

**Report of the Research and Research Training Committee****13.2 Report of the Research and Research Training Committee meeting held on 7 August 2007**

The Committee met on 7 August 2007 when there were present: The Chair (Associate Professor P McCallum) presiding, Professors M Behnia, J Christodoulou, M Crossley, T Hambley, A Masri, B Sutton, A Vickers and N Weber, Associate Professors E Cowley, M Crock, M Halliwell and J Kril, Drs A Ammit, A Black, D Cabrera, S Kilbreath and I Shariv and Ms M Fairskye and Ms K Barnsley. Ms M Kemmis and Ms J Webb were in attendance.

**13.2.1 Report of the Doctoral Theses Examination Working Party** *pages H6-H12*

The Chair of the Academic Board, Professor Bruce Sutton, requested that a working party be established to consider the way doctoral theses at the University of Sydney are examined with a view to reducing examination time and improving the pedagogic aspects of the examination. A Working Party, led by the Chair of the PhD Awards Sub-Committee, Associate Professor Jillian Kril was convened by invitation from the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee, Associate Professor Peter McCallum.

The initial report of the Working Party was considered by the Research and Research Training Committee at its meeting of 8 May 2007. It was agreed that the report would be circulated to faculties for comment and response. The Working Party received faculty responses at the end of June and met on 10 July to consider the responses and make revisions to the original report.

The amended report and recommendations was considered by the Research and Research Training Committee. The following points were raised in discussion:

- the proposed manual of good practice would require resourcing, and Professor Kril would approach the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on this matter;
- members noted the draft form for certifying a thesis was ready for submission; and
- the investigation of participation of RHD candidates in existing short courses and units of study would be referred to the Academic Pathways For Research Training Working Party (Professor Sutton undertook to discuss this further with Professor Kril).

Members endorsed the report and agreed to refer the recommendations to the Academic Board for approval.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the report of the Doctoral Theses Examination Working Party and approve the following recommendations of the Working Party, as set out in the report presented:*

- (1) *using the current system of a primary supervisor and one or more associate supervisors faculties should be encouraged to:*
  - (a) *explore ways of increasing the pool of supervisors by including members of their profession/discipline from outside the University as associate supervisors;*
  - (b) *view the inclusion of junior members of academic staff, postdoctoral research fellows, and similarly qualified persons as associate supervisors as an opportunity for mentoring less experienced supervisors and contributing to the career development of those staff; and*
  - (c) *ensure that associate supervisors are active participants in the supervisory process;*
- (2) *formalise the procedures for annual review to include content review by supervisory panel as well as broader review by faculty/school; and*

- (a) *revise the annual report forms to include evaluation of the “milestones” for each stage of candidacy in addition to the resource and supervision aspects of candidacy covered in the existing forms;*
  - (b) *develop a manual of “best practice” with respect to the administration and monitoring of RHD candidacies for distribution to faculties; and*
  - (c) *develop a training program for postgraduate coordinators and others responsible for monitoring candidacies and conducting annual reviews.*
- (3) *establish a working party to examine ways to facilitate the participation of RHD candidates in existing short courses and units of study;*
  - (4) *require supervisors to attest to the prima facie worthiness of a thesis for examination prior to it being sent for examination;*
  - (5) *change the examiners report form and instructions to better reflect the differences between the recommendations;*
  - (6) *maintain the current practice of three examiners, at least two of which must be external to the University;*
  - (7) *remove the provision for examiners to consult prior to submission of their report.*
  - (8) *alter the appointment of examiners form to include a statement that there is no conflict of interest between the candidate or supervisor and the examiner and to more clearly articulate the other requirements for appointment as examiner;*
  - (9) *form clusters of administrative units for doctoral research candidates; and*
  - (10) *adopt a universal definition of examination times to facilitate proper analysis and comparison of performance.*

### **13.2.2 Proposals for New and Amended Courses**

#### **13.2.2.1 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies: Master of Philosophy** *pages H13-H17*

At the end of 2006, the School of Information Technologies in the Faculty of Science was merged with the Faculty of Engineering to become the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. The transfer of the related courses to the Faculty led to a review of the Faculty's postgraduate offerings. In particular, the Faculty has determined that its existing postgraduate research degree, the Master of Engineering (Research) will be replaced with a Master of Philosophy, which will be available to students from both Engineering and IT courses.

Students in courses linked to the School of Information Technologies previously enrolled in the Master of Science in the Faculty of Science to undertake masters-level studies by research. With the transfer of the school to the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, there is currently no equivalent course. The replacement of the Master of Engineering (Research) with a Master of Philosophy will provide a broader research degree to cover all students within the Faculty.

The full proposal can be found at the Committee's website:  
[http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/oldcom/rrtc/2007\\_agendas.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/oldcom/rrtc/2007_agendas.shtml)

#### **Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board:*

- (1) *approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to introduce the Master of Philosophy and delete the Master of Engineering (Research);*
- (2) *recommend that Senate:*
  - (a) *endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal; and*
  - (b) *approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate relating to the list of degrees, diplomas and certificates in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, the rescission of the*

*Resolutions of Senate relating to the Master of Engineering (Research) and the introduction of the Resolutions of Senate relating to the Master of Philosophy,*

- (3) *approve the faculty requirements related to the Master of Philosophy with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out in the report.*

### **13.2.3 Amendments to Resolutions of Senate**

#### **13.2.3.1 Faculty of Law: Doctor of Juridical Studies**

*pages H18-H22*

The Faculty of Law is seeking to replace the current Resolutions of Senate for the Doctor of Juridical Studies with Faculty Resolutions. There is no amendment to the course itself, but the material currently covered in the Resolutions of Senate will be transferred to Faculty Resolutions, as outlined in the attached report.

#### **Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board:*

- (1) *approve the proposal from the Faculty of Law to replace the current Resolutions of Senate for the Doctor of Juridical Studies with Faculty Resolutions;*
- (2) *recommend that Senate:*
- (a) *endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal; and*
- (b) *approve the rescission of the Resolutions of Senate relating to the Doctor of Juridical Studies and PhD Thesis Length and the introduction of new Resolutions of Senate relating to the degree,*
- (3) *approve the introduction of Faculty Resolutions relating to the degree with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out in the report.*

### **13.2.4 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 24 July 2007**

#### **13.2.4.1 Time Limit for Submission of Emendations**

*page H23*

The PhD Award Sub-Committee has identified a discrepancy between the procedures for approving the extension of time limits for the completion of emendations to higher degree theses.

The Academic Board had adopted the policy *Postgraduate Higher Degree Research Theses: Time Limit for submission of emendations* at its meeting on 10 September 2003 which stipulates that the Dean of Graduate Studies approves extensions to time limits for submission of emendations.

This policy is contradictory to the procedures detailed in the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the Degree Doctor of Philosophy (2007 Calendar, p. 147),

#### **4. Examiners' reports and head of department's recommendation**

##### **4.25 Emendations and lodging corrected thesis**

If a candidate does not carry out the required emendations within the time limit set, or the Head of Department after consultation with the supervisor does not consider that the emendations made are satisfactory, the head of department shall refer the matter to the faculty or college board which may grant additional time or set different conditions or may initiate proceedings under the provisions for the termination of candidate.

These resolutions allow the Head of Department after consultation with the supervisor, to refer the matter to the faculty or college board which may grant additional time or set different conditions for candidates.

The Sub-Committee agreed that it would be easier for the Head of Department to continue to make recommendations to the Faculty postgraduate board in relation to extending time limits for emendations. It was noted that these decisions would be best made at a local level as the Faculty staff had a greater understanding of the issues involved with candidates.

The Committee supported the recommendation of the Sub-Committee that the policy *Postgraduate Higher Degree Research Theses: Time Limit for submission of emendations* be rescinded to ensure a consistent procedure is applied. The Committee noted that the Sub-Committee would provide an amendment to the Academic Board resolutions relating to the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy to require the reporting to the Sub-Committee of any extension of the time limit under clause 4.25.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board rescind the policy "Postgraduate Higher Degree Research Theses: Time Limit for submission of emendations" with immediate effect.*

**13.2.4.2 Revised Examiners Report Form**

page H24

The PhD Award Sub-Committee has made a number of amendments to the Examiner's Report Form including providing further explanation about the meaning of the examiners' recommendations and including a confidentiality clause for examiners to sign.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Examiners Report Form, as set out in the report presented.*

**13.2.4.3 Appointment of Examiners Form**

pages H25-H26

To ensure the process of appointing qualified and experienced examiners is a timely one the PhD Award Sub-Committee has proposed that the following amendments be made to the Appointment of Examiner form:

- the supervisors must indicate whether a particular examiner is currently active in research;
- the supervisors must indicate whether a particular examiner has previous experience as an examiner; and
- the supervisor must indicate whether a particular examiner is free from any conflict of interest.

The Committee endorses these amendments.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Appointment of Examiners Form, as set out in the report presented.*

**13.2.5 Report of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee meeting held on 29 June 2007**

**13.2.5.1 APA/UPA Allocations and Ranking Guidelines**

page H27

The Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee discussed the need to revisit the Research Potential Indicators (RPI) table of points allocation in the ranking guidelines and add a few descriptive remarks on the criteria to award RPI points. It was agreed that this exercise should be deferred until after the 2008 APA/UPA round so that the faculties have an opportunity to comprehend the changes in the ranking categories and the move to a single merit. However, the following three

additions should be included in the RPI table now so that the intent of the ranking principles are clear:

- add 'national or international' before 'conference paper';
- add 'in national or international conference' after 'presenting author abstract'; and
- add 'and not in a training situation' after 'experience since graduation'.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Research Potential Indicators in the policy "Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPA) Ranking Guidelines", as set out in the report presented.*

**13.2.6 Allocation of APAs and UPAs**

pages H28-H30

At its meeting of 30 May 2007, the Academic Board approved amendments to the procedures for allocating APAs and UPAs, and consequent amendments to the following policies:

- Australian Postgraduate Awards and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards: Method of Award;
- Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPA) Ranking Guidelines; and
- Co-funded University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards: Method of Award

The policy "Australian Postgraduate Awards: Transfer Guidelines" was omitted in error, and amendments have now been made to this document.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board approve the amended "Australian Postgraduate Awards: Transfer Guidelines" with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.*

**13.2.7 Proceedings of the Committee**

**(1) Report of the Chair**

Members noted and confirmed the action of the Chair in approving the award of a higher degree.

**(2) Report of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)**

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) provided members with further information on the introduction of the Vice-Chancellor's Research scholarships and other activities aimed at improving the University's recruitment of talented PhD students.

**(3) Report of the Dean of Graduate Studies**

The Dean of Graduate Studies advised members on revisions to the register of supervisors and the development of KPIs and report cards to assist faculties in benchmarking their research and research training activities.

**(4) Other Reports**

The Committee noted also noted:

- a report from the Director of Sydnovate regarding the new Indirect Cost Recovery policy;
- the reports of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meetings held on 26 June 24 July 2007;
- the reports of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee meetings held on 29 June and 9 July; and
- the report of the Academic Board meeting of 11 July 2007.

## Examination of Doctoral theses at The University of Sydney

### Summary of Faculty feedback and Working Party comments– July 2007

#### Comments on the Working Party report were received from the following

Conservatorium of Music  
Faculty of Arts  
Faculty of Education and Social Work  
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies  
Faculty of Health Sciences  
Faculty of Law  
Faculties of Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy  
Faculty of Pharmacy  
Faculty of Science  
Faculty of Veterinary Science  
Sydney College of the Arts  
Sydney College of Business (BLO)  
SUPRA  
Professor Christopher Moran, Faculty of Veterinary Science

The Working Party met on July 10, 2007 to discuss the comments and revise the recommendations. A Summary of the feedback is listed below for each of the original recommendations.

#### **Section 3A: Proposed changes to doctoral training.**

*Recommendation 1: change the method of supervision to include a greater number of supervisors with broader supervisory and research experience.*

Summary: Response to this recommendation was mixed. Several faculties expressed concern regarding the additional workload that would result from this change. Concern was also expressed about potential communication problems which might arise from involving a larger number of supervisors, especially if the supervisors' advice to students differed. Furthermore, the value of additional panel members who were seen to be simply "making up the numbers" was questioned.

Working Party comment: The Working Party acknowledges the concerns about additional workload but believes that postgraduate research supervision should be recognised as a core activity of the University and that faculties should allocate the resources necessary to allow quality supervision. This view is in line with the University's position as a research-intensive university and its 1:5:40 goal. Further discussion by the working party suggested the more flexible option of encouraging a broader view of the role of associate supervisors. In addition, the working party encourages the recognition of associate supervisor status for advancement opportunities such as promotion and in funding formulae between faculties/schools.

#### Working Party Recommendation:

Using the current system of a primary supervisor and one or more associate supervisors faculties should be encouraged to;

- 1 explore ways of increasing the pool of supervisors by including members of their profession/discipline from outside the University as associate supervisors,
- 2 view the inclusion of junior members of academic staff, postdoctoral research fellows, and similarly qualified persons as associate supervisors as an opportunity for mentoring less experienced supervisors and contributing to the career development of those staff.

- 3 ensure that associate supervisors are active participants in the supervisory process.

*Recommendation 2a: formalise the procedures for annual review to include content review by supervisory panel as well as broader review by faculty/school.*

Summary: Several faculties, including the larger faculties of Arts, Medicine and Science, currently incorporate elements of content review into their annual review process. These faculties commented that their existing review processes were working well. Support for content review was also given by a number of other faculties, while some of the smaller faculties commented that such changes would increase their workload.

*Recommendation 2b: revise the annual report forms to reflect the progress requirements for each year of candidacy.*

Summary: In general this recommendation well supported. Although several faculties commented that the forms would need to reflect the different stages of candidacy and the variation in milestones between disciplines.

Working Party comment: The faculty of Arts argued against separating content review from review of the generic resource and “well-being” issues, as both are integral to a student’s progress. This point was accepted by the working party, so recommendations 2a and 2b are dealt with together. It is apparent from the feedback that several faculties have invested a great deal of time and effort in adapting the annual review process to serve the needs of their students and staff. The working party felt that this “best practice” should be shared among faculties to facilitate improvements across the University. The working party also discussed the integral role of postgraduate coordinators (PGCs) in the implementation of review and monitoring policies. There was discussion of developing a training program for PGCs to equip them with the skills needed to derive the greatest benefit from the review process. Professor Behnia, Dean of Graduate Studies, commented that, in his experience, it was difficult to identify those responsible for RHD candidates in each faculty because of the variable structure of postgraduate administration and titles given staff, and that this made communication of issues relating to RHD candidates more difficult. The working party advocates the adoption of a uniform structure in order to facilitate effective communication.

Working Party Recommendation:

- (i) Revise the annual report forms to include evaluation of the “milestones” for each stage of candidacy in addition to the resource and supervision aspects of candidacy covered in the existing forms,*
- (ii) Develop a manual of “best practice” with respect to the administration and monitoring of RHD candidacies for distribution to faculties, and*
- (iii) Develop a training program for postgraduate coordinators and others responsible for monitoring candidacies and conducting annual reviews.*

*Recommendation 3: More formal training be incorporated into doctoral candidacy*

Summary: Response to this recommendation was varied largely because some faculties interpreted the recommendation as the inclusion of *mandatory* coursework which has resource implications and may lengthen candidature times. There are a number of faculties which already have well-developed coursework programs for their RHD candidates. In general there was support for facilitating students’ participation in existing units of study and short courses.

Working Party comment: There are several major barriers to RHD students undertaking coursework relevant to their area of study. In brief these are (i) lack of awareness or any

type of database/register of units of study, short courses etc which are available across the University, (ii) administrative issues associated with monitoring outcomes of the courses or units of study, and (iii) funding issues associated with students from one faculty undertaking courses in another faculty. It was acknowledged that this is a large issue which requires input from many areas of the University and beyond the scope of the current working party.

Working Party Recommendation: A working party be established to examine ways to facilitate the participation of RHD candidates in existing short courses and units of study.

*Recommendation 4: Internal assessment by panel prior to submission*

Summary: In general, faculties were not in favour of this recommendation. They raised a number of concerns including possible delay in submission, additional workload for panel members and the potential for conflict if panel members have differing opinions. Overall most commentators believe that the responsibility for ensuring that a thesis is of a standard suitable for examination lies with the supervisor.

Working Party comment: The working party reinforced its view that, in many cases, long examination time is related to the poor quality of the thesis. It acknowledged the primary role of the supervisor in this process, but also recognised that there is ample evidence that some theses submitted for examination have not undergone rigorous review. In an attempt to draw more attention of the supervisor to their responsibilities in reviewing the thesis, the working party suggested that supervisors be required to complete a form which states that in their opinion the thesis is worthy of examination. To protect candidates from being prevented from submitting their thesis by a supervisor who wishes to delay submission unreasonably, provision should be made for the candidate to approach the Dean (or nominee) to attest to the readiness of the thesis for examination after considering both the candidate's and the supervisor's viewpoints. Similar documents are in use in other Go8 universities.

Working Party Recommendation: Supervisors be required to attest to the *prima facie* worthiness of a thesis for examination prior to it being sent for examination. A draft document is attached as an Appendix.

**Section 3B: Recommendations on Examination Process and Procedures**

*Recommendation 5: change the examiners report form and instructions to better reflect the differences between the recommendations*

Summary: This recommendation was uniformly accepted as being worthwhile.

Working Party comment: A draft of the revised form be presented to the Research and Research Training Committee for consideration, comment and recommendation to the Academic Board.

Working Party Recommendation: recommendation is unchanged.  
Academic Board resolutions and associated documentation be altered to reflect this change

*Recommendation 6: that the number of examiners be reduced to two and that both be external to the university.*

Summary: The majority of faculties were not in favour of this recommendation for several reasons. Firstly, it is not clear that reducing the number of examiners will reduce examination time. Professor Sid Burke presented data at the Examinations Forum which suggested that institutions using two examiners did not have shorter examination times

than institutions using three examiners. This is supported by data from the Faculties of Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy which shows that examination times would not be reduced for 65% of candidates. Secondly, concern was expressed that the examination time may be prolonged in the high proportion cases where the examiners recommendations differ. Indeed, most faculties believed that examination time would be increased by the need to either refer the case to the PhD Award Subcommittee or request an additional examiner/assessor.

Working Party comment: nil

Working Party Recommendation: Maintain the current practice of three examiners, at least two of which must be external to the University.

*Recommendation 7: remove the provision for examiners to consult prior to submission of their report.*

Summary: Only one faculty was not in favour of this recommendation. They argued that consultation among examiners may be of benefit in reaching a consensus. It was noted that consultation is an integral part of the examination in the case of an oral examination or where performance or exhibition forms part of the examination.

Working Party comment: It is important and desirable to obtain independent reports from examiners. It was felt that the final decision concerning award of the degree should be made by the university on advice from the faculty after weighing up all of the examiners comments. To this end the opportunity for *informal* consultation between examiners should be removed.

Working Party Recommendation: recommendation is unchanged.  
Academic Board resolutions and associated documentation be altered to reflect this change

*Recommendation 8: the appointment of examiners form be altered to include a statement that there is no conflict of interest between the candidate or supervisor and the examiner and to more clearly articulate the other requirements for appointment as examiner*

Summary: This recommendation was uniformly accepted, although one faculty commented that the definition of conflict of interest would need consideration so as not to be too restrictive.

Working Party comment: A draft of the revised form be presented to the Research and Research Training Committee for consideration, comment and recommendation to the Academic Board.

Working Party Recommendation: recommendation is unchanged.  
The appointment of examiners form and all correspondence to examiners include a statement that examiner should be free from a conflict of interest. Suggested wording;

A person should not be nominated as examiner if he/she;

- i. has had involvement in the student's research;
- ii. is a co-author on any part of the work;
- iii. has worked in the same department in an institution as the candidate;
- iv. has a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate or supervisor; or
- v. has had substantial contact with the candidate in any other circumstance which might jeopardise the independence of the examination.

*Recommendation 9: form clusters of administrative units for doctoral research candidates*

Summary: Opinion on this issue was split. In general, those faculties not situated on the Camperdown campus saw difficulties with “centralisation”. The larger Faculties of Arts, Medicine and Science commented that this was already largely in place and worked well.

Working Party comment: The working party believes there is merit in using the experience and practices established in faculties which deal with many examinations to benefit those which administer small numbers of examinations each year.

Working Party Recommendation: recommendation is unchanged.

*Recommendation 10: a universal definition of examination times be adopted to facilitate proper analysis and comparison of performance*

Summary: This recommendation was widely supported

Working Party comment: nil

Working Party Recommendation: recommendation is unchanged.



# The University of Sydney

## Statement by Supervisor on Submission of Doctoral Thesis

**This form MUST accompany the thesis on submission\*.**

Candidate's details:

Student ID:

Family name:

Given names\*:

Faculty:

School (if appropriate)

Thesis title:

Supervisor's details:

Title:

Prof

A/Prof

Dr

Other

Family name:

Given names:

Faculty:

School (if appropriate)

Address:

Telephone:

Declaration overleaf completed by supervisor \*:

Yes

No

**\* NOTES:**

1. The purpose of this form is to ensure that submitted theses are *prima facie* worthy of examination.
2. In the event that a supervisor is unwilling to certify that a thesis is properly presented and/or worthy of examination, written comments detailing the supervisor's concern should be attached to the form.
3. In situations where the supervisor declines to complete this form, a candidate may approach the Dean, or nominee, to complete this form.
4. Candidates are required to countersign the form to indicate awareness of the supervisor's comments.
5. "Thesis" refers to all material presented for examination; in most cases this will be a standard thesis but there are exceptions, for example, an exhibition or portfolio of musical compositions presented by some candidates.

Certification:

1. **Presentation of thesis:**

- |   |     |                          |    |                          |
|---|-----|--------------------------|----|--------------------------|
| • In my opinion the thesis is properly presented.   | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • In my opinion the thesis is worthy of examination.  | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • I certify that in accordance with doctoral thesis guidelines, the thesis does not exceed the prescribed maximum word limit; <b>or</b> | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Prior approval has been sought to go beyond the word limit.   | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |

2. **Responsibility for research:**

I hereby certify to the best of my knowledge that:

- |  |     |                          |    |                          |
|--|-----|--------------------------|----|--------------------------|
| • the research and writing embodied in the thesis are those of the candidate except where due reference is made in the text; | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • any assistance provided during the research phase has been appropriately described and acknowledged;                       | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • any editorial assistance in the writing of the thesis has been appropriately described and acknowledged.                   | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |

3. **Ethics clearance:**

- |   |     |                          |     |                          |    |                          |
|---|-----|--------------------------|-----|--------------------------|----|--------------------------|
| • I confirm that all ethics clearances have been obtained for this project. | N/A | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|-----|--------------------------|-----|--------------------------|----|--------------------------|

4. **Nomination of examiners:**

- |   |                        |                          |    |                          |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------|----|--------------------------|
| • I confirm that I have submitted the nomination of examiners form.   | Yes                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • If NO, please specify the date by which this form will be received. | Date of receipt: _____ |                          |    |                          |

Supervisor's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Candidate's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Postgraduate coordinator Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**THIS SECTIONS TO BE COMPLETED BY DEAN (or nominee) WHERE RELEVANT**

I certify that the thesis submitted is *prima facie* worthy of examination.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

## Amendment of Resolutions of the Senate

### Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies (p 229, *Calendar 2007*) are amended, with effect from 1 January 2008, as follows (additions indicated by underline, deletions indicated by strikethrough):

### DEGREES, DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES IN THE FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

1. The degrees in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies shall be:

1.1 Bachelor of Engineering (BE)

1.2 Bachelor of Information Technology (BIT)

1.3 Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology (BCST)

1.3.1 which shall also incorporate the stream:

1.3.1.1 Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology (Advanced) (BCST(Advanced))

1.4 Master of Automation in Field Robotics (MAFR)

1.5 Master of Engineering (ME)

~~1.6 Master of Engineering (Research) (ME(Res))~~

1.6 Master of Engineering Practice (MEP)

1.7 Master of Environmental Engineering Practice (MEEP)

1.8 Master of Mechatronic Engineering (MMtE)

1.9 Master of Philosophy (MPhil)

1.10 Master of Project Management (MPM)

1.11 Doctor of Engineering (DEng)

1.12 Doctor of Engineering Practice (DEngPrac)

1.13 Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

### **Resolutions of the Senate**

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of Philosophy in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies (p 229, *Calendar* 2007) are inserted, with effect from 1 January 2008, as follows:

#### **MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY (MPhil)**

1. Requirements for the Master of Philosophy

1.1 A candidate who has been admitted in accordance with section 1 shall:

1.1.1 engage in research in some branch of Engineering or Information Technology in the University of Sydney either full-time for not less than one year or part-time for not less than two years,

1.1.2 undertake Units of Study as the School or the Faculty may prescribe,

1.1.3 undergo a probationary period as imposed by the Faculty.

## Resolutions of the Faculty

The Faculty Resolutions relating to the Master of Philosophy in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies are inserted, with effect from 1 January 2008, as follows:

### Master of Philosophy Faculty Resolutions

#### 1. Admission Requirements

1.1 Except as provided in Part 9, University of Sydney (Amendment Act) 1999, an applicant for admission to candidature for the degree of Master of Philosophy shall:

1.1.1 be a graduate in Engineering or Information Technologies of the University of Sydney and have achieved first or second class honours or a standard deemed acceptable by the Faculty; or

1.1.2 be a graduate of any other Faculty of the University of Sydney and have achieved first or second class honours or a standard deemed acceptable by the Faculty; or

1.2 be a graduate of another institution holding equivalent qualifications to a graduate of the University of Sydney; and

1.2.1 have completed courses acceptable to the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies; and

1.2.2 have in the opinion of the Faculty reached first or second class honours standard.

1.3 Any applicant who furnishes evidence that satisfies the Faculty that a suitable standard of knowledge has been acquired, may be admitted by the Dean on the recommendation of the Head of School.

#### 2. Requirements of the Degree

2.1 A candidate who has been admitted in accordance with section 1 shall:

2.1.1 engage in research in some branch of Engineering or Information Technology in the University of Sydney either full-time for not less than one year or part-time for not less than two years,

2.1.2 undertake Units of Study as the School or the Faculty may prescribe,

2.2 undergo a probationary period as imposed by the Faculty.

#### 3. Time Limits

3.1 A candidate shall, unless special permission is granted by the Faculty, complete the requirements of the degree, in the case of a full-time student not later than two years, and in the case of a part-time student not later than four years, after the commencement of candidature.

3.2 The Faculty may include in the minimum period of candidature time spent in advanced study and research in the University of Sydney Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies (or any other institution as approved by the Faculty) prior to the application for admission to candidature.

#### 4. Suspension of Candidature

4.1 Candidates seeking suspension for a semester or longer (up to 12 months) should apply in writing to the Faculty and should have their HECS status amended accordingly.

Scholarship holders should also notify the Research Office of their intended periods of absence.

#### 5. Supervision

5.1 The Dean of the Faculty, on the recommendation of the Head of the School concerned, shall appoint a full-time member of the academic staff or research staff of the University to act as supervisor of each candidate.

5.2 Where the supervisor is a member of the research staff, the Dean of the Faculty, on the recommendation of the Head of the School concerned, shall also appoint a member of the full-time academic staff as associate supervisor. Any person so appointed as associate supervisor must be capable of acting as supervisor in the event that the supervisor is no longer able to act.

5.3 The Dean of the Faculty, on the recommendation of the Head of the School concerned, may appoint a full-time member of the academic staff of the University or other appropriately qualified person to act as associate supervisor.

## **6. Satisfactory Progress**

**6.1** A report on the progress towards completion of the requirements for the degree shall be submitted annually in respect of each candidate through the Head of School to the Faculty by the Postgraduate Advisor of the School concerned.

**6.2** Candidates deemed to have achieved outstanding performance may be recommended for an upgrade to PhD.

**6.3** If the candidate fails to submit evidence of progress or if the Faculty considers that the evidence submitted does not indicate satisfactory progress, the Faculty may call upon that candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards completion of the degree and where, in the opinion of the Faculty, the candidate does not show good cause the Faculty may terminate that candidature or may impose conditions on the continuation of that candidature.

## **7. Assessment and Examination**

**7.1** A candidate shall submit a thesis embodying the results of the research.

**7.2** A candidate may be required, at the discretion of the Faculty, to attend lectures, seminar courses or practical work courses or to undertake courses and, if required, the assessment of such courses, subject to the approval of the Faculty.

**7.3** A candidate shall state in the thesis, generally in a preface and specifically in notes;

**7.3.1** the sources from which the information was derived;

**7.3.2** the extent to which the work of others has been used; and

**7.3.3** the portion of the work claimed as original.

**7.4** The candidate shall not present as the thesis any work previously submitted for a degree of this or any other institution, but may incorporate any work that has not been submitted elsewhere, provided that the work so incorporated is indicated.

**7.5** A candidate shall lodge with the Faculty three copies (printed or typewritten) of the thesis.

**7.6** The thesis shall be accompanied by a certificate from the supervisor stating whether, in the supervisor's opinion, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory, and that the examiners have expertise in the field of the thesis.

**7.7** Having considered the certificate of the supervisor, the Faculty shall, if it thinks fit, appoint two examiners, one of which is external to the University of Sydney. The Supervisor shall not be one of the examiners.

**7.8** The examiners shall report to the Faculty which shall determine the result of the examination.

## **8. Previous work**

**8.1** The Faculty may deem time spent or work done (either at the University of Sydney or other Institution as approved by the Faculty) towards the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by a candidate before admission to candidature to be time spent or work done after admission, provided that the candidate has ceased to be a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

## **9. Alternate path in Information Technologies**

**9.1** The MPhil may be combined with the MIT (Master of Information Technology) and MITM (Master of IT Management) in a two-year program subject to the Faculty approval and provided that the candidates meet the following requirements:

**9.1.1** A minimum WAM of 75 in an undergraduate degree in Science, Computing, Engineering or IT from the University of Sydney or another institution of equivalent standing.

**9.1.2** Achieve a minimum WAM of 75 in the first 24 credit points completed during their candidature, and

**9.1.3** Achieve a minimum WAM of 75 in the subsequent enrolment which consist of an 18cr thesis and 6cr unit of study on research methods.

## **10. Transition arrangements for candidates enrolled in Master of Engineering Research**

**10.1** Candidates enrolled in Master of Engineering Research (MER) may elect to continue with the current degree or transfer to MPhil in which case the time spent or work done towards the degree of MER by a candidate before admission to MPhil will be deemed time

spent or work done towards the degree of MPhil after admission, provided that the candidate has ceased to be a candidate for the degree of MER.

## Senate Resolutions

### Doctor of Juridical Studies

The Resolutions of Senate relating to the Doctor of Juridical Studies and PhD Thesis Length in the Faculty of Law (pp 254-255, *Calendar 2007*) are rescinded and the following Resolutions of Senate inserted, with effect from 1 January 2008:

### Doctor of Juridical Studies

#### 1. Requirements for the Doctor of Juridical Studies

- 1.1 To qualify for the award of the Doctor of Juridical Studies degree a candidate must:
  - 1.1.1 complete three postgraduate coursework units of study offered for the degree of Master of Laws at the University of Sydney which relate to the thesis, three postgraduate research units, namely, Legal Research 1, 2 and 3 and a thesis of 75,000 words; and
  - 1.1.2 satisfy the requirements of all other relevant By-laws, Rules and Resolutions of the University.

## Faculty Resolutions

The Resolutions of Faculty relating to the Doctor of Juridical Studies in the Faculty of Law are inserted, with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out below:

### Doctor of Juridical Studies (SJD)

#### 1. Admission

1.1 An applicant for admission to candidature shall:

1.1.1 lodge an application with the Faculty; and

1.1.2 submit with the application an outline of the proposed course of advanced study and research, including both the area of the proposed thesis and proposals for related coursework units of study.

1.2 An application for admission to part-time candidature shall submit with the application a written undertaking that the applicant will:

1.2.1 have sufficient time available to complete the requirements for the degree in accordance with section 7.2 and within the maximum period prescribed in section 7.2.2 of these resolutions; and

1.2.2 be able to attend at the University at such times and on such occasions for purposes of consultation and participation in departmental activities, as may be required on the recommendation of the head of department concerned or the Associate Dean (Postgraduate Research).

1.3 The Postgraduate Research Committee of the Faculty (hereafter referred to as the Committee) may admit an applicant to candidature for the degree if:

1.3.1 the candidate's application complies with section 1.1 and 1.2, and

1.3.2 (except as provided in section 1.4 of these resolutions) the applicant holds or has fulfilled the requirements for:

1.3.2.1 the degree of Bachelor of Laws of the University of Sydney with First or Second Class Honours, or

1.3.2.2 the degree of Master of Laws of the University of Sydney by coursework at a level of attainment prescribed by the resolution of the Postgraduate Studies Committee of the Faculty of Law.

1.4 On the recommendation of the Faculty, the Academic Board may admit to candidature for the degree an applicant whose application complies with section 1.1 and 1.2, and who:

1.4.1.1 is either a law graduate of another university or college of advanced education; or

1.4.1.2 a person accepted by the Faculty and by the Academic Board as having standing equivalent to that required of a law graduate of the University who is qualified for admission to candidature for the degree; and

1.4.1.3 is recommended by the Faculty as being suitably prepared in the particular field of study in which the applicant proposes to be a candidate.

#### 2. Requirements for the Doctor of Juridical Studies

2.1 Candidates shall pursue an approved course of advanced study and research comprising:

2.1.1 three postgraduate coursework units of study offered for the degree of Master of Laws at the University of Sydney which relate to the thesis referred to in 4.2 below and completed in accordance with the resolutions relating to that degree;

2.1.2 three postgraduate research units of study which until the Faculty otherwise prescribes shall be:

2.1.2.1 Legal Research 1

2.1.2.2 Legal Research 2

2.1.2.3 Legal Research 3; and

2.1.3 a thesis.

2.2 With the approval of the Committee a candidate may complete up to two of the postgraduate coursework units of study referred to in section 2.1.1 in another faculty of this University or at another University, provided that:

2.2.1 no unit of study for which credit is granted is the basis for the award of any other degree;

2.2.2 the unit or units of study are passed at a level, or with such additional assessment or other requirements, as may be determined by the Committee in each case.

2.3 With the approval of the Committee a candidate may in exceptional circumstances complete one unit of study referred to in section 2.1.1 in either an undergraduate course offered by this Faculty or in another faculty of this University or at another university, provided that:

2.3.1 no unit of study for which credit is granted is the basis for the award of any other degree;

2.3.2 the unit of study is passed at a level, or with such additional assessment or other requirements, as may be determined by the Committee in each case.

2.4 The Committee may approve a variation in a candidate's course of study and research.

### **3. Credit for previous studies**

#### *3.1 Coursework degrees*

3.1.1 The Committee may grant a candidate credit for:

3.1.1.1 up to three postgraduate coursework units of study completed for the degree of Master of Laws in this Faculty; or

3.1.1.2 up to two postgraduate coursework units of study in respect of units of study completed in another faculty of this University or at another university, provided that:

3.1.1.2.1 no unit of study for which credit is granted has been a basis for the award of any other degree;

3.1.1.2.2 the units of study were passed at a level or with such additional assessment or other requirements as may be determined by the Board in each case;

3.1.1.2.3 the units of study were completed within six years immediately preceding the commencement of

candidature for the degree of Doctor of Juridical Studies; and

3.1.1.2.4 each unit of study falls within the scope of the approved course of study and research under section 4.

#### *3.2 Research degrees*

3.2.1 The Board may grant credit for the whole or any part of a period of candidature undertaken for the degree of Master of Laws by thesis or the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in this Faculty provided that the candidate has abandoned candidature for the degree for which credit is sought and the period of candidature for which credit is sought:

3.2.1.1 involved a course of advanced study and research related to the candidate's proposed course of advanced study and research for the degree of Doctor of Juridical Studies; and

3.2.1.2 was taken within six years immediately preceding the commencement of the degree of Doctor of Juridical Studies.

### **4. The thesis**

4.1 The candidate for the SJD shall present a thesis which is a substantially original contribution to the subject concerned.

4.2 The thesis shall have an upper limit of 75,000 words of text that may be exceeded only with permission from the Associate Dean (Postgraduate Research).

4.3 The candidate shall state:

4.3.1 the sources from which the information is derived;

4.3.2 the extent to which the work of others has been made use of; and

4.3.3 the portion of the work the candidate claims as original.

4.4 The topic of the thesis shall be approved by the Committee.

4.5.1 The Committee on the recommendation of the Associate Dean (Postgraduate Research) shall appoint a supervisor who shall be a member of the academic staff of the Faculty.

4.5.2 In appropriate cases the Committee may appoint an associate supervisor.

4.6 A candidate may not present as the thesis any work which has been presented for a degree at this or another university, but the candidate will not be precluded from incorporating such work in the thesis, provided that, in presenting the thesis, the candidate indicates the part of the work which has been so incorporated.

4.7 A candidate shall submit to the Faculty three copies of the thesis in a form prescribed by the Committee.

4.8 The thesis shall be accompanied by a certificate from the supervisor stating whether, in the supervisor's opinion, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory.

4.9 When the degree has been awarded, a copy of the thesis incorporating any required emendations and revisions shall be lodged in the University Library.

#### **5. Appointment of examiners**

5.1 On receiving the thesis and having considered the certificate of the supervisor, the Committee shall, if it thinks fit, appoint examiners.

5.2 If the Committee resolves to appoint examiners it shall appoint at least two examiners, one of whom shall be external.

5.3 The Committee shall report the names of the examiners appointed to the Academic Board, which may appoint one or more additional examiners.

5.4 In any case where the Committee, having received the thesis and having considered the report of the supervisor, resolves not to appoint examiners, it shall report the circumstances for its decision to the Academic Board.

#### **6. Degree result**

6.1 Upon completion of the coursework at the level prescribed by the Board and after consideration of the reports of the examiners on the thesis, the Committee shall submit the reports, together with a recommendation concerning the award of the degree, to the Academic Board which shall determine the result of the candidature.

#### **7. Time limits**

7.1 Subject to section 7.2 a candidate may proceed either on a full-time or part-time basis.

7.2 Except in special circumstances and with the approval of the Committee:

7.2.1 the maximum length of candidature for a full time candidate shall be eight semesters (excluding any period of approved suspended candidature);

7.2.2 the maximum length of part time candidature shall be 16 semesters (excluding any period of approved suspended candidature).

7.3 A candidate shall prepare annually, before enrolment, a statement of the work done by the candidate towards

completion of the requirements for the degree and submit it to the appointed supervisor.

7.4 The supervisor shall also prepare annually a report on the work done by the candidate, which shall be shown to the candidate for comment, and the candidate shall sign the report as having sighted the contents.

7.5 Both reports shall then be forwarded to the Associate Dean (Postgraduate Research).

7.6 Where, in the opinion of the Committee, a candidate has not made satisfactory progress towards completing the

requirements for the degree, the Committee may call upon the candidate to show cause why the candidature should not be terminated for lack of satisfactory progress.

#### **8. Suspension of Candidature**

8.1 The Postgraduate Research Committee, or the Committee's nominee, may on written application by a candidate suspend the candidature on the grounds and conditions the Committee or its nominee thinks fit.

8.1.1 Any period of suspension does not count towards any period which the course of study would otherwise have been required to be completed.

8.2 The Postgraduate Research Committee, or the Committee's nominee, may on written application by a candidate permit a candidate who has been admitted to candidature but has not enrolled for a first time to defer enrolment for one year.

#### **9. Satisfactory progress**

9.1 The Postgraduate Research Committee, or the Committee's nominee, may require a candidate to show cause why the candidature should not be terminated for unsatisfactory progress, in any of the following circumstances:

9.1.1 a candidate has not completed all the requirements of the degree within the time specified in seven of these resolutions: or

9.1.2 the candidate has obtained failures in any two units of study or two failures in one unit of study.

9.2 If the Postgraduate Research Committee considers that the candidate has not shown good cause why the candidature should not be terminated, the Committee may terminate the candidature.



# The University of Sydney

## ~~Postgraduate Higher Degree Research Theses: Time limit for submission of emendations~~

~~Approved by Academic Board on 10 September 2003  
Date of effect: 11 September 2003~~

### ~~1. Policy~~

~~This policy sets out the University's time limit for candidates of postgraduate higher degrees to complete emendations or typographical corrections to theses.~~

### ~~2. Background~~

~~The policy was developed in response to specific instances of deferred completion and in an attempt to improve the University's procedures and encourage candidates to complete degree requirements.~~

### ~~3. Coverage~~

~~This policy applies to all candidates for postgraduate higher degrees including the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy, Master of Philosophy and professional doctorates which required the completion of a thesis.~~

### ~~4. Procedures~~

~~4.1 Where a candidate for a postgraduate higher degree is required to complete emendations or typographical corrections as a result of the examination of the thesis, the candidate has three months from the notification of the result to make such changes.~~

~~4.2 Where a candidate requires an extension to this time limit, an application must be made to the Dean of Graduate Studies through the Faculty concerned outlining any extenuating circumstances and proposing a new date by which such changes will be made.~~

~~4.3 The Dean of Graduate Studies shall determine whether an extension of the time limit will be granted.~~

~~4.4 Where a candidate has not completed the required changes within the time limit, a Faculty may request the Dean of Graduate Studies to require the candidate concerned to provide evidence of why the candidature should not be terminated.~~

### ~~5. Authority~~

#### ~~5.1 Development/consultation~~

~~This policy was developed by the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee at the request of the Graduate Studies Committee.~~

#### ~~5.2 Management responsibility~~

~~Dean of Graduate Studies.~~

#### ~~5.3 Implementation and monitoring~~

~~Dean of Graduate Studies.~~

#### ~~5.4 Review~~

~~30 July 2004~~

#### ~~5.5 Communication~~

~~Dean of Graduate Studies.~~

#### ~~5.6 Contact~~

~~Dean of Graduate Studies, email: [DOGS@usyd.edu.au](mailto:DOGS@usyd.edu.au)~~



The University of Sydney

## Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

### Examiner's report on thesis

Report due date .....

Name of examiner .....

Examiner's institution .....

Name of candidate ..... SID.....

Faculty..... Date of submission .....

Title of thesis.....

#### A Content and Presentation of thesis

The thesis should

- (a) be a substantially original contribution to the knowledge of the subject concerned,
- (b) afford evidence of originality by the discovery of new facts, and/or
- (c) afford evidence of originality by the exercising of independent critical ability,
- (d) be satisfactory as regards literary presentation, and
- (e) contain a substantial amount of material which is suitable for publication.

#### B Recommendation

After examination of the thesis and supporting material, I recommend that:

(1) *The candidate be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without further conditions* .....

or (2) *Award be made subject to minor correction of the thesis to the satisfaction of the University* .....

There are minor errors or omissions in the thesis, e.g. citation omissions/errors, typographical errors, which must be corrected but which do not alter the conclusions of the thesis.

or (3) *Award be made subject to the conditions outlined in my report* .....

3(a) the making of emendations .....

Emendations are the correction of errors or the addition or deletion of material in the text, tables, figures, or appendices. Changes should, in the opinion of the examiner, not require an additional period of research and would not result in the conclusions of the thesis being significantly altered. Emendations do not require the thesis to be returned to examiners, but can be adjudicated by the Head of School.

3(b) the fulfillment of other conditions .....

Other conditions the candidate should fulfill such as substantial changes to the text or some form of further examination. Please advise on the form of such examination. The University rules do allow for an examiner to recommend an oral examination. Changes should, in the opinion of the examiner, not require an additional period of research and would not result in the conclusions of the thesis being significantly altered. Fulfillment of these conditions does not require the thesis to be returned to examiners, but can be adjudicated by the Head of School.

or (4) *The candidate not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, but be permitted to resubmit a revised thesis for examination following a further period of study* .....

The thesis in its current form does not merit award. There are errors and/or deficiencies that, in the opinion of the examiner, substantially affect the argument or the conclusions of the thesis. Changes may include, but are not limited to, the provision of extra data or material. In the opinion of the examiner the candidate demonstrates sufficient ability that, after an additional mandatory period of study, a thesis of the required standard may be achieved. Following revision and resubmission the thesis is re-examined.

I feel a further period of research extending over ..... semesters would be necessary

Please indicate whether you would be willing to re-examine a revised thesis if so invited. .... Yes / No

or (5) *The candidate not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy* .....

The thesis does not merit award of the degree and does not demonstrate sufficient ability by the candidate for a resubmitted thesis to achieve this merit e.g. the hypothesis and methods are fatally flawed, therefore rendering the conclusions completely invalid and not able to be rescued by an additional period of study.

#### C Release of examiner's name and comments to the candidate

I agree to the release to the candidate, when the examination is complete,

(a) of my comments (in whole or in the parts designated).....  (b) of my name .....

Notwithstanding your wishes, the University may be required, in some circumstances, to release this information.

Examiner ..... Date .....

#### D Grounds for recommendation

Please state the grounds on which you base your recommendation relative to the statements about the content and presentation of the thesis in A above. Examiners are not always unanimous in their recommendations and so a decision must be made about the award of the degree on the basis of these reports. Indicate, where appropriate, the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis and the particular contributions made by the candidate. If suggesting emendations, please list them in the report rather than writing them in the margin of the thesis.



The University of Sydney

**Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**  
Appointment of Examiners

- Note:
- Heads of departments/schools are required to use this form in recommending the appointment of examiners to the faculty concerned. Approved recommendations are then forwarded to the PhD Award Sub-Committee.
  - Nomination of examiners should be made at least 4 weeks prior to submission of thesis
  - Please read the notes on the reverse of this form before completing the details below.
  - Forms must be typewritten
  - Please attach additional pages if required.

SID: \_\_\_\_\_ Candidate's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis title: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_ School/Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Anticipated date of thesis submission: \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

	Examiner 1	Examiner 2
Name (including title)		
Academic Qualification		
Current position title		
Institution		
Postal Address		
email		
telephone		
fax		
<b>1. Justification for nomination*</b>		
Currently active in research	Yes / No	Yes / No
Previous experience as examiner	Yes / No	Yes / No
<b>2. Free from conflict of interest*</b>		
	Yes / No	Yes / No
<b>3. Agreed to act as examiner*</b>		
	Yes / No	Yes / No
<b>4. Willing to conduct oral examination</b>		
	Yes / No	Yes / No
<b>5. Willing to examine electronically</b>		
	Yes / No	Yes / No
	Examiner 3	Examiner 4#
Name (including title)		
Academic Qualification		
Current position title		
Institution		
Postal Address		
email		
telephone		
fax		
<b>1. Justification for nomination*</b>		
Currently active in research	Yes / No	Yes / No
Previous experience as examiner	Yes / No	Yes / No
<b>2. Free from conflict of interest*</b>		
	Yes / No	Yes / No
<b>3. Agreed to act as examiner*</b>		
	Yes / No	Yes / No
<b>4. Willing to conduct oral examination</b>		
	Yes / No	Yes / No
<b>5. Willing to examine electronically</b>		
	Yes / No	Yes / No

\* see notes on reverse of form. If no, please provide justification for the nomination of this examiner. # see notes on reverse of form.

Approved by the Head of department/school

.....  
Signed Date

Approved by/on behalf of the Board/Committee  
of Postgraduate Studies of the Faculty.

.....  
Signed Date (of meeting if applicable)

Noted by the PhD Award Sub-Committee

.....  
Signed Date of meeting



The University of Sydney

**Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**  
Appointment of Examiners

The Resolutions of Senate relating to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy provide for a faculty to appoint three examiners of a thesis submitted for the degree, at least two of whom shall be external, and for the appointment to be reported to the Academic Board. The Academic Board has delegated its powers and responsibilities with respect to doctoral studies matters to the Research and Research Training Committee, who in turn has established the PhD Award Sub-Committee to act on its behalf in the consideration of examiners appointed by faculties.

It is expected that heads of departments/schools, in recommending the appointment of examiners, have consulted the supervisor. This consultation should include a general discussion of a wide range of possible examiners with the candidate by the supervisor and/or head of department/school, which may be initiated by the candidate or the supervisor or the head of department/school.

Candidates may in addition, advise the names of persons they do not wish to see appointed as examiners giving their reasons in writing. The consultation process however, should not result in the candidate being given the names of his/her examiners and care must be taken not to jeopardise the integrity and independence of the examination process.

In order to reduce delays it is necessary to contact examiners in advance of their appointment to see if they are willing and able to act within the time frame expected. Provision is also made on the form for the nomination of a fourth person as an alternative examiner should one of the recommended examiners decline to act, later withdraw or not complete the examination within the time frame specified.

The following specific points should be noted:

1. The examiners should be known to be familiar with the supervision and/or examination of research theses. Justification should be provided for examiners who have not had previous experience.
2. Recommendations for examiners who are not persons of obvious academic standing (i.e. who do not themselves hold a doctorate or do not hold an academic appointment) must be supported with justifying statements and documentation
3. Examiners should normally be still active in research/scholarship thus ensuring that their knowledge of the field is current. Recommendations for the appointment as examiner of someone who has retired should be supported with a justifying statement including how long it has been since the person retired.
4. At least two examiners shall be external to the University.
5. Examiners should be free from bias, for or against the candidate or supervisor.
6. Conflict of interest. A person should not be nominated as examiner if he/she;
  - a. has had involvement in the student's research;
  - b. is a co-author on any part of the work;
  - c. has a close personal relationship with the candidate or supervisor; or
  - d. has had substantial contact with the candidate or supervisor in any other circumstance which might jeopardise the independence of the examination.
7. The examiners must be appointed under the agreement that the contents of the thesis, including any intellectual property rights contained in the thesis, remain strictly confidential and to use the thesis only for the purposes of performing the examination.
8. Thesis will be sent to the fourth examiner if reports from examiners 1, 2 and 3 are not received by the due date.

**Research Potential Indicators - Table of Points Allocation**

<b>Relevant academic qualification in addition to Honours 1 (applicable to Category One &amp; Two applicants only)</b>	<b>Points</b>		
A completed Masters degree with 100% in research	10		
A completed Masters degree with at least 2/3 in research	6		
A completed second Honours 1 degree	6		
<b>Scholarly publications - must be published or accepted for publication by a reputable publisher in the relevant field of research within the last five years</b>	<b>Sole author</b>	<b>Main* author</b>	<b>Co-author</b>
A published book	20	18	16
A published chapter in an edited book (not conference proceedings)	10	8	6
A published research article in a refereed international journal (ISI-listed or DEST-approved)	10	8	6
A patent	10	8	6
A published or refereed <u>national or international</u> conference paper	5	3	2
A published or refereed <u>in national or international conference</u> presenting author abstract	3	2	1
A published research report	2	2	1
* Subject to evidence that the author is the main contributor of the publication.			
<b>Output in the art and music areas within the last five years</b>	<b>Sole contributor</b>	<b>Co-contributor</b>	
An exhibition (with published catalogue) with multiple venues of international standard, or a series of performances of international standard for which reviews in significant outlets are available	12	8	
An exhibition in a Public Gallery or Museum (with published catalogue)	12	8	
An exhibition in a Private Gallery of standing in which the artist is asked to exhibit by invitation	12	8	
Visual work(s) held in significant National and/or International Collections or commissioned by Government Bodies and/or the Corporate Sector	8	6	
Visual documentation of performance, installation and electronic creative works in significant National and/or International Collections	8	6	
A significant published musical composition or a significant commercially published CD of a musical performance In exceptional circumstances, a higher mark (maximum 12) can be argued by the Faculty.	6	4	
An exhibition or performance of a creative work for which reviews in significant outlets are available	6	4	
Participation (as presenting author or equivalent) in significant National or International Festivals or professional conventions	3	2	
<b>Relevant professional experience at a responsible level or direct research experience since graduation <u>and not in a training situation</u> (must be documented)</b>	<b>Points</b>		
2 to 3 full-time years	2		
Up to 5 full-time years	4		
More than 5 full-time years	6		
<b>Other</b>	<b>Points</b>		
Participation in moots such as the Jessop International Law moot at an international level	3		



# The University of Sydney

## Australian Postgraduate Awards: Transfer Guidelines

Approved by: Academic Board on 11/09/2002

Date of effect: 12/09/2002

Amended by: Academic Board on

### 1. Policy

The DEST rule on transfer of APA funding for the 2002 onwards cohort is that if the receiving institution wishes to support any transferring-in student it must do so from within its allocated APA funding. This means that a transferring-in APA student in the 2002 onwards cohort will not bring an APA scholarship to the University, nor will a transferring-out student be able to take an APA scholarship with them.

### 2. Background

This policy has been developed to provide guidance on the process for consideration of APA scholarships to candidates seeking to transfer-in to the University.

### 3. Coverage

This policy covers candidates transferring in and out of the University who have been awarded APAs from the 2002 cohort onwards.

### 4. Procedures

#### 4.1 Transferring-out students

4.1.1 A request by a student to transfer an APA from the University of Sydney will only be approved in exceptional circumstances, for example where the student's supervisor is leaving the institution and no suitable replacement supervisor is available. The approval of the transfer is made on the understanding that the student will need to secure APA funding from the receiving institution.

#### 4.2 Transferring-in students

4.2.1 The University recognises that there is a difference between a student-driven transfer and a supervisor-driven transfer.

4.2.1.1 A student-driven transfer refers to incidents where the student wishes to study at this University for personal reasons.

4.2.1.2 A supervisor-driven transfer refers to cases where the students are following their **principal** supervisor who is taking up employment at this University.

4.2.2 Transferring-in students wishing to apply for an APA must ~~first~~ be admitted to candidature and complete enrolment by the relevant HECS census date.

- 4.2.3 In considering whether to admit to candidature a transferring-in student applying for an APA, faculties should refer any APA enquiries to the Manager, Research Training Scholarships, Research Office before admitting the student to candidature.
- 4.2.4 Faculties are not obliged to accept a student-driven transfer if the faculty is not satisfied that suitable and adequate supervision can be provided to the student concerned.
- 4.2.5 Requests from transferring-in students for an APA will not be accepted if the transfer occurs within the first semester of a student's candidature. However, students are able to apply for APAs or UPAs in subsequent scholarship rounds, in which their application will be ~~treated as an internal~~ ranked with all other applications received for that round in accordance with the guidelines for the APA Method of Award.
- ~~4.2.6 Applications for APAs from student-driven transfers will only be accepted at the beginning of the academic year and the deadline is 15 January.~~
- ~~4.2.7 Applications for APAs from supervisor-driven transfers will be considered twice a year and the deadline is 15 January for First Semester enrolments and 15 July for Second Semester enrolments.~~

#### ~~4.3 Allocation of awards~~

- ~~4.3.1 A preliminary ranking of any application for an APA from a transferring-in student will first be conducted by the Chair of the relevant College Ranking Committee in accordance with the guidelines for the APA Method of Award.~~
- ~~4.3.2 If an application received under (2)(f) above has at least met the University's first round cut-off marks, the relevant faculty will then be contacted for confirmation about whether the applicant has been admitted to candidature. A decision to award an APA to a transferring-in student will be made by the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee in accordance with the guidelines for the APA Method of Award.~~
- ~~4.3.3 If an application received under (2)(g) above has at least met the University's first round cut-off marks, the relevant faculty will then be contacted for confirmation about whether the applicant has been admitted to candidature. A decision to award an APA to a transferring-in student will be made by the Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee, taking into account the guidelines for the APA Method of Award.~~
- ~~4.3.4 In making a decision to award an APA under (c) above the Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee will consider whether all APAs in a year have been taken up.~~
- ~~4.3.5 If the Chair of the Sub-Committee awards an APA for a transfer-in student under (d) above, one new APA award for the following year will be deducted from the relevant College's allocation. However if a student who was awarded an APA transfers-out in the same year as~~

~~the Chair makes such an award, no deduction will be made from the relevant College's allocation.~~

~~4.3.6 A faculty or college may consider funding an unsuccessful APA application of a transferring-in student from its own resources.~~

~~4.3.7 If a faculty or college determines to fund an APA application under (f) above, the student may in a subsequent year compete for the University APA awards, and if unsuccessful, will continue to be funded by the faculty or college concerned in accordance with the decision of the faculty or college, subject to the normal reviews of candidature.~~

## 5. Authority

### 5.1 Development/consultation

This policy was developed by the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee of the Research and Research Training Committee and approved by the Academic Board.

### 5.2 Management responsibility

Manager, ~~Research Training Scholarships~~, Research Office

### 5.3 Implementation and monitoring

Manager, ~~Research Training Scholarships~~, Research Office

### 5.4 Review

~~1 August 2004~~ As required.

### 5.5 Communication

Manager, ~~Research Training Scholarships~~, Research Office

### 5.6 Contact

Manager, ~~Research Training Scholarships~~, Research Office

## 6. Related information

### 6.1 Related University legislation, resolutions, policies and procedures include:

6.1.1 Australian Postgraduate Awards (APAs) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPAs): Method of Award at [http://db.usyd.edu.au/policy/policy\\_index.stm](http://db.usyd.edu.au/policy/policy_index.stm)