

A meeting of the Research Education and Development Committee will be held in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street, from
2.30 pm on 6 July 2009.

AGENDA

FORMAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies**
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 1 June 2009
Recommendation: that the Research Education and Development Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 1 June 2009.
5. **Business Arising from the Minutes (not otherwise listed on this agenda)**
(Item 5)

MAJOR REPORTS or ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR APPROVAL

6. * **Examples of Good Practice in Research Education**
Dr Coaldrake to present.
7. * **Master of Philosophy Program Rules**
Professor Russell to report. For discussion (Item 7).
8. * **Master of Philosophy Examination Report Form**
Professor Russell to report. For discussion (Item 8).
As part of this discussion, members are asked to consider whether or not the PhD Examination Report Form should be amended in line with the proposed MPhil Form (i.e. delete the (a), (b) and (c) recommendations and substitute these with the "Passed" section).

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

9. **Student Matters**

To note Student Matters reports SM 09/4 and 09/5 (both unconfirmed).

10. **Doctoral Education**

No further meetings have been held.

11. **Quality Issues Working Party**

No further meetings have been held.

UNSTARRED ITEMS FOR APPROVAL OR NOTING

12. **REDC Membership Change**

To note that Dr Annette Braunack-Mayer has replaced Professor Nettelbeck as the Faculty of Health Sciences Representative.

13. **Doctoral Education**

To note that members are requested to provide Faculty feedback, about doctoral education in a general sense and what a PhD should encompass, to Professor Russell for the next meeting.

14. **E-collect in HSS**

Recommendation to include HSS in the E-collect program

15. **Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting will be held from 2.30 pm to 4.30 pm on 10 August 2009 in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street.

DONNA FROST
Secretary
F: 2009/39

FOR APPROVAL

MINUTES OF MEETING 4/09

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 1 June 2009.

Present: Professor Richard Russell (Convenor), Mr Simon Bodie and Mr Mark Williams (for Item 8), Mr Simon Brennan, Dr Kimi Coaldrake, Dr Chris Ford, Dr Ian Green (for Item 7), Miss Yun Guan (in place of Mr Morteza Mohammedzeri), Professor Ted Nettelbeck (for all items except Item 13), Dr Michelle Picard, Dr Anthony Zander.

In attendance: Miss Rosanna Scarsella, Ms Anne Witt

FORMAL MATTERS

1. Apologies/Announcements

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 13.1 was added to the agenda at the start of the meeting. Both Items 12 and 13.1 were starred at the beginning of the meeting.

4. Minutes of Meeting

A document entitled, "Educational Fee Waiver for Dependents of International HDR students sponsored by their Home Governments" was tabled. The document provided additional information relating to an item of the same name under Item 12 of the minutes of Meeting 3/09. This information had been made available after Meeting 3/09 had been held.

With this additional information, the Committee resolved:

to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2009.

5. Business arising from the minutes

MAJOR REPORTS and ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

6. Examples of Good Practice in Research Education

A document entitled, "Examples of Good Practice in Research Education – Faculty of Sciences" was tabled.

Dr Ford highlighted two areas within the Faculty of Sciences: "Management and review processes during candidature, including actions for students identified in the review as 'at risk'"; and "Pastoral care provided by postgraduate co-ordinators".

Management and review processes during candidature, including actions for students identified in the review as 'at risk'

- All the areas which had provided responses had well-developed review processes in place.
- In most Schools/Disciplines, greatest emphasis was placed on the Major Review.
- Biochemistry's "Rubicon" was a review which formed the major part of the Core Component of the Structured Program. Each student prepared a written review which incorporated all of the relevant background information directly related to his/her topic; the aims/hypotheses; and a research plan for the next three years. In addition, the student gave a 30-minute presentation to the Discipline, followed by a 30-minute closed question and answer session with members of the academic staff and two external reviewers (one local and one from interstate).
- Some respondents reported that while it was relatively easy to identify students "at risk", it was more difficult to put them back "on track". There was still a degree of reluctance to make the "hard decisions" needed to solve problems.
- Some Schools/Disciplines appointed an external advisor to each student's supervisory panel for part of the candidature. The external input was invaluable and provided the student with an additional source of expert advice.
- The management of research postgraduate students' candidatures was overseen by a single School Committee within Agriculture, Food & Wine. There was a School-based Induction, reviews, a seminar series and annual postgraduate symposium. A student-run organization (The Agricultural Postgraduate Society – AgPOGs) had been set up by the Head of School, Professor Roger Leigh and, for a small payment, provided both social and developmental programs.

It was noted that the "Rubicon" would form the basis of the Graduate Centre's "new" Major Review format.

It was felt that the Adelaide University Postgraduate Students' Association (AUPGSA) was not as effective as it could be and that it would be beneficial for the AUPGSA to see if a diverse model (e.g. that of AgPOGs) would be more effective.

Action	Responsible
Provide an example of good practice in research education at the next REDC meeting to be held on 6 July 2009	Dr Coaldrake
Propose, to the AUPGSA, that the possibility of a more effective model of student association be investigated	Miss Guan
Invite the AUPGSA to participate in discussions (with Professor Russell, Dr Ford and Professor Nettelbeck) about implementing a more effective model of student association	Professor Russell

Pastoral care provided by postgraduate co-ordinators

- More time than in the past (particularly in cases of students with problems) was spent on supporting, encouraging and counselling students.

It was pointed out that, on occasion, the best counselling was referring a student to professional help.

It was noted that completions had improved dramatically over the past three years and that attrition was now the greater concern. In this context it would be helpful for Faculties to receive information about attrition rates.

Action	Responsible
Discuss setting up a “pastoral care professional development program” for Postgraduate Co-ordinators	Professor Russell and Dr Picard
Arrange for regular “attrition reports” to be sent to Faculties	Professor Russell

7. Towards an on-line Induction Program for students and staff

A document entitled, “Project Summary II: on-line HDR Student Induction” was tabled.

Dr Green reported that the on-line student induction was intended to supplement Session I of the face-to-face Research Postgraduate Induction. The Induction site had gone live from 6 May 2009 for about ten days. Problems with “browser rendering” in some pages had been experienced. Subsequent work-arounds, together with inexplicable glitches, had exacerbated the problem, so the site had been removed in order to fix the difficulties. The last remaining problem (with the home page) was currently being resolved.

The site was aligned with the Induction hard copy materials and RED websites. There were links to the various Induction presentations and the following functionality was intended for each presentation:

- a “lead piece” on the home page;
- further material on a dedicated page;
- a PDF of Powerpoint slides; and
- a video of the narrated Powerpoint in QuickTime, iTunes and Windows formats.

If the aims of the Induction were to:

- build a sense of research community;
- give students an entry point to, and provide tips and advice for, a range of services; and
- provide on-going reference material;

then it would be prudent to consult with Session I presenters so that their presentations aligned more closely with these objectives. In this context, presenters could make better use of links, graphics and audio-visual material and work in tandem with the website.

In order to address multi-media downloading issues, the possibility of publishing Induction material on YouTube was raised.

The Induction site would require some on-going development and regular maintenance.

Dr Green suggested that Mr Allan Carrington from the Centre for Learning and Professional Development (CLPD) was a helpful contact for staff members requiring guidance about setting up these types of sites.

8. Service Excellence Program: HDR enrolments and completions

Mr Bodie presented the outcomes of the Service Excellence Program's investigations into HDR enrolments and completions (the investigations having come about as a result of the University's desire to increase the number of admissions and reduce completion times).

Feedback had been obtained via surveys, workshops, interviews, the literature, benchmarking with other G08 universities, international studies and past and future modelling (financial and operational).

The research had identified eleven key factors and sixty-eight potential root causes.

The following recommendations had been proposed:

- improve the website (e.g. link already existing pages);
- assign case managers (to track enquiries);
- modify application forms;
- re-engineer the process to improve time to offer rate;
- focus resources on the first year;
- build an international support infrastructure;
- establish a supervisors' charter;
- stratify students at the end of the first and subsequent years;
- establish more realistic workload models;
- assign supervisor according to load and prior outcomes;
- communicate "reasonable scope" of a PhD;
- structure rewards and penalties for both supervisors and students;
- use KPIs to assist business management;
- review the need for a marketing plan; and
- fund additional scholarships from planned benefits.

The planned benefits from the imposition of the recommendations were expected to result in:

- commencements from 377 to 587;
- completions from 300 to 440;
- attrition from 48% to 25%;
- completion within four years from 33% to 52%;
- completion and load revenue up by more than AUD10m;
- full-time student equivalents up to 1,600; and
- supervisor capacity released.

REPORTS FROM RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKING PARTIES

9. Student Matters

There was nothing to report.

10. Doctoral Education

There was nothing to report.

11. Quality Issues Working Party

There was nothing to report.

UNSTARRED ITEMS FOR APPROVAL OR NOTING

12. REDC membership change: Professor Nettelbeck's last meeting

Professor Russell, on behalf of REDC, thanked Professor Nettelbeck for his many years of service to the Committee.

13. Other Business

13.1 Doctoral education

Professor Russell reported that the definition of doctoral education, as previously agreed by the G08 universities, was being challenged by The University of Melbourne, which intended to introduce the Juris Doctor and the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and convert the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery into the Doctor of Medicine.

As a result, Academic Board had asked Professor Russell to consider the future of doctoral education in this University.

Professor Russell envisaged looking at:

- doctoral education in a general sense; and
- what a PhD should encompass

and would appreciate feedback from all REDC members.

Action	Responsible
Provide feedback to Professor Russell on the above two points.	All REDC members

14. Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will be held from 2:30pm to 4:30pm on 6 July 2009 in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street.

ROSANNA SCARSELLA
Acting Secretary

CONFIRMED:
Day/Month/Year
Date CONVENOR

**Item 8
The University of Adelaide**

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY
Thesis Examination Report Form**

Please note that the generic term "thesis" is used to describe the submission for the Master of Philosophy degree

Candidate's Name:	name
Faculty:	faculty
Type of MPhil:	Conventional MPhil/MPhil by creative or visual work/MPhil by publication format (published and/or accepted and/or submitted and/or text in manuscript)/Combination Conventional MPhil and publication format (published and/or accepted and/or submitted and/or text in manuscript)/MPhil by composition/MPhil by performance
Thesis title:	title
Examiner's name:	<i>(Please Print)</i>
Report due:	date

RECOMMENDATION OF EXAMINER (Please tick one recommendation ONLY)

PASSED

<input type="checkbox"/>	1) the candidate be awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy unconditionally
<input type="checkbox"/>	2) the candidate be awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy subject to corrections or revisions required by the examiners in the thesis to be made to the satisfaction of the University in the copy intended for deposit with the University Library <i>Please note that this recommendation means that the thesis requires minor and relatively few corrections, e.g. errors of spelling, grammar, referencing or a missed caption, or, that the thesis requires more substantial corrections (but not complete revision and re-submission for re-examination), e.g. re-writing of paragraphs, clarification of results, minor additional explanations, addition of tables or figures. There may also be other minor errors of spelling, grammar, etc., to attend to, in addition to the more major ones.</i>

HONOURS GRADE

Where your recommendation is that the candidate be awarded the degree, please recommend one of the following Honours Classes and Divisions in which to pass the thesis.

<input type="checkbox"/>	I. First Class (1A) 100-80
<input type="checkbox"/>	Division 1 90+
<input type="checkbox"/>	Division 2 85-89
<input type="checkbox"/>	Division 3 80-84
<input type="checkbox"/>	II. Second Class, Level A (2A) 70-79
<input type="checkbox"/>	Division 1 75-79
<input type="checkbox"/>	Division 2 70-74
<input type="checkbox"/>	III. Second Class, Level B (2B) 60-69
<input type="checkbox"/>	IV. Third Class (3) 50-59

OR

RE-SUBMIT

<input type="checkbox"/>	3) the candidate be NOT awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy but be permitted to re-submit the thesis for re-examination in revised form
--------------------------	--

	<p><i>A thesis which must be re-submitted requires changes of such scale, complexity and/or conceptual significance that it should be examined again.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that if the University's decision is 3), the candidate will be required to provide a comprehensive statement outlining the substantive changes made to the thesis prior to resubmission, together with a concise defence against any of the examiners' recommendations for changes that were not accepted. Under normal circumstances, the revised thesis will be examined by the original examiners. The examiners of a revised thesis will be required to check whether or not the candidate has addressed the requirements for additional work specified by the original examiners, in the supervisor(s)' report and the outcome letter to the candidate. In addition, examiners of a revised thesis should not introduce new areas of substantive concern in the re-examination.</i></p>
--	--

OR

FAILED

<input type="checkbox"/>	4) the candidate be NOT awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy
--------------------------	--

RE-EXAMINATION OF THE THESIS

Following the receipt of all the examiners' reports, if the University's decision is that the thesis be re-submitted for re-examination AND your recommendation was d), or e), please indicate if you would be prepared to re-examine this thesis.

<input type="checkbox"/>	I am prepared to re-examine this thesis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	I am NOT prepared to re-examine this thesis.
--------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

EXAMINER'S REPORT

Please provide a detailed report of not less than one page in length justifying your recommendation. Your report should be sufficiently detailed to enable the University to determine whether or not the thesis is of the quality normally accepted for a **Master of Philosophy** degree.

It would be very much appreciated if you would include in your report some additional comments on the thesis under the following headings:

1. standard of work completed;
2. possibility for publication;
3. further work that may arise from the research completed; and
4. contacts in related fields.

These comments will be helpful to the student in planning his/her future career.

<input type="checkbox"/>	I have attached a detailed report of not less than 1 page justifying my recommendation and I am happy for the entire content of this report to be disclosed to the student.
--------------------------	--

OPTIONAL CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

Whilst it is University practice to disclose examiners' reports to candidates, if you have any comments which are to be kept confidential from the student, please provide a separate report, marked on every page: "CONFIDENTIAL".

<input type="checkbox"/>	I have attached a report containing comments which are to be kept confidential from the student and have marked each page of the report "CONFIDENTIAL".
--------------------------	--

SPECIAL COMMENDATION

Candidates identified by examiners as having produced an excellent thesis are eligible for a special commendation from the Dean of Graduate Studies. Do you wish to recommend this thesis for a Dean's commendation?

This thesis is outstanding and deserves a special commendation from the Dean of Graduate Studies

DISCLOSURE OF EXAMINER'S IDENTITY

Please place a "✓" in the box if you wish to remain anonymous. Leaving this box unchecked will indicate that you do not mind having your identity disclosed to the candidate.

I wish to remain anonymous.

Please note that under the South Australian Freedom of Information Act, the University may not be able to guarantee your anonymity.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

I confirm that there is no actual or perceived conflict of interest arising from my examination of this thesis.

EXAMINER'S SIGNATURE

Signature	Date
-----------	------

RETURN OF THESIS

On completion of the examination process please return (any) physical copies of the thesis to the Adelaide Graduate Centre and delete (any) electronic copies from your computer.

UNCONFIRMED

STUDENT MATTERS SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING 09/5 – DATE 2009



FOR APPROVAL

Item 9

MINUTES OF MEETING 09/4

A meeting of the Student Matters Sub-committee (SMS) was held from 1.00 pm on 24 April 2009 in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street.

Present: Professor Richard Russell (Convenor); Dr Kimi Coaldrake; Dr Liz Cousins;
Dr Chris Ford; and Ms Felicity Rai

In attendance: Miss Rosanna Scarsella

FORMAL MATTERS

1. Apologies/Announcements

Item 9 (for noting) was added under "Any Other Business".

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 25 March 2009
were approved.

MAJOR ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/APPROVAL

All members reviewed all documentation and the fact that a particular issue was not mentioned explicitly in these minutes did not mean that it was not reviewed in depth and at length.

4. PhD examination case 09_4_1

Both examiners had serious reservations about the thesis.

After discussion, it was decided that the thesis be sent to a third examiner.

5. MA examination case 09_4_2

Despite the difference in recommendations, the comments of both examiners were similar.

It was decided that the thesis be sent to an arbitrator with expertise in the methodology/ies used by the student who, in addition to the usual tasks, would be asked to comment on those methodology/ies.

6. PhD examination case 09_4_3

The examiners commented that the data was insufficient and lacked detail. One examiner considered the overall quality of the written work very poor and the other that the thesis lacked clarity, contained insufficient detail, errors of detail or logic, mis-numbered figures, and that there was an overall lack of illustration or documentation.

It was decided that the thesis be sent to an arbitrator.

Any Other Business

7. PhD examination case 09_1_1 (considered by SMS at the meeting on 19 January 2009)

The information was noted.

8. PhD examination case 09_1_3 (considered by SMS at the meeting on 19 January 2009)

The information was noted.

9. PhD examination case 09_3_1 (considered by SMS at the meeting held on 25 March 2009)

Professor Russell reported that the student had advised she would provide the additional information for arbitration and that she had been given two months in which to do so.

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting would be scheduled as required.

The meeting concluded at 1.45 pm.

ROSANNA SCARSELLA
Secretary

CONFIRMED:

.....
CONVENOR

UNCONFIRMED

STUDENT MATTERS SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING 09/6 – DATE 2009



FOR APPROVAL

Item 9

MINUTES OF MEETING 09/5

A meeting of the Student Matters Sub-committee (SMS) was held by e-mail distribution on 22 May 2009. The documentation was sent to Dr Chris Ford, Dr Liz Cousins, Ms Felicity Rai and Dr Kimi Coaldrake (Dr Coaldrake for information only, as the case was from her Faculty)

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 24 April 2009

would be distributed with the next agenda.

MAJOR ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/APPROVAL

All members reviewed all documentation and the fact that a particular issue was not mentioned explicitly in these minutes did not mean that it was not reviewed in depth and at length.

4. PhD examination case 09_5_1

It was noted that the comments of Examiner 1 were more compatible with a (c) recommendation than an (a). Examiner 2 had provided a very detailed and well-argued report which was compatible with the (d) recommendation.

All three SMS members had recommended that the thesis go to a third examiner.

The Dean of Graduate Studies had considered all the documentation and had agreed that the thesis should be sent to a third examiner.

In addition, this case was to be brought forward to the next SMS meeting for further discussion.

Any Other Business

There was none.

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting would be scheduled as required.

ROSANNA SCARSELLA
Secretary

CONFIRMED:

.....
CONVENOR