

A meeting of the Research Education and Development Committee will be held in the Finance Board Room, Level 1, 115 Grenfell Street, from 2.30 pm on 21 April 2008.

AGENDA

FORMAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies**
Dr Kimi Coaldrake
 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 31 March 2008
Recommendation: that the Research Education and Development Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2008.
 5. * **Business Arising from the Minutes** (not otherwise listed on this agenda)
(Item 5)
- MAJOR REPORTS or ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR APPROVAL**
6. * **Proposal to Introduce More Flexible Entry Pathways to the PhD for International Students through a Master of Research Studies**
Professor Russell to report.
 7. * **Proposed Generic Master of Philosophy**
Faculty representatives to report on the views of their respective Faculties.
 8. * **Procedure in Response to Students' Queries about Progress of Theses Examination**
Professor Russell to report (Items 8a and 8b)

9. * **Master Of Ophthalmology Specific Academic Program Rules**
Feedback from Dr Casson has clarified that the intended admission requirement for the Master of Ophthalmology degree was a relevant Honours degree or equivalent. Students would not additionally be required to complete an MBBS. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Specific Program Rules for the Master of Ophthalmology be deleted from the 2009 Calendar and in parallel, the General Program Rules for Masters Degrees by Research be amended for 2009 to indicate that the Master of Ophthalmology is completely bound by the General Program Rules (Item 9).
10. * **The Core Component of the Structured Program and Plagiarism**
Professor Russell to report. Is it feasible to make the REP online module in plagiarism a compulsory part of the Core Component of the Structured Program?
11. * **Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies (DDoGs) Meeting, April 2008**
Professor Russell to report
12. * **Quality in Postgraduate Research (QPR) Conference, April 2008**
 Dr Cadman to report.
13. * **Australasian Research Training Administrators (ARTA) Meeting, April 2008**
 Mrs Witt to report.
14. * **Award and Distribution of APA Scholarships Across the University: Alternative Models**
 Dr Ford to report.
15. * **Current Eligibility Criteria for Applicants Applying for Scholarships Selected by the Graduate Scholarships Committee**
 Mrs Witt to report. To discuss whether it should be possible to allow up to 6 months of prior enrolment without jeopardising eligibility for scholarship consideration (Item 15).

REPORTS FROM RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKING PARTIES

16. **Student Matters**
To note the confirmed report of the meeting held on 14 March 2008 (2/08).
17. **Doctoral Education**
No further meetings have been held.
18. **Quality Issues Working Party**
No further meetings have been held.

UNSTARRED ITEMS FOR APPROVAL OR NOTING

19.

LLB Curricula Restructure

For noting: REDC's recommendation to accept only those Honours students who graduated from the restructured LLB after completion of the 6 unit (optional) research dissertation will be discussed at the Program Approvals Committee on 15 April 2008 (Item 19A).

For approval: The revised admission requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy, General Masters by Research and General Professional Doctorate Program Rules which have been amended to ensure that only Honours degrees containing a research component acceptable to the Research Education and Development Committee, will be acceptable for direct entry to a Higher Degree by Research at the University of Adelaide (Item 19B).

20.

Program Rules for 2009

To note that any proposed changes to research programs for 2009 must be presented to the REDC meeting to be held on 2 June 2008.

21.

REDC Meeting to be held on 2 July 2008

To note that Professor John Williams will Chair the next meeting of REDC in Professor Russell's absence.

22.

Other Business

23.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will be held from 2.30 pm to 4.30 pm on 2 June 2008 in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street.

DONNA FROST
Secretary
F: 2007/4371

FOR APPROVAL

MINUTES OF MEETING 2/08

A meeting of the Research Education and Development Committee was held in the ARI Board Room, Level 14, 115 Grenfell Street, from 2.30 pm on 31 March 2008.

Present: Professor Richard Russell (Convenor) Professor John Williams, Dr Kate Cadman, Dr Kimi Coaldrake, Dr Chris Ford, Professor Ted Nettelbeck, Dr Bertram Ostendorf (till 4.30 pm), Dr Anthony Zander (till 3.45 pm), Professor John Taplin (from 3.05 pm)

In attendance: Miss Rosanna Scarsella, Mrs Anne Witt, Ms Donna Frost

FORMAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies/Announcements**

Apologies were noted from the following: Mr Simon Brennan

Professor Russell welcomed Ms Frost on her return to the Graduate Centre.

2. **Conflict of Interest**

No conflicts were declared.

3. **Starring of Items**

The Committee resolved:

to adopt the recommendations contained in the unstarred items.

Item 16 was starred at the start of the meeting.

4. **Minutes of Meeting**

The Committee resolved:

to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2008.

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. Proposal to introduce more flexible entry pathways to the PhD for international students [“Item 7 from Meeting 1/08 and Item 6 Strategies for increasing HDR completions and meeting recruitment targets – bring a paper about the difficulties in interfacing with international educational institutions (prepared for Executive Deans) to REDC in 2008” from Meeting 7/07]

Professor Russell reported that the proposal had been considered by the Postgraduate Coursework Working Party, which was in favour of such a pathway. Professor Christopher Findlay (Head of Economics) was in the process of writing the generic document, using the School of Economics as a specific example.

The generic REP modules were in hand.

Action	Responsible
Bring generic document to a future REDC meeting for final comment	Professor Russell
Once endorsed by REDC, present to Academic Board (via URC) for approval	Ms Frost

7. DDoGS meeting in Sydney

Professor Russell reported that there had been G08 management changes in Canberra.

He and Professor Williams, Dr Ford and Mrs Witt had attended a special DDoGs meeting in Sydney, the aim of which had been to ascertain how the G08 universities wanted to position doctoral studies in the next five years. It was hoped to set up a common terminology whose meaning was the same for all G08 institutions.

All the attendees from this University agreed there had been a great spirit of collaboration and honesty in discussions.

Much of the discussion had been inspired by a UK study of UK PhD students who, in competition with Americans (with American PhDs), had found it difficult to get jobs in the UK. The UK PhD programs, in general, did not contain the same generic skill sets as the American PhD programs.

Suggestions had been made about what was required in order to keep Australian PhD graduates “employable”.

The DDoGS envisaged lobbying Senator the Honourable Kym Carr, who had chaired a Senate inquiry into the higher education legislation and, if necessary, the Honourable Julie Bishop MP, the Deputy Lead of the Opposition, about consensus regarding the constitution of a PhD in Australia.

Senator Carr had indicated in a paper that, in future, it was planned to make APAis and Australian Research Fellowships open to international as well as domestic students.

The Minister had been asked to look at a G08 proposal based on Labour pre-election promises, one of which had been the provision of more PhD scholarships. The Federal Government would be asked to:

- (1) raise the value of PhD scholarships to AUD26,000 (as it had been a long time since the last increase); and
- (2) make the PhD scholarship funding available for four years.

If these requests were agreed to, the G08 would reach agreement among its members that:

- (1) in future, research training would be offered only in areas of research strengths, recognizing that some disciplines were small, but that it was important to retain national networks of supervisors in those areas; and
- (2) there was a real need to clearly articulate the generic skills required of PhD students, the training which was available for the provision of those skills and that the skills would be recognized as part of the PhD.

This second proposal was in line with the University's proposed double degree program of Master of Research Studies/PhD.

It was noted that there would be another DDoGS meeting in Adelaide in April 2008.

The question was raised as to whether the inclusion of official coursework in the PhD program (as in the USA) would result in less time being available to devote to research. A PhD in the US typically took five to six years to complete and the length of time added to the difficulty in retaining students.

8. Higher Degree by Research Completions

Documents 8a (Load as at 27 March 2008 – previous year comparison) and 8b (HDR Completions by month – 2006-March 2008) were tabled.

It was noted that the University was not performing as well as had been expected.

The time taken to examine theses had not changed significantly between 2006 and 2007. There had been more examinations in 2007 but, based on the examination numbers in 2005 and 2006, there did not seem to be very much improvement.

The load reports showed that the University was not performing well on RTS load, but that it was performing exceptionally well on unfunded load.

The EFTSL to date in 2008 was just slightly less than for the same time in 2007.

Current University strategies in obtaining the required student numbers from interstate were not proving successful.

Professor Nettelbeck spoke about a Health Sciences initiative (in collaboration with the Sciences) in which advertisements encouraged potential students to use a website to obtain more information about research at the University. Potential students had their expenses paid to come to Adelaide where they were paired with a buddy/mentor and met potential supervisors, who encouraged them to apply for scholarships.

Professor Russell spoke of a research project which he, Mrs Witt and Dr Meredith Wallwork [in the Research Quality Framework project area in the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (R) and Vice-President (R)] were undertaking.

The goal of the project was to try to ascertain definitively the pathway from the initial student enquiry about undertaking research at the University.

In response to a query about having a set of databases which allowed the progress of an enquiry to be viewed, Professor Taplin advised that the University was looking for a company which could provide an on-line system of international applications.

9. Generic University Master of Philosophy

Professor Russell reported that the proposal to establish the degree was gaining momentum.

Whereas a three-year degree program would be acceptable for entry into the proposed Master of Research Studies (part of the proposed double Master of Research Studies/Doctor of Philosophy), the entry requirement for this proposed program would be more than a three-year degree.

It was suggested that a study comparing the outcomes of those with traditional entry backgrounds (i.e. Honours) with those from non-traditional backgrounds (e.g. equivalent Honours such as Fellowship of the Royal Australasian College of Physicians) might provide interesting data.

Action	Responsible
Bring Faculty feedback regarding the proposed Master of Philosophy to the next meeting of REDC.	All REDC members

10. Engaging undergraduate students in the research environment

It was agreed that it was important that undergraduate students be made aware of the postgraduate research environment.

Professor Nettelbeck spoke of a 2003 Health Sciences survey of students in first-year (mostly in Psychology). Students had expressed a strong interest in research, but did not have any understanding of exactly what was involved in research. This had resulted in the incorporation of research into the first-year curriculum. Feedback indicated that this change had been successful.

In 2007 a forum (basically an expansion of the research in first-year) was introduced at third-year level. A presentation about the research undertaken in Psychology was made so that students became aware of staff research interests before they reached the Honours year.

Professor Taplin advised that Study Abroad sponsors (especially from the USA) wanted students to take part in research activities at the University. The American National Science Foundation funded internships for undergraduate students to take part in research (in addition to their being employed in a research capacity).

It was suggested that the "Open Night" concept which had been held in the past could be expanded so that all undergraduate (not just Honours) students were encouraged to attend. Presentations by

undergraduates of the research projects they undertook (e.g. as part of the Summer Scholarships program) could be incorporated in the "Open Night".

Action	Responsible
Provide any comments and/or suggestions about how undergraduates could be involved in the research environment to Ms Frost by 21 May 2008.	All REDC members

11. China Scholarships

Professor Russell advised that applications had been received from a variety of disciplines in a number of Chinese institutions.

He said that the intention had been for students to enrol at the University and complete their programs in their entirety here.

There were two types of funding:

- (1) funding from the home institution, for up to four years, for travel, setting up the grant and living allowance. The University would waive tuition fees. The students would complete all their study at the University;
- (2) funding for students to undertake their study jointly between the home institution and the University.

However, problems had arisen with the second form of funding because some Chinese institutions were not able to issue jointly-badged degrees. In addition, some students would be "visitors" and would not graduate from this University.

The cotutelle scheme could be used only if the relationship between institutions was reciprocal and it was unlikely that the required number of Australian students would wish to study in China.

The problems which had arisen would need to be resolved on an ad-hoc basis.

It was expected that the administrative infrastructure would be streamlined for the next round of the scheme so that students would be enrolled in, and complete their studies at, this University. A website should be operational shortly.

REPORTS FROM RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKING PARTIES

12. Student Matters

The information was noted.

13. Doctoral Education

There was nothing to report.

14. Quality Issues Working Party

There was nothing to report.

UNSTARRED ITEMS FOR APPROVAL OR NOTING

15. ORBIT – for noting

The information was noted.

Other Business

16. Scholarship ranking in Earth & Environmental Sciences

Dr Ostendorf queried whether or not it was possible to increase the score for students whose ranking was very low but who had had work published in international journals.

It was pointed out that the Scholarships Committee looked at each case individually and decided on a banding (out of three) and a computer program ranked the students based on the band. The Order of Merit list was sent to Heads of Schools/Executive Deans for checking of any data entry errors and Schools had three to four days in which to provide feedback if they had any concerns.

The process with regard to the Scholarships Committee meeting (which was open and evidence-based) was provided.

Action	Responsible
Provide names of relevant students to Mrs Witt	Dr Ostendorf

17. LLB Curricula re-structure

Items 17a and 17 b were noted.

Professor Williams advised that the proposed changes to Honours had been formulated as a result of various reviews and in an effort to harmonize with the other G08 universities.

In the ensuing discussion, the following points were made:

- it was possible, under the proposed program, to graduate with Honours without having undertaken research in the Honours year.
- the proposed changes would not align with the University's mission to be known as a "great research university," but REDC appreciated the Law School's desire to provide programs which kept it competitive with other universities and understood that Law graduates were more likely to undertake coursework postgraduate study rather than research postgraduate study;
- the PhD academic standing rule currently stated that acceptance as a PhD candidate was on the basis of a relevant Honours degree of Bachelor of at least a IIA standard or equivalent. The generic research Masters' rule stated that acceptance was on the basis of a relevant Honours degree of Bachelor or equivalent. This was understood to mean existing Honours degrees which had

substantial research training components. Some of the proposed Law Honours permutations would not provide adequate preparation for direct entry to the PhD or the research Master at this University;

- if the proposed changes were accepted, the current academic standing rule (for both PhD and Master) would need to be amended to indicate that an Honours degree which was presented as the basis for entry into the program had to include a substantial research component deemed appropriate by REDC;
- the proposed Honours program would be setting a precedent.

REDC decided that it would not oppose the changes, but agreed that the relevant academic standing rules must be changed so that an Honours degree which was presented as the basis for entry had to include a substantial research component deemed appropriate by REDC.

Action	Responsible
Amend the relevant academic standing rules to indicate that an Honours degree which was presented as the basis for entry had to include a substantial research component deemed appropriate by REDC	Ms Frost

The meeting concluded at 1700.

18. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for 21 April 2008 in the Finance Board Room, Level 1, 115 Grenfell Street.

ROSANNA SCARSELLA
Acting Secretary

CONFIRMED:
Day/Month/Year
Date

.....
CONVENOR

FOR NOTING

ITEM 5

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

MEETING 2/08

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>6. Proposal to introduce more flexible entry pathways to the PhD for international students [“Item 7 from Meeting 1/08 and Item 6 Strategies for increasing HDR completions and meeting recruitment targets – bring a paper about the difficulties in interfacing with international educational institutions (prepared for Executive Deans) to REDC in 2008” from Meeting 7/07]</p> <p>Bring the Master of Research Studies/Doctor of Philosophy document to REDC for comment</p> <p>Once endorsed by REDC, present to Academic Board (via URC) for approval.</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p> <p>Ms Frost</p>	<p>In progress. See Item 6.</p> <p>Pending.</p>
<p>9. Proposed Generic University Master of Philosophy</p> <p>Bring Faculty feedback regarding the proposed Master of Philosophy to REDC.</p>	<p>All REDC members</p>	<p>In progress. See Item 7</p>
<p>10. Engaging undergraduate students in the research environment</p> <p>Provide comments and/or suggestions about how undergraduates could be involved in the research environment to Ms Frost by 21 May 2008.</p>	<p>All REDC members</p>	<p>In progress.</p>
<p>16. Scholarship ranking in Earth & Environmental Sciences</p> <p>Provide names of relevant students to Mrs Witt.</p>	<p>Dr Ostendorf</p>	<p>In progress.</p>
<p>17. LLB Curricula re-structure</p> <p>Amend the relevant academic standing rules to indicate that an Honours degree which was presented as the basis for entry to a PhD or research Master had to include a substantial research component deemed appropriate by REDC.</p>	<p>Ms Frost</p>	<p>Completed. See Item 15.</p>

MEETING 1/08

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>8. Procedure in response to students' queries about progress of theses examination</p> <p>Prepare draft document for consideration by Professors Williams and Nettelbeck and Dr Coaldrake</p>	Miss Scarsella	Completed. See Item 8.
<p>11. Master of Ophthalmology Specific Academic Program Rules</p> <p>Invite the Discipline to present a fuller proposal, which incorporated a background paper and a case for Honours equivalence, for consideration by REDC at a future meeting</p>	Miss Scarsella	Completed. See Item 9.
<p>17. Other Business Problems with Assignment of Supervisors</p> <p>Speak with Mr Shane McGregor, the Chief Financial Officer, about how the course description related to monies reaching the School/Discipline</p>	Professor Russell/Mrs Witt	In progress

MEETING 7/07

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>6. Strategies for increasing HDR completions and meeting recruitment targets (Item 7 from Meeting 5/07 and Item 6 from Meeting 6/07)</p> <p><u>Generic Research Proposal template</u> Send copy of final version of Faculty proforma to Miss Scarsella</p> <p>Liaise with Professor Turnbull of Psychology with regard to a University-wide survey of supervisory staff (early next year) to ascertain expectations/perceptions about constitution of PhD</p> <p>Obtain data, regarding HDR completions and meeting recruitment targets, on PhD students in the UK</p>	<p>All REDC members</p> <p>Professor Russell</p> <p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>In progress</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>Pending</p>

MEETING 6/07

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>7. HDR Student Accommodation (Item 15.1 from Meeting 5/07)</p> <p>Refer Recommendation 6 of the "Principles of Research Space Management" paper to Dr McMaster, Secretary, URC, for re-consideration</p> <p>Investigate the issue of provision of space to postgraduate research students, in the context of the "Minimum Resources Proforma"</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p> <p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed (specification of a University wide minimum space for PGR students is not feasible.)</p>

MEETING 4/07

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>10. Proposal to make the combined MPsyCh(Clin)/PhD a double degree</p> <p>Confirm with Ms Jessica Raeburn of the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Academic) that the proposal meets all the requirements of the University policy on double degrees</p> <p>Once above confirmation received, refer proposed change to Academic Board (via URC)</p>	<p>Professor Nettelbeck</p> <p>Miss Scarsella</p>	<p>In progress</p> <p>Pending</p>

MEETING 1/07

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>15. Management of extended leave of absence on medical grounds</p> <p>Further investigate the possibility of fixing a maximum period of LOA on medical grounds</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>Completed (fixing a maximum period of LOA on medical grounds is unacceptable.)</p>

MEETING 8/06

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>7. Higher Degree by Research Completions</p> <p>Consider the introduction of financial incentives for submission within 3.5 years FTE from commencement.</p>	<p>Professor Russell/Mrs Witt</p>	<p>Pending</p>
<p>10. The Core Component of the Structured Program and Plagiarism</p> <p>Assess the feasibility of making completion of the REP online module in plagiarism a compulsory part of the Core Component of the Structured Program</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>Pending</p>

ROSANNA SCARSELLA
Acting Secretary

FOR DISCUSSION

ITEM 8A

Proposed Procedure in Response to Students' Queries about Progress of Examination of Theses

Background

The examination of theses is a significant exercise in logistics. While the Graduate Centre endeavours to ensure that the examination process is completed in a timely manner, there can be delays for various reasons including, but not limited to: peak postage periods (e.g. Christmas); examiners going on leave; divergent examiners' recommendations; examiners' reports not being received by the expected due date; civil unrest; natural disasters; theses being lost in transit; theses returned unexamined by examiners; peak academic times (e.g. enrolment, examination); and provision (by examiners and/or students) of incorrect information.

This can be frustrating for all concerned - students, supervisors and the Graduate Centre.

Currently the process is not very transparent and involves a large degree of confidentiality, which may be disproportionate to the process. The standard response to any student queries about the progress of the thesis examination is that "the thesis is under examination". Understandably, such a response causes anxiety among students, who often assume delays are related to the (lack of) quality of the thesis.

Discussion

Transparency in the process

While increasing the amount of information given to students to keep them informed about the progress of their thesis examination is desirable, this must be tempered by the fact that divulging too much information might create the very anxiety the process is seeking to alleviate.

The proposed procedure seeks to strike a balance between keeping the student informed without compromising the confidentiality involved in the examination process.

It is suggested that a three-stage indicator be developed.

Stage 1 would normally involve the following actions/steps:

- waiting for examiners' details from School/Discipline;
- waiting for examiners' responses to invitation to examine;
- thesis sent to examiners and/or arbitrators;
- waiting examiners' or arbitrator's reports;
- utilizing new or replacement examiners.

Stage 2 would normally involve the following actions/steps:

- both examiners' reports received;
- waiting for supervisor(s)' reports;
- Executive Action to HDC;
- Executive Action to REDC;
- case referred to SMS;
- SMS decision;
- SMS decision to go to third examiner and/or arbitrator*

Stage 3 would normally involve the following actions/steps:

- outcome letter;
- qualification letter;
- revise and re-submit outcome.

*if the SMS decision is to go to a third examiner and/or arbitrator, then the process goes back to Stage 1

Informing the student

The Graduate Centre would be able to indicate the stage at which the examination was currently, without divulging the particular step within the stage.

Proposal to retain the existing system when responding to student queries regarding the progress of thesis examinations

Currently, in response to students' queries, Graduate Centre staff simply advise that a thesis is "under examination" and the student will be notified of the outcome as soon as possible. Staff are not at liberty to disclose any information about the stage the examination has reached and have a clear policy directive to support them when dealing with repeat student enquiries.

Whilst it has been suggested that the lack of transparency in this process may increase students' anxiety, particularly in cases where the examination process is lengthy, the system retains the advantages of simplicity, clarity and ease of implementation.

A proposal has been made to introduce a system whereby students are advised of how far thesis examination has progressed by reference to one of "three examination stages" together with a list of the possible actions/steps involved in each stage (REDC 08/3/x). On the surface, the increased transparency of this process might be expected to reduce student anxiety, however following discussion amongst senior Graduate Centre staff, it is suggested that, in fact, the reverse will result.

Providing students with limited information about the progress of the examination i.e. the *stage*, but not the *step* of the stage that the thesis has reached may lead to students trying to "hurry up" *all* the steps in that stage, or, assuming the worst scenario in cases where the thesis examination is lengthy. For example, a student who is told that their thesis examination has reached stage 2 may begin to repeatedly ask whether their supervisor has completed his/her report, or, may assume that the thesis has been sent to a third examiner even though they don't know for sure which step of the process the examination has reached.

Consequently, the Graduate Centre is of the opinion that the proposed three-tier system will not achieve the objective of reducing student anxiety whilst still maintaining the integrity of the examination process and may even promote further anxiety and calls to supervisors/AGC staff. Certainly, a level of ambiguity not currently seen in staff responses to student queries would be introduced.

The Graduate Centre requests that REDC consider the following recommendation:

Recommendation: To retain the existing system of non-disclosure when responding to student queries regarding the progress of thesis examinations.

Masters Degrees by Research

The General Academic Program Rules shall apply to all Masters by Research programs at the University of Adelaide. Specific Academic Program Rules for other Masters by Research awards have been developed within the framework of these General Masters Rules and are listed under their respective Faculty/School. The following academic programs have no specific Academic Program Rules and therefore are bound entirely by the General Masters Program Rules:

- Master of Agricultural Science
- Master of Applied Science
- Master of Design Studies
- Master of Design Studies (Landscape)
- **Master of Ophthalmology**
- Master of Science
- Master of Urban Design

CURRENT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR APPLICANTS APPLYING FOR SCHOLARSHIPS SELECTED BY THE GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS COMMITTEE

The Graduate Scholarships Committee at its meeting in November requested a summary of the eligibility criteria for each scholarship program that the Committee had responsibility for. In particular, the Committee was concerned about the impact of students enrolling before scholarship selection and wished to discuss whether it should be possible to allow up to 6 months of prior enrolment without jeopardising eligibility for scholarship consideration?

An overview of the current eligibility criteria is included below for discussion.

DOMESTIC SCHOLARSHIPS

Scheme: Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA)

Funding: Federal Government

Special conditions: Students who have commenced can be considered.

Scholarship provides RTS place and living allowance

Scheme: Divisional Scholarships

Funding: University (Central) and Faculty/School/Discipline

Special conditions: Students who have commenced cannot be considered. The purpose is to attract commencing students therefore currently enrolled students are not eligible to be considered.

Scholarship provides RTS place and living allowance

INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Endeavour International Postgraduate Research Scholarships (EIPRS)

Funding: Federal Government funds tuition fees, University pays living allowance

Special conditions: Students who have commenced can be considered if their application was received after the 31 August closing date and therefore they were not considered in that year's scholarship round. Students can only be considered once so if they are unsuccessful they cannot be considered in the following year. This is a DEEWR Rule.

Scholarship provides payment of tuition fees and living allowance.

Adelaide Scholarships International (ASI)

Funding: University (Central)

Special conditions: Students who have commenced cannot be considered. The purpose is to attract commencing students therefore currently enrolled students are not eligible to be considered.

Scholarship provides payment of tuition fees and living allowance.

Adelaide Fee Scholarships International (AFSI)

Funding: University (Central)

Special conditions: Students who have commenced cannot be considered. The purpose is to attract commencing students therefore currently enrolled students are not eligible to be considered.

Scholarship provides payment of tuition fees ONLY.

Adelaide Graduate Fee Scholarships (AGFS)-Applicants must be currently enrolled at UA in Honours or Masters or completed in the previous year and be eligible to gain entry into a Masters by research or PhD.

Funding: University (Central)

Special conditions: Students who have commenced cannot be considered. The purpose is to attract commencing students therefore currently enrolled students are not eligible to be considered.

Scholarship provides payment of tuition fees ONLY.

STUDENT MATTERS SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING 08/3 – 10 APRIL 2008



FOR APPROVAL

MINUTES OF MEETING 08/2

A meeting of the Student Matters Sub-committee (SMS) was held in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street, from 1.00 pm on Friday, 14 March 2008.

Present: Professor Richard Russell (Convenor); Dr Liz Cousins; Dr Chris Ford

In attendance: Miss Rosanna Scarsella

FORMAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies/Announcements**

Dr Kimi Coaldrake; Ms Felicity Rai

2. **Conflict of Interest**

Members did not participate in the discussion of student cases from their Faculties.

3. **Minutes of Meeting**

The minutes
of the meeting held on 29 January 2008
were approved.

MAJOR ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/APPROVAL

4. **PhD examination case 08_2_1**

It was noted that neither examiner was satisfied with the exegesis, the "scholarly" aspect of the "thesis".

After consideration of all the documentation, it was decided that the thesis be sent to a third examiner.

5. **PhD examination case 08_2_2**

Examiner 1's criticism of the premise in Chapter 3 ignoring the findings in Chapter 4 was explained by the fact that Chapter 4 made use of improved technology which had not been available at the time of the experimentation contained in Chapter 3. In order to overcome this, the student could perhaps have incorporated the contents of both chapters into one. Examiner 1's comments [even though he had recommended (d)] were entirely consistent with a (c) recommendation and after consideration of all the documentation it was decided: (c) the student be awarded the degree subject to amendments being made to the thesis.

6. PhD examination case 08_2_3

It was apparent from all the documentation that a major re-working of the thesis was required. It was decided: (d) the student be invited to revise the thesis for re-submission.

7. PhD examination case 08_2_4

Examiner 1 did not believe the thesis satisfied the criteria for award of the PhD: "there (was) scant evidence of critical thought(;) there (was) no significant contribution to knowledge(;) the research (was) very minimally related to the field of environmental education(; and) the thesis (was) not clearly or accurately written". In addition this examiner had alleged that the student had "engaged in plagiarism".

As the supervisor had refused to provide a supervisor(s)' report, it was not possible to ascertain his thoughts on the matter.

It was agreed that the material in the thesis was a verbatim copy of the web pages the examiner had attached to her report.

Given that the authors of the web pages ("FUNDERSTANDING") just acknowledged the authorship of "On Purpose Associates" it was decided that the examiner be asked if she could shed any light on this group. In dealing with plagiarism it was crucial to identify the source of the original material.

Professor Russell would write to the examiner. When she had responded, the case was to be brought back to SMS.

8. PhD examination case 08_2_5

There was a list of related publications at the beginning of the thesis.

Examiner 1 had had difficulty in ascertaining the extent of the student's contribution to the contents of the thesis. He had commented on the use of the passive voice, saying that this had made "it nearly impossible to tell what the author accomplished during her PhD project." He suggested the use of past tense to make clear the work done by the student.

The supervisor(s) had not provided any defence of the examiner's comments. Indeed, if the statements of the supervisor(s) were correct, then the student's contribution to the thesis was very unclear.

After consideration of all the documentation, it was decided that the thesis be sent to a third examiner.

Other Business

9. PhD case 07_10_1 considered at SMS meeting 07/10 (28 November 2007)

The information was noted.

10. MSc case 07_5_3 considered at SMS meetings 07/5 (22 June 2007), 07/6 (8 August 2007) and 07/8 (5 September 2007)

The information was noted.

11. PhD case 08_1_2 considered at SMS meeting 08/1 (29 January 2008)

The information was noted.

12. Next Meeting

The next meeting would be scheduled as required.

The meeting concluded at 2.20 pm.

ROSANNA SCARSELLA
Secretary

CONFIRMED:

.....
CONVENOR

FOR NOTING

ITEM 19A

4 April 2008

Mrs Allison Stokes
Secretary, PAC

Dear Allison

I respond to the request from the Programs Approval Committee (PAC) for Research Education and Development Committee (REDC) comments regarding the LLB curricula re-structure proposal.

REDC considered the proposed Honours program, which involved changes that would allow students to graduate with Honours without having to undertake any research.

REDC understood that the proposed changes had been formulated as a result of various reviews and in an effort to harmonize with the other G08 universities.

The following points were made:

- the changes would not align with the University's mission to be known as a "great research university", but REDC appreciated the Law School's desire to provide programs which would keep it competitive with other universities and understood that Law graduates were more likely to undertake coursework postgraduate studies than research postgraduate studies;
- the Honours option with no research would not provide adequate preparation for direct entry to a PhD at this University. The PhD rules currently state that "the academic standing required for acceptance as a candidate for a Doctor of Philosophy in the University shall be a relevant Honours degree of Bachelor of at least a IIA standard ... or equivalent". This is understood to refer to existing Honours degrees which have a substantial research training component, so there would need to be a change to the rule in the future if the new LLB (Hons) program were to be approved.
- the proposed Honours structure without any research would be setting a precedent in the University of Adelaide.

After an in-depth discussion, REDC decided that it would not oppose the proposed changes but noted that amendments to the PhD and research Masters' rules would be required so that an Honours degree which was presented as the basis for entry included a substantial research component deemed appropriate by REDC. In the present context, this would mean that the only LLB (Hons) acceptable to direct entry to the PhD would be the option containing a major research dissertation.

Yours sincerely

Professor Richard A Russell AM
Dean of Graduate Studies and Convenor of REDC

Revised Admission Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy, General Masters by Research and General Professional Doctorate Program Rules

Doctor of Philosophy

Academic Program Rules

Academic standing

- 4.1 The academic standing required for acceptance as a candidate for a Doctor of Philosophy in the University shall be a relevant Honours degree of Bachelor of at least a IIA standard or a degree of Master of the University of Adelaide or the equivalent thereof. An Honours or Masters degree presented as a qualification for admission to a PhD program must contain a research component deemed appropriate by the Research Education and Development Committee. An Honours or Masters degree that contains only coursework will not be accepted for this purpose.

Masters Degrees by Research

Academic Program Rules

Academic standing

- 4.1 The academic standing required for acceptance as a candidate for a Masters degree by research in the University shall be a relevant Honours degree of Bachelor or a relevant degree of Master of the University of Adelaide or the equivalent thereof. Where an Honours or Masters degree is presented as a qualification for admission to a Masters by Research program, the degree must contain a research component deemed appropriate by the Research Education and Development Committee. An Honours or Masters degree that contains only coursework will not be accepted for this purpose.

Professional Doctorate Degrees

Academic Program Rules

Academic standing

- 4.1 The academic standing required for acceptance as a candidate for a Professional Doctorate in the University shall be a relevant Honours degree of Bachelor of at least a IIA standard or a degree of Master of the University of Adelaide or the equivalent thereof. Where an Honours or Masters degree is presented as a qualification for admission to a doctoral program, the degree must contain a research component deemed appropriate by the Research Education and Development Committee. An Honours or Masters degree that contains only coursework will not be accepted for this purpose.