



MACQUARIE
University

Quick Guide

Candidates who have been identified as making unsatisfactory progress

Unsatisfactory progress identified by Supervisor

If your supervisor/supervisory panel have identified that you are not making satisfactory progress, he/she/they should initially speak with you about their concerns and provide you with the opportunity to address or mitigate any issues.

At this stage a Candidate Action Plan may be agreed upon and implemented.

If the supervisor continues to have concerns about your progress, he or she may recommend to the Associate Dean (HDR) in your faculty that your candidature be formally reviewed.

You may decide to submit to the review process or discontinue your candidature at this point.

Formal Review

The task of the Formal Review panel is to determine if a referred candidate has a viable research program, has made satisfactory progress relative to stage of candidature against that viable plan and is able to complete degree requirements within the period allowed. One outcome of a Formal Review is a recommendation that candidature is terminated. Another outcome may be the implementation of a Candidate Action Plan, as above.

The Formal Review Panel's Terms of Reference is provided in this toolkit.

You will be provided with the opportunity to respond in writing and in person to the identified issues being considered by the Formal Review Panel. It is recommended that you provide any relevant evidence or supporting documentation to support your submission/s.

Appeal against a decision to terminate candidature

To lodge an appeal against a decision to terminate, you must identify where the Faculty has incorrectly followed its own policy or procedure or be able to demonstrate that procedural fairness was not properly afforded to you.

It is important to note that an appeal is not a new consideration of whether your candidature should be terminated or not. Rather, an appeal considers and evaluates the process involved in reaching the decision.

Grounds for an appeal* are limited to situations where:

- The candidate was not given a reasonable opportunity, appropriate to the circumstances, to present his or her case or provide an explanation, before the decision was made.
- The decision maker in making the decision was biased or there was a reasonable apprehension of bias, against the person affected.
- The decision maker in making the decision, took an irrelevant consideration into account.
- The decision maker in making the decision, failed to take a relevant consideration into account.
- The decision maker in making the decision, acted dishonestly or for an improper purpose.
- There was no evidence to justify the decision made by the decision maker.
- The decision was so illogical or unreasonable that it could not have been rationally made.
- The decision was made in accordance with a guideline or direction from the University of general application without regard to the merits of the particular case.
- The decision maker made the decision in the particular case in accordance with the wishes of another person.
- The required procedure for making the decision (the formal review process, as above) was not followed.

**Note: grounds will be reviewed and updated by the University's Academic Senate in April 2016.

Support

Throughout the entirety of this process, candidates can seek support and advice from the Student Advocacy and Support Service and the Counselling Service at Campus Wellbeing and Support Services.