

## PGP 3.4.1 Revise and Resubmit - Doctoral

### Summary

Where it is determined that a student receives a 'revise and resubmit' outcome there are University processes that need to be followed in order to provide sufficient information, support and instructions to the student.

This protocol defines the criteria that determine when a revise and resubmit outcome should be approved. The protocol provides the process for the University Postgraduate Board (UPB) decision as well as the process for the revisions to be undertaken and monitored. The details for the resubmission and final outcome are detailed.

### Purpose

This protocol outlines the requirements, regulations and process, that need to be undertaken when a doctoral student is recommended 'revise and resubmit' as a result of the examination for a student's doctoral research.

### Scope

This protocol applies to all doctoral research examinations and does not include Master's or Bachelor's with Honours research examinations or examinations that are not managed through the Graduate Research School (GRS).

### Application

#### Definition

When a student is required to revise and resubmit for further examination within a specified time the outcome means the student does not meet the criteria for examination based on one or more of the following:

- there is limited or no internal consistency;
- more data is required;
- there are methodological issues;
- multiple chapter changes.

The above may necessitate an in-depth re-writing of the literature review and/or restructuring of the thesis.

#### Determining the outcome

The examiners may recommend that the thesis be revised and resubmitted either (1) as part of the examination report, or (2) as a result of the oral examination.

- (1) In the first instance, the Dean of the Graduate Research School or nominee/Convenor will contact the examiners and seek consensus (where they are not unanimous) and the revisions will be agreed to. The meeting is documented in a short report to accompany the PGR20 to the UPB. The PGR20 - Revise and Resubmit form (Appendix 1) will be completed and recommendations stated. Normally, the oral examination will be held after the revisions have been completed, however student has the right to request an oral examination at this stage
- (2) In the second instance, the revisions will be recorded during the oral examination. The Convenor will complete the PGR20 and the Convenor's report, both of which go to the UPB.

Once the PGR20 has been finalised, a meeting between the student, supervisors and Associate Dean (Postgraduate) (ADP) or delegate will be arranged to discuss the PGR20, recommendations, process and timetable for revision. A copy of the examiners reports are given to the student at this meeting.

## Process for Revision

The ADP will oversee the resubmission process against an agreed plan. The supervisors are responsible for ensuring the required revisions have been made by the student. The student and supervisors will be sent a PGR20 outlining criteria where the examination criteria have not been met and detail the revisions required.

If required, an experienced supervisor (may be external from the Faculty) may be appointed, with expertise in methodology and/or area of scholarly inquiry, to work with the supervisory team. An agreement which details a plan with specific milestones and timetable for resubmission, including meetings, is to be signed by all parties and sent through the Faculty Postgraduate Committee (FPC) to the University Postgraduate Board (UPB). Any deviation to the agreed plan must be discussed with the ADP and reported to UPB. Where an experienced supervisor is approved to work with the supervisory team, the person must have expertise in the methodology and/or area of scholarly inquiry.

The student will be required to re-enrol and pay fees for the period agreed to for the revisions to be undertaken.

Students must be able to complete the changes for the revised thesis within the timeframe agreed by the UPB as recommended by the examiners. This will normally be for a period of up to 12 months. If the revisions are to the extent that this is not possible, the student will be recommended for Fail and the degree not awarded. This would be determined in conjunction with the examiners when the revise and resubmit outcome was determined.

During the revise and resubmit process students should continue to demonstrate the ability to act as an independent researcher and should not seek excessive amounts of guidance from the supervisory team above that of normal supervision requirements. The normal support the student will receive through the resubmission process includes a schedule of monthly meetings between the supervisor and the student. Where a six month resubmission is decided, monthly meetings are required; where a twelve month resubmission is decided, two-monthly meetings are required. The ADP will provide monthly verbal updates to the UPB. Every three months the student should submit a written (PGR8) progress report to be submitted via the Faculty to the UPB. Where the student is not meeting the milestones detailed in the plan the student's candidacy will be discontinued, and a DNC grade will be entered. A student not meeting their milestones in the agreed plan will receive a final warning after the first set of milestones have not been met.

## Resubmission

Following the completion of the revision the normal submission process will be followed.

## Types of Re-examination

There are a number of types of re-examination:

1. a re-examination of the thesis after revision and the holding of an additional oral examination;
2. the thesis only to be re-examined after revision
3. an additional oral examination (without the need to revise or resubmit the thesis);
4. the holding of a different form of examination to test the student's knowledge.

Where examiners are unable to agree on an outcome for the second examination the University Postgraduate Board may consider appointing additional examiners or a moderator.

## Re-examination

Once the revisions are completed, the standard examination processes should be followed, in the same manner as the first examination. At the discretion of the UPB, the revised thesis may be sent to those examiners wishing to re-examine. Where an original dissenting examiner declines to re-examine, another examiner will be appointed. This examiner may be the reserve examiner appointed for the original examination.

For students whom a revise and resubmit outcome was determined at the oral examination, the examiners will determine if a subsequent oral examination is required or if the examination of the thesis only is sufficient. For students whom a revise and resubmit outcome was determined during the writing of the examination reports of the thesis will be required to undertake an oral examination.

The student will be permitted to submit the thesis for re-examination only once, and then only at the discretion of the University Postgraduate Board. Examiners will be informed that there will be no option to recommend a further revise and resubmit.

The Convenor for the initial oral examination will normally be re-appointed and provided with an update that the revisions had been made on re-submission by the GRS.

### Final Outcome

A student who has been required to revise their thesis may not have a further outcome of revise and resubmit. The outcome must be either a pass or fail. A pass grade can be awarded with amendments, which need to be completed within the allocated timeframes (please refer to the **Examination Protocol** for details on amendment timeframes).

Students who have been awarded a fail grade will be given the opportunity to request an oral examination if they wish.

Students who are not awarded the doctorate may be awarded a lesser degree,( add in outcome 5 from handbook page 127 'Outcome 5'.

### Outcome

Students who are required to revise and resubmit their thesis for further examination are aware of the correct process and procedure to assist resubmission and examination process.

### Review

Original Approval Date

May 2015

Version Approvals

V 1.1 May 2017

V 1.2 Apr 2018

V1.3 July 2019

Review Date

July 2021

Effective Date

May 2015