

Report of the Research and Research Training Committee**13.2 Item held over from Report of the meeting held on 7 August 2007****13.2.1 Report of the Doctoral Theses Examination Working Party** *pages H5-H11*

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.*

13.3 Report of the Research and Research Training Committee meeting held on 18 September 2007

The Committee met on 18 September 2007 when there were present: The Chair (Professor R Overall) presiding, Professors M Behnia, J Christodoulou, T Hambley, A Masri, K Refshauge, A Vickers and N Weber, Associate Professors M Crock, M Halliwell, J Kril and S West, Drs A Ammit, J Bobis and D Cabrera, and Ms K Barnsley and Mr W Dawson. Ms M Kemmis was in attendance.

13.3.1 Proposals for New and Amended Courses

13.3.1.1 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Master of Philosophy (Nursing)

pages H12-H17

The Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery has amended the Senate and Faculty resolutions relating to the Master of Philosophy (Nursing). The bulk of the information previously contained in the Senate Resolutions will now reside in the Faculty Resolutions for the degree.

The full proposal can be found at the Committee's website:
http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/oldcom/rtc/2007_agendas.shtml

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

- (1) *approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Master of Philosophy(Nursing);*
- (2) *recommend that Senate:*
 - (a) *endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal; and*
 - (b) *approve the rescission of the existing Resolutions of Senate relating to the course and the insertion of new Resolutions of Senate; and*
- (3) *approve the faculty requirements related to the Master of Philosophy (Nursing)*

with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out in the report.

13.3.2 Amendments to Faculty Requirements

13.3.2.1 Faculty of Pharmacy: Doctor of Pharmacy and Master of Pharmacy

The Faculty of Pharmacy has amended the English language requirements for admission relating to the Doctor of Pharmacy and Master of Pharmacy. The IELTS score is being reduced from 7.0 to 6.5. There are no amendments to existing resolutions required as a result of this change.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the English language requirements for admission to the Doctor of Pharmacy and Master of Pharmacy with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out in the report.

13.3.3 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 28 August 2007

13.3.3.1 Conferral of Examiners

At its meeting of 7 August 2007, the Committee had noted the recommendation of the PhD Award Sub-Committee that examiners not be allowed to confer. The Sub-Committee was asked to recommend amendments to the Academic Board resolutions relating to the Doctor of Philosophy in support of this recommendation.

The Sub-Committee recommends that following amendments to the Academic Board Resolutions relating to the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Calendar 2007, p 144) (Additions indicated by underline, deletion indicated by strikethrough):

2.Consideration by examiners

Examiners to report within two months

2.1 An examiner is required to complete the examination of the thesis and submit a report on the prescribed form within two months of receipt of the thesis. The examiner may return the report by electronic mail, but if using this medium must also send a signed, hard copy of the report by mail or facsimile.

Examiners to submit independent reports

2.2 The examiner shall not be advised of the names of the other examiners who have agreed to act. The University requires that there be no consultation among co-examiners during the examination process and that examiners submit an independent report. ~~The examiner shall be advised by the Registrar of the names of the other examiners who have agreed to act and may consult these co-examiners directly at any stage of the examining process, but shall submit an independent report and shall not have any right of access to other examiners' reports.~~

Recommendation

That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the resolutions relating to the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, as set out in the report presented.

13.3.4 Proceedings of the Committee

13.3.4.1 Report of the Chair

The Chair reported to the Committee on the following matters:

- the approval of the admission to candidature, and appointment of examiners for, a higher doctorate candidate in the Faculty of Science;
- recent meetings of the English Language Competency Working Party;
- the terms of reference for the Academic Pathways to Research Training Working Group; and
- the new Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.

13.3.4.2 Report of the Dean of Graduate Studies

The Dean of Graduate Studies reported to members on recent analysis of the progression rates of scholarship holders. It was noted that faculty-specific data from this analysis would be provided to all faculties.

13.3.4.3 Other Reports

The Committee also noted:

- the appointment of members to the RQF panels and the release of the final RQF guidelines;
- the report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 28 August 2007; and
- the report of the Academic Board meeting of 29 August 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; or | 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 Nursing and Midwifery

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of Philosophy (Nursing) in the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery (pp 271-272, *Calendar* 2007) are rescinded and the following Resolutions inserted, with effect from 1 January 2008, as follows:

Master of Philosophy (Nursing)

1. Requirements for the Master of Philosophy (Nursing)

- 1.1 To qualify for the award of the Master of Philosophy a student must:
 - 1.1.1 complete any units of study prescribed by the Faculty; and
 - 1.1.2 carry out supervised research leading to a thesis of a maximum of 60,000 words; and
 - 1.1.3 satisfy the requirements of all other relevant By-laws, Rules and Resolutions of the University.

Resolutions of the Faculty

Master of Philosophy (Nursing)

Faculty Resolutions

[Section 1]

1. Admission

- 1.1 An applicant for admission to candidature for the degree shall, except as provided in Part 9, Division 10 of the *University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999 (as amended)*:
 - ~~1.1.1 hold an honours degree in nursing from The University of Sydney; or~~
 - ~~1.1.2 hold an equivalent degree from another tertiary institution, or~~
 - ~~1.1.3 in special cases, be a graduate with honours of another faculty or board of studies of the University; or~~
 - ~~1.1.4 hold a masters degree awarded with merit in an appropriate subject area, or~~
 - ~~1.1.5 hold such other relevant qualifications, including clinical experience, considered by the Faculty to be equivalent to those specified in sections 1.1.1 to 1.1.4; and~~
 - 1.1.1 hold the degree of master, or
 - 1.1.2 hold the degree of bachelor with first or second class honours, and
- 1.2 be registered with the Nurses and Midwives Board of New South Wales; or
 - 1.2.1 for international applicants, be registered in their ~~own~~ home country; and
 - 1.2.2 have such post-registration clinical experience as may be specified by the Faculty.
- 1.3 The Faculty may admit as a candidate for the degree an applicant holding the degree of bachelor without first or second class honours after the applicant has passed a qualifying examination at a standard equivalent to the bachelor's degree with first or second class honours, provided that the Faculty may exempt an applicant from the qualifying examination the applicant has obtained a high distinction or distinction in the highest course available in the subject or subjects relevant to the proposed course of advanced study and research.
- 1.4 The Academic Board has endorsed an interpretation of the qualifying examination as including completion of a period of relevant full-time or part-time advanced study and research towards a master's degree in the University of Sydney, such a standard as would demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Faculty that the candidate is suitably prepared in the particular field of study to undertake candidature for the Master of Philosophy.
- 1.5 The Academic Board may, in accordance with this Rule, admit as a candidate for the degree an applicant holding qualifications which, in the opinion of the Faculty are equivalent to those prescribed in 1.1 or 1.3 above and such candidate shall proceed to the degree under such conditions as the Faculty may prescribe.
- 1.6 A candidate may be accepted by the Faculty on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding 12 months.
 - 1.6.1 Upon completion of this period the Faculty shall review the candidate's work and shall either;
 - 1.6.1.1 confirm the candidate's status; or
 - 1.6.1.2 terminate the candidature.
- 1.7 An applicant may be required to undertake units of study prescribed by the Faculty; and
 - 1.7.1 complete such preliminary examinations as the Faculty may prescribe, before admission to candidature.
- ~~1.5 Admission to any subject area may be limited by quota.~~
- ~~1.6 In determining the quota the University will take into account:~~
 - ~~1.6.1 availability of resource including space, library, equipment and computing facilities; and~~
 - ~~1.6.2 availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.~~
- 2. Requirements for degree of Master of Philosophy (Nursing)**
 - 2.1 A candidate may be admitted to proceed on either a full-time or part-time basis.

- 2.2 A candidate for the degree shall proceed by research and thesis, notwithstanding any requirements prescribed by the Faculty to undertake units of study.
 - 2.3 Except with the permission of the Faculty and under such special conditions as it may prescribe:
 - 2.3.1 a full-time candidate shall complete all the requirements for the degree:
 - 2.3.1.1 not earlier than the end of the fourth semester of candidature; or
 - 2.3.1.2 not later than the sixth semester of candidature.
 - 2.3.2 a part-time candidate shall complete all the requirements for the degree:
 - 2.3.2.1 not earlier than the end of the ~~sixth~~ eight semester of candidature; or
 - 2.3.2.2 not later than the end of the ~~tenth~~ twelfth semester of candidature.
 - 2.3 A qualifying student as described in 1.4 above shall not be eligible to be enrolled as a research degree candidate until a period of at least one semester has elapsed from initial enrolment.
 - 2.4 A qualifying student shall complete the prescribed qualifying program within two years.
 - 2.5 On the recommendation of the ~~head of department~~ Associate Dean (Academic) the Faculty:
 - 2.5.1 shall appoint a suitably qualified supervisor and associate supervisors, being a member of the academic staff of the University for each candidate in respect of the thesis component. for each candidate to take primary responsibility for the conduct of their candidature and to be responsible for the progress of the candidature to the Associate Dean (Academic) and the Faculty in accordance with policy established by the Academic Board and the Faculty.
 - ~~5. A candidate is required to:~~
 - ~~5.1 complete an annual report on his or her work to the Faculty each year; and~~
 - ~~5.2 maintain satisfactory progress.~~
 - ~~6. The candidate shall give two months' notice in writing of their intention to submit the thesis to their supervisor who shall so advise the head of department concerned Associate Dean (Academic).~~
- 3. Progress**
- 3.1 At the end of each year each candidate shall provide evidence of progress and attend a progress review interview to the satisfaction of the supervisor and the Associate Dean (Academic).
 - 3.2 On the basis of evidence provided and the interview, the Associate Dean (Academic) shall recommend the conditions of the candidature to apply for the following year and may require the candidate to provide further evidence of progress at the end of one semester or such other period as the Associate Dean (Academic) considers appropriate.
 - 3.3 If a candidate fails to submit evidence of progress or if the Associate Dean (Academic) considers that the evidence submitted does not indicate satisfactory progress, the Faculty may, on the Associate Dean (Academic)'s recommendation, ask 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.
 - 3.4 The examination process will be in accordance with the regulations set out in the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery Resolutions, Part VI, Division V.
- 4. Award of the degree of Master of Philosophy (Nursing)**
- 4.1 To qualify for the award of Master of Philosophy (Nursing) a candidate must:
 - 4.1.1 complete any units of study prescribed by the Faculty; and
 - 4.1.2 carry out supervised research leading to a thesis of a maximum of 60,000 words.
 - 4.2 The degree will be awarded in the pass grade only.

5. Restrictions on enrolment

- 5.1 In considering an application for admission to candidature the Faculty will select in preference applicant who are most meritorious in terms of sections 1.1 above.

6. Discontinuation of enrolment

- 6.1 A student who has discontinued candidature or whose candidature is deemed to have lapsed must apply for re-admission in accordance with the current procedures for new applicants to the degree.

7. Suspension of enrolment

- 7.1 Suspension of candidature is only applicable in cases of hardship or activities on the part of the student that are of national or state importance/are of a significant nature.
- ~~7.2 Examples of hardship may be illness or financial difficulties. Activities of a significant nature may be the inclusion of the student on a national sporting team, orchestra, etc that requires him/her to travel extensively for a specific period of time.~~
- 7.3 The granting of a suspension of candidature is at the discretion of the Dean.
- 7.4 Suspension of candidature will be for a minimum of one semester and a maximum of two semesters and may be granted only once during the certificate, diploma or degree.
- 7.5 In cases where a suspension of candidature is not granted, students may be required to discontinue their studies and follow the procedures for re-enrolment after an absence.

8. Re-enrolment after an absence

- 8.1 There is no automatic right of re-entry. Students who wish to be considered for re-enrolment need to fulfil the following conditions:
- 8.1.1 lodge an application by the date advised by the Faculty in the year prior to that in which re-enrolment is sought;
- ~~11.1.2 attach a current academic transcript (progress status is contingent upon an absence of not more than two years from the course); and~~
- 8.1.3 ensure that outstanding debts with the University and/or show cause requirements are attended to before submission of the application (applications cannot be considered until financial obligations and show cause requirements are completed).
- ~~11.2 Applications will be considered in conjunction with all other applications by students applying under these conditions prior to the commencement of the academic year in which the student wishes to enrol.~~

9. Satisfactory progress

- 9.1 The Board of Studies shall have the power to resolve on satisfactory progress and progression in individual cases.
- 9.2 All Master of Philosophy students admitted to the degree are to be subjected to ~~departmental~~ a review after their ~~second~~ first year of candidature, regardless of the status of their candidature. ~~whether enrolled full-time or part-time for full-time applicants and after their second year of candidature for part-time applicants.~~
- 9.2.1 Candidates shall provide evidence of progress to the satisfaction of the supervisor and the Associate Dean (Academic) and any review committee constituted by the Faculty.
- 9.2.1.2 On basis of the evidence provided, the Associate Dean (Academic) shall recommend the conditions of candidature to apply for the following year; and
- 9.2.1.3 may require the candidate to provide further evidence of progress at the end of one semester or such other period as the Associate Dean (Academic) recommends to the Board of Studies as appropriate.
- 9.2.1.4 If a candidate fails to submit evidence of progress or if the Board of Studies considers that the evidence submitted does not indicate satisfactory progress;
- 9.2.1.5 the Board of Studies may, on the recommendation of the Associate Dean (Academic), call upon the candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards completion of the degree; and
- 9.2.1.6 where, in the opinion of the Board of Studies, the candidate does not show good cause the Board may either terminate the candidature or impose conditions on

the continuation of candidature.

- 9.3 Those students admitted to the degree on a probationary basis are also required to be subjected to a review at the end of the specified probationary period.
- 9.4 The satisfactory completion of this probationary period requires:
- 9.4.1 successful completion of any specified coursework;
 - 9.4.2 presentation of a seminar on their project;
 - 9.4.3 a supportive letter from the student's supervisor related to the student's ability to complete a project of appropriate scope and nature; and
 - 9.4.4 a supportive recommendation from the ~~Head of Department Director~~ Research Associate Dean (Academic) on the basis of the supervisor's advice, the student's performance and progress towards completion; and
 - 9.4.5 that the requirements of this probationary review must be communicated in writing to the candidate in their offer of admission letter.

10. Time limits

- 10.1 Candidates enrolled in the Master of Philosophy shall complete the course in a minimum of four semesters for full-time students and eight semesters for part-time students, and a maximum of twelve semesters.
- 10.2 The maximum time limit for completion will be six semesters for full-time students and 12 semesters for part-time students and includes any time spent away from the course including exclusion.

11. Credit for previous studies

- ~~14.1 Credit may be granted for up to 18 credit points in any coursework component prescribed by the Faculty for the Master of Philosophy.~~
- ~~14.2 Credit will not be granted for any units of study that were completed more than five years before admission or re-admission to candidature.~~
- 11.1 A candidate who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed not less than six months as a candidate for the degree of master in the Faculty may be permitted by the Faculty to be credited for the whole or any part of the period of candidature completed for the degree of master, a period of candidature completed for the degree of Master of Philosophy, provided that the period of candidature for the degree of master for which credit is sought shall have been a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research under a supervisor appointed by the Faculty and directly related to the candidate's proposed course of advanced study and research for the degree of Master of Philosophy.
- 11.2 A candidate who, at the date of admission has completed not less than six months as a candidate for a higher degree in another university or institution may be permitted by the Faculty to be credited for the whole or any part of the period of candidature completed as a period completed for the degree of Master of Philosophy, provided that:
- 11.2.1 at the date of admission to candidature for the higher degree of the other university or institution concerned the candidate shall have fulfilled the requirements of admission to candidature set out in section 1 above;
 - 11.2.2 the period of candidature for the higher degree of the other university or institution concerned for which credit is sought shall have been a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research under a supervisor appointed by the other university or institution and directly related to the candidate's proposed course of advanced study and research in the University of Sydney;
 - 11.2.3 the candidate shall have abandoned candidature for the higher degree of the other university or institution concerned for which credit is sought;
 - 11.2.4 the amount of credit which may be so granted shall not exceed one year; and
 - 11.2.5 no candidate who has been granted credit shall present a thesis for examination for the degree earlier than the second year after acceptance.

12. The thesis

- 12.1 The candidate shall present a thesis of approximately 60,000 words in length, which shall be a substantial and original contribution to the subject concerned in which the candidate shall state:
- 12.1.1. the sources from which the information is derived;
 - 12.1.2. the extent to which the work of others has been made use of; and
 - 12.1.3. the portion of the work the candidate claims as original.;
- 12.2 The topic of the thesis shall be approved by the Faculty.
- 12.3 A candidate may not present as the thesis any work that has been presented for a degree at this or any other university, but the candidate will not be precluded from incorporating such work into the thesis, provided that, in presenting the thesis, the candidate indicates the part of the work that has been incorporated.
- 12.4 As part of the candidature, candidates ~~are~~ may be required to present at research seminars ~~as required~~.
- ~~15.5 The Faculty shall appoint, on the recommendation of the Associate Dean (Academic) Director (Research) at least one supervisor and associate supervisor.~~
- 12.5 A candidate shall submit to the Faculty four copies of the thesis in a form prescribed by the Faculty.
- 12.6 The thesis shall be accompanied by advice from the supervisor stating whether, in the opinion of the supervisor, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory.
- 13. Appointment of examiners**
- ~~13.1 Appointment of examiners shall be in accordance with the Resolutions of the Academic Board in relation to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The Faculty will appoint two examiners, at least one of whom will be external to the University.~~
- 13.2 All other examination procedures will be in accordance with the Resolutions of the Faculty relating to the degree of Master of Philosophy.