

GUIDELINES FOR SUPERVISORS AND RESEARCH CANDIDATES MELBOURNE LAW SCHOOL

INTRODUCTION

The supervisor-candidate relationship can be one of the most rewarding aspects of academic life for both supervisor and candidate. There is no single right way to supervise or to complete a PhD and the supervision relationship will usually change over time as the needs of the candidate change. There are, however, some hallmarks of most successful supervision relationships including: good communication; agreed standards; professionalism; consideration of the needs of the other party; and ethical behaviour.

The University has rules for supervision and PhD candidature, These rules prevail over any of the comments made here. In particular, see the PhD handbook (<http://www.gradresearch.unimelb.edu.au/current/phdhub/> - the current guidelines for students and supervisors are extracted below) and the Melbourne School of Graduate Research webpage (<http://www.gradresearch.unimelb.edu.au/>)

The aim of the guidelines below is to assist supervisors and candidates in the Law School to develop a sense of what is required of each and to identify some common areas where problems have arisen in the past in the Law School. It was developed in consultation with RHD candidates, supervisors, staff of the Law Research Office and the School of Graduate Research, and the Law Research Committee.

The guidelines should be read in the context of Melbourne Law School's commitment to ensuring that research candidates have a role as an important part of the life of the Law School and are welcomed as members of the Law School community. Research candidates have:

- A two year programme of structured classes that support student research (the Research Support Programme).
- Membership of the Post-graduate Law Students Association, which provides student representation and activities for members.
- Opportunities for international experiences including at ATLAS, a coalition of elite research universities from around the world that provide an annual Agora at which students can hear from top international researchers and present their own work to an international audience.
- Research support funding to assist students who are presenting at national or international conferences or undertaking field work.
- Dedicated desk space, computer facilities and all hours access to the building to full time research students.
- The chance to participate in the weekly Monday seminar series and collegial conversations in which academics present and discuss their work.
- Twice yearly colloquia at which research students present their work to their peers and academics.
- A dedicated Research Office to assist with queries about candidature, ethics, scholarships etc.

GUIDELINES FOR SUPERVISORS

Before Taking on a Student

The Process

- If a student approaches you directly, make sure that they are aware that you do not have the final decision making power as to whether they will be accepted into the programme; that decision lies with Melbourne School of Graduate Research and can only be made with a complete application, including certified transcripts etc.
- Before agreeing to have your name put down as a supervisor, please make sure that you have enough information about the applicant. Do not rush in to the decision on the basis of a brief cv and a paragraph or two of proposal. It is usually sensible to ask the applicant to fill in an Expression of Interest [<http://research.law.unimelb.edu.au/go/graduate-research-program/prospective-students/expression-of-interest/index.cfm>] at this point because this will give you considerable information and the student will have to complete it at some point anyway.
- Before an applicant is approved by the Law School (though note that MSGR approval will still be needed) s/he must complete an Expression of Interest and be interviewed (in person for Victorian candidates or via phone for those outside Victoria) by the proposed supervisors and the Associate Dean (Research).
- If you are unsure about any aspect of the application or enrolment, please contact the Law School Office for Research. It is very important that you do not make any commitments to applicants or give them information about rules or processes that turn out to be incorrect.

Questions to Consider Before Accepting a New Student

- When you are asked to supervise use the information in the Expression of Interest and from the interview to consider:
 - How many students do you have at present and how many of them are likely to complete before the applicant would start? Most academics should try to have 2-4 students at any one time. Only in exceptional cases should they have more than 6.
 - Given your other responsibilities, do you have sufficient time to dedicate at least an hour a week (and possibly up to two hours a week) to this applicant?
 - Do you have sufficient expertise and interest in the proposed topic to supervise it well? (Note that expertise may be shared between different members of a supervisory team).
 - Does the research proposal indicate that the applicant has done some serious research into this area already, is enthusiastic about the subject and has good ideas for a thesis topic? (It may still need some refining or polishing).

- Does the proposal indicate that the applicant has the necessary scholarly, linguistic and other skills necessary to commence a PhD/MPhil (recognising that some limited support with developing such skills will be available over the candidature)?
 - Would it be more appropriate to suggest to a PhD applicant that they commence as an MPhil student and transfer to a PhD if they demonstrate the necessary commitment and skills?
 - Does the student have the time to undertake study properly? (This will be particularly important for part-time students).
 - Do the student and the supervisors share a similar understanding of the commitment that each of you is taking on with this supervision? (This might entail a fairly explicit discussion in the interview of how often and for how long you would normally expect to meet with a candidate). Remember that an applicant's understanding of the relationship between a supervisor and candidate may be shaped by their cultural or personal background.
 - Does the applicant appear responsive to suggestions or recommendations? Is s/he the type of person that you could feel comfortable working with for several years?
- Remember that taking on a research student is a serious and substantial commitment that extends over several years. It is important that we take on new candidates and encourage applications from talented students. But it is also important that we do not rush into decisions or take on a candidate without properly considering the candidate's capabilities and our own capacity to supervise.

During Candidature

Time commitment - meetings

- Taking on the role of supervisor to a research candidate is an important commitment. It is the supervisor's responsibility to ensure that sufficient time is put aside to give the candidate the support that is needed. The principal supervisor has responsibility for ensuring that regular meetings are held with the candidate, even if it is agreed that some meetings will not involve all members of the supervisory group. If responsibility for organising meeting times is delegated to a co-supervisor or the candidate, that needs to be made explicit and the principal supervisor should still monitor to ensure meetings occur.
- Candidates tend to need more intensive supervision and regular meetings at the start of candidature and before confirmation and completion. However, supervisors would be expected to have a substantial and formal meeting with a candidate (ie an hour or more) *at least* once a month and to spend an appropriate period of time preparing for this meeting, particularly through reading materials. This would average out to a minimum an hour a week (many supervisors find that it takes closer to 2 hours a week) with more time given at critical points in the candidature. It is very difficult for a supervisor to keep track of a candidate's progress or to monitor for problems that might lead the candidate not to complete unless there are regular meetings. Supervisors will also need to be available for confirmation, completion and work in

progress presentations, confirmation meetings and assist with time intensive tasks such as ethics applications.

- However, both supervisors and candidates are entitled to four weeks leave a year. Candidates should be given notice of times when one or both of their supervisors will be away (for leave or university business) and arrangements made about how work will proceed during this time. This may involve the other supervisor(s) taking on a larger role or may mean that there are simply periods where candidates have to work independently.
- If a candidate fails to attend a meeting without giving notice or continually delays meetings, the supervisor should follow this up with the candidate and explain the importance of regular meetings. If the candidate continues not to attend meetings or to complete promised work, the matter should be raised with the Associate Dean (Research).
- Supervisors should not cancel meetings or change their timing at the last minute without good reason. They should always give as much notice to candidates as possible if changes are needed and set up a suitable alternative time.

Establishing Supervisory Practices

- Early in candidature, the principal supervisor should initiate a discussion with all supervisors and the candidate in order to reach agreement on the way in which supervision will be handled (if this was not agreed to before admission). The principal supervisor should not expect candidates to organise this meeting or to have the confidence or understanding to be able to initiate a discussion on these issues. This discussion should include issues such as:
 - The role of co-supervisors – will all the supervisors attend all meetings? Will they all read all the material? How will disagreements between them be resolved?
 - The regularity of formal meetings.
 - How those meetings will be arranged – at the end of the previous meeting? By the candidate initiating or the supervisor? By agreement at the start of the year?
 - The willingness of each of the supervisors to have less formal meetings (students ‘popping in’ when there is a problem).
 - The sort of preparation by both supervisor and candidate required for meetings.
 - The expectation of how far in advance of the meeting any written material should be submitted.
 - Expectation that the candidate participate in the Research Support programme and other law school events. Discussion of what other skills development programmes at MLS or the University would be useful.
 - A timetable for the first several months of candidature (which would usually include developing a timetable for the whole of candidature).

- Are supervisors prepared to read material written by the candidate other than the thesis (for example, publications arising from it)? Does the supervisor expect to be told about such publications or of other commitments, such as work, that the candidate takes on?

Relationships

- Supervisors should make clear to the candidate that they can raise problems or concerns regarding the thesis with them at any time, including concerns about the supervisory relationship. If issues cannot be resolved between the supervisors and the candidate, any one of them can contact the Associate Dean (Research) for assistance.
- Supervisors should be familiar with the University and Law School timetable and rules for candidature. They should be aware of the major hurdles (confirmation, review by circulation, completion etc) and what is required for them. Advice on these matters can be sought from the Research Office.
- When supervisors also employ their candidates (eg as research assistants, teaching assistants, translators etc) it is very important to draw a clear line between the different relationships. Formal supervisions should only be used to discuss the thesis and not blur into discussions about other aspects of the relationship. Supervisors should be aware of not pressuring students to take on more work than is compatible with good progress on the thesis. Supervisors and candidates who work jointly on research need to comply with the university requirements regarding co-authorship and should make sure that it is clearly understood in advance who will be accredited as an author on particular works. Candidates who are also employed by supervisors find it very difficult to police these boundaries themselves and it is the supervisor's responsibility to put processes in place to ensure that the employment relationship does not improperly interfere with the supervisory relationship.
- Supervisors are expected to provide a supportive environment for candidates and to be able to refer them on to services such as counselling, language support, accommodation or employment services etc (or at least to the Office for Research where further assistance on these matters can be found). Supervisors are not expected to provide these services themselves.
- If the supervisors of a candidate form the view that there are serious problems with the candidate's progress, these should be discussed with the candidate in an open and frank manner and decisions reached about how these problems will be resolved. A written record of the nature of the problem and the solution agreed to should be kept by the supervisors. If the problem persists or the supervisors form the view that the candidate is unlikely to be able to complete the thesis, the supervisors should inform the Associate Dean (Research).

Reading and Commenting on Written Work

- Supervisors should undertake to read carefully and comment on written work provided by the candidate in compliance with agreed timetables. There should usually be an understanding shared between supervisors and candidates about the time that it will take for the work to be read. It would be very unusual for a supervisor to take more than one month to read and comment on a single chapter (approx 10,000 words) or more than eight weeks to comment on a full draft thesis *if the candidate has presented work on the timetable agreed*. If

special circumstances prevent the supervisor from being able to comment in the time agreed, the supervisor should inform the candidate as soon as it becomes clear that the timetable will not be met and set out a revised time for return of comments.

- Comments may be conveyed to the candidate in a variety of ways (by email, in writing, notes on the draft, orally etc) but the supervisor has responsibility for ensuring that the comments are clear and constructive. Supervisors should agree between themselves and the candidate whether both supervisors will comment on all parts of the thesis and all drafts.
- In making comments, supervisors should:
 - Be as clear and precise as possible.
 - Give candidates an honest assessment of the quality of their work and their overall progress.
 - Give guidance as to how to improve the work (not simply criticism)
 - Give feedback about the good qualities of the work and try to ensure that the feedback is given in a way that is respectful of the feelings of the candidate.

Keeping Records/Monitoring Progress

- Supervisors should keep a written record of all formal supervisions. This need not be detailed but should briefly state when the meeting took place, who was present, what was discussed and agreed, and future action. This a way of monitoring progress and in case disputes arise about the supervision relationship in the future.
- One way of ensuring that a candidate has understood feedback and of keeping good records is to ask candidates to write a brief email/memo after each formal supervision (where relevant, copied to all supervisors and not just the ones who were present) outlining the issues above.
- It is important that, from reasonably early on, there is an agreed timetable up to the point of submission that sets out when each major step is to be accomplished. This will need to be reviewed and updated on a regular basis.

GUIDELINES FOR CANDIDATES

Defining and Refining the Topic

- Candidates should work with their supervisors in the early months of candidature to refine their thesis topic and to develop appropriate methodologies/approaches, timelines and research plans.
- While the supervisor can assist candidates in refining or focussing a thesis topic, it is primarily the responsibility of the candidate to put forward and develop a thesis topic. Generally a law supervisor will not provide a topic for you. It does happen though eg when the candidate has a scholarship as part of a grant held by the supervisor.

Researching and Writing the Thesis

- Candidates have primary responsibility for undertaking the research thesis. Supervisors may recommend reading and Law Library staff are happy to assist with additional training in research methods, but the final responsibility for ensuring that the research is sufficiently comprehensive lies with the candidate.
- Candidates also take primary responsibility for the writing of the thesis. Supervisors should comment on the quality of the thesis and assistance with writing and English language skills is available from the Language and Learning Support Unit, but the work that is produced should be the candidate's own and they should not expect it to be re-written for them by supervisors or anyone else.

Meetings

- Candidates should produce work to the timetable as agreed with supervisors. If it becomes clear that deadlines will not be able to be met for good reason (such as ill health or because it becomes clear that the task undertaken is more substantial than originally thought) then the candidate should give the supervisor as much notice as possible of this and negotiate a new deadline.
- Candidates should attend meetings as agreed with the supervisor. While it may occasionally be necessary to change a meeting time, the supervisor should be given as much notice of this as possible. Candidates should never simply fail to turn up to a meeting or cancel a meeting at the last minute for anything but serious reasons.
- Some candidates find it useful to prepare 'agendas' for their meetings with supervisors to give supervisors advanced notice of particular issues that they would like to focus on and to help them to remember key points (eg to get a form signed off, to discuss a particularly difficult issue etc). Candidates might wish to discuss with their supervisors whether this is appropriate.

Feedback

- Supervisors' comments on work should be taken seriously. If the candidate does not understand those comments, it is the responsibility of the candidate to ask for clarification. At times the candidate may disagree with the comments. It is better in those circumstances to discuss this disagreement with the supervisors rather than to simply ignore the comments or to comply with them even though the candidate does not agree. The final decisions as to what is included in the thesis belongs to the candidate, but the supervisor will also need to be satisfied as to the quality of the thesis if s/he is to sign off on it prior to submission.
- Reading a chapter of 8,000-10,000 words takes most supervisors about half a day. Reading the full draft of a thesis takes several days to a week. When developing timelines, candidates should be aware that supervisors need to be given sufficient time to read and comment on work. Supervisors will generally have many different responsibilities and have to organise reading around these responsibilities. If work is handed in after an agreed deadline, candidates should be aware that this may significantly extend the time that it takes a supervisor to read it (for example, if that supervisor has put aside the morning after the work was due to read it, but does not have any further time that week).

- Candidates should also be realistic about their timetables for completion. It may well take a month to eight weeks for supervisors to turn around a full draft of a thesis. The timetable for completion should be discussed well in advance with supervisors and supervisors need to be consulted about how long they will need to read and comment on work. It should not be assumed that full drafts can be turned around in the space of a week or two.
- It is reasonable to expect a supervisor to look at a draft of every chapter and to read the whole thesis. Many supervisors will read a second draft of a chapter, but candidates should not expect supervisors to read and re-read the same chapter many times. If particular parts of a chapter have changed or need particular attention, it might be appropriate to draw these to the supervisors' attention.
- Candidates should generally make sure that work is of a professional and competent standard before asking supervisors to look at it. There may be some circumstances in which supervisors are prepared to (or even wish to) look at notes or rough drafts, but they are not obliged to do so. Similarly, drafts need not be perfect but should be proof read so as not to distract supervisors with avoidable errors. However, the fact that a piece of work is not in a polished state is not a reason for avoiding a meeting. Regular meetings are important even if it is only to discuss progress.

Rules and Process

- The supervisor and Research office will provide guidance in complying with the rules but it is up to you to be fully aware of how the details of the rules (in particular, the PhD or MPhil handbooks and the Law School specific requirements) apply to your situation and to comply with them. Advice is available from the Law School Research Office and the Melbourne School of Graduate Research, but it is ill advised to wait until the last moment or after deadlines have expired to let these offices know that you have a problem or may need extensions; this will sometimes make it impossible to deal flexibly with your requests.
- Candidates have responsibility for carrying out their research ethically and in compliance with the University *Code of Conduct for Research*. Any research involving human or animal subjects is likely to need approval from the Ethics Committee and this process can take considerable time to complete. It is a shared responsibility of the supervisor and candidate to ensure that ethics approval is obtained and that the ethical obligations are complied with.
- If problems emerge with supervisors it is generally appropriate to make every effort to resolve those problems at first instance with the supervisor. When this proves impossible or is inappropriate (for example, where there is a matter of serious misbehaviour) candidates should contact the Associate Dean (Research). The Associate Dean (Research) will counsel the candidate on the range of options available, which may include informal discussion with the current supervisors, changing supervisors and/or instituting grievance procedures. Advice and support is also available from the Post-graduate Law Students' Association and the University of Melbourne Post-graduate Association.

Taken from the Melbourne PhD Handbook at 27 April 2009

Please note that these may be updated from time to time and supervisors and candidates should both take responsibility for keeping up to date with any new requirements.

B. Principles for PhD supervision

These principles should be read in the context of [Section A. Responsibilities of academic departments to PhD students](#). As previously stated, they are intended as a guide to overcoming problems which are known to impede progress.

1. Except in rare circumstances, staff new to postgraduate supervision may not be principal supervisors.
2. All supervisors of research higher degrees students are required to undertake an approved supervisor training course or refresher course at least every 5 years.
3. Supervisors are expected to provide continuing guidance to PhD candidates on the research being undertaken and on meeting time-lines.
4. Supervision of research students is not only a complex teaching task, it should be regarded as a shared enterprise in which both supervisor and student have an intellectual investment. Proposed research projects should therefore be of mutual interest. Prospective supervisors should have a sufficient range of theoretical and methodical expertise to offer the student proper supervision. There should be adequate time to supervise when other academic commitments are taken into account.
5. The supervisor needs to be well acquainted with the candidate's academic background so that if the proposed project needs additional skills and knowledge, the candidate can be informed how these might be acquired. Supervisors should ensure that they and the candidates under their supervision are familiar with the 'Attributes of Melbourne Doctoral Graduates' and that they support candidates in further skill development as they proceed through their candidature.
6. The supervisor should alert the commencing candidate to commonly encountered tasks, processes and standards expected of doctoral programmes in the particular field. This is a useful framework for helping the student to develop and refine a topic which can be researched and written up within the required time-frame.
7. Once the topic is refined to the satisfaction of the student and the supervisor, the supervisor should assist the student to formulate a framework for the research and time estimates for the completion of various phases. Having such a framework, which may be modified as the research proceeds, gives a sense of focus, helps student and supervisor to check progress, and is often a useful early orientation to writing the thesis. The framework should be used to guide the student, but should not constrict the development of the research.
8. From the outset of candidature, supervisors and students should ensure that they confer at what are agreed by them to be appropriate and regular intervals. This is particularly vital in the first year and for part-time students. Such agreements may be re-negotiated from time to time as the candidature

proceeds. Meetings may be minor and frequent and/or more formal and less frequent. In this context, it is helpful for the supervisor to make explicit the purpose of the meeting. It is a useful practice to keep a diary of supervisions with dates and details of discussions. In addition to informal meetings, it is important that major reviews take place at least six monthly in order that the student's achieved work can be assessed within the overall shape of the study and the time-frame for completion. Both supervisor and student should then be in a position to be able to report when required on progress and to judge when some intervention may be desirable.

9. Early in the student's candidature, the supervisor must make an assessment of a student's written work. If the supervisor considers that further work is required in areas such as composition and grammar for the student to be successful in completing the PhD, the supervisor should then provide advice and assistance as to how an appropriate standard can be achieved. Such advice may include referral to units such as the Learning Skills Unit and the Academic Support Team at the School of Graduate Research. The supervisor should continue to monitor the student's progress in order to resolve any on-going difficulties.
10. The supervisor is expected to read any written work thoroughly, in advance of meetings, and to provide regular feedback on the student's work, although a supervisor should not be obliged to read an excessive number of drafts of the same section or chapter. It is vital that criticism is given in a constructive, supportive and sensitive fashion. The supervisor needs to recognise that doing a research degree is an emotional as well as an intellectual commitment; students will be discouraged by continual harsh criticism. Supervision sessions should be structured so that it is relatively easy to exchange ideas.
11. The supervisor has a responsibility to ensure that both full-time and part-time candidates are included in the academic life of the department. Candidates should be required to present work-in-progress papers to their peers and academic staff. Candidates should be strongly encouraged to take part in departmental and/or inter-departmental seminars, conferences, informal functions and the like. Reports from conferences etc., should be conveyed to departments and research students. Postgraduates should be encouraged to publish their work, jointly with supervisors when appropriate. A supportive environment and a sense of collegiality are important influences, particularly for women, in timely completion of research projects.
12. At the beginning of the candidature the supervisor has the responsibility for initiating discussions with a view to making mutually satisfactory arrangements regarding intellectual property, including patents and authorship of any publications arising from the candidate's work. The head of department should be notified that these discussions have taken place. Arrangements that are made should reflect codes of practice with respect to authorship in the discipline and accord with the University *Code of Conduct for Research*. Arrangements should also reflect the responsibility of the supervisor in fostering the student's career. Any restrictions on publication rights due to confidentiality or other intellectual property protection requirements need to be clearly outlined at the outset, and reviewed during the project as appropriate. This particularly involves restrictions arising from the registration of patents. Advice should be sought from the Research Innovation and Development Group, Melbourne Research and Innovation Office <http://www.research.unimelb.edu.au/ridg/>. The Guidelines Relating to Student

Intellectual Property, approved by Academic Board, make it clear that a *limited* embargo on publication may be acceptable, and then only so as to allow consideration of commercial potential and/or the pursuit of statutory protection such as a patent. (*Guidelines* - see [http://www.research.unimelb.edu.au/ridg/ip/.](http://www.research.unimelb.edu.au/ridg/ip/))

13. Supervisors should ensure that they and the candidates under their supervision are familiar with the University's *Code of Conduct for Research* (reprinted below as Section E of the Guidelines).
14. It is important not to lose sight of the personal dimension of the supervisory relationship. A candidate's progress may be impeded by personal crises to which the supervisor should be responsive. The supervisor should know where help might be sought within the University and what to do if there is a need to suspend candidature or negotiate an extension.
15. There are some instances when the supervisory relationship breaks down. In such cases, the supervisor should see to it through the head of department, or the RHD Committee if necessary, that other arrangements are made to the satisfaction of the student.
16. In view of the fact that women postgraduates sometimes encounter particular problems in relation to the research environment and the supervisory relationship, supervisors should actively support the University's policies and strategies on affirmative action and avoidance of sexual harassment.

C. Responsibilities of candidates

PhD candidature may be considered as a threeway interaction between the academic department, supervisor(s) and student. While departments and supervisors are expected to provide many forms of support and guidance, the ultimate responsibility for managing the project and obtaining the degree rests with the candidate.

1. All candidates should observe the University's rules, regulations and requirements (both specifically relating to the degree and other requirements), and consult the PhD handbook for guidance especially when making applications for variations of candidature.
2. Through the orientation session held by their department or by consulting with their supervisors, commencing candidates should become quickly familiar with:
 - a. the nature and limitations of PhD research in their field;
 - b. the facilities (including support for field work if necessary) available for postgraduates in their department and the University;
 - c. the dimensions of the project, the time frame for completion, and the normal stages encountered along the way;
 - d. the qualities and skills the University expects its doctoral graduates to have, as outlined in the 'Attributes of Melbourne Doctoral Graduates', and with the assistance of their supervisor, prepare a plan for further skill acquisition as they proceed through their candidature.

3. From the outset of candidature, students should ensure that they confer with their supervisors at what are agreed mutually to be appropriate and regular intervals. Candidates should keep supervisors informed of their research activities, progress and problems.
4. Around 9 months full-time (21 months part-time) after admission to probationary candidature, the candidate should submit an application for confirmed candidature and a report on the research (based on a format set out in an application form sent out by the School of Graduate Research) so that confirmation may be finalised by the end of the probationary period. Individual departments may have additional requirements.
5. If a Department recommends against granting confirmed candidature or recommends that candidature should be terminated on the grounds of unsatisfactory progress, the candidate may make a submission to the RHD Committee, and may subsequently appeal to the Academic Board against any decision of the Committee.
6. After proceeding to confirmed candidature, candidates should present to their supervisor at least one significant piece of written work (in the form of a report, draft chapter or work-in-progress paper) annually. Student and supervisor should also undertake a major review of work completed at least six-monthly so it can be assessed within the overall shape of the study and the time-frame for completion.
7. If a candidate is unable to resolve serious problems with the supervisor(s), he or she should first ask the head of department to help. If the head of department is unable to resolve the problem, the Secretary of the RHD Committee should then be approached. It is important that these steps be taken without delay so that progress is not unduly impeded. In cases where the supervisor and the head of the department are one and the same person, the Secretary of the RHD Committee should be approached directly. Help is also available from the University of Melbourne Postgraduate Association and the University Counselling Service.
8. A PhD program at the University of Melbourne is a demanding undertaking requiring performance to the full extent of the candidate's ability. It is therefore expected to be a full-time commitment unless enrolment is part-time. Part-time students should ensure that they continue to have sufficient time available each week as agreed with their departments, to work on their projects. In some instances, the candidate, in consultation with their supervisor and head of department might determine that additional coursework subjects will assist in their PhD research program. Application should be made on the [Application for Adding and Deleting Additional Subjects](#) form in these cases. Professional development is considered an integral part of the PhD training program, and might include tutoring or demonstrating. The University of Melbourne does not stipulate the maximum hours to be worked, but recommends as a guide, that more than 6 hours per week across the year, during normal working hours would be undesirable. Where sessional teaching is undertaken, it should be understood that the initial tutorial will include two hours of preparation and marking. Repeat tutorials involve one additional hour. No other commitments should impact on the time commitment to the PhD program. It is the responsibility of the supervisor, head of department and student to ensure that paid work will not jeopardise the completion of the course of study in the time allowed.

9. While it is recognised that teaching experience may be beneficial if candidates wish to pursue an academic career, they should not be required to undertake demonstrating or tutoring if this will hold back their PhD studies.
10. Candidates have a responsibility (shared with the University) to ensure that they re-enrol each year. It is important to notify the School of Graduate Studies of any change of address so that enrolment papers are received.
11. Candidates should apply to the RHD Committee through their departments in good time before any planned leave of absence, period of study away, change of status, change of title, change of supervisor. Candidates should notify the School of Graduate Research when they return from leave of absence or leave to study away from the University.
12. In preparing the thesis, candidates should bear in mind the following:
 - a. they are expected to be familiar with the literature in the particular field and assess it critically;
 - b. they should formulate a clear hypothesis or overall question, and should support their conclusions with adequate data or evidence and analysis;
 - c. the evidence presented should be relevant to the main hypothesis being investigated;
 - d. candidates should pay particular attention to the final presentation of the thesis. Not only should the final version be carefully checked for errors, but it should be clearly structured and easy to follow, and should form an integrated whole (examiners can ask for theses to be revised if presentation is below the required standard). A high standard of written English should be attained. Candidates should refer to the specifications in the chapter "PhD Thesis".
13. In writing up their research, candidates must avoid the following:
 - a. the fabrication of data - claiming results where none have been obtained;
 - b. the falsification of data - altering results to confirm the hypothesis;
 - c. plagiarism, including the direct copying of textual material, the use of data or ideas from other people without adequate attribution;
 - d. attribution to others who have not in fact contributed to the research. Candidates should observe the University's Code of Conduct for Research (see [Section E](#) below).
14. At the outset of their candidature, candidates should clarify with their supervisors University & departmental practice regarding intellectual property, including patents and authorship of any publications arising from their work. They should be informed by the supervisor in writing of any limitations on publication or communication of their work consequent upon commercial agreements at the outset of the candidature or as soon as such commercial agreements have been reached. In such cases a written agreement should be concluded over the signatures of the candidate, principal supervisor(s) and Head of the unit(s) and department(s) concerned.

15. Candidates collecting data from human subjects (including surveys) should ensure that approval from the relevant ethics committee is obtained. Candidates undertaking any experiment involving animals should also ensure that ethics approval and a licence is obtained. Applications for ethics approval and licences should be made before data collection commences.
16. Candidates should be aware that the University provides insurance coverage for post-graduate students. The University of Melbourne has in force Personal Accident insurance coverage for postgraduate students for up to \$100K. The Personal Accident Insurance provides students with various levels of benefits under the policy, including Accidental Death, Permanent Disability and non recoverable medical expenses incurred through accident whilst engaged in activities relating to studies or research including field trips. However, in some cases, especially travel, this cover may not be sufficient and it is therefore advisable that students arrange separate travel insurance.