must be accessible by examiners.
- v. Exemption from submitting the thesis in digital format, in whole or in part, may be granted by the Committee in special cases.
- vi. At the time the thesis is submitted, the principal supervisor shall send to the Committee a certificate stating:
 - a. that the principal supervisor and co-supervisor(s) have discussed with the candidate and amongst themselves the academic content of the thesis in the form submitted and that, while neither expressing nor implying a judgement about the merit of the work, in the principal supervisor's opinion all are agreed that it is ready for submission for examination for the degree;
 - b. that all requirements of the Faculty, in regard to the deposition of museum/archive material or any other supporting material have been met; and
 - c. that the physical form and presentation of the thesis are appropriate to the discipline.

Should the principal supervisor be unwilling to provide a certificate in these terms, the principal supervisor shall so advise the candidate and shall send to the candidate and the Committee a written statement setting out the grounds on which the certificate is withheld. This statement will not be forwarded to any examiners.

- vii. The principal supervisor shall forward to the Committee the certificate referred to in paragraph 5.1(vi) before a thesis is accepted for examination. When, for any reason, the certificate is withheld, the Committee may decline to accept the thesis for examination or may accept it following such consultation or under such additional conditions as the Committee may deem to be appropriate for specific cases.

5.2 Thesis Examination Process

- i. The student shall inform the principal supervisor and the respective Faculty the intention of initial submission of the final thesis three months in advance.
- ii. Once the intention of the initial submission of the final thesis is informed by the Dean of Faculty, the Committee shall identify a pool of at least five potential examiners in consultation with the principal supervisor, three months before the submission of the thesis. The Committee shall appoint three examiners from this pool at least two of whom shall be external, (whereby at least one of them shall be international unless otherwise the thesis is written in Dhivehi), to the University. The candidate will not be given any indication of the final set of examiners that have been appointed. The Dean of the Faculty, or principal supervisor as appropriate, will be expected to obtain written or emailed consent, from each examiner excepting the reserve, to examine the thesis within two months of its receipt. The Committee 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 100 000 word limit, examiners shall be informed of this fact so they may consider it when making their decision to examine.
- iii. 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 Committee.
- iv. No person who has been a principal supervisor or co-supervisor of the candidate shall be appointed as an examiner. No person who is currently or has ever been in a personal relationship with the candidate or any current supervisor will be approved as an examiner.
- v. Each examiner shall make a separate written report on the merits of the thesis and may be required to consult with the other examiners and report to the Committee. Each examiner will be reminded to provide his or her report within two months of receipt of the thesis. However, if an examiner fails to provide his or her report, after appropriate reminders, within a maximum of three months,

the Committee, after consultation with the relevant Dean of the Faculty, may notify the examiner that his or her services are no longer required and the reserve examiner may then be activated as a replacement.

- vi. For a PhD in creative practice to pass, both the exegesis and the creative work must be deemed by examiners to be of pass standard.

5.3 Oral Defence of Thesis

The oral defence is an integral part of the examination process. The performance of the candidate in the oral defence will have a bearing on the overall recommendation submitted by the examiners.

5.3.1 *Date, Time and Place*

The day, date, time and the place for the oral defence of thesis shall be notified by the Dean of the Faculty at least eight days in advance. Normally the oral defence of the thesis shall be arranged in the University. In exceptional cases, the Vice-Chancellor may allow the oral defence to be conducted at a place outside of the University. The oral defence must take place in-person with at least one examiner. The other examiners may interact with the candidate using multi-media channels of communication.

5.3.2 *Support People and Audio Recording*

The candidate may ask for a small number of people to be allowed to attend the oral defence for moral support, and the faculty may request to have observers present. The candidate may also request to have the oral defence audio-recorded. The candidate and the chairperson of the oral defence must consent to all arrangements.

5.3.3 *Composition of the oral defence panel of examiners*

The oral defence will be chaired by a senior and independent academic from the University. The examination panel shall consist of 3 examiners and an academic staff from the relevant faculty. The internal examiner and the in-country examiner (external to the university but resident in the Maldives) will be present in the room. The overseas examiner may be linked by telephone or video or have their questions put by one of the other examiners. The primary supervisor and co-supervisors may also attend based on the student's choice. The supervisors will not take part in discussion during the oral, though they may make a statement to the examiners at the end of the defence.

5.3.4 *Format of the Oral*

Oral examinations generally take place as follows.

- i. The chair will commence with a welcome and introductions of all present.
- ii. The candidate will then have an opportunity to address the examiners for 10 to 15 minutes without interruption.
- iii. The examiners will question the candidate on his/her thesis and engage the candidate in discussion about his/her research.
- iv. The chair may invite the candidate to make a closing statement.
- v. The chair will ask the candidate to leave the room.
- vi. The supervisors will be given an opportunity to make a statement to the examiners and will answer any questions the examiners wish to pose if the supervisor or co-supervisor is present.
- vii. The supervisors may be then requested to leave the room.
- viii. The examiners will discuss the thesis and agree on what recommendation to make to the Committee.
- ix. The chair will recall the candidate to the room, and the candidate will be advised of the examination panel's recommendation.

The whole examination should take around three hours.

5.4 **Thesis Examination Outcomes**

- i. Taking into account the recommendations of the examiners, the Committee may:
 - a. recommend that the degree be awarded;
 - b. recommend that the degree be awarded conditional upon the making of such amendments as the Committee deems appropriate;
 - c. request the examiners to consult and report to the Committee;
 - d. appoint an additional examiner or examiners;
 - e. appoint an external adjudicator who shall consider and report to the Committee upon the thesis and any supporting papers invited or requested by the Committee and the reports of the examiners;
 - f. require the candidate to sit for such written, oral or practical examinations as the Committee may prescribe;
 - g. 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;

- h. recommend that the degree be not awarded.
- ii. A candidate awarded the degree in terms of Rule 5.4(i)(b) shall complete the amendments within three months for minor amendments and six months for major amendments. These will be made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor, the relevant Dean of the Faculty, or both.
- iii. A candidate permitted to revise a thesis for re-examination in terms of Rule 5.4 (i)(g) shall complete the revision within 9 months under the supervision of a principal supervisor or supervisors endorsed by the Committee.
- iv. A candidate who has revised a thesis in terms of Rule 5.4 (i)(g) and who fails the re-examination shall not be eligible for any further examination.
- v. An external adjudicator will only be appointed by the Committee if the three 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.
- vi. A doctoral candidate may be awarded the PhD with merit 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.

5.5 Process Upon Recommendation of “Degree Not Be Awarded”

- i. Where any examination, adjudication or consultation report is received by the Committee, on which basis the Committee is considering recommending that the candidate not be awarded the degree pursuant to 5.4(i)(h), the candidate and their principal supervisor shall be notified in writing of the content of that report and may within eight weeks lodge a response limited to the academic and substantive matters raised therein. The Committee shall consider the submissions of the principal supervisor and/or student in determining whether the degree be awarded.

5.6 Appeals Against a Recommendation of “Degree Not Be Awarded”

- i. Candidates have the right of appeal against an unfavourable examination outcome described in Rule 5.4(i)(h) and will be invited to submit a report to the Academic Senate detailing any concerns they may have about the examination process. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Academic Senate within four weeks of receiving the advice of the unfavourable outcome. The formal appeal, recommendation, all examiners' reports, candidate responses and any other relevant material shall then be referred to a committee for review and final decision.
- ii. Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
 - a. procedural irregularities in the conduct of the examination;
 - b. documental evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of one or more examiners.

- iii. Academic Senate 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 candidate’s PhD programme (problems encountered during candidature should be handled by grievance procedures at the appropriate time).
- iv. Any member of the Academic Senate involved in making the recommendations in Rule 5.4.(i)(h) from the Higher Degrees Committee will absent themselves from all discussions of the appeal. If the review committee sends a formal recommendation of fail, thereby upholding the procedural fairness of the Higher Degrees Committee’s recommendation to the Academic Senate, these same individuals shall absent themselves from the Senate meeting during discussion of the recommendation. There shall be no appeal against the final decision of the Academic Senate.

Date Approved by Higher Degrees Committee	5 October 2011
Most recent revision	1 st March 2022
Approved by	Higher Degrees Committee
Indicative time for Review	2 years from approval date
Responsibility for Review	Higher Degrees Committee

Adapted from the Doctoral Course Rules of University of New England, Australia and University of Auckland, New Zealand.