

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 10 August 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 6 July 2009
Recommendation: that the Research Education and Development Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 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 Braunack-Mayer to present for the Faculty of Health Sciences (next meeting Dr Anthony Zander to present).
 7. * **Master of Philosophy Program Rules**
Professor Russell to report (Item 7a and 7b).
 8. * **Revised Master of Philosophy Examination Report Form and Grading Descriptors**
Professor Russell to report. For discussion (Items 8a and 8b).
 9. * **Doctoral Education**
Faculty views on doctoral education and of what a PhD should encompass in the future. Faculty representatives to report.
 10. * **Service Excellence Project on HDR Enrolments and Completions**
Professor Russell to report.

11. * **Progress of the English Language Working Party**
Dr Picard to report.
12. * **Towards an Online Induction Program**
Dr Picard to report.
13. * **HDR student Research Education Needs**
Dr Picard to report.
14. * **University Medals for HDR Theses**
Professor Russell to report on the outcome of discussions at Academic Board.
15. * **Outcomes of the Go8 DDoGs Meeting held in Sydney on 28/8/09**
Professor Russell to report.

REPORTS FROM RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKING PARTIES

16. **Student Matters**
No further meetings have been held.
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. **Scholarship Ranking of Master's and Bachelor's Degrees with Honours**
To note that the proposed scholarship ranking of Master's and Bachelor's degrees with Honours compiled by REDC has been endorsed by the Masters Implementation Working Group.
20. **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.
21. **E-collect in HSS**
Recommendation to include HSS in the E-collect program.
22. **Next Meeting**
The next scheduled meeting will be held from 2.30 pm to 4.30 pm on 21 September 2009 in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street.

FOR APPROVAL

MINUTES OF MEETING 5/09

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 6 July 2009.

Present: Professor Richard Russell (Convenor), Dr Annette Braunack-Mayer, Dr Kimi Coaldrake, Dr Chris Ford, Professor John Taplin, Dr Anthony Zander.

In attendance: Ms Donna Frost, Ms Anne Witt

FORMAL MATTERS

1. Apologies/Announcements

Mr Simon Brennan, Dr Bertram Ostendorf, Dr Michelle Picard, Professor John Williams

2. Conflict of Interest

No conflicts were declared.

3. Starring of Items

The Committee resolved:

to adopt the recommendations contained in the unstarred items.

4. Minutes of Meeting

The Committee resolved:

to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 1 June 2009.

5. Business arising from the minutes

Professor Russell reported that the Service Excellence Report on Higher Degree by Research Enrolments and Completions had been presented by Mr Simon Bodie at the last Vice-Chancellor's Committee (VCC) meeting. The report contained 16 recommendations for which the Vice-Chancellor had requested that Professor Russell prepare an implementation plan. The final report would be made available to REDC at their next meeting on 10 August 2009.

MAJOR REPORTS and ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

6. Examples of Good Practice in Research Education

Dr Coaldrake highlighted several examples of good practice in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, involving both academic and management practice (documents tabled).

1. Academic Practice

It was noted that the Faculty ran two Sponsored Postgraduate Advanced Training Seminars (PATS), which were open to all postgraduate research students in the Faculty. The PATS were externally funded by the ARC Network for Early European Research (NEER) and focussed on preparing students for life after the PhD. The title of the first seminar was “From Postgraduate to Professional: How to get a real job” and aimed to give participants a head start in today’s competitive job market through the production of a job application package. The second seminar entitled “From thesis (or other scholarly work) to book: the proposal” encouraged students to look beyond their PhD with the production of a book proposal based on their thesis for an academic press.

2. Management Practice

Using the School of Music as an example, Dr Coaldrake described how the issue of the Postgraduate Coordinator’s (PGC) role and authority had been addressed. In Music, the range of specialisations (*Music by text/thesis; Music Folio; Music Performance*) available to students added to the complexity of the PGC role. To increase the authority of the role, postgraduate students were overseen by a ‘Head of Program’ whose responsibilities encompassed the PGC role together with:

- Postgraduate Prizes Selection Committee and administration;
- Financial management of the annual budget for postgraduate maintenance or professional development funds;
- University public examination Music Performance recitals: oversight of recordings, archive of Master copy, HS&W etc;
- Production of the Conservatorium Handbooks: CCSP (including special requirements for each specialisation above) and General Postgraduate Handbooks;
- Case management of enquiries and development of Discipline Information sheets;
- Website and Publication preparation and review;
- Convening the Postgraduate Program Board four times a year with a view to monitoring programs with short term responsiveness to student needs, undertaking policy development and implementation of REDC/University requirements and reporting through the Elder Conservatorium to the Faculty;
- Undertaking Annual Reports;
- Advising the Director/Head of School on Higher Degree by Research and Postgraduate Coursework matters, both to ease the load on the incumbent of these positions and to ensure compliance for reporting etc and
- Preparing documents relating to postgraduate program development e.g. preparing Program Approval Committee (PAC) documentation for Program Board or Conservatorium review, thereby easing the load of the over-burdened Head of School.

Action	Responsible
Provide an example of good practice in research education at the next REDC meeting to be held on 10 August 2009.	Dr Braunack-Mayer

7. Master of Philosophy Program Rules

The draft program rules for the new Master of Philosophy program (Item 7), intended to be the only RTS Master by Research at the University eligible for RTS funding from 2010 were discussed at length by members, together with the amendments proposed by Professor Iain Reid, Dean of Postgraduate Coursework Programs prior to the meeting.

In addition to minor editorial changes, the following points were agreed:

- that the academic standing required for acceptance as a candidate for the Master of Philosophy would be a relevant degree of Bachelor, in which the candidate had achieved a minimum of a distinction average;
- that it would not be feasible to have a two year and a one year version of the Master of Philosophy degree, for students admitted on the basis of a Bachelor and an Honours qualification respectively. The Committee favoured a single qualification, where students would have a minimum of one year and a maximum of two years to generate a thesis of Masters standard;
- that the Master of Philosophy would be the normal route to the PhD, with domestic students being required to make a choice at the end of their Bachelor qualification about whether to proceed directly to the Master of Philosophy, or to first undertake an Honours year (Note that in reaching this conclusion, members considered the possibility of an upgrade mechanism from Honours to the Master of Philosophy which would enable students first admitted to Honours to complete the MPhil in a shorter time, provided that the Honours work was relevant to the proposed Master of Philosophy thesis. However, this idea was rejected on the grounds that it would cross two funding systems and would be unlikely to get support at Governmental level. [Secretary’s note: subsequent advice was received from Strategy and Planning, to the effect that: in order to be eligible to enrol as a Commonwealth supported student in Honours it must be the intent of both the University and the Government, for the units of study lead to a coursework degree; the University is not permitted to enrol students in “Master’s Qualifying” programs as commonwealth supported students];
- that the possibility of creating scholarships specifically for the Master of Philosophy be investigated. The Committee anticipated that students with an Honours or Master by Coursework qualification (with a research component), would be more likely to seek direct entry to the PhD, whereas those with only a Bachelor level qualification would be required to first undertake a Master of Philosophy. Creating targeted scholarships for the Master of Philosophy would provide students admitted on the basis of a Bachelor qualification to be competitive in the scholarship application round;
- The creation of a “Masters of Research” exit degree, which could be awarded by the University to a student who “failed” the PhD but who had completed work of a Masters standard was viewed unfavourably by members. Whilst the suggested intent was to avoid devaluing the Master of Philosophy qualification by not awarding the MPhil to students who had failed the PhD, it was thought that the Masters of Research qualification would be of little value to students and employers. The preferred option was to award no degree for students who failed the PhD (a very rare outcome), whilst ensuring that any student whose work was not of the required standard, was encouraged to transfer to the Master of Philosophy within two years FTE of commencement, or, at the very latest, prior to thesis submission. It was suggested that the Annual Review be used as a mechanism to initiate conversations about program transfer for underperforming students;
- The Master of Philosophy would be a graded degree, thereby facilitating the ranking of students for scholarship selection purposes. Based on the recommendations of examiners, students who passed the MPhil would do so with a grade of Higher Distinction, Distinction, Credit or Pass.

Action	Responsible
Revise the Master of Philosophy Program rules as agreed.	Ms Frost

Investigate whether other Go8 universities offer examiners the choice to award a Masters degree for PhD theses which are not of the required standard.	Ms Frost
--	----------

8. Master of Philosophy Examination Report Form

The proposed Examination Report Form for the Master of Philosophy (Item 8) was discussed by members. Significant changes included the consolidation of the recommendations for award of the degree following “minor” corrections and award of the degree “subject to” corrections into a single category and the introduction of a request for examiners to grade each thesis (using the postgraduate coursework mark scheme) for scholarship ranking purposes.

Additional changes requested by members were to move the section on special commendation under the one requiring examiners to nominate a grade for the thesis and to delete the ambiguous request for examiners to include comments in their report on “contacts in related fields”.

Members agreed that subject to the above amendments, the revised form would be acceptable for implementation from 1 January 2010. In addition, it was agreed that the PhD exam report form be revised along the same lines, excepting the request for examiners to grade the thesis.

Action	Responsible
Revise the Master of Philosophy and Doctor of Philosophy exam report form as discussed and circulate to the Committee for noting.	Ms Frost

REPORTS FROM RESEARCH EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKING PARTIES

9. Student Matters

The unconfirmed reports of Student Matters meetings SM 09/4 and 09/5 were noted.

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

Dr Annette Braunack-Mayer was welcomed to her first meeting of the Committee. Dr Braunack-Mayer replaces Professor Nettelbeck as the Faculty of Health Sciences’ Higher Degree Committee Convenor and REDC representative.

13. Doctoral Education

Members were reminded that Faculty feedback about doctoral education in a general sense and specifically, about what a PhD should encompass would be required for discussion at the next meeting of REDC on 10 August 2009.

14. Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will be held from 2:30pm to 4:30pm on 10 August 2009 in the ARI Board Room, Level 7, 115 Grenfell Street.

DONNA FROST
Secretary

CONFIRMED:
Day/Month/Year
Date CONVENOR

FOR NOTING

ITEM 5

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

MEETING 5/09

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>6. Examples of Good Practice in Research Education</p> <p>Provide an example of good practice in research education at the next REDC meeting to be held.</p>	Dr Braunack-Mayer	See Item 6
<p>7. Master of Philosophy Program Rules</p> <p>Revise the Master of Philosophy Program rules as discussed and forward to the Academic Board for consideration.</p> <p>Investigate whether other Go8 universities offer examiners the choice to award a Masters degree for PhD theses which are not of the required standard.</p>	<p>Ms Frost</p> <p>Ms Frost</p>	<p>Completed. See Item 7</p> <p>Completed. See Item 7</p>

MEETING 4/09

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
<p>6. Examples of Good Practice in Research Education</p> <p>Provide an example of good practice in research education at the next REDC meeting to be held on 1 June 2009.</p> <p>Propose, to the AUPGSA, that the possibility of a more effective model of student association be investigated</p> <p>Invite the AUPGSA to participate in discussions (with Professor Russell, Dr Ford and Professor Nettelbeck) about implementing a more effective model of student association</p> <p>Discuss setting up a “pastoral care professional development program” for Postgraduate Co-ordinators</p> <p>Arrange for regular “attrition reports” to be sent to Faculties</p>	<p>Dr Coaldrake</p> <p>Miss Guan</p> <p>Professor Russell</p> <p>Professor Russell and Dr Picard</p> <p>Professor Russell</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>In progress</p>

13. 13.1 Doctoral education		
Faculty feedback, regarding doctoral education in a general sense and what a PhD should encompass, to Professor Russell	REDC members	See Item 9

MEETING 3/09

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
9. What is the Minimum Research Requirement for Students intending to articulate from Masters by Coursework to PhD programs? Amend the proposed scholarship ranking of Master's and Bachelor's degrees with Honours as agreed and submit the revised paper to URC and UAB for approval.	Professor Russell	See Item 19
11. Towards an Online Induction Program for Supervisors and Students Provide regular updates on progress towards the development of an online Induction Programs for students and supervisors.	Dr Picard/ Dr Green	See Item 12

MEETING 2/09

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
7. Recognition of Outstanding Higher Degree by Research Theses Following approval by the UAB, provide the revised examination documentation to REDC for information.	Ms Frost	See Item 14

MEETING 1/09

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
19. Research Proposal Proforma Provide Ms Frost with a copy of the finalised Faculty of Profession's Research Proposal Proforma.	Professor Williams	Pending

MEETING 9/08

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
7. English Language Proficiency and Academic Outcomes for International Students Interview 1-2 supervisors from each Faculty who have supervised significant numbers of both international and domestic students about the impact of English proficiency on supervisory work load.	Professor Russell	Pending
9. Postdoctoral Education Request assistance from Mr Glen Harrison to identify the University's Early Career Researchers through ORBIT.	Professor Russell	Pending

MEETING 3/08

ACTION	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS
6. Proposal to Introduce more Flexible Entry Pathways to the PhD for International Students through a Master of Research Studies Bring PAC proposal for the creation of the Master of Research Studies/PhD double degree program to a future REDC meeting for consideration.	Professor Russell	Pending

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

DONNA FROST
Secretary

FOR NOTING

ITEM 7A

EXAMPLES OF GO8 UNIVERSITIES' RULES ON 'FAILED' PHDS

University of Melbourne

*** No option for an MPhil to be awarded as an examination outcome.

Examiner's report

Examiners are requested to submit a written report on the thesis and to award a result from the following scale from 1 to 5. The 5 recommendations available to examiners when submitting a first report are:

1. Be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without further examination or amendment.
2. Be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without further examination, subject to inserting in the thesis the minor corrections and/or additions as I have specified and which may be subsequently carried out to the satisfaction of the Chair of Examiners, without further reference to me.
3. Be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy subject to revising part or parts of the thesis to either
 - (a) the Chairperson of Examiners, or
 - (b) my satisfaction.
4. Not yet be awarded the degree, but be permitted to resubmit the thesis in a revised form for re-examination. Areas requiring major amendment are identified in my attached report.
5. Not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and not be permitted to submit for re-examination.

University of Queensland

*** No option for an MPhil to be awarded as an examination outcome.

What happens?

1. Examiners are asked to return recommendations within 8 weeks for a PhD and 4 weeks for an MPhil
2. Recommendations:
 - a. Thesis accepted
 - b. Thesis accepted subject to correction of minor errors
 - c. Thesis accepted subject to modifications or defence
 - d. Thesis not accepted....revise and resubmit
 - e. Thesis not accepted

Monash

*** *No option for an MPhil to be awarded as an examination outcome.*

I recommend: Tick one box only

Pass

(i) The candidate be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without further examination

Pass – amendments to Head of Department

(ii) The candidate be awarded the degree without further examination subject to insertion in the thesis of amendments noted in the enclosed list to the satisfaction of the Head of Department

- This recommendation should be made only when the examiner can specify amendments with reasonable precision. Please ensure that candidates are given clear instructions on amendments to be undertaken.

Pass – amendments to examiner

(iii) The candidate be awarded the degree without further examination subject to insertion in the thesis of amendments noted in the enclosed list to my satisfaction

Pass – questions

(iv) The candidate be awarded the degree subject to satisfying me regarding the attached questions

- Re-enrolment is not required in recommendations (i) to (iv).

Revision and resubmission

(v) The candidate not yet be awarded the degree but be permitted to resubmit the thesis in a revised form

- This recommendation means that the candidate must re-enrol for a period of up to 12 months. The revised thesis will be considered to be a new thesis and will require reexamination.

- The revisions could range from extensive reformatting of the written presentation to conducting further research, analysis and interpretation of results.

Fail

(vi) The candidate not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Section 4 – Grounds for this recommendation

Whether your report is favourable or unfavourable, it would be very much appreciated if you could provide some detailed comments on the strengths and/or weaknesses of the thesis. This is especially important where the two examiners disagree in their assessment of the thesis and it becomes necessary for an advisory panel to recommend further appropriate action. Please attach a detailed written report. If you recommend revision and resubmission, please provide the candidate with a clear program for undertaking their revisions.

ANU

*** *No option for an MPhil to be awarded as an examination outcome.*

4.10 Examination: degree of Master of Philosophy: former candidates for degree of Doctor of Philosophy

4.10(1) Notwithstanding anything else in these Rules, a former candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy may submit a thesis for examination under these Rules as part of his or her candidature for the degree of Master of Philosophy:

- (a) whether or not it has been revised since being submitted for examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; and
- (b) whether or not it exceeds the maximum length normally acceptable for theses submitted for such an examination.

[Note: See also rule 2.12.]

4.10(2) If the appropriate ANU College Dean appoints examiners to examine a thesis referred to in subrule 4.10(1), the ANU College Dean must, unless the circumstances of the case are exceptional, appoint examiners who were not previously appointed to examine the thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4.10(3) If the examiners appointed to examine a thesis referred to in subrule 4.10(1) have not previously examined the thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, the examiners must not be advised that the thesis was previously examined under these Rules.

4.11(2) The report of an examiner must recommend:

- (a) that the candidate be granted the award; or
- (b) that the candidate be failed; or
- (c) that the candidate be granted the award subject to corrections or revisions (if any) required by the examiners in the thesis to be made to the satisfaction of the Delegated Authority in the copy intended for deposit with the University Library; or
- (d) that the candidate be permitted to submit a revised thesis for re-examination.

4.12 Decision about results

4.12(1) After consideration of the examiners' reports, the Delegated Authority may recommend to the appropriate ANU College Dean:

- (a) that the candidate be granted the award; or
- (b) that the candidate be granted the award subject to making any minor amendments in the thesis required under paragraph 4.11(2)(c); or
- (c) that the candidate be re-examined by resubmission of thesis or re-examination of coursework or both, as the case requires; or
- (d) that the candidate be failed.

Academic Program Rules

Adelaide Graduate Centre

Contents

Master of Philosophy

Version 21.7.09 DF

Master of Philosophy

1 Rules

1.1 There shall be a Master of Philosophy degree which may be awarded an overall grade. The award of the grade shall be made for meritorious performance in the program, with greatest weight given to completion of the research project as evaluated by the examination of the research thesis.

1.2 The grade may be awarded in one of the following classifications: Higher distinction, Distinction, Credit and Pass according to the standard University grading scheme.

1.3 In accordance with their area of research, a candidate may enrol for a Master of Philosophy degree, or, a Master of Philosophy degree with one of the following specialisations, as follows:

Faculty of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences

Master of Philosophy (Aerospace Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Applied Mathematics)
Master of Philosophy (Architectural Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Automotive Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Chemical Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Civil and Environmental Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Civil and Structural Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Computer Science)
Master of Philosophy (Electrical and Electronic Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Marine Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Mechanical Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Mechatronic Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Mining Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Petroleum Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Petroleum Geoscience)
Master of Philosophy (Petroleum Management)
Master of Philosophy (Pure Mathematics)
Master of Philosophy (Sports Engineering)
Master of Philosophy (Statistics)
Master of Philosophy (Sustainable Energy Engineering)

Faculty of Health Sciences

Master of Philosophy (Clinical Science)
Master of Philosophy (Dentistry)
Master of Philosophy (Grief and Palliative Care Counselling)
Master of Philosophy (Medical Science)
Master of Philosophy (Ophthalmology)
Master of Philosophy (Surgery)

Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences

Master of Philosophy

Faculty of Professions

Master of Philosophy

Faculty of Sciences

Master of Philosophy

1.4 The Vice-Chancellor, with authority devolved to her/him by Council, and after receipt of advice from the Research Education and Development Committee, shall from time to time prescribe Rules defining the academic standing required for candidature, eligibility for enrolment, the program of study and research for the degree, the condition of candidature and the assessment for the degree.

1.5 Such Rules shall become effective from the date of prescription by the Vice-Chancellor or such other date as the Vice-Chancellor may determine.

1.6 All students must comply with the Academic Program Rules and are advised to refer to them to gain an understanding of their rights and responsibilities regarding program matters.

2 Guidelines

The Research Education and Development Committee may from time to time approve guidelines on any matters included in these Rules and may authorise the Dean of Graduate Studies or the Manager, Graduate Administration and Scholarships, to act in accordance with such guidelines without reference to the Committee in each case. Notwithstanding this, Faculties may develop their own specific guidelines as permitted within the framework of these Rules.

3 Definitions

3.1 The Master of Philosophy shall, in general, have the objectives of

- a training students in research methodology and techniques
- b developing critical evaluation skills appropriate to their research topic
- c training students in the application of such methods by conducting a specified program of research under appropriate supervision and the development of new knowledge where possible
- d providing training in literature analysis *and*
- e encouraging debate in the substantive area of the thesis at an advanced level.

3.2 Examiners of the Master of Philosophy should satisfy themselves that the candidate has

- a a thorough understanding of the relevant methodology as demonstrated by a thorough critical review of the literature
- b demonstrated competence through judicious selection and application of appropriate methods to yield meaningful results
- c demonstrated the capacity to evaluate critically these results and presented a clear and well written thesis in accordance with the format specified in 8.3 below.

4 Academic standing

4.1 The academic standing required for acceptance as a candidate for the Master of Philosophy in the University shall be a relevant degree of Bachelor, in which the candidate achieved a minimum of a distinction average, or the equivalent thereof.

4.2 A person who holds a relevant Bachelor degree of another university, at distinction average or higher, or equivalent thereof, may be accepted as a candidate provided that the program of study undertaken and the academic standard reached are equivalent to those required of a candidate who is a graduate of the University of Adelaide.

4.3 Applicants for a Master of Philosophy must satisfy the minimum English language proficiency requirement as set by the university.

5 Credit for work previously completed

5.1 At the time of application, the Committee may grant credit in a Master of Philosophy for research undertaken in another program in the University or in another university or tertiary institution.

5.2 In consideration for acceptance under Rule 5.1, the Committee must be satisfied that

- a the person is of such academic standing as would be required of other candidates for the degree and
- b the person's progress so far has been satisfactory and the research for which credit is granted is both relevant and of a satisfactory standard.

6 Enrolment

6.1 A person shall not be enrolled as a candidate for the degree of Master of Philosophy unless:

- a the applicant's proposed research topic is acceptable to the University and the School/Discipline responsible for the supervision of the candidate's work
- b there are available at least two supervisors able to provide supervision of the proposed candidacy throughout its likely duration. The principal supervisor shall be a member of the academic staff of the School/Discipline of the University in which the candidate is enrolled *and*
- c suitable resources and facilities are available (either in the University or, by arrangement acceptable to the Faculty, elsewhere) for the proposed research to be undertaken.

6.2 Except with the permission of the Dean of Graduate Studies, a candidate may not enrol concurrently in another academic program

6.3 Except with the permission of the Dean of Graduate Studies, a candidate who is permitted to enrol concurrently in another academic program and who is granted leave must intermit all academic programs in which he or she is enrolled.

7 Duration of candidature and mode of study

7.1 A candidate may proceed to the degree by full-time study or, if the Head of the School/Discipline concerned is satisfied that the candidate has adequate time to pursue supervised research under the control of the University, by half-time study. Except in circumstances approved by the Committee, the work for the degree shall be completed and the thesis submitted:

7.2

- a in the case of a full-time candidate, not less than one year nor more than two years from the date of commencement of candidature
- b in the case of a half-time candidate, not less than two years nor more than four years from the date of commencement of candidature
- c in the case of a candidate granted credit under Rule 5.1, the candidature shall normally expire:
 - i in the case of a full-time candidate, not less than one year and not more than two years from the date the candidate commenced work in the other program *or*
 - ii in the case of a half-time candidate, not less than two years and not more than four years from the date the candidate commenced work in the other program.

8 Work for the degree

8.1 A candidate shall pursue an approved program of study and research under the control of the University and under the general guidance of supervisors appointed by the University leading to the generation of a thesis.

8.2 Where a Master of Philosophy program contains coursework, the candidate shall be required to pass both the coursework and thesis components independently but, in exceptional circumstances, this requirement may be waived by the Committee.

8.3 Any coursework requirements will be set by the Faculty of enrolment and may include "core" and "student specific" courses totaling a maximum of 16 units (or one third of the degree). Students will be advised of any "core" course requirements at enrolment, whilst any "student specific" course requirements will normally be finalised prior to completion of the Research Proposal. See Rule 10.6.

8.4

- a The University recognises that a thesis may take a variety of formats that are influenced by the discipline or field of study. Students should consult their supervisor(s) and the University's Specifications for Thesis and, if applicable, the Specific Academic Program Rules, to determine the most appropriate format.
- b Work presented in the thesis must have been produced during the period of candidature.
- c Published works included in a thesis under these Rules must have been published or accepted by publishers approved by the Discipline and in accordance with DEEWR criteria for the Higher Education Research Data Collection
- .d Where appropriate, texts may be submitted in manuscript form and suitably identified as such.

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

Thesis.

i A thesis that incorporates publications shall also contain: a contextual statement that normally includes the aims underpinning the publication/s; a literature review or commentary that establishes the field of knowledge and provides a link between publications; and a conclusion showing the overall significance of the work and contribution to knowledge.

ii Where a portfolio of publications is submitted, as a Master of Philosophy thesis or is combined with conventional written narrative, the publications must be closely related in terms of subject matter and form a cohesive research narrative.

iii The number and length of scholarly works included in a portfolio of publications shall be determined by Faculties in consultation with specific Discipline areas. Where the publication/s are deemed to constitute a body of work worthy of the award, the candidate may include additional material submitted for publication.

8.6 Where a thesis contains work attributed to joint or multiple authors, for example co-authored publications, candidates must include a clear statement of their contribution and that of the co-authors (in terms of the conceptualization of the work, its realization and its documentation).

8.7 Jointly- or multi-authored works must have the signed approval of the co-author(s) attesting to the candidate's claimed contribution and authorizing the inclusion of the publication(s) in the thesis.

8.8 A thesis should not normally exceed 40,000 words.

8.9

i Creative work may be in the form of exhibition, music composition or performance, literary work, film or other format approved by the Research Education and Development Committee.

ii The creative work should provide a coherent demonstration that the candidate has reached an appropriate standard in the research and has made a significant contribution to knowledge in the area. The creative work should be the research outcome, while the exegesis that accompanies it should describe the research process and elaborate, elucidate and place in context the artistic practice undertaken.

9 Required program of activities at the commencement of candidature

9.1 Each candidate (including those on remote candidature) will be enrolled on a provisional basis for the first twelve months of the degree.

9.2 A major review of progress after twelve months will recommend confirmation of Masters candidature, or a further period of conditional candidature not exceeding six months, or termination.

9.3 Candidates granted a further period of conditional enrolment will undergo a second major review at the end of this time period. No further periods of conditional enrolment will be permitted.

9.4 Continuation of enrolment at the end of this period will depend on overall academic progress and the completion of set activities to the satisfaction of the School/Discipline concerned. These activities will form part of a Structured Program of activities extending through the candidature.

9.5 Such activities will be determined by the School/ Discipline through which the candidate is enrolled and in the first year must include the completion and presentation of the research proposal and other programs and skills training deemed necessary by the School/Discipline. In the case of international students, completion of the Integrated Bridging Program is also required, except in those cases where an exemption has been granted.

9.6 The research proposal must be agreed and submitted to the Adelaide Graduate Centre preferably within three, but no later than six months (or half-time equivalent) from the commencement of candidature.

9.7

- a) A candidate who has completed the first year of a Master by Philosophy or half time equivalent and who is qualified for transfer to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy may do so where permitted by the Faculty and the Committee . Where a transfer is approved, the candidate will be deemed to have completed the Core Component of the Structured Program and the transfer will confirm candidature in the PhD. A revised research proposal must accompany the application to upgrade candidature.
- b) A candidate who is not qualified for admission to the Doctor of Philosophy, but has completed the first eighteen months of a Master by Philosophy, or half time equivalent, may transfer to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy where the transfer is supported by the Faculty and the Committee. Where a transfer is approved, the candidate will be deemed to have completed the Core Component of the Structured Program and the transfer will confirm candidature in the PhD. A revised research proposal must accompany the application to upgrade candidature.

10 Remote candidature

10.1 Initial enrolment as a remote candidate may be permitted on academic grounds where the School/Discipline concerned can ensure the provision of external supervision, facilities and affiliation to the satisfaction of the Research Education and Development Committee.

10.2 Unless otherwise exempted, a remote candidate will normally be required to complete a period/s of residence in the University of Adelaide as determined by the Research Education and Development Committee in consultation with the School/Discipline concerned.

10.3 Notwithstanding Rule 10.2, a remote candidate will normally be required to undertake his/her candidature in an internal attendance mode until such time as the Core Component of the Structured Program has been completed.

10.4 In accordance with rule 7.1, a remote candidate may proceed to the degree either by full-time or half-time study.

10.5 On the recommendation of the School/Discipline, the Committee at any time may permit an enrolled student to enrol as a remote candidate subject to the conditions specified in 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3 above.

10.6 A remote candidate may be permitted to convert to an internal mode of attendance at any time and shall be subject to the conditions normally applied.

10.7 Notwithstanding Rules 10.1 to 10.6 above, remote candidates are also required to abide by the other Rules and guidelines for the degree of Master of Philosophy.

11 Review of academic progress

11.1 The Committee may review the progress of a candidate at any time during the program of candidature and, if the candidate's progress is unsatisfactory, may terminate the candidature.

11.2 Progress and confirmation of candidature will occur twelve months after enrolment (see 9.2 above). Additional reviews will occur around October each year with written reports forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies. A candidate's re-enrolment in the following year is conditional upon satisfactory progress in the year of the review.

12 Absence from the University

Except for remote candidates, the Committee, on the recommendation of the School/Discipline concerned, may permit a candidate to pursue away from the University work connected with the research for the degree. Such permission may only be granted under special circumstances during provisional candidature.

13 Leave of absence

A candidate whose work is interrupted for a period of time may be granted cumulative leave by the Committee of up to twelve months. If an application for leave is approved, the minimum and maximum periods specified in Rule 8.1 will be adjusted accordingly by adding the length of the approved leave.

14 In exceptional circumstances, the Committee may grant a candidate cumulative leave in excess of 12 months. Where a student is granted this exceptional leave, the University will endeavour to ensure, but cannot guarantee, that appropriate supervision and resources will be available to support the student on return from leave.

15 In some fields of study, time plays a critical role in the currency of the research. In such cases, the research project may no longer be current following leave and the University may not be able to secure supervision in an area where currency is compromised. Additionally, the University may not be able to accommodate an amendment to the research project. Under these circumstances, continuation of candidature may not be possible and the only options will be:

- i withdrawal by the candidate *or*
- ii termination of candidature by the University.

16 The candidature of a student who takes leave from the University without approval will be suspended immediately, on notification of the Adelaide Graduate Centre.

17 A candidate granted leave must inform the Adelaide Graduate Centre in writing of resumption of candidature within two weeks of the approved date of return.

18 A candidate seeking to extend a period of leave must apply in writing for an extension of leave at least one week prior to the originally approved date of return.

19 Withdrawal from candidature

19.1 A student may withdraw from candidature at any time.

19.2 Candidature may be reinstated at a future date without academic consequences, subject to the continuing currency of the research undertaken prior to withdrawal and the currency of the research skills of the candidate. The approval of the Head of School and the ongoing availability of appropriate supervision and resources are also required.

20 Suspension of candidature

A student's candidature may be suspended for failure to comply with any formal requirement of candidature, including:

i failing to abide by the responsibilities of research candidates as detailed in the Research Student Handbook

Failing to undertake a required review of progress by the due date or extended due date

ii failing to respond to any University correspondence sent to the nominated mailing address or campus email address within two months of the requested date of response,

iii failing to accept reasonable offers of supervision facilitated by the University

iv taking leave without prior approval

v failing to return from leave on the agreed date

vi failing to notify the Adelaide Graduate Centre of return from leave within two weeks of return *and*

vii Non-payment of University fees and charges.

21 Termination of candidature

A student's candidature may be terminated where:

i progress is unsatisfactory following a review of progress, whether programmed or otherwise *or*

ii where candidature has been suspended for more than twelve months *or*

iii where the candidate has failed to complete the core component of the structured program within six months or half-time equivalent of commencement.

22 A terminated candidature may only be reinstated following a successful appeal.

23 Extension of candidature

Irrespective of full time or half time status, a candidate may be granted by the Committee one extension of candidature only of six months beyond the maximum period specified in Rule 7. If the thesis has not been submitted by the end of the extended period, the candidature will lapse.

24 Completion of thesis outside the University

A candidate who has completed the equivalent of one year of full-time work under the control of the University, who has completed the experimental work (where appropriate) and whose progress is sufficiently well advanced to permit the satisfactory completion of the thesis outside the University, may be granted permission by the Committee to complete the writing-up of the thesis outside the University. If such permission is granted the candidate will be allowed either twelve months or until the end of candidature, whichever is the lesser, to submit the thesis. If the thesis has not been submitted by the end of the writing-up period the candidature will lapse.

25 Lapsed candidature

25.1 Candidature shall be deemed to have lapsed if the candidate fails to submit his/her thesis within the maximum duration of the program as specified in Rule 7, provided that candidature has not otherwise been withdrawn, suspended or terminated.

25.2 A candidature, which has lapsed for not more than twelve months, may be resumed if the completed thesis, which has not departed from the field of study that was being pursued before the candidature lapsed, is subsequently submitted to the Manager, Graduate Administration and Scholarships. The thesis

will only be accepted for examination if the School/Discipline certifies that it is satisfactory to that School/Discipline.

25.3 Approval of the Committee is required for the resumption of a lapsed candidature under any other conditions.

26 Intention to submit thesis

A candidate shall notify the Manager, Graduate Administration and Scholarships, in writing, approximately three months before he or she expects to submit a thesis for examination. A summary of the thesis, together with the proposed thesis title, shall be submitted at or prior to lodgment of the thesis.

27 Submission and examination of the thesis

27.1

a On completion of the approved program of study and research, including all coursework requirements, a candidate shall submit a thesis embodying the results of that study and research, and may submit also, in support of the thesis, other relevant material.

b The thesis shall embody the values described in Rule 3.2.

27.2 The format of a thesis which incorporates publications and/or manuscripts shall be in accordance with Rules 8.5 to 8.7.

27.3 The Head of School/Discipline shall certify that the thesis is worthy of examination.

27.4 In the case of a thesis submitted in the areas of musical, artistic or visual practice, presentation may be in one of three forms, a) by a theoretical thesis or b) by one or more creative works and an exegesis or c) a series of music performance recordings and an exegesis.

27.5 In the case of a thesis submitted in the areas of musical, artistic or visual practice, the creative work and the exegesis will not be examined separately but as an integrated whole constituting the original and substantial contribution to knowledge required from Masters' candidates.

27.6 In the case of visual arts, the examiners will attend the exhibition at which time they will be given a copy of the exegesis in temporary binding. A final copy of the exegesis will be provided to the examiners within three months of their viewing the creative work.

27.7 The thesis and any other material submitted shall be assessed by at least one examiner who is external to the University. 27.8 No thesis, material or publications presented for any other degree within this or any other institution shall be so submitted.

27.9 With the exception of suitably referenced work, material, both physical and intellectual, presented for examination should have been generated during the period of candidature.

27.10 The Committee shall prescribe the form in which the thesis shall be submitted and the number of copies to be submitted.

28 Appointment of examiners

28.1 Candidates shall have the right, prior to the commencement of the examination process, to identify people they do not wish to examine their theses. Any such objections should be submitted to the Manager, Graduate Administration and Scholarships, at the same time as the notification of intention to submit required under Rule 26. Such objections do not serve as a veto.

28.2 Assessment of the thesis shall in every case be by no fewer than two examiners appointed by the Committee of whom:

a at least one shall be external to the University

b at least one shall be an academic member or affiliate of a tertiary institution.

28.3 The candidate's supervisors shall not be eligible to act as examiners.

28.4 The examiners shall be requested to report in such form as the Committee will determine and to recommend one of each of the alternatives listed in Rules 29.1 and 29.2.

28.5 After consideration of the reports of the examiners, the Committee may appoint a third external examiner and/or an external arbitrator.

29 Examination results

29.1 After consideration of the reports of the examiners and such other information as it thinks fit, the

Committee shall determine that:

- a the candidate be awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy unconditionally *or*
- b 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 *or*
- c the candidate be not awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy but be permitted to resubmit the thesis for re-examination in revised form *or*
- d the candidate be not awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy.

29.2 Where the Committee determines that the candidate be awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy, the Committee shall also determine an overall grade.

29.3 In the case of a thesis presented for re-examination as provided for in Rule 29.1(c), the thesis will, as far as possible, be assessed by the original examiners.

29.4 A thesis presented for re-examination will not be submitted for further re-examination.

30 Thesis amendments following examination

The time limits for revision of the thesis are:

- i three months where the examination result is to award the degree following corrections or revisions to be made to the satisfaction of the University (see Rule 29.1(a and b)) *and*
- ii twelve months where the examination result is not to award the degree but to permit resubmission of the thesis in a revised form (see Rule 29.1(c)).

31 Candidates who require additional time to complete revisions must apply to the Dean of Graduate Studies for permission, stating the reasons for the request. The request should be approved by the principal supervisor and the Head of School/Discipline or the Postgraduate Coordinator.

32 Deposit of thesis

Such number of copies of a thesis and any other material on which the degree is awarded shall be deposited in the Barr Smith Library or elsewhere as determined by the Committee. Unless otherwise determined by the Committee, the copies shall be available for loan and photocopy.

33 Loan or photocopy of thesis

A candidate who does not wish to allow the thesis to be lent or photocopied when it is deposited in the Library under Rule 32 shall make a written application to the Manager, Graduate Administration and Scholarships, at the same time as he or she notifies his or her intention to submit under Rule 26. The withholding of such permission and the period of time involved shall be determined by the Committee.

34 Graduation

Subject to Chapter 89 of the Statutes, candidates who have satisfied the requirements for any award of the University shall be admitted to that award at a graduation ceremony for the purpose.

35 Posthumous award

If a person dies after completing, or in the opinion of the Committee, substantially completing the requirements of the award, the University may confer the award posthumously.

36 Revoking the award

If the Committee is satisfied that, when the Master of Philosophy was conferred on a person, and that person was subsequently found to have breached ethical requirements, e.g. they

- a did not possess the relevant qualifications *or*
- b had not completed the necessary requirements,

The Vice-Chancellor with authority devolved to her/him by Council may revoke the award. Upon revocation, the person is taken never to have received the award.

37 Return of documents

If requested by the Dean of Graduate Studies, the recipient of a Master of Philosophy must deliver to the

University the documents certifying or evidencing the award.

38 General

When, in the opinion of the Research Education and Development Committee, special circumstances exist, the Committee, on the recommendation of the relevant Faculty in each case, may vary any of the provisions in Rules 1-37 above.

Statement of Graduate Attributes

(i) The capability to conduct research independently at a high level of originality, quality and creativity

This will be evidenced by the conceptual design and implementation of a research project that leads to a contribution to knowledge and/or to the production of a body of creative work. Indicators will include peer review, milestones set and goals achieved, the ability to frame questions and explore emerging issues and, where appropriate, to identify solutions using a wide range of analytical methods.

A contribution to knowledge, or the production of a body of creative work, will be achieved through one or more of the following:

- The discovery of new information
- The formulation and defence of new theories
- The innovative re-interpretation of known data and/or established ideas
- The innovative re-interpretation of the practice of the profession.

(ii) A deep knowledge of the field of study

This will be evidenced by:

- The ability to critically review information from a wide range of sources, and to develop a comprehensive understanding of relevant prior research
- The demonstration of a sound theoretical basis of knowledge, as evidenced by the arguments presented within the thesis, or a series of publications or creative works, produced during candidature.

(iii) The ability to communicate research significance clearly and concisely with audiences at all levels and to demonstrate its relevance to the broader community

This will be evidenced by:

- Successful examination of the thesis; peer reviewed publications or professional outcomes; participation in specialist and generalist conferences, public forums and other professional contexts
- A capacity to apply theoretical knowledge to discipline specific practical activity, where appropriate
- Being sought after by employers.

(iv) Broadening of the research experience through undertaking professional development in a range of areas of interest through the framework provided by the development component of the structured program.

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 Music composition/MPhil by Music performance
Thesis title:	title
Examiner's name:	(Please Print)
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 the corrections specified in my report

GRADE

Where your recommendation is that the candidate be awarded the degree (you have checked option 1 or 2 above), please recommend one of the following Grades in which to pass the thesis:

<input type="checkbox"/>	a) High Distinction 85-100
<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Distinction 75-84
<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Credit 65-74
<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Pass 50-64

Please also, indicate whether the thesis is worthy of a *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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	This thesis is outstanding and deserves a special commendation from the Dean of Graduate Studies
--------------------------	--

RE-SUBMIT

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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> <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>
--------------------------	--

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 3), or 4), 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 one page or more 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; and
3. further work that may arise from the research completed

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".
--------------------------	---

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.

Grade Descriptors

*(approved by the Vice-Chancellor and President on behalf of Council, 9 March 2005
on the recommendation of the Academic Board at Meeting 1/05, 2 March 2005)*



Generic grade descriptors

The descriptors are to be interpreted within the context of the year-level of the course and within the scope of the assessment task. (Assessment tasks include examinations, essays, assignments, etc.)

The descriptors provide a general guide to the standard of work that is expected at each grade level. Schools and departments should develop discipline-specific elaborations of these descriptors and more detailed descriptions of what students are expected to do to achieve at the various levels. In developing discipline-specific descriptions, schools and departments might find it useful to refer to taxonomies such as Bloom's taxonomy or the Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) taxonomy. (One useful on-line reference to the SOLO taxonomy is <http://www.dmu.ac.uk/~jamesa/learning/solo.htm>. Information about Bloom's taxonomy can be accessed at: <http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/bloom.html>.)

	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Conceded Pass*	Fail
General description	Outstanding or exceptional work in terms of understanding, interpretation and presentation	A very high standard of work which demonstrates originality and insight	Demonstrates a high level of understanding and presentation and a degree of originality and insight	Satisfies the minimum requirements	Just fails to satisfy the minimum requirements	Fails to satisfy the minimum requirements
Reading	Strong evidence of independent reading beyond core texts and materials	Evidence of reading beyond core texts and materials	Thorough understanding of core texts and materials	Evidence of having read core texts and materials	Some evidence of having read core texts and materials	Very little evidence of having read any of the core texts and materials
Knowledge of topic	Demonstrates insight, awareness and understanding of deeper and more subtle aspects of the topic. Ability to consider topic in the broader context of the discipline	Evidence of an awareness and understanding of deeper and more subtle aspects of the topic	Sound knowledge of principles and concepts	Knowledge of principles and concepts at least adequate to communicate intelligently in the topic and to serve as a basis for further study	Some knowledge of principles and concepts but insufficient to communicate intelligently in the topic or to serve as a basis for further study	Scant knowledge of principles and concepts

	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Conceded Pass*	Fail
Articulation of argument	Demonstrates imagination or flair. Demonstrates originality and independent thought	Evidence of imagination or flair. Evidence of originality and independent thought	Well-reasoned argument based on broad evidence	Sound argument based on evidence	Some ability to argue coherently	Very little evidence of ability to construct coherent argument
Analytical and evaluative skills	Highly developed analytical and evaluative skills	Clear evidence of analytical and evaluative skills	Evidence of analytical and evaluative skills	Some evidence of analytical and evaluative skills	Little evidence of analytical and evaluative skills	Very little evidence of analytical and evaluative skills
Problem solving	Ability to solve very challenging problems	Ability to solve non-routine problems	Ability to use and apply fundamental concepts and skills	Adequate problem-solving skills	Some evidence of problem-solving skills but skills inadequate	Very little evidence of problem-solving skills
Expression and presentation appropriate to the discipline	Highly developed skills in expression and presentation.	Well developed skills in expression and presentation.	Good skills in expression and presentation. Accurate and consistent acknowledgement of sources.	Adequate skills in expression and presentation	Some skills in expression and presentation Inaccurate or inconsistent acknowledgement of sources.	Rudimentary skills in expression and presentation Inaccurate and inconsistent acknowledgement of sources.

* Conceded passes are not used in all academic programs.