

TABLE OF CHANGES: STATUTE AND POLICIES

Summary

This table identifies clauses that contain requirements and obligations which are different from, additional to, or less than the requirements contained in the existing documents.

It does **not**:

- Identify every rephrasing or language change (all documents are rewritten, so this is almost all clauses)
- Identify every instance of removal of intra-clause referencing, which has been done throughout
- Identify structural / ordering changes to content, as the new structure is so different from the existing one that this would involve all clauses
- Identify changes in text that has been removed from these documents but will be transferred elsewhere (changes will be noted in the new location)

Contents

Summary	1
Statute.....	2
Subtractions	2
Additions.....	3
Changes.....	4
Doctorates Policy	6
Supervision Policy	11

Statute

Subtractions

Change #	Existing clauses (numbers only)	Reason (simplification, improved hierarchy of content)
1	2-5	Taken to Doctorates Policy
2	7-12 (Duration)	Replaced with one clause directing to Doctorates Policy where this is now contained (clause 5)
3	13-14 (Admission)	Replaced with one clause directing out: “To be admitted to the PhD programme, applicants must satisfy the University’s Admission regulations and the criteria established in the Doctorates Policy and Doctoral Admissions Procedure.”
4	19-20	Moved to Doctorates Policy
5	22-24 (Supervision)	Moved to Supervision Policy / absorbed within new text
6	27-33, 35 (Enrolment)	Mostly moved to Doctoral Enrolments Procedure
7	36-40 (Fees)	Moved to Doctorates Policy
8	41-45, 47 (Examinations)	Replaced with: “The outcomes of the research are subject to examination in accordance with the Doctorates Policy and its Procedures as amended from time to time.” (Clause 46 retained in Statute)
9	54-57 (Appeals)	Replaced with: “Candidates and former candidates may appeal a range of decisions made with respect to their enrolment, supervision, candidature and examination under the relevant provisions of the Doctorates Policy.” Other content will be picked up in Disputes and Appeals Procedure

Additions

Change #	New clause	Reason
10	2. A candidate for a Higher Doctorate must submit a substantial and significant corpus of published original work that has, over an extensive period of time, given them authoritative standing and international eminence in their respective field.	To incorporate Higher Doctorates in scope. Enables development of a single overarching Doctorates Statute
11	3. A candidate for a Named Doctorate must undertake all the required elements of their programme as specified in the applicable programme Regulations.	To incorporate Named Doctorates in scope. Enables development of a single overarching Doctorates Statute
12	7. Nothing in this Statute: a. gives any person any right to be admitted to any programme; or b. require the University to admit, or offer to admit, any person.	Added as necessary provision. Removes expectation of an appeal in relation to an admission decision. Leaving the door open to appeals would create an impossible administrative burden.

Changes

Change #	Existing Clause/s	New Clause/s	Change / justification
13	Authorities refer to the Vice-Chancellor (or delegate)	In practice, all decisions are made by the Vice-Chancellor's delegate. For clarity and transparency, the Vice-Chancellor's delegate is listed inline.	Improve document clarity, readability, and user friendliness
14	1. A candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is required to undertake an original and coherent research project and to present the outcome of that research project for examination as a thesis.	1. A candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is required to undertake an original and coherent programme of research and to present the outcomes of that research for examination.	Recognises that doctoral research may comprise more than one 'project'; retains need for coherency. Remains consistent with NZQA Framework 10. The definition of 'thesis' shifts to the Doctorates Policy.
15	6. In order for the PhD degree to be awarded...	4. In order for a PhD or Named Doctorate degree to be awarded...	Statute simplification: Added Named Doctorates, removed intra clause referencing, changed thesis to programme of research, moved to subclausing instead of "and" descriptors.
16	49. (Termination conditions)	Added 4 extra subclauses / reasons: c. failure to re-enrol (in accordance with the Doctorates Policy; d. failure to comply with the general requirements of candidature; e. failure to satisfy any specific conditions	These provide a stronger basis for action

Change #	Existing Clause/s	New Clause/s	Change / justification
		imposed on the candidature;	
17	63. This Statute may itself be reviewed and amended from time-to-time.	29. This Statute may itself be reviewed and amended from time-to-time and may be repealed and replaced with a new Statute.	Inserted to provide for future Statute movement
18	65. For candidates initially enrolled under a previous statute, the Vice-Chancellor (or delegate) may agree to vary the application of the provisions of this Statute to ensure consistency with the provisions of the statute under which the candidate was enrolled, where it is satisfied that the candidate would otherwise be at a disadvantage.	30. The PVC GGR may vary the application of the provisions of this Statute, or any associated policies and procedures, to ensure that candidates initially enrolled under a previous statute will not experience an unjustified disadvantage in terms of their candidature, enrolment or the examination process or thesis expectations due to a requirement of this Statute or its associated policies and procedures. The process for making a submission to the PVC GGR and any appeals process will be outlined in the Doctoral Complaints and Appeals Procedure.	This proposed change: - Replaces consistency test with unjustified disadvantage test (borrowed from NZ employment law phrasing) - Adds ability here at Statute level to vary P&Ps as well

Doctorates Policy

*As this is a new document, no clause-by-clause analysis is possible regarding additions and subtractions. This table therefore identifies only requirements / directions that have been changed.

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language	Reason for change / justification
19	Creative works are treated as a separate / distinct thing	Creative practice integrated into every section, with appropriate nuancing of clauses	Better integration overall, less othering of creative practice, noting that creative practice can include a broad range of practice beyond fine arts, music, dance etc. This is consistent with NZQA Level 10
20	Authorities refer to the Vice-Chancellor (or delegate)	The decision-maker in practice is listed inline.	Improve clarity, document readability, and user friendliness
21	Detailed descriptions of how exceptional circumstances admissions are assessed	Clause 3. In exceptional circumstances, a person may be admitted to the PhD programme despite not meeting all the requirements of the Procedure. a) Research capacity must still be demonstrated, and will be assessed by the PVC Graduate Research in accordance with relevant Practice Notes.	The current framing is complicated and restrictive. New approach gives greater discretion with access to Practice Notes for guidance, which would be developed by subject matter experts.
22	No statement on student responsibility	Added Clause 6: All doctoral candidates must comply with all relevant regulations, policy and procedures throughout their enrolment.	Reminds students of responsibilities early
23	Requirement to re-enrol previously had no timeframe attached	Candidates who are required to revise and resubmit their thesis for examination	Provides clarity on process timeline. Will reduce hanging decisions by providing an

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language	Reason for change / justification
		are required to re-enrol within 2 calendar months and be enrolled for the duration of the period of revision of the thesis.	opportunity for next steps to be followed should the candidate be unresponsive.
24	No previous statement of expected candidature length	Added clause 13: It is the University's expectation that candidates will submit their doctoral theses within 3.5 years FTE of first enrolment.	The average time to submission is 3.9 years, which means that candidates are taking much longer to submit than the period for which support is available (e.g., 3.5 years UoADS). As well as the financial stress on candidates at such a critical time, many remain enrolled beyond the 4-year TEC funding window, meaning that all academic units are carrying tuition costs for unfunded doctoral students. This impacts supervisor capacity. This principle is designed to realign expectations and would be supported by introduction of a formal 36-month review that focuses on preparation for submission and development of a support plan if required.
25	Extension periods are currently listed as 1 – 12 months	Clause 15: A (former) doctoral candidate may apply for an extension of time, of not less than one month (FTE), and not more than 6 months (FTE), on grounds including	Tightened expectation period for “regular” extensions as requested. Here it is envisioned that getting an up-to-6-month extension would be relatively straightforward.

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language	Reason for change / justification
26	No upper limit to overall extensions	Added clause 17: Extensions of candidature beyond 4 years FTE (excluding any periods of approved intermission) will only be considered in exceptional circumstances.	This has been added to support submission within the 4-year TEC-funded window.
27	No maximum total amount of suspension	Added clause 21: The maximum total elapsed time allowed for suspension within a candidature is 2 years.	Data analyses demonstrate that the more suspensions a student takes, the longer time it takes to submission (not counting the period on suspension). Should an exception be required for compassionate reasons, there is an override clause in the Statute that allows the PVC GGR to approve a variation to the policies/procedures/regs (Clause 23)
28	Provisional candidature was set at 13 months maximum with option to extend by up to 6 months	Revised wording, clause 24: “The time limit for provisional candidature is 12 months of full-time equivalent (FTE) enrolment (plus no more than 1-month administrative allowance). It may be extended by up to 3 months in accordance with the Doctoral Candidature and Progress Procedures.”	Tightening timeline to ensure key decisions are made in a timely way to give clarity to candidates as early as possible in their doctoral journey. This reduces risk of mismatched expectation and downstream litigation.
29	Candidature is reviewed every 12 months on or by anniversary date	Confirmed candidature must be reviewed at least every 12 months after confirmation date (excluding any approved periods of suspension).	Allows for improved process.

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language	Reason for change / justification
30	No inclusion of a final review focused on supporting progression to submission	Added clause 27: A final review must take place at 36 months (FTE) of enrolment, excluding any periods of suspension, and not earlier than 30 months (FTE).	Formalised a final review to allow greater support through to a 3.5-year submission timeline. It is envisaged that this review would involve a panel and presentation and operate in a similar way to the provisional candidature review.
31	“Intervention”	“Conditions”	New language to more appropriately reflect what occurs
32	Integrated intervention with continuation	Separation of the two concepts: Clause 28: Where progress concerns arise during candidature, either as part of continuation reviews or at any other time, it is often appropriate to impose conditions on a candidate’s continuation in the programme. Such conditions may be configured as additional milestones that must be satisfied.	Improves clarity.
33	Thesis requirements	Amended framing in clause 37: Doctoral candidates are expected to complete a programme of research that results in a coherent outcome or coherent suite of outcomes, which is placed in its scholarly context and presented for examination as an archival artefact: the thesis.	NZQA Framework 10 defines the body of work that leads to the award of a doctorate as one or more of the following: • A thesis, which may include published work • Creative work with an exegesis • Coursework in combination with a thesis, which may include published work, or creative work with an exegesis.

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language	Reason for change / justification
			For the PhD, it then states that ‘A thesis constitutes the entire body of work on which the award of the qualification will be judged’. Ipso facto, creative work with an exegesis also is a ‘thesis’. In the draft policy statement, the more encompassing definition of the word ‘thesis’ is used; the different approaches to thesis construction will be articulated in the Doctoral Thesis Procedure.
34	Responsibility not defined in relation to quality of work	Added clause 38: Responsibility for the quality of work ultimately rests with the candidate.	Sets out expectation that the candidate carries the responsibility for the quality of their work.
35	Muddled definition of the written portion of the thesis/exegesis.	Amended principle, clause 42: The written requirement for the thesis is satisfied by a coherent document, which must not normally exceed 100,000 words in length but may be shorter where other work (such as creative work or inventive work) forms part of the overall inquiry. It must be completed in accordance with the Doctoral Thesis Procedure.	Rewritten and extended clause to cater for differential thesis lengths, noting that this clause may be better positioned within the procedures.

Supervision Policy

This table identifies changes to clauses in the current [Doctoral Supervision Policy and Procedures](#), and also describes requirements / directions that have been changed where these are not specific to an existing clause. Some content in the source document will instead be located in the two planned Supervision procedures.

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language or change	Reason for change / justification
36	Clause 2: joint supervisors hold joint responsibility for the provision of academic advice and support. Primary responsibility for administrative requirements must be held by one (UoA-based) supervisor	The role of joint supervisor is retired. Clause 4 thus states that: Each doctoral candidate will be provided with a main supervisor and one or more (up to a maximum of three) co-supervisor/s.	The 50:50 weighting in the current joint supervision model does not reflect the workload associated with primary responsibility for administrative requirements and thus this role is misaligned. This is further addressed in Clause 22, which defines the workload distribution across the supervisory team.
37	Clause 4: Advisers – no mention of committee	Added, Clause 5: This may take the form of an advisory committee of up to 4 members.	Alignment with Masters guidelines
38	Supervisor requirements (Clauses 9 & 10)	Added Clause 6: All supervisors must hold: a. the degree for which the student or candidate is enrolled; or b. an equivalent qualification; or c. have a substantial and appropriate record of research outputs; or d. have a strong and documented record in the relevant field	The Creative Works Policy and Procedures have been slated for removal. This list is designed to ensure sufficient flexibility to engage an appropriate supervision team for all programmes of doctoral research.
39	Main supervisor requirement	Clause 15: Wording change, main supervisor must be employed in an academic staff	Ensures the candidate is under supervision of a research academic

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language or change	Reason for change / justification
		position at the University of Auckland under an employment agreement which includes a requirement that they undertake research.	and/or research fellow. Other roles can contribute to co-supervision.
40	Requirement for main supervisors to be research active	Added Clause 14: Co-supervisors must be research-active or have strong professional expertise in the relevant fields.	Allows for co-supervision by PTFs and/or non-UOA staff with constraints to ensure high level function of supervisory team.
41	Supervisors on fixed term contracts	Added additional clause 21 and sub-clauses: University of Auckland staff on fixed term contracts who the Academic Head agrees are likely to be funded for the expected period of supervision may be appointed as main supervisors. When this occurs: a. a co-supervisor must be appointed who is not on a fixed term contract, to maximise stability of supervision; b. staff should be informed that appointment as a supervisor does not imply or give any expectation of permanent employment; and c. the Academic Head must confirm at the outset that appropriate alternative supervision is available if the main supervisor's contract	Supports early-career researcher development with safeguards.

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language or change	Reason for change / justification
		ends before the project is completed	
42	References to accreditation	Across several clauses: Retains need for accreditation as a main or co-supervisor. Removes references to accreditation for joint supervision.	Consistent with retirement of joint supervisor role. No change to need for accreditation. Note that requirements for accreditation and conditions leading to de-accreditation will be defined in the procedures.
43	Clause 15: “co-supervisors will normally be members of academic staff at UoA, or of another tertiary institution, or appropriate research organisation”	Definition now covered by Clause 14: Co-supervisors must be research-active or have strong professional expertise in the relevant field(s); and Clause 16: At least one co-supervisor should be employed in an academic position at the University of Auckland and must be accredited to supervise in accordance with the Supervisor Accreditation and Training Procedures.	Recognises that in some fields it is normal for suitable supervisory expertise to sit outside traditional tertiary or other research organisations, and balances risk in case main supervisor becomes unavailable.
44	Distribution of supervision	Simplified from a series of options to Clause 22: The distribution of supervision must equate to no more than 1.0 FTE and be allocated such that: a. The Main Supervisor’s contribution must be at least 40%, and they must carry the greatest load in the supervisory team.	Sets out principles without forced granularity. Definition of ‘joint’ supervisor is redundant under this framing.

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language or change	Reason for change / justification
		b. Individual supervisory contributions must be documented as per procedures and be not less than 10% and not more than 70% within any supervisory team.	
45	None	NEW: Section on Supervisor workloads: 23. The Academic Workload Principles and Policy sets expectations for doctoral supervisor workload. 24. The Dean is responsible for reviewing and approving supervision workload norms in consultation with academic heads and staff, and ensuring adherence to these norms. 25. Supervision workload is discipline specific, dependent on supervisory models, and agreed annually through discussion with the Academic Head. 26. The Academic Head must be satisfied that the quality of supervision and doctoral experience is not compromised by the supervisor's workload. 27. The outcome of workload relevant to supervision must be documented in the supervisor's annual academic development and performance review.	Aligns with Academic Workload Principles and Policy. Clarifies accountability and escalation steps.

Change #	Current requirement or language	New requirement or language or change	Reason for change / justification
		28. Where the School of Graduate Studies and/or Associate Dean Post-Graduate Research are concerned that doctoral experience and/or development may be compromised by a supervisor's workload: a. The ADPGR will discuss concerns with the supervisor and academic head. b. Where the Academic Head agrees that there is a material risk to student experience and development, the Academic Head will put in place a mitigation plan. c. If the ADPGR remains concerned that the supervisor's workload is such that a candidate's doctoral experience and/or development are compromised, the ADPGR will escalate concerns to the Dean.	