

A meeting of the Research Education and Development Committee will be held in the Research Education Programs Seminar Room, 10 Pulteney Street, L13 at 2:30pm on 6 November 2006.

---

## AGENDA

### FORMAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies**  
*For noting*
2. \* **Conflicts of interest**  
*For declaration by Committee members*
3. \* **Starring of items**  
*Recommendation: That the Research Education and Development Committee adopt any recommendations contained in the unstarred items.*
4. \* **Minutes**  
Minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2006  
*Recommendation: That the Research Education and Development Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2006.*
5. \* **Business arising from the minutes (not otherwise listed on this agenda)**  
*(Item 5)*

### MAJOR REPORTS or ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

6. \* **Commercialisation Training Scheme**  
*Professor Russell to report (Item 6).*
7. \* **Higher Degree by Research Completions**  
*Professor Russell to report. To note the predicted HDR completions by Faculty for 2006 (including Humanities & Social Sciences data (Item 7)).*
8. \* **International Scholarships Application Process**  
*Professor Russell to report.*

9. \* **Policy on the Recognition of Eligible Research Supervisors/Can a Staff Member be a Principal Supervisor Supervising a Student to Completion as a Co-Supervisor?**  
*Professor Russell to report.*
10. \* **The Core Component of the Structured Program and Plagiarism**  
*Professor Russell and A/Professor Coaldrake to report (Item 10).*
11. \* **PhD by Publication and Authorship**  
*Professor Russell to report. For discussion.*
12. \* **Inclusion of Unpublished Material in Theses by Publication**  
*Professor Russell to report. For discussion.*

**REPORTS FROM RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT  
COMMITTEE WORKING PARTIES**

13. **Student Matters**  
*To note the unconfirmed report of the meeting held on 19 October 2006.*
14. **Doctoral Education**  
*No further meetings held.*
15. **Quality Issues Working Party**  
*No further meetings held.*
16. **Other Business**
17. **Next Meeting**  
*The next meeting is scheduled for 11 December 2006 in the Research Education Programs Seminar Room, 10 Pulteney Street/Level 13.*

DONNA FROST  
Secretary  
F: 2006/438

FOR APPROVAL

ITEM 4

---

### MINUTES OF MEETING 7/06

A meeting of the Research Education and Development Committee was held in the Research Education Programs Seminar Room, 10 Pulteney Street/L13 at 2:30pm on 9 October 2006.

**Present:** Professor Richard Russell (Convenor), Mr Simon Brennan, Dr Kate Cadman, A/Professor Kimi Coaldrake, Ms Glenis Crane (proxy for Ms Felicity Rai), Professor Ted Nettelbeck, Professor Sally Smith (until 3:45pm) Professor John Wallace, Dr Anthony Zander

**In attendance:** Ms Donna Frost (Secretary), Ms Anne Witt

### FORMAL MATTERS

#### 1. Apologies/Announcements

Apologies were noted from the following staff: Dr Gerard O'Brien, Ms Felicity Rai, Professor John Taplin, and Professor John Williams.

#### 2. Conflict of Interest

No conflicts were declared.

#### 3. Starring of Items

Item 18 was starred. The Committee resolved:

*to adopt the recommendations contained in the unstarred items.*

#### 4. Minutes of Meeting

The Committee resolved:

*to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2006.*

#### 5. Business arising from the minutes

Members noted the status of actions arising from previous meetings of REDC, as detailed in ITEM 5.

### MAJOR REPORTS and ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

#### 6. Commercialisation Training Scheme (CTS)

Professor Russell advised that discussions with other universities about how to administer the CTS were ongoing; decisions had not yet been finalised, however, it appeared likely that:

1. The University of Adelaide would offer the Graduate Certificate in Commercialisation in-house with ECIC as the provider (a name change from the existing Science & Technology Commercialisation would be sought through the Program Approvals Committee in due course);
2. The training would be offered from Semester 2 and advertised to students early in the new year;
3. CTS students would be required to maintain full time student status for the duration of their study, except, with approval, for a defined period post thesis submission;
4. Students would be able to complete CTS training over two years.

Members noted that the selection process for CTS scholarships would be the subject of a paper prepared by Mr Rex Hunter for discussion at a future meeting of REDC.

<b>Action:</b>	<b>Responsible:</b>
Provide further information on selection for CTS training to REDC when available.	Professor Russell

## 7. Higher Degree by Research Completions

Members noted the results of the exercise to identify expected HDR completions by Faculty for 2006 (Item 7), which had been undertaken following the identification of a concerning downward trend in the University's completion numbers during recent years. The downward trend if not reversed in 2006 and beyond would result in loss of Research Training Scheme income to the University.

Faculty responses indicated that >270 completions were expected across the University during 2006. This figure compared to actual completions of 120 as at the end of September and an Office of Planning and Quality (OPQ) prediction of 160 completions by the end of 2006. It was suggested that at least part of the discrepancy between the number of completions predicted for 2006 by OPQ (160) and the Faculties (>270) could be explained by confusion about the requirements for counting a completion.

Professor Russell clarified that a completion could only be counted by the University after a student had qualified for the award of their degree; qualification occurs when the student submits their three hard bound thesis copies to the Graduate Centre after making any required amendments to the satisfaction of their Head of School/Discipline. A completion cannot be counted at thesis submission and consequently, executing all elements of the examination process in a timely fashion (including selection of examiners, time taken to prepare supervisor/Faculty reports and time taken by the student to undertake amendments) is of critical importance.

Despite the apparent confusion with terminology, it was hoped that Faculty predictions for >270 submissions in 2006 would translate to higher numbers of completions than predicted by OPQ and a spike in completions during the early part of 2007.

In addition to the decreases in absolute numbers of completions, Professor Russell advised that the analysis of completion rates provided by OPQ was cause for concern. Of the PhD cohort who enrolled in 2000, the following completion rates had been achieved to date:

- Sciences & Health Sciences: 50%;
- Professions: 45%
- Engineering, Computer & Mathematical Sciences: 33%;
- Humanities & Social Sciences: 28%

Whilst it was acknowledged that high numbers of part time students (as in Humanities & Social sciences) would impact on completion rates, even the best completion rates achieved by Sciences & Health Sciences were below expectations. Members noted that historically, completion rates to 1999 were in the range of 65-70%.

Clearly, a greater focus on completion numbers and timely completions is required within the University if RTS income is to be maintained and grown. Members agreed that greater emphasis on the design and completion of Doctoral projects by (full time students) within three to three and a half years was required. Students and supervisors should plan to complete research within three years, to enable submission by three and a half years.

<b>Action:</b>	<b>Responsible:</b>
----------------	---------------------

Renew the focus on the three/three and a half year PhD at Faculty level and consider measures to improve completion rates and times including additional emphasis on choice of examiners and completion of amendments.	All Faculty representatives.
Ensure that information about completion rates and times and the impact on RTS income is incorporated into supervisor training programs.	Professor Russell
Consider the introduction of financial incentives for completion.	Professor Russell
Amend the Annual Review form for 2007 to make explicit that supervisors are assessing students progress in terms of the rate required to achieve a submission within three and a half years full time equivalent.	Ms Frost

## 8. International Scholarships Application Process

Mrs Witt advised that international scholarship applications had been sent out to the Faculties for ranking, with responses due by 20 October. A memo had been sent to Executive Deans regarding the changes to the selection process for 2006; no response had been received to date, however, Faculty REDC representatives were in agreement that some improvements to the logistics of the selection process had been achieved following Professor Russell's talk with the International Office.

During the course of discussion, two other issues were flagged:

1. From 2007, DEST had changed the rules for funding international scholarships, such that institutions would now be paid only three years of scholarship funding per student. The consequence of the change would be that the cost of scholarship extensions (both tuition and stipend) would be borne by institutions. Members noted that universities were appealing the change given the lack of prior consultation.
2. There was a need to initiate scholarships targeted at international Honours graduates with a view to ensuring their progression to postgraduate research programs.

Action:	Responsible:
Provide REDC with advice regarding the outcome of the appeal to DEST on international scholarship funding when available.	Mrs Witt
Provide REDC with an update on progress towards instigating scholarships for international Honours graduates.	Professor Russell

## 9. Towards the Development of an Online Qualification for Early Career Researchers

Items 9 and 10 were considered together. See Item 10.

### 10. Towards the Development of an Online Integrated Bridging Program - Research

Professor Russell reported that some funding had been obtaining to establish online programs within the Graduate Centre. The DVC (A) had also indicated that he would look favourably on the development of a formal qualification for Early Career Researchers incorporating the work on supervision done by the Research Education Program staff in the Graduate Centre.

Action:	Responsible:
Provide further information about progress towards the development of an online ECR qualification and online IBP-R when available.	Professor Russell

## 11. Policy for Establishing Professional Doctorates

Members were asked to consider a draft policy, developed by the Doctoral Education Working Party on the establishment of new professional doctorates at the University.

The policy was endorsed by REDC noting that, under the policy, all professional doctorates would be required to meet DEST guidelines for eligibility for RTS funding, by containing two thirds of their assessable content by research.

<b>Action:</b>	<b>Responsible:</b>
Refer the policy to Academic Board for consideration via the University Research Committee.	Professor Russell/Ms Frost

## 12. Analysis of Supervision Patterns Throughout the University

Professor Russell advised that in preparation for the implementation of the supervisor register and the audit on research supervision, an analysis of supervision patterns throughout the University had been undertaken (Items 12a – 12d). The information provided included:

1. A summary of the number of non-staff members (divided into Non-Title Holders and Title Holders) who are supervising University of Adelaide Research Students (Item 12a);
2. A summary of the University of Adelaide's usage of Title Holders as principal research supervisors (Item 12b);
3. A summary of the highest qualification of supervisors by supervisory role, Title Holder status and number of HDR students being supervised (Item 12d) and
4. Histograms of the Number of HDR students per principal supervisor by Faculty and Title Holder status (Item 12d).

Members noted that the reliance on non-staff supervisors was greatest in the Faculty of Health Sciences and that the (local level) data (Item 12c) could be used to identify supervisors who exceeded the maximum principal supervisory load of 6 students.

## 13. Policy on the Recognition of Eligible Research Supervisors/Can a Staff Member be a Principal Supervisor Before Supervising a Student to Completion as a Co-Supervisor?

Professor Russell reported on progress towards the approval of the policy on the recognition of eligible research supervisors. Members noted that the policy had been conditionally returned by the Academic Board with requests to:

1. clarify how supervisors could be removed from the register; and
2. clarify supervisory provisions with respect to title holders and affiliates.

With respect to the second condition, two conflicting legal opinions had been obtained regarding whether the University had the right to expect title holders to meet and abide by the same conditions as staff members with regard to the supervision of Higher Degree by Research students. It was acknowledged that resolution of this issue would be required before the policy could be presented to Academic board for further consideration. Given this, it was agreed that it would also be timely to revisit the question of whether a staff member should be constrained to act as a co-supervisor until they had successfully completed a HDR student.

In practical terms, members felt that this constraint was too limiting given the lengthy timeframes for HDR completions. It was agreed that, the same outcome could be achieved by incorporating the following into the policy on the recognition of eligible research supervisors:

1. expanded supervisor training requirements; and
2. a requirement that at least one supervisor on the panel have supervised a HDR student to completion.

<b>Action:</b>	<b>Responsible:</b>
Revise the Policy on the Recognition of Eligible Research Supervisors before further consideration by the Academic Board.	Professor Russell

**REPORTS FROM RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKING PARTIES**

**14. Student Matters**

The unconfirmed minutes of the Student Matters sub-committee meeting held on 15 August 2006 were noted.

**15. Doctoral Education**

The minutes of the Doctoral Education Working Party meeting held on 4 July 2006 were noted.

**16. Quality Issues**

Nothing to report.

**UNSTARRED ITEMS FOR APPROVAL OR NOTING**

**17. REDC Membership**

Members noted that:

1. Professor John Williams would replace Professor Pomfret as Convener of the Higher Degrees Committee in the Faculty of Professions for the remainder of 2006 and accordingly, would be the Faculty's representative on REDC for this period;
2. Mr Simon Brennan, as the newly appointed Director, Research Services would replace Ms Anne Witt as an ex-officio member of the Committee. [Mr Brennan was welcomed to his first meeting of the Committee];
3. Ms Witt, as Manager of the Graduate Centre would continue to attend REDC meetings.

**18. Specifications for Thesis**

The Specifications for Thesis document was approved for inclusion in the 2007 Postgraduate Calendar with one minor amendment to 2.2A: "Jointly authored papers must be *accompanied by* a clear statement on the contribution made by each author".

**19. Other Business**

Research Education and Development Committee meeting dates for 2007

The dates for REDC meetings in 2007 were tabled and endorsed.

The meeting concluded at 16:20.

DONNA FROST  
Secretary

CONFIRMED:

Day Month Year .....  
Date CONVENOR

FOR NOTING

ITEM 5

**BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

**MEETING 7/06**

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p><b>6. Commercialisation Training Scheme (CTS)</b> Provide further information on selection for CTS training to REDC when available.</p>	Professor Russell	Completed.
<p><b>7. Higher Degree by Research Completions</b> Renew the focus on the three/three and a half year PhD at faculty level and consider measures to improve completion rates and times including additional emphasis on choice of examiners and completion of amendments.</p> <p>Ensure that information about completion rates and times and the impact on RTS income is incorporated into supervisor training programs.</p> <p>Consider the introduction of financial incentives for completion.</p> <p>Amend the annual review form for 2007 to make explicit that supervisors are assessing students progress in terms of the rate required to achieve a submission within three and a half years full time equivalent.</p>	<p>All Faculty representatives.</p> <p>Professor Russell</p> <p>Professor Russell</p> <p>Ms Frost</p>	<p>In progress</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>Completed. See Item 7.</p> <p>Completed</p>
<p><b>8. International Scholarships Application Process</b> Provide REDC with advice regarding the outcome of the appeal to DEST on international scholarship funding when available.</p> <p>Provide REDC with an update on progress towards instigating scholarships for international honours graduates.</p>	<p>Mrs Witt</p> <p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>In progress</p> <p>Completed. See Item 8.</p>
<p><b>10. Towards the development of an online integrated bridging program – research</b> Provide further information about progress towards the development of an online ECR qualification and online IBP-R when available.</p>	Professor Russell	In progress

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<b>11. Policy For Establishing Professional Doctorates</b> Refer the policy to Academic Board for consideration via the University Research Committee.	Professor Russell/Ms Frost	Completed.
<b>13. Policy On The Recognition Of Eligible Research Supervisors/Can A Staff Member Be A Principal Supervisor Before Supervising A Student To Completion As A Co-Supervisor?</b> Revise the policy on the recognition of eligible research supervisors before further consideration by the academic board.	Professor Russell	In progress

#### MEETING 6/06

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<b>6. Student Confidentiality</b> Circulate the "Student Complaint – Insurance Notification Procedure" and "Insurance Guide" to Heads, Postgraduate Coordinators and Supervisors when approved.	Ms Frost	Awaiting approval.
<b>10. Specifications For Thesis</b> Forward the final version of the Specifications for Thesis to Ms Lynn Larsen, Marketing and Strategic Communications.	Ms Frost	Completed.
<b>11. Quality Assurance Framework for Learning and Teaching</b> Provide REDC with updates on the Quality Assurance Framework when available.	Professor Russell	In progress.
<b>19. Other Business</b> <b>Postgraduate Students' Association (PGSA) Website</b> Provide Professor Russell with a copy of the suggested changes to the PGSA web site prior to their implementation.	Mr Jewell	In progress.

#### MEETING 5/06

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<b>6. Supervisory Issues</b> Promote the aims of the IBP-R and the responsibilities of supervisors involved in the IBP-R to supervisors and postgraduate coordinators.	Dr Cadman	In progress.
<b>7. Higher Degree By Research Program Rules For 2007</b> Consult with the other Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies to determine how extended leave of absence on medical grounds is managed.	Professor Russell	In progress.

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p><b>13. Any Other Business</b></p> <p><b>Appointment Of Higher Degree By Research Thesis Examiners</b> Add to the "Responsibilities of Supervisors" listed in the Research Student Handbook, the requirement to nominate examiners by the time of thesis submission and where a replacement examiner or third examiner/arbitrator is required, to forward the additional recommendation(s) within two weeks of the requested date.</p> <p>Add to the "Responsibilities of the Head of School" listed in the Research Student Handbook and to the "Major Review of Progress form", the responsibility to ensure that there is a sufficient pool of examiners available to examine the proposed thesis by the time of candidature confirmation.</p>	<p>Ms Frost</p> <p>Ms Frost</p>	<p>In progress.</p> <p>In progress.</p>

#### MEETING 4/06

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p><b>7. Towards an English Language Policy for the University</b> Prepare a draft English language policy for postgraduate research students for review by REDC.</p>	Ms Frost	In progress.

#### MEETING 10/05

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p><b>11. Exit Survey</b> Undertake revision of the Handbook and organise the revision of the Annual Review form in line with the Committee's recommendations.</p>	Ms Frost	In progress (AR update completed).

#### MEETING 5/05

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p><b>2.1 Honours Report</b> Review and comment on the review of Honours grading when available.</p>	All REDC members	Awaiting report.
<p><b>5.1 Proposal to Reconceptualise the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry as a Research Professional Doctorate</b> Develop instructions to examiners for Faculty Higher Degree Committee and REDC consideration.</p>	Professor John Spencer, Dental School	Pending.

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE  
ADELAIDE GRADUATE CENTRE

COMMERCIALISATION TRAINING SCHEME (CTS)

REPORT TO REDC  
CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF CANDIDATES

**1. DEST Requirement**

Beyond stating that universities must conduct a competitive application process for selection which accords with fairness requirements of the Act, the only further stated criteria is that a university must preferentially select **students considered to have the best prospects of pursuing a career that will utilise the skills, knowledge and experience gained in CTS training** and without hindering or compromising the student's HDR progress.

**Note:** DEST has moved away from its original criteria of choosing students whose research had the best potential to be commercialised

**2. Initial Thoughts**

The revised criteria prompts the following questions and responses

- *Question:* Who has the best prospects of pursuing *any* career based on completing a specialised course of study? *Response:* This involves consideration of an individual's personal qualities and qualifications.
- *Question:* What are the specialised skills, knowledge and experience gained in CTS training? *Response:* DEST outlines desired skills to be taught including innovation management, entrepreneurship, IP strategies, project management, business planning, R&D management, business writing skills.
- *Question:* What are the careers that would most value those specialised skills? *Response:* Employment within positions that would seem to benefit from these skills include: Technology based business manager, IP Manager, Entrepreneur/start-up manager, Commercial researcher, Patent attorney, Venture capitalist.

**3. General Approaches to Selection Criteria**

Eliciting information on which the selection of candidates may have reference to the above considerations raises several key issues.

### **Who provides the information?**

Either or both the **student** applicant and the student's **supervisor** will be asked to complete answers to questions.

### **What will be the nature of information sought by questions?**

Two possible approaches involve quantitative and qualitative data

#### **Quantitative**

Questions can be asked that will:-

- (i) be awarded a points value related to meeting certain criteria (either, say, 1 point or 2 points with the points value being dependant upon the perceived importance of the question/answer)
- (ii) be awarded a points value on a sliding scale ( 3 out of 5; 4 out of 5 etc, depending on the strength of the applicant's assessed position in regard to the issue)

#### **Qualitative**

Rather than weighing answers to questions with relatively prescribed answers, applicants can be asked to write an 'essay-type' response on topics that aim to identify the suitability/preferability of the applicant for the CTS.

### **Should there be a Discipline based Quota?**

Given a possible bias in favour of Science-based disciplines arising from the nature of questions, should there be a minimum number of CTS places guaranteed to each Faculty/broad discipline?

## **4. Comments on Selection Approaches**

Qualitative assessment involving essays/interviews adds to the complexity of measurement, increases the subjectivity and significantly increases the commitment in time and effort of the selection panel and those who service it.

However, without the moderating impact of essay (or possibly interview) intervention, the terms of quantitative questions asked become absolutely critical as possibly leading to a bias in selection. (As an example, if points are awarded for a positive response to a question regarding a student's involvement with commercial/commercialisation activities as part of their PhD research, this may more likely favour Science/Engineering applicants.)

If a balanced system of questions can be devised, it seems preferable to rely on merit rather than a quota.

## **5. Other University's Early Thoughts**

UNSW

Selection based on a tiered and weighted points system relating to solely quantitative responses to questions based around commercial/commercialisation factors involving student and supervisor.

### **Sydney University**

A base scoring system related to non-scaled questions/answers moderated by interviews and possible discipline quota.

### **UWA**

A group of core eligibility (threshold) questions followed by key questions asked of supervisor relating to commercial record of both student and supervisor and scaled questions relating to commercial/commercialisation aspects of student research. Moderated by qualitative questions to be devised.

## **6. Suggestion**

There is no clear agreement on criteria and there is merit in each of the approaches. But to find candidates who best meet the broad guidelines of DEST, it seems important not to overemphasise current commercialisation activities at the expense of a student's potential future involvement in the area. Nevertheless, quantitative responses in that regard also seem appropriate to establish an assessment base – if moderated by qualitative information. Whether interviews are desirable may need to be considered after first testing a possible selection process and formula.

There is a need for threshold/essential criteria to be satisfied before any further assessment is made.

Taking account of the issues outlined, a selection process is suggested, as presented in detail in the **attached** draft forms and **summarised below**

#### **MINIMUM SELECTION CRITERIA:**

Applicants must:

1. be currently enrolled in a higher degree by research and have completed the Core Component of the Structured Program (CCSP). Failure to complete the CCSP renders a student ineligible to apply for CTS.
2. be citizens or permanent residents of Australia.
3. not have previously completed any commercialisation training equivalent to the course offering.
4. have at least 12 months of research candidature time remaining.
5. be able to complete the Graduate Certificate within 24 months of commencement and within 6 months of completion of research candidature (whichever is sooner).

6. have support from their principal supervisor.

FOR COMPLETION BY STUDENTS

1. Why do you wish to apply for CTS – with reference to (a) proposed career path and (b) skills you believe CTS will give you to help achieve your career goals.  
MAXIMUM OF 500 WORDS  
(To be assessed by a score out of 10)
2. What are the IP issues involved in your project or usually involved in your discipline or project area? MAXIMUM OF 200 WORDS  
(To be assessed by a score out of 5)
3. Describe any commercialisation opportunities relevant to your project or that usually occur in your discipline or project area. MAXIMUM OF 200 WORDS  
(To be assessed by a score out of 5)
4. Has your current project required you to sign a Student Project Participation Agreement or other agreement related to intellectual property or commercialisation? Yes No  
If YES, 5 points
5. Is one of your supervisors based outside the University sector? Yes No  
If YES, 5 points

MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 30

FOR COMPLETION BY SUPERVISORS:

1. Have you or any of the co-supervisors on the project had any involvement in patenting and/or other commercialisation activities? Yes No  
If YES, 3 points
2. Does the student's project have any connection with an industry partner or grant funding? Yes No  
If YES, 2 points
3. Please give an appropriate indication in response to the selection criteria:  
1 = none, 2 = limited, 3 = moderate, 4 = high, 5 = extensive
  - a) What level of industry engagement is involved in the applicant's research project?  
1            2            3            4            5
  - b) Does the applicant's project have any intellectual property issues associated with it?  
1            2            3            4            5
  - c) Do you anticipate undertaking any commercialisation activity associated with this project?  
1            2            3            4            5
  - d) Do you think the applicant is enthusiastic about participating in CTS?  
1            2            3            4            5
  - d) Do you think the applicant will benefit from participating in CTS?  
1            2            3            4            5

MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 30

## **7. Comments on Suggested Criteria**

The draft form:

- presents student questions that are intended not only to provide information but also to elicit responses that require some research to indicate the level of interest/commitment of the applicant.
- aims at a balance between the formularic, quantitative approach (with an emphasis on commercial relevance) and qualitative student interest based inquiry.
- offers the ‘essay-type’ responses with higher scaled mark opportunities to balance the position of Humanities etc applicants.

Questions on both sections of the form –applicant and supervisor – are deliberately worth the same maximum of points (30) so that the option exists to give greater weight to the student based points rating if ultimately preferred.

Reference to points value, in sections of the draft form, are removed and details are provided in the above section on an explanatory basis.

Substitution, deletion or addition of questions is a matter for further discussion. The draft is offered as one attempt to resolve the competing pressures and different approaches in selecting CTS candidates. It is intended as an in-house document as a basis for discussion and a starting point for final agreement on the terms and structure of selection criteria.

**Rex Hunter**  
**30 October 2006**

<b>RESEARCH EDUCATION &amp; DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE</b>					
<b>MEETING 8/06 – 6 November 2006</b>					
<b>FOR NOTING</b>	<b>ITEM 7</b>				
<b>Expected Number of Higher Degree by Research Completions by Faculty for 2006</b>					
Supervisor Faculty	Number of Students	Notes			
DVC & P	1	The Expected Number of HDR Completions by Faculty for 2006 includes, students who have:			
DVC(R)	1	completed this year (to 23 June 2006)			
EC&MS	111	or submitted their thesis in 2005 or 2006 (to 30 May 2006)			
Health Sciences	125	or notified the graduate centre in 2005 or 2006 of their intention to submit (to 30 May 2006)			
Hum&SS	99	or sought permission to write up outside (to 30 May 2006)			
Professions	25	or less than 6 months entitlement remaining (at 30 May 2006)			
Sciences	175	or run out of entitlement (at 28 June 2006)			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>537</b>	or lapsed their enrolment in either semester 2 2005 or semester 1 2006.			
<b>Expected Number of Higher Degree by Research Completions as predicted by Faculties for 2006</b>					
<b>Expected to Complete in 2006?</b>					
<b>Supervisor Faculty</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Possibly</b>	<b>Unable to verify</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
DVC & P			1		1
DVC(R)				1	1
EC&MS	49		4	61	114
Health Sciences	49	1	5	79	134
Humanities & Social Sciences	63	3		33	99
Professions	3	2	9	15	29
Sciences	70	3		118	191
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>569</b>
N/A: Data not available					

FOR NOTING

ITEM 10

---

The University of Adelaide  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences  
RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Total number of pages contained in this Proposal	
Name	
School	

I declare that all material in this Research Proposal is my own work except where there is clear acknowledgement and reference to the work of others. I have read the University Policy Statement on Plagiarism, Collusion and Related Forms of Cheating (<http://www.adelaide.edu.au/policies/7230>).

I give permission for my draft writing to be reproduced and submitted to other academic staff for the purposes of evaluation and to be copied and retained in a form suitable for electronic checking of plagiarism.

Signed ..... Date .....

STUDENT MATTERS SUB-COMMITTEE  
MEETING 06/7 – 19 OCTOBER 2006



FOR APPROVAL

---

MINUTES OF MEETING 06/6

A meeting of the Student Matters Sub-committee was held in the Old Optical Room, Mitchell Building, from 2 pm on Thursday, 19 October 2006.

**Present:** Professor Richard Russell (Convenor); Professor John Wallace; Dr Kimi Coaldrake; Dr Anthony Zander

**Absent:** Ms Felicity Rai

**In attendance:** Miss Rosanna Scarsella

FORMAL MATTERS

1. Apologies/Announcements

None

2. Conflict of Interest

No conflicts of interest were raised.

3. Minutes of Meeting

The minutes  
*of the meeting held on 15 August 2006*  
had been previously approved.

MAJOR ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/APPROVAL

4.1 Master of Landscape Architecture by research examination case 06\_7\_1

It was noted that the supervisor had made a very convincing case for the (c) outcome.

SMS was of the opinion that the thesis needed a more convincing presentation, a tightening of the methodology and some "trimming" of the contents.

After due consideration, SMS approved the (c) recommendation.

4.2 PhD examination case 06\_7\_2 (Dr Zander attended in place of Dr Coaldrake for consideration of this case)

After careful consideration of Professor Russell's outline of the case and the tabled documentation, SMS decided (d): that the student not be awarded the degree of [Doctor of Philosophy](#) for the thesis in its current form, but that he be invited to revise and re-submit his thesis for re-examination. SMS did not accept the supervisor's proposal that re-examination of the thesis be undertaken internally within the University.

Recognizing that it had taken the student six years to reach his current position, SMS believed that it would be appropriate for the School to establish a group of experienced supervisors, including the student's supervisor, to see that the revised thesis was appropriately prepared for examination. Furthermore, SMS recommended that this group be chaired by an experienced current or former postgraduate co-ordinator. SMS noted that, if available, Dr Paul Corcoran might be a valuable chair because of his very considerable experience.

5. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting would be scheduled as required.

The meeting concluded at 2.45 pm.

ROSANNA SCARSELLA  
Secretary

CONFIRMED:

.....  
CONVENOR