

The purpose of this document is to:

- a) outline the modes of submission available to candidates at RMIT;
- b) explain the criteria to be used when assessing the doctoral work and the recommendations available to you as an examiner; and
- c) provide guidance about the structure of your report.

Please complete your examination within six weeks of receiving this document.

Section 1. Criteria for each mode of submission

At RMIT, the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is a degree with a duration of between three and four years full-time (or part-time equivalent), of which at least two thirds are devoted to research. Candidates complete either a thesis or a thesis with a creative component. Submitted work for examination may include publications or other publicly presented research outputs. Candidates who include published material in their submitted work complete a research output declaration form as part of their submission. The length and format of the thesis should be consistent with the normal standards for the discipline/field.

Thesis

The thesis must be unified and coherent in content addressing a single, significant research question/theme.

Project

The project must also address a single, significant research question/theme, comprising of the following integral components, which together form the entirety of the candidate's examinable output.

The project will contain:

- i. the artefact(s) and /or body of work presented in an exhibition or performance (visual or sonic); or a visual/sonic record of the artefact(s) or body of work; and,
- ii. a thesis which defines the purpose and theoretical basis of the work.

An oral presentation made by the candidate, may be agreed to by the candidate and their supervisors in certain disciplines. Supplementary information on the creative component may be available for specific disciplines.

Section 2. Criteria for examination and consideration of the award

Regardless of mode of submission, in accordance with the Australian Qualifications Framework¹, for the award of a doctoral degree the candidate must demonstrate:

- i. a substantial, original and significant contribution to the knowledge or understanding in the field of study;
- ii. an expert understanding of theoretical knowledge and the ability to reflect critically on relevant theory and practice;
- iii. intellectual independence in evaluating existing knowledge and ideas, and planning and undertaking systematic investigation to generate original knowledge;
- iv. technical and creative skills, including use of relevant research principles and methods, applicable to the field of study or learning;
- v. communication skills to explain and critique their field of research, including the ability to present a sustained argument;
- vi. an ethical approach and a high level of research integrity.

Section 3. Examiner's report

In assessing the research, please complete the Examiners' report form - Doctor of Philosophy, and prepare a written report indicating whether the criteria in (i) – (vi) above have been satisfied and, if not, what amendments are necessary to reach this standard.

Please provide the grounds for your recommendation by detailing, as fully as possible, the strengths and weaknesses of the research. This feedback will be used by RMIT to advise the candidate on any revisions needed to improve the research.

If you make a recommendation of R5 please keep in mind that candidates may appeal against a final examination classification at RMIT and your examination report should provide clear evidence of the failure of the candidate to meet the required standards of the degree and your reasoning behind not recommending a classification of R4.

¹ Australian Quality Framework qualifications http://www.aqf.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/14AQF_Doctoral-Degree.pdf

Section 4. Examiner’s recommendation

After examination the examiner shall make one of the following recommendations:

| Examiner’s Recommendation | Definition |
|---|--|
| Passed (R1): | The candidate should be awarded the degree with no requirements for amendments other than corrections of an editorial nature. Amendments are to be made within four weeks of classification and certified by an RMIT academic delegate. |
| Passed subject to minor amendments (R2): | The candidate should be awarded the degree subject to minor amendments. Recommended amendments may include re-writing of small sections of text. Amendments are to be made within six weeks of classification and certified by an RMIT academic delegate. |
| Passed subject to major amendments (R3): | The candidate should be awarded the degree subject to major amendments. Recommended amendments may involve substantial re-writing of parts of the thesis. Amendments are to be made within six months of classification and certified by an RMIT academic delegate. |
| Revise and resubmit (R4): | The candidate should <u>not yet</u> be awarded the degree. Substantial revisions and a re-examination (by an approved external examiner) are required before a pass can be considered. Resubmission for re-examination to take place within 12 months of initial classification. |
| Failed (R5): | The research does not meet the criteria for the degree as specified by the University and a significant amount of additional research work and/or major substantive revision will not raise it to an acceptable standard. |

Section 5. Integrity of the examination process

During the examination process, there should not be any direct contact between an examiner and the candidate or supervisors. Only the Associate Deputy Vice-Chancellor Research Training & Development (ADVC, RT&D) (or nominee) may communicate with an examiner on matters of assessment, and the candidate’s submission should be treated as a confidential document.

Where an oral presentation or exhibition forms part of the examination, examiners may meet each other and the candidate. This is to enable examiners to experience the examinable work in an appropriate format. No assessment of the work, or opinion about the work’s assessment, may be expressed or discussed in this context.

All examiners are required to submit independent reports and should not consult other examiners in making their assessment other than in exceptional circumstances, either following the approval of, or at the request of, the ADVC, RT&D.

For examinations conducted by written review only, examiners’ names will only be revealed to the candidate after the examination has concluded, if the examiner has given their approval.

Section 6. Classification of submission

The examiners shall individually and independently assess the submission, prepare a brief assessment report for the guidance of the candidate and make a recommendation to the ADVC, RT&D. The ADVC, RT&D will use the Examination classification schedule to determine the examination outcome, based on the collective examiners' recommendations.

If the submission receives a final classification of *C4 Revise and Resubmit* (see section 4) all examiners of the work are asked if they are prepared to re-examine the revised submission when it has been revised, within 12 months of the initial examination. The only recommendations available for re-examination are *Passed* or *Failed*. Examiners are asked to indicate their preparedness to re-examine a revised version of the submission in the attached *Examiner's report form - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)*.

Section 7. Process

In order to be awarded the degree, any amendments or revisions made by the candidate must be approved by the Senior/Joint senior supervisor/s and Dean/Head of School or their delegate.