

A meeting of the Research Education and Development Committee will be held in the ARI Board Room, Level 14, 115 Grenfell Street, from 2.30 pm on 18 August 2008.

AGENDA

FORMAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies**
Professor Richard Russell, Dr Anthony Zander
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 7 July 2008
Recommendation: that the Research Education and Development Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2008.
5. **Business Arising from the Minutes** (not otherwise listed on this agenda)
(Item 5)
6. * **MAJOR REPORTS or ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR APPROVAL**
Examples of Good Practice in Research Education
Dr Coaldrake to present. To note the revised schedule of presentations (Item 6)
7. * **IELTS Requirements for International Students**
Professor Williams to report. For continued discussion and decision (Item 7).
8. * **Confirmation of Candidature Practices**
Professor Williams to report.
9. * **Electronic Thesis Delivery to Examiners**
Ms Jade Wildy and Ms Libby Hamilton from the Adelaide Graduate Centre to report. To consider the extension of the scheme to the Sciences Faculty.

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

10. **Student Matters**

To note Student Matters report 08/4 from 9 July 2008.

11. **Doctoral Education**

No further meetings have been held.

12. **Quality Issues Working Party**

No further meetings have been held.

UNSTARRED ITEMS FOR APPROVAL OR NOTING

13. **Submission of a Research Publication as Part of Two Students' PhD Theses**

To note the revised extracts of the HDR Academic Program Rules and Specifications for Thesis document which have been amended to clarify that a research publication can be submitted as part of two research students' theses (Item 13).

14. **Overdue Submissions from Lapsed Candidates.**

To note the statement added to the 2009 Academic Program Rules regarding the applicability of the rules to all enrolled research candidates (Item 14).

15. **Other Business**

16. **Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting will be held from 2.30 pm to 4.30 pm on 29 September 2008 in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street.

DONNA FROST
Secretary
F: 2007/4386

FOR APPROVAL

MINUTES OF MEETING 5/08

A meeting of the Research Education and Development Committee was held in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street, from 2.30 pm on 7 July 2008.

Present: Professor Richard Russell (Convenor), Mr Simon Brennan, Dr Chris Ford, Dr Ian Green (from 3:10pm), Professor Ted Nettelbeck, Dr Bertram Ostendorf, Dr Adrian Peace, Professor John Taplin (from 3:15pm), Professor John Williams, Dr Anthony Zander.

In attendance: Ms Donna Frost, Mrs Anne Witt

FORMAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies/Announcements**

Apologies were noted from the following: Dr Kate Cadman, Dr Kimi Coaldrake

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 23 was starred at the start of the meeting.

4. **Minutes of Meeting**

The Committee resolved:

to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 2 June 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. **The Core Component of the Structured Program and Plagiarism**

Professor Russell advised that funding was available to undertake the required modifications to the online module in plagiarism; however, the staff time required to turn the module from a formative to a summative tool was yet to be resourced.

Action	Responsible
Advise the Committee of further progress towards the development of a summative version of the online plagiarism module when available.	Professor Russell

7. Submission of a Research Publication as Part of Two Students' PhD Theses

The Committee agreed that, from 2009, a research publication could be submitted as part of two research student theses provided that the appropriate detailed descriptors of each individual's contribution to the paper (both materially and in terms of IP) was provided. Accordingly, the 2009 academic program rules and thesis declaration for a thesis that contains publications (3.2 of the Specifications for Thesis document) would require amendment.

Action	Responsible
Amend the HDR Academic Program Rules and Specifications for Thesis document to clarify that a research publication can be submitted as part of two research students' theses.	Ms Frost
Advise supervisors and students of the change to the rules from 2009, through <i>AGC News</i> .	Ms Frost

8. Confirmation of Candidature Practices

Following the discussion at the previous REDC meeting on how to strengthen confirmation of candidature practices, members noted the variation in practices in different Faculties, Schools and Disciplines (Item 15A and subsequently circulated paper from Dr Ford for the Sciences Faculty).

Bad practice was clearly identified as the principal supervisor just "ticking the boxes", whilst good practice typically involved the candidate presenting a seminar to a candidature confirmation committee comprising the supervisors and others familiar with the discipline area e.g. the Postgraduate Coordinator, senior academic staff and/or external staff), followed by a discussion amongst the candidature confirmation committee of the student's ability to meet the standard required for a PhD within the allowable timeframe.

Where doubts were expressed about a candidate's rate of progress, he or she would be given one opportunity to improve during a period of provisional candidature before being confirmed in the PhD, transferred to a Masters program or terminated. The principal advantages of using a candidature confirmation committee to make the decision was that it enabled the whole Discipline to be made aware of the candidate's progress and removed the burden of responsibility from the supervisor for giving a student negative feedback about their progress and the likelihood of completion.

The Committee went on to consider the timing of candidature confirmation and whether 12 months was an appropriate period of time in which to determine a candidate's ability to succeed in a PhD program. Views ranged from yes to undertaking confirmation of candidature at 6 months (combined with completion of the Core Component of the Structured Program), to undertaking confirmation of candidature at 18 months, with a maximum extension of 3 months of provisional candidature for those candidates whose rate of progress was a concern. Against changing the timing of candidature confirmation to six months was the difficulty of accurately assessing research ability, potential and progress within this timeframe, particularly for international students heavily involved in the IBP for

their first semester of candidature and for students in programs with a front loaded coursework component. Additionally, it was noted that once students were confirmed in candidature, it became much more difficult to either terminate or downgrade candidature to a Masters level program.

Reasons for not delaying candidature confirmation to 18 months concerned the large (and ultimately wasted) commitment of effort, time and money already invested by this point where the outcome was negative i.e. termination or downgrade of candidature.

Action	Responsible
Prepare a paper for the Vice Chancellor's Committee detailing recommendations for the strengthening of candidature confirmation practices at the University.	Professor Russell

9. Identifying Opportunities for Improving Research Student Support

Members noted the responses of Faculties, Schools and Disciplines regarding areas of student support identified as lacking or inadequate (Item 15B and the subsequently circulated paper from Dr Ford for the Sciences Faculty). In addition, the relationship between the inadequate level of scholarship stipends and the necessity for students to undertake many hours of paid work outside of their program of study was highlighted. This, together with the inadequate space allocations in many areas and the lack of support available to students at the writing-up stage of candidature were highlighted as primary issues.

On a more positive note, it was reported that at Flinders University a suite on non-academic programs were made available to students e.g. habits of successful PhD students, avoiding self-sabotage and bad habits and that these kinds of programs were starting to be included in the general training provided to supervisors and researchers.

Action	Responsible
Prepare a paper for the Vice Chancellor's Committee detailing recommendations for the strengthening of candidature confirmation practices at the University.	Professor Russell

10. Examples of Good Practice in Research Education

In the interests of time, Dr Zander's talk was postponed to the 18 August meeting of REDC.

Action	Responsible
Prepare a revised schedule for the 2008 presentations on "Examples of Good Practice in Research Education Policy and Practice".	Ms Frost

11. Award and Distribution of APA Scholarships across the University: Alternative Models

In the interests of time, this item was postponed.

12. Recognition of Outstanding Higher Degree by Research Theses

The Committee supported the introduction of awards for the recognition of outstanding Higher Degree by Research Theses. It was envisaged that the awards would take the form of University Medals with three to five awarded per Faculty each year.

In order to identify the most outstanding theses, it was agreed that examiners be asked to assess the quality of the thesis independently of required corrections affecting the presentation of the thesis e.g. errors of spelling, grammar, referencing or missing captions etc.

Action	Responsible
Revise the Examiner's Report form for the Committee's consideration.	Ms Frost

13. Admission Requirements for the Master of Ophthalmology and the PhD in Ophthalmology

The Committee discussed the admission requirements for the Master of Ophthalmology and the PhD in Ophthalmology proposed in Item 13A by Dr Casson and determined that:

1. The MBBS alone was a sufficient pre-requisite for direct admission to the Master of Ophthalmology and that therefore the specific program rules detailed in Item 13B were acceptable;
2. The MBBS alone was an insufficient pre-requisite for direct admission to the PhD in Ophthalmology. As with all other PhD programs, candidates for the PhD in Ophthalmology would be required to demonstrate evidence of research training equivalent to a relevant Honours degree of at least IIA standard. In cases where candidate's lacked an Honours degree, but held an MBBS, a case for Honours equivalency would need to be presented to the Dean of Graduate Studies for consideration. Evidence of additional research training could include completion of the primary fellowship examinations, research publications and previous work experience etc;
3. The Committee's decision in this matter was final.

Action	Responsible
Advise Dr Casson of REDC's determination in relation to the entry requirements for the Masters and PhD in Ophthalmology.	Ms Frost
Advise the Program Approvals Committee of REDC's determination in relation to the entry requirements for the Masters in Ophthalmology.	Ms Frost

14. Report of the Postgraduate Working Party

Professor Russell advised that REDC had been invited to make a submission to the Postgraduate Working Party on the report of the review.

One of the issues highlighted by the Working Party had been the inflexible entry requirements to the University's higher degree by research programs and the corresponding disadvantage this placed on the University's ability to market its programs to international students. It was observed that even the University's entry level research degrees (Masters by Research), normally required an Honours degree for admission, and this, given the low prevalence of Honours degrees outside of Australia, precluded many international students from admission.

Members agreed that it would be timely to introduce greater flexibility in the entrance requirements for Masters level programs, which could be reconceptualised as providing the training ground in research methodology that would be required to successfully complete a PhD. It was envisaged that students could progress directly from Bachelor level programs to a two year Masters by Research or from an Honours program to a one year MPhil degree by research. Furthermore, the Master of Research Studies/PhD double degree program [discussed previously], would provide a pathway for international students with a limited research background (lacking in Honours), to transition easily into the research stream.

Action	Responsible
Prepare REDC's submission to the Postgraduate Working Party.	Professor Russell

15. IELTS Requirements for International Students

Professor Taplin advised that at the last Internationalisation Committee meeting, Faculty comment had been invited on the adequacy of English language entry requirements to various programs across the University. During the ensuing discussion, some anomalies in the current minima for research students had been highlighted: PhD students in most areas need an IELTS of only 6.0, in Education and Law the IELTS requirement is higher for undergraduate than Masters students, and in Creative Writing the IELTS requirement is lower for PhD students than others.

Given that the PhD is the University's flagship program and that no other Go8 university has an IELTS requirement below 6.5 for PhDs, the Internationalisation Committee invited REDC to review the existing IELTS requirements for HDR programs (as detailed in ITEM 15A), with a view to either increasing or defending the current standards ahead of the impending Australian University Quality Agency (AUQA) visit. Members were specifically asked to consider whether it was justified for entry into our PhD programs to be less stringent than entry into our undergraduate or Masters by Coursework programs.

The following points were highlighted in support of retaining the existing IELTS requirements:

- Patricia Anderson *et al*'s 2004 study into the relationship between language proficiency and academic outcomes for international postgraduate students at the University of Adelaide indicated that there was 'not a clear relationship between English language proficiency and academic performance and outcomes [for postgraduate research students].';
- Professor Nettelbeck advised that the Faculty of Health Sciences (which has an IELTS requirement of 6.5, with at least 6.0 in all bands, for all programs including PhDs), considered their current entry requirements to be sufficient; however, it was thought that a difference of 0.5 was insignificant in terms of academic outcomes at the PhD level i.e. an IELTS of 6.5, 6.0, or 7.0 would be expected to yield students of similar competency. Members noted that a widespread perception existed amongst supervisors in Health Sciences that the language problems encountered by (some) students were more to do with discipline specific language than the level of general English competence assessed which is assessed by the IELTS;
- Whilst the minimum IELTS requirement is 6.0, how many PhD students are admitted on the basis of having achieved only the minimum competency?
- At the University of Adelaide, international students have access to ongoing language support through the Integrated Bridging Program (IBP) and their performance in the IBP was thought to be an accurate reflection of their PhD specific language competence than the IELTS.

To confirm that Faculty views were in accordance with those of the Committee, it was agreed that staff be canvassed for their opinions on the adequacy of the current English language proficiency requirements for HDR students, for continued discussion at the next meeting.

Action	Responsible
Consult with Faculty/School/Discipline staff to determine views on the current English language proficiency requirements for HDR programs as detailed in ITEM 15A.	All REDC members
Submit a report to Ms Frost by 11 August or table at the REDC meeting to be held on 18 August 2008.	All REDC members

16. Overdue Submissions from Lapsed Candidates

Professor Russell advised that he had been contacted in relation to the possible submission of a PhD thesis in publication format, by a student whose candidature had lapsed several years earlier. It was clarified that under normal circumstances, students submitted under the current rules, however, they could, if they considered themselves disadvantaged by them, apply to the Dean of Graduate Studies for dispensation to be treated, as far as possible, in accordance with the rules in place in their year of enrolment.

At the time of the student's enrolment (some 10 years ago), submission in publication format was not permissible, however, whilst the current rules do allow for such a submission to be made, they preclude candidates who lapsed more than 12 months earlier from submission. Consequently, the candidate would normally be precluded from submission by whichever set of rules were employed.

Given that, the University's policy defining the applicability of rules was not clearly articulated in the academic program rules for higher degrees by research, it was agreed that in this particular case, an exception be made to permit the candidate to submit under the provisions of Rule 41, provided that this was done within 6 months of notification of the Committee's decision.

To avoid future ambiguity, it was agreed that the following statement be added to the relevant Higher Degree by Research Rules:

"These rules are applicable to all currently enrolled research students; however, if any student who enrolled prior to this year considers themselves disadvantaged by the stipulated rules, they may apply to the Dean of Graduate Studies for dispensation to be treated, as far as possible, in accordance with the rules in place in their year of enrolment."

Action	Responsible
Add a statement regarding the applicability of rules to all the relevant Higher Degree by Research program rules in the 2009 Calendar.	Ms Frost
Advise the candidate of the Committee's decision regarding permission to submit a thesis for examination.	Professor Russell

17. The Future of Honours Research at the University of Adelaide

Discussed under Item 14.

18. Exit Survey Report – June 2008

The Exit Survey report from June 2008 (Item 18) was noted.

19. Electronic Thesis Delivery to Examiners

Members noted that the trial electronic delivery of theses to examiners in the Faculty of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences had been very successful. As depicted in Item 19, over a 5 week period, 89% of examiners had elected to receive an electronic thesis copy for review, resulting in postage savings of over \$900.

Action	Responsible
Extend the option of electronic delivery of theses to examiners in other Faculties where possible.	Professor Russell/ Mrs Witt

REPORTS FROM RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKING PARTIES

20. Student Matters

The Student Matters report from 10 April 2003 (08/3) was noted.

21. Doctoral Education

There was nothing to report.

22. Quality Issues Working Party

There was nothing to report.

UNSTARRED ITEMS FOR APPROVAL OR NOTING

23. Higher Degree by Research Academic Program Rules and Specifications for Thesis for the 2009 Calendar

The Higher Degree by Research Academic Program Rules and Specifications for Thesis document prepared for the 2009 Calendar (Item 23B) were approved by the Committee, with the proviso that the changes stipulated in Items 7 and 16 be made.

Action	Responsible
Seek ratification of the 2009 Academic Program Rules and Specifications for Thesis document by the University Research Committee, the Academic Board and the Vice-Chancellor.	Ms Frost

Once the necessary approvals have been received, forward the final Rules and Specifications for Thesis document to Lynn Larsen for inclusion in the	Ms Frost
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

24. Clarification of the Responsibility of Staff and Students in Relation to the Submission and Certification of a Thesis for Examination

The extracts of the Research Student Handbook and the Certification of Thesis for Examination which had been revised to clarify the responsibility of staff and students in relation to the submission and certification of a thesis for examination (Item 24) were noted.

25. Other Business

There was none.

26 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for 18 August 2008 in the ARI Board Room, Level 14, 115 Grenfell Street.

DONNA FROST
Secretary

CONFIRMED:
Day/Month/Year
Date CONVENOR

FOR NOTING

ITEM 5

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

MEETING 5/08

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>6. The Core Component of the Structured Program and Plagiarism</p> <p>Advise the Committee of further progress towards the development of a summative version of the online plagiarism module when available.</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>In progress</p>
<p>7. Submission of a Research Publication as Part of two Students' PhD Theses</p> <p>Amend the HDR Academic Program Rules and Specifications for Thesis document to clarify that a research publication can be submitted as part of two research students' theses.</p> <p>Advise supervisors and students of the change to the rules from 2009, through <i>AGCNews</i>.</p>	<p>Ms Frost</p> <p>Ms Frost</p>	<p>Completed. See Item 13</p> <p>Completed</p>
<p>8. Confirmation of Candidature Practices</p> <p>Prepare a paper for the Vice-Chancellor's Committee detailing recommendations for the strengthening of candidature confirmation practices at the University.</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>In progress. See Item 8</p>
<p>9. Identifying Opportunities for Improving Research Student Support</p> <p>Prepare a paper for the Vice-Chancellor's Committee detailing recommendations for the strengthening of candidature confirmation practices at the university.</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>In progress</p>
<p>10. Examples of Good Practice in Research Education</p> <p>Prepare a revised schedule for the 2008 presentations on "Examples of Good Practice in Research Education Policy and Practice".</p>	<p>Ms Frost</p>	<p>Completed</p>

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>12. Recognition of Outstanding Higher Degree by Research Theses</p> <p>Revise the Examiner's Report form for the Committee's consideration.</p>	Ms Frost	Pending
<p>13. Admission Requirements for the Master of Ophthalmology and the PhD in Ophthalmology</p> <p>Advise Dr Casson of REDC's determination in relation to the entry requirements for the Masters and PhD in Ophthalmology.</p> <p>Advise the Program Approvals Committee of REDC's determination in relation to the entry requirements for the Masters in Ophthalmology.</p>	Ms Frost Ms Frost	Completed Completed
<p>14. Report of the Postgraduate Working Party</p> <p>Prepared REDC's submission to the Postgraduate Working Party.</p>	Professor Russell	Completed
<p>15. IELTS Requirements for International Students</p> <p>Consult with Faculty/School/Discipline staff to determine views on the current English language proficiency requirements for HDR programs as detailed in ITEM 15A.</p> <p>Submit a report to Ms Frost by 11 August or table at the REDC meeting to be held on 18 August 2008.</p>	REDC members REDC members	In progress. See Item 7 In progress. See Item 7
<p>16. Overdue Submissions from Lapsed Candidates</p> <p>Add a statement regarding the applicability of rules to all the relevant Higher Degree by Research Program Rules in the 2009 Calendar.</p> <p>Advise the candidate of the Committee's decision regarding permission to submit a thesis for examination.</p>	Ms Frost Professor Russell	Completed. See Item 14 Completed
<p>19. Electronic Thesis Delivery to Examiners</p> <p>Extend the option of electronic delivery of theses to examiners in other Faculties where possible.</p>	Professor Russell/Ms Witt	Completed. See Item 9

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>23. Higher Degree by Research Academic Program Rules and Specifications for Thesis for the 2009 Calendar</p> <p>Seek ratification of the 2009 Academic Program Rules and Specifications for Thesis document by the University Research Committee, the Academic Board and the Vice-Chancellor.</p> <p>Once the necessary approvals have been received, forward the final Rules and Specifications for Thesis document to Lynn Larsen for inclusion in the 2009 Calendar.</p>	<p>Ms Frost</p> <p>Ms Frost</p>	<p>Waiting on approvals from UAB & the VC&P</p> <p>pending</p>

MEETING 4/08

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>6. The Core Component of the Structured Program and Plagiarism</p> <p>Discuss the options for the ongoing support of students identified as requiring remedial assistance in avoiding plagiarism and report back to REDC.</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>In progress</p>

MEETING 3/08

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>6. Proposal to Introduce more Flexible Entry Pathways to the PhD for International Students through a Master of Research Studies</p> <p>Bring PAC proposal for the creation of the Master of Research Studies/PhD double degree program to a future REDC meeting for consideration.</p>	<p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>Pending</p>
<p>13. Australasian Research Training Administrators (ARTA) Meeting, April 2008</p> <p>Give consideration to the basis for PhD in excellence awards at the University of Adelaide and review practice at other Go8 institutions.</p>	<p>Professor Russell/Ms Frost</p>	<p>Completed</p>

MEETING 1/08

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
17. Other Business Problems with Assignment of Supervisors Speak with Mr Shane McGregor, the Chief Financial Officer, about how the course description related to monies reaching the School/Discipline.	Professor Russell/Mrs Witt	In progress

MEETING 7/07

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
6. Strategies for Increasing HDR completions and Meeting Recruitment Targets (Item 7 from Meeting 5/07 and Item 6 from Meeting 6/07) Obtain data, regarding HDR completions and meeting recruitment targets, on PhD students in the UK	Professor Russell	In progress

MEETING 8/06

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
7. Higher Degree by Research Completions Consider the introduction of financial incentives for submission within 3.5 years FTE from commencement.	Professor Russell/Mrs Witt	Tied to the future of the scholarships scheme

DONNA FROST
Secretary

RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING 6 – 2008



FOR NOTING

ITEM 6

Examples of Good Practice in Higher Degree by Research Policy and Practice: Schedule for 2008

Date of Meeting	Presenter	Faculty/Division
7 July 08	POSTPONED	POSTPONED
18 Aug 08	Dr Kimi Coaldrake	Humanities and Social Sciences
29 Sep 08	Dr Anthony Zander	Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences
27 Oct 08	Professor Ted Nettelbeck	Health Sciences
1 Dec 08	Professor John Williams	Professions
1 st Meeting 2009	Dr Chris Ford	Sciences

FOR NOTING

ITEM 7

IELTS REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

FACULTY RESPONSES:

Faculty of Health Sciences

Hi Donna,

At the most recent REDC Rick asked that we reconsider the IELTS criteria, with a view to being able to justify these in the event of an audit. I have now had a thorough discussion of this matter with members of the FHS Higher Degrees Committee.

The consensus is that our current requirement of 6.5, with a minimum of 6.0 in all bands is the minimum acceptable; and there is widespread opinion that we would be better served by adopting 7.0 overall, with either 6.5 or even 7.0 on each band. All schools report that international students on 6.5 require extensive language support throughout their candidature, particularly for technical language.

Comments reflected concerns about competence with both spoken and written language. There was also a query about whether was refining its standard when assessing speaking -- in effect, an impression that the standard had been lowered. I was not able to comment on that; but it would certainly be a concern if this was so.

There was comment also about the competencies of international students who are not required to take the IELTS because they have studied years 11 and or 12 in the Australian school system. This comment actually reflected a concern about undergraduate competencies; but the point had some validity. Essentially, the suggestion was that language assessment should not be waived for any international student whose first language is other than English, unless they had completed their entire secondary education and undergraduate training in Australia.

To summarize, the opinions of my colleagues can be summarised as regarding current practice as scarcely adequate; and there is widespread opinion that we'd be better served by raising the criterion to 7.0 overall, with a minimum of 6.5 for all bands.

Cheers, Ted

Ted Nettelbeck
Professor School of Psychology

Responses are pending from all other Faculties.

STUDENT MATTERS SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING 08/5 – XXXX



FOR APPROVAL

MINUTES OF MEETING 08/4

A meeting of the Student Matters Sub-committee (SMS) was held on Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street, from 1.00 pm on Wednesday, 9 July 2008.

Present: Professor Richard Russell (Convenor); Dr Liz Cousins; Dr Chris Ford;
Professor Ted Nettelbeck; Ms Felicity Rai

In attendance: Miss Rosanna Scarsella

FORMAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies/Announcements**

There were none.

2. **Conflict of Interest**

No conflicts were declared. Members did not participate in discussion of cases from their Faculties.

3. **Minutes of Meeting**

The minutes
of the meeting held on 10 April 2008
were approved.

MAJOR ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/APPROVAL

4. **PhD examination case 08_4_1**

Although Examiner 1 had recommended (c) she required a number of serious corrections.

The supervisors, in their report, had acknowledged and addressed all the problems noted by the examiners. However, they had not effectively argued why their comments should be interpreted as support for a (c) – their recommendation - rather than a (d) outcome. Their comments seemed to lean more towards a (d) outcome.

It was noted that the supervisor(s)' report in this case was an example of supervisors not addressing the considerations which should be taken into account when compiling such reports and that this could form a topic for inclusion in supervisor training workshops.

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

5. **PhD examination case 08_4_2**

This case highlighted the difficulty in examining a multi-disciplinary thesis.

The three main issues of concern for Examiner 1 did not seem to indicate that further re-writing or interviewing were required.

While there was no argument from the examiners about conclusions being incorrect or poor methodology having been employed, there were discrepancies in their comments. For example, Examiner 2 believed "Murphy's family meeting process (was) very clearly and skilfully described ..." whereas Examiner 1 stated that "Because there (was) no account of the content of the family meeting, (she) was unable to assess the validity of the claims made This (was) not a peripheral issue. It (was) central to the claims of the thesis".

Members noted that the supervisors' argument had been cogently made.

After due consideration, it was decided to send the thesis to an arbitrator.

6. MMedSc examination case 08_4_3

One of Examiner 2's major concerns had been that the theory behind the entropy-based analyses had not been adequately provided by the student.

The supervisors, in their report, had advised that the precise technology involved in the entropy-based analyses was the basis of a patent and some aspects of the technology had not been disclosed as part of the procedure. Therefore the student would find it difficult to give a full explanation of the technology utilized as it was not available to her.

Concern was expressed that the student had been working within the constraints of a patent.

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

7. PhD examination case 08_4_4

Members noted that the report of Examiner 1 [who had recommended (d)] was very thorough and detailed whereas the report of Examiner 2 [who had recommended (b)] was extremely brief.

Professor Russell advised that he had looked into the credentials of Examiner 1 and the examiner had a great deal of expertise in the research area.

Members noted with concern that the student's experimentation had been undertaken late in the candidature because funding had not been available until then. Members queried if the funding ought not to have been sorted out by Major Review time at the latest. Professor Russell advised that a recent discussion by the Research Education and Development Committee (REDC) had considered the disturbing fact that the only academic input in some Major Reviews came from the supervisors. REDC had recommended to XXXXXXXX that Major Reviews be undertaken by panels of experts in the research areas (which perhaps excluded the supervisors).

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

Other Business

8. PhD examination case 08_1_3 (considered at Meeting 08/1 – 29 January 2008)

The information was noted.

9. PhD examination case 08_1_1 (considered at Meeting 08/1 – 29 January 2008)

The information was noted.

10. PhD examination case 08_2_1 (considered at Meeting 08/2 – 14 March 2008)

The information was noted.

11. PhD examination case 08_3_3 (considered at Meeting 08/3 – 10 April 2008)

The information was noted.

12. Next Meeting

The next meeting would be scheduled as required.

The meeting concluded at 2.35 pm.

ROSANNA SCARSELLA
Secretary

CONFIRMED:

.....
CONVENOR

SUBMISSION OF A RESEARCH PUBLICATION AS PART OF TWO PHD STUDENTS' THESES

Following approval from the Research Education and Development Committee, from 2009, it will be possible for the same research publication to be submitted as part of two research student theses provided that the appropriate detailed descriptors of each individual's contribution to the paper (both materially and in terms of IP) is provided in the Statement of Authorship.

Accordingly, the 2009 academic program rules and thesis declaration for a thesis that contains publications (3.2 of the Specifications for Thesis document) have been amended as follows:

8.4 PhD rules/8.3 Professional Doctorate rules/8.4 General Masters by Research rules

*Irrespective of the nature of the thesis, its content, in part or in total, must not have been accepted for any other degree **in the name of the candidate** at the University of Adelaide or other academic institution. Candidates should consult the appropriate recommended declarations and the University's Specifications for Thesis.*

Specifications for Thesis: From 2009, Thesis Declarations should be as follows:

3.1 For a thesis that does not contain work already in the public domain

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution **to <name of student>** and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

3.2 For a thesis that contains publications

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution **to <name of student>** and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed below*) resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

** The thesis declaration must include a list of all publications or works contained within the thesis and include the bibliographical details of the copyright holder(s) for each work.*

DONNA FROST
Deputy Manager, Graduate Administration and Scholarships

APPLICABILITY OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM RULES

The following statement has been added to all relevant 2009 Higher Degree by Research Program rules to clarify the applicability of the rules to students:

These rules are applicable to all currently enrolled research students; however, if any student who enrolled prior to this year considers themselves disadvantaged by the stipulated rules, they may apply to the Dean of Graduate Studies for dispensation to be treated, as far as possible, in accordance with the rules in place in their year of enrolment.

APPLICABILITY OF THE SPECIFICATIONS FOR THESIS

The following statement has been added to the 2009 Specifications for Thesis document to clarify its applicability to students:

These specifications for thesis are applicable to all currently enrolled research students; and supersede any previous editions.