



# The University of Sydney

---

## Graduate Studies Committee Agenda

Committee Secretary: Keri Neveldsen

Secretariat, Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: [K.Neveldsen@secretariat.usyd.edu.au](mailto:K.Neveldsen@secretariat.usyd.edu.au)

Web site: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/committees/GSC/index.html>

---

### NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the **Graduate Studies Committee** will be held at **2.00pm** on **Monday 3 June 2002** in the Western Tower Room.

(Room S 495, first floor of the Western Tower area of the Quadrangle Building on the Camperdown Campus, opposite the Clock Tower.)

Members who are unable to attend are asked to notify Keri Neveldsen at the above address. Enquiries concerning this meeting may also be directed to Miss Neveldsen.

*Keri Neveldsen*

for

Dr W Adams

**Registrar**

29 May 2002

---

### AGENDA

Pages

**1. Apologies**

**2. Minutes of previous meeting**

**5-16**

*Recommendation*

*That the Graduate Studies Committee adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 May 2002 as a true record.*

**3. Business arising from Minutes (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)**

**3.1 Treatise containing published work**

**17**

*Recommendation*

*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report relating to treatise containing published work, as set out in the report presented.*

- 3.2 Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor** **17, 19-20**
- Recommendation**  
*That the Graduate Studies Committee:*
- (1) endorse the policy “Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor”; and
  - (2) recommend that the Academic Board amend the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the Examination Process for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy,  
as set out in the report presented.
- 3.3 Requirement to complete candidature within the University** **18**
- Recommendation**  
*That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend through the Academic Board that Senate amend the University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999 (as amended), as set out in the report presented.*
- 4. Report of the Chair**
- 4.1 Research Policy Sub-Committee** **21**
- Recommendation**  
*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to the Research Policy Sub-Committee, as set out in the report presented.*
- 4.2 Oral report**
- Recommendation**  
*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair.*
- 5. Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee** **22-26**
- 5.1 Oral report of the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee**
- Recommendation**  
*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee.*
- 5.2 Report of the meeting held on 14 May 2002** **22-26**
- 5.2.1 Receipt of report**
- Recommendation**  
*That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 14 May 2002.*

**5.2.2 First Quarter Report 2002** **22, 24-26**

**Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee:*

- (1) *note the first quarter report of 2002;*
- (2) *encourage all faculties to make greater use of the provisions for oral examinations and that appropriate advice on procedures for such examinations be circulated to the faculties; and*
- (3) *refer the review of the PhD process at the University of Sydney, including the conduct of oral examinations, to the Dean of Graduate Studies (when appointed);*  
*as set out in the report presented.*

**5.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee** **23**

**Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting of 14 May 2002, as set out in the report presented.*

**6. Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee** **27-33**

**6.1 Oral report of the Chair of the Coursework Sub-Committee**

**Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair of the Coursework Sub-Committee.*

**6.2 Report of the meeting held on 21 May 2002** **27-33**

**6.2.1 Receipt of report**

**Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the Coursework Sub-Committee meeting held on 21 May 2002.*

**6.2.2 Proposals for new and amended courses**

- (1) **Faculty of Engineering: Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics** **27, 29-33**

**Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend through the Academic Board that Senate approve:*

- (1) *the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering for the introduction in 2003 of the new course, the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics;*
- (2) *the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degree, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 January 2003, as set out in the report presented; and*
- (3) *the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the above course, with effect from 1 January 2003;*  
*as set out in the report presented.*

**(2) Faculty of Health Sciences: Master of Health Science 28**

***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the additional mode of delivery for the Master of Health Science, as set out in the report presented.*

**6.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee 28**

***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the Coursework Sub-Committee meeting of 21 May 2002, as set out in the report presented.*

**7. General business**

**8. Next meeting**

The next meeting will be held on 1 July 2002 in the Western Tower Room.

## **Agenda Item 3 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

### **Minutes of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on Monday 6 May 2002**

**There were present:** The Chair (Associate Professor R Ross) presiding, Professors C Adam, M Crossley, L Field, G Gill, D Hensher and F Nicholas, Associate Professors J Christodoulou, J Finkelstein, D Kenny, A F Masters, M Prosser and J Small, Drs M Boughton, I Karpin, B Singh and R Walker and Mr K Barlow. Miss K Neveltsen was in attendance.

**1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

Professor P Ramsden, Associate Professors G Gurr and W Julian, Dr E Baily and Mr M Hall.

**2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

**Resolution 21/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 4 March 2002 as a true record.

**3. Business arising from Minutes**

There was no business arising from the minutes.

**4. Report of the Academic Board**

**Resolution 22/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the decisions of the Academic Board, at its meeting of 13 March 2002 in respect of the report of the Graduate Studies Committee, as set out in the report presented.

**5. Report of the Chair**

**5.1 Committee membership**

The Committee welcomed new members Dr Balwant Singh, Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources and Professor David Hensher, Faculty of Economics and Business. The Committee also noted a schedule of faculty representatives detailing membership of other Academic Board Committees, Sub-Committees of the Graduate Studies Committee and other Committees on which the Graduate Studies Committee has representation.

**Resolution 23/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to Committee membership and welcome new members to the Committee, as set out in the report presented.

**5.2 Treatise containing published work**

The item was deferred for further consideration at the next meeting.

**Resolution 24/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee defer consideration of Item 5.2, Treatise containing published work, to the next meeting of the Committee.

### **5.3 Postgraduate Co-ordinators Workshop**

The Chair noted that the annual workshop for Postgraduate Co-ordinators was successfully held on Friday 19 April with approximately 60 attendees. Professor Les Field and Associate Professor Tony Masters were thanked for their participation in leading the workshop. Information arising from the workshop would be circulated to all faculties.

The Committee noted that interest had been expressed in another workshop later in the year and that this was being investigated.

#### **Resolution 25/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to the Postgraduate Co-ordinators Workshop, as set out in the report presented.

### **5.4 Review of APA Allocation Guidelines**

The Chair reported that the current policy for allocating APAs to the three Colleges was introduced three years ago, at which time it was agreed that the Guidelines would be reviewed in 2001. At the time of that Review, it was decided to delay a decision on the nature of any changes to the structure of the allocation guidelines until this year. This decision was based on the impending implementation of the Research Training Scheme from 2003.

Members noted that the Chair had agreed to co-ordinate with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) a review of the Guidelines over the next few months, in time for the Committee to make any decisions on changes to the Guidelines in time to advise applicants prior to September. It was anticipated that the review would take place in several stages, and the Committee would be kept informed of progress at each meeting, with a view to having a proposal finalised for the Committee's consideration at the July meeting.

#### **Resolution 26/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to the Review of APA Allocation Guidelines, as set out in the report presented.

### **5.5 Higher doctorates**

#### **5.5.1 Admission to candidature and appointment of examiners**

The Committee noted that the Chair, on the recommendation of the faculties, had approved admission to candidature and appointment of examiners for one candidate for the degree of Doctor of Medicine and one candidate for the degree of Doctor of Laws.

#### **Resolution 27/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note and confirm the action of the Chair in approving the admission to candidature of, and appointment of examiners for, candidates for higher doctorates, as set out in the report presented.

#### **5.5.2 Award of Degree**

The Committee noted that the Chair, on the recommendation of the Faculty, had approved the award of the degree of Doctor of Science to one candidate.

#### **Resolution 28/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note and confirm the action of the Chair in approving the award of the higher degree(s), as set out in the report presented.

**5.5.3 Deferment of public availability of theses**

The Committee noted that the Chair, on the recommendation of the faculties, had approved the deferment of public availability of higher degree theses (the period granted being in addition to the six months the Dean of the Faculty was entitled to approve) to one candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources for six months, to one candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Science for 12 months and to one candidate for the degree of Master of Philosophy in the Faculty of Arts for six months.

**Resolution 29/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note and confirm the action of the Chair in approving the deferment of public availability of higher degree theses, as set out in the report presented.

**5.6 Oral report**

The Committee was advised that the selection process for the position of Dean of Graduate Studies was underway. Interviews of shortlisted candidates had been held and it was expected that an appointment would be announced within the next month.

The Chair advised the Committee that the commencement of the Research Policy Sub-Committee had been put on hold pending the appointment of the Dean of Graduate Studies and that work would now be undertaken in preparing for its establishment. Members noted that the original proposed membership of the Sub-Committee would change due to changes in members of the Graduate Studies Committee and expressions of interest were invited.

**Resolution 30/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair.

**6. Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee**

**6.1 Oral report of the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee**

The Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee, Associate Professor Tony Masters noted that the Sub-Committee had considered a variety of policy matters over the last months and that these would be discussed individually.

**Resolution 31/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

**6.2 Report of the meeting held on 12 March 2002**

**6.2.1 Receipt of report**

**Resolution 32/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 12 March 2002.

**6.2.2 Annual report of 2001**

Members were asked to note the Annual report of 2001, with particular regard to the thesis examination periods where more work was required to ensure the timeliness of the process.

**Resolution 33/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the annual report of 2001 of the PhD Award Sub-Committee, as set out in the report presented.

### **6.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee**

#### **Resolution 34/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 12 March 2002, as set out in the report presented.

### **6.3 Report of the meeting held on 9 April 2002**

#### **6.3.1 Receipt of report**

#### **Resolution 35/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002.

#### **6.3.2 Examination of Doctor of Philosophy Theses Containing Predominantly Published Work**

The PhD Award Sub-Committee recommended that the Graduate Studies Committee approve the draft policy document *Submission of Theses Containing Predominantly Published Work* and refer it to the Academic Board for endorsement.

The draft policy outlined procedures for the submission of theses which contain predominately published work of the candidate and was developed in response to an increase in queries regarding the issue.

The following points were raised in discussion:

- the policy related to the submission of theses, rather than the examination;
- the policy would need to be adopted by the Academic Board and would be binding on all faculties;
- the current Resolutions did not preclude this form of thesis and both candidates and examiners needed guidance in this area;
- the University should be encouraging candidates to publish during candidature;
- the thesis could only contain work the candidate had undertaken during candidature;
- the thesis needed to represent a connected whole;
- there was an issue of where this form of thesis aligned with the overall definition of a PhD;
- this form of publication was already occurring and needed a policy which could be reviewed in an overall review of the PhD;
- there were issues surrounding the contribution of the candidate, particularly regarding the inclusion of jointly authored works;
- currently a candidate needs to declare that the work is their own, therefore it may not be necessary in these instances to get a statement from the head of department regarding the candidate's contribution;
- it may be more appropriate for a supervisor to attest to the candidate's contribution than the head of department;
- other issues of impact included the timing of the publications and intellectual property issues; and
- there may not be many theses published in this manner.

The Committee supported the PhD Award Sub-Committee recommendation noting that Associate Professor Dianna Kenny and Mr Kristin Barlow did not support the recommendation.

### **Resolution 36/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee

- (1) approve the policy "Submission of Doctor of Philosophy Theses Containing Predominantly Published Work"; and
- (2) recommend that the Academic Board endorse the policy; as set out in the report presented.

### **6.3.3 Guidelines for Examiners of Doctor of Philosophy Theses**

The Committee considered the recommendation from the PhD Award Sub-Committee that the draft *Guidelines for Examiners of PhD Theses* be approved.

Members discussed the Guidelines noting it was intended that the Guidelines would be distributed to all examiners when the thesis was sent for examination and that information that would assist examiners in performing their function was helpful.

The content of the Guidelines was discussed and the following points raised:

- the nomenclature of the Guidelines needed to reflect the Examiners Report Forms;
- the phrasing of the section relating to non-award needed to clarify that publication did not necessarily mean a piece of work was written and published in a journal and to clarify the circumstance in which additional justification would be required;
- the section relating to the examination of theses containing predominately published work needed to reflect the decisions of the Committee; and
- the section relating to the release of the examiner's name and comments to the candidates would be revised based on advice received from the University's Privacy and Freedom of Information Officer.

The Committee agreed to adopt the Guidelines in principle with further editorial work as discussed to be undertaken.

### **Resolution 37/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee approve in principle the "Guidelines for Examiners of Doctor of Philosophy Theses", with amendments as discussed to be incorporated.

### **6.3.4 Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor**

The report noted that under the current resolutions, faculties were not required to obtain further comments from the supervisor if a fourth examiner was appointed to assess a thesis, or if the examiners' reports were referred back to the examiners for comments. The draft document circulated with the agenda sought to clarify the procedures to be followed by faculties in the appointment of an additional examiner as assessor, with particular regard to the level of consultation which should be undertaken with the supervisor.

The PhD Award Sub-Committee recommended through the Graduate Studies Committee that the Academic Board Resolutions relating to the Examination Process for the Doctor of Philosophy be amended to include reference to such consultation.

During discussion, the Committee noted the following points:

- there was an argument that the more information provided to an assessor, the easier their role would be;
- the proposed amendment would provide additional opportunity for expression on behalf of the candidate;
- there was concern however, that the supervisors comments could be adversely prejudicial to the candidate;
- it was proposed that only the thesis and the examiners reports be sent to the assessor; and
- the faculty and assessor needed to be considering the same information.

The Committee agreed that the item should lie on the table for further consideration at the next meeting and that comments should be forwarded to the Secretary prior to the next meeting.

**Resolution 38/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee defer consideration of Item 6.3.4, Appointment of additional examiner as assessor, to the next meeting of the Committee and that comments relating to the item be forwarded to the Secretary to the Committee.

**6.3.5 Thesis Document Checklist**

The Committee noted the Thesis Document Checklist circulated with the agenda and agreed that it be distributed to all faculties with the request that the form be used when preparing examiners' reports and supporting documentation for referral to the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

**Resolution 39/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the Thesis Document Checklist and approve its distribution to faculties for their use when preparing examiners' reports for submission to the PhD Award Sub-Committee, as set out in the report presented.

**6.3.6 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee**

**Resolution 40/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002, as set out in the report presented.

**6.4 Requirement to complete candidature within the University**

The item was deferred for consideration at the next meeting.

**Resolution 41/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee defer consideration of Item 6.4, Requirement to complete candidature within the University, to the next meeting of the Committee.

**7. Report of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee**

**7.1 Oral report of the Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee**

The Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee, Associate Professor Russell Ross, noted that a review would be undertaken on the APA Allocation Guidelines which would be referred to the Committee for endorsement.

**Resolution 42/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee.

## **7.2 Report of the meeting held on 29 April 2002**

### **7.2.1 Receipt of report**

#### **Resolution 43/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee meeting held on 29 April 2002.

### **7.2.2 2001-2002 Australian Postgraduate Awards with Stipend and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards**

The Committee noted that the annual total number of awards were determined by the government and that the University determined distribution by College.

A member expressed concern relating to the marking of Masters and Honours theses and the impact on the award of scholarships and it was agreed that this should be considered at the College level and then referred directly to the Sub-Committee.

#### **Resolution 44/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report relating to the 2001-2002 Australian Postgraduate Awards with Stipend and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards, as set out in the report presented.

## **8. Report from Faculties**

### **8.1 Faculty of Health Sciences: English Language Requirements**

The Committee noted the recommendation of the Faculty of Health Sciences that the English language requirements and the overall IELTS band in respect of the Doctor of Health Science be raised.

It was noted that the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Graduate Studies Committee, had determined that international applicants must either have a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary/tertiary studies in which the language of instruction was English or must meet one of the set English language requirements as a condition of entry and set the overall band score of IELTS at 6.5 (with a minimum of 6.0 in each band). Academic Board policy permits individual faculties to request Board approval for higher requirements for some or all of the faculty's postgraduate award courses.

The Committee supported the Faculty recommendation that the IELTS requirement for the Doctor of Health Science, be set at an overall IELTS band of 7.0, with individual bands of speaking and writing of no less than 6.5, with effect from 1 January 2003.

#### **Resolution 45/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the English Language Requirement for admission to the Doctor of Health Science, as set out in the report presented.

## **9. Survey of Higher Degree Research Students**

The Committee noted that the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research)(Acting) had developed a survey directed at postgraduate students and it had been circulated with the agenda for the endorsement of the Committee.

It was noted that it was intended that the survey would be completed annually and would provide baseline data which, over time, would provide University-wide indicators for monitoring and managing the postgraduate cohort.

Members noted that the survey would be attached to the annual progress report for each student with an instruction that it should be completed, detached and returned directly to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) or the Dean of Graduate Studies (should this person be in post).

It was anticipated that by attaching the survey to the report form, there was a greater chance of a reasonable response rate.

Members commended the survey and noted that students would be asked to include their SID which would permit data to be aggregated to College, Faculty of Department level, that in future the survey could be available and completed on-line, and that co-operation with other institutions could lead to future benchmarking exercises.

The Committee agreed that further feedback on the survey should be forwarded to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research)(Acting).

**Resolution 46/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report relating to the Survey of Higher Degree Research Students, as set out in the report presented.

**10. General business**

It was noted that many of the issues considered raised issues relating to the role and responsibility of the supervisor in relation to thesis submission and it was agreed to discuss this at the next meeting of the Committee.

**11. Next meeting**

The Committee noted that next meeting would be held on 3 June 2002 in the Western Tower Room.

### **Submission of Doctor of Philosophy Theses Containing Predominantly Published Work**

The University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999 (as amended) provides that:

85. (2) A candidate may submit in support of the candidature any publication of which the candidate is the sole or joint author. In such a case the candidate must provide evidence to identify satisfactorily the sections of the work for which the candidate is responsible.

However, this provides no guidance as to the situations in which this would be acceptable, nor as to how it should be done, nor what is meant by "in support of the candidature".

Not many theses have been examined in this way, but as the provision exists, it may provide an incentive for publication of work during a candidature where that is possible. This would be of advantage to the student in terms of, for example, providing critical feedback on the student's work during candidature, spreading and possibly shortening the writing period, providing a measure of the progress of the candidature, adding to the student's curriculum vitae, etc. The University would also benefit under the provisions of the recent white paper if research was published sooner rather than (often, unfortunately much) later.

Conversely, a collection of disparate publications, no matter what their quality, would not necessarily be appropriate for the award of a PhD. Rather, the University expects that the candidature has been responsibly planned and supervised as an integrated project and that the publications represent elements of a connected whole, as they would, for example, as chapters in a thesis in advance of publication.

The PhD Award Sub-Committee recommends the following policy for the examination of Doctor of Philosophy theses composed predominantly of published work.

- the Faculty is notified by the Head of Department that the thesis is to be examined under these provisions;
- the work described in the thesis should be presented as a connected whole;
- the Head of Department provides a statement with the thesis certifying the extent of the candidate's contribution and input to the published work;
- in addition to copies of the published work, the thesis should contain an introductory section in which the student places the thesis critically in the context of the field, the student's summary of their contribution to the publications and the student's critical evaluation of the role of the thesis in informing further research in the field;
- the examiners are advised of the nature of the publications and are given a copy of the certification of the candidate's contribution and input to the published work;
- the published material is presented in such a way that it satisfies the University's provisions regarding the presentation for examination and lodgement in the University Library; and
- the material is presented in such a way that the examiners are able to "... record whether in the opinion of the examiner:
  - the thesis is a substantially original contribution to the knowledge of the subject concerned;
  - the thesis affords evidence of originality by the discovery of new facts;
  - the thesis affords evidence of originality by the exercising of independent critical ability;
  - the thesis is satisfactory as regards literary presentation; and
  - a substantial amount of material in the thesis is suitable for publication." As presently required by the resolutions

It may be considered appropriate in the case of a thesis presented in this manner to have the Head of Department's certification as to the involvement of the student bound into the copy of the thesis deposited in the library.

## **Guidelines for Examiners of Doctor of Philosophy Theses**

These guidelines have been developed to assist examiners in reaching their conclusions regarding the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to the candidate for the body of research presented to the examiner.

The following recommendations are available to examiners:

**1. Award Without Further Examination**

The thesis has fulfilled all of the requirements for a research thesis, as listed in part 2 of the examiner's report, and is of such quality that no corrections of any sort are required.

**2. Award Subject to Typographical Corrections**

The award of the degree is clearly appropriate but there are a number of typographical corrections which should be made, including errors in spelling, syntax, grammar, punctuation, capitalisation or in the references.

**3. Award Subject to Conditions**

The examiner acknowledges that in the main the thesis is worthy of the award, but there are a number of changes or additions that need to be made that would not substantially alter the conclusions of the thesis. Normally, the changes are of such a nature that the thesis would not need to be re-examined. The examiner should normally provide clear detail as to what is required and the Head of Department/School would be able to make an assessment as to whether the changes have been satisfactorily completed.

**(1) Emendations**

The recommended changes, whilst more substantial than correction of typographical or grammatical errors, are still not of a substantial nature and are able to be evaluated by the Head of Department/School based on the information provided by the examiner. Examples in this category would include modifications that might need to be made to the contents pages, tables or figures, appendices, etc.

Emendations are the correction of errors or the addition or deletion of material in the text, table of figures or appendices. Emendations do not require a return to examiners, but, with the guidance of the examiners' reports, can be adjudicated by the Head of Department. Changes as substantial as the addition or re-writing of a whole chapter, or the provision of extra data, would normally be considered a revision not emendations.

**(2) Other Conditions**

The examiner may suggest other conditions on which the award may be granted. Again, normally a thesis would not be re-examined. Such conditions could include updating the literature review to incorporate more recent relevant publications, alterations in the structure of a chapter and some of its content, or explanations or clarifications as to certain questions raised by the examiner (such answers may need to be incorporated into the thesis as emendations, or may be included in a letter of response from the student to the Head of Department/School).

Where a whole chapter needs to be rewritten, this would usually be considered more in the line of a revision, requiring the whole thesis to undergo re-examination. The examiner may on occasion recommend an oral examination to help clarify certain issues (see below).

Where an examiner makes a recommendation of award of the PhD subject to conditions, it is requested that the examiner list the specific typographical corrections, emendations and other conditions that would need to be completed to satisfy the examiner. The University considers all examiners reports and the provision of this detail will assist the University in reaching its decision.

In cases where the examiner's report is sufficiently detailed that the Head of Department/School can ascertain whether the examiner's concerns have been satisfied, the University would consider awarding the degree subject to conditions rather than requiring that the thesis be re-examined. However, if data were missing, altered conclusions were possible, or the conclusions needed to be tested, a revision and re-examination of the thesis may be more appropriate.

**4. Revision and Resubmission**

The thesis in its current form is not worthy of being awarded the degree, but has many redeeming features. Deficiencies in the thesis may include inadequate experimental work, the failure to include original data in the thesis, inappropriate statistical analyses or incorrect or unsophisticated conclusions drawn, from for example a statistical analysis. The changes or additions required for this thesis are such that it is very likely they would alter the conclusions reached, and thus warrant re-examination of the entire thesis. Alternatively, the examiner may not be able to determine whether the conclusions are sustainable because data are missing or inaccessible.

It is appropriate for an examiner to make the recommendation of revise and resubmit if it is felt that new experimental work needs to be undertaken. It should be remembered, however, that there may be practical issues preventing a candidate from being able to undertake more clinical or laboratory experimental work.

In making a recommendation of revise and resubmit, the examiner is asked to estimate the length of time required for any additional research (exclusive of the writing of the revised thesis).

**5. Non-award**

In making the recommendation of non-award, the examiner is of the opinion that the thesis is not salvageable, even with a period of further experimental or research work and a complete rewrite of the thesis. The examiner makes this recommendation on the basis that the research was fatally flawed in its conception, design and execution, and that the conclusions reached are not valid.

If the thesis contains a substantial amount of material that has been published in or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed format, then the recommendation by an examiner of non-award may not be considered reasonable by the Board of Postgraduate Studies. In such a circumstance, additional information may be required. In such cases the examiners may be asked to comment on whether the extent of the student's contribution and the stature of the publication vehicle(s) are appropriate for the award of the degree.

As a general rule, if the examiner feels that the changes that need to be made are more related to the text rather than the research of the thesis, then award under 2 or 3 above might be considered appropriate. If on the other hand, additional research is required, then a recommendation under 4 or possibly 5 above might be more appropriate.

**Oral Examination**

Candidates may request that they undergo an oral examination as part of the primary examination process, in which case the examiner would have been notified of this prior to commencing examination of the thesis. The examiner has the option of agreeing to participate in the oral examination process, and if the examiner has agreed to this, the examiner will be provided with more details as to how the examination will proceed (including the possible arrangement of participation via a teleconference or videoconference link).

Most Doctor of Philosophy theses do not include an oral examination as part of the normal examination procedure. In some circumstances an examiner may recommend an oral examination under 3(2) if there are concerns as to the candidate's grasp of the subject matter or where the examiner seeks clarification on a number of issues. If this recommendation were made, it would be very helpful for the examiner to provide a list of questions that could be used during the oral examination.

#### **Examination of theses containing predominantly published work**

In some cases most of the work in the thesis will have already been published in recognised peer-reviewed form. If a thesis is submitted for examination in this setting, the examiner should assess whether the thesis demonstrates that the candidature has been responsibly planned as an integrated project. The publications should represent elements of a connected whole, as they would, for example, as chapters in a thesis in advance of publication. Verification of this will be evidenced by the Head of Department/School, who will provide a statement with the thesis certifying the extent of the candidate's contribution and input to the published work.

In such cases the examiners are asked to comment on whether the extent of the student's contribution and the stature of the publication vehicle(s) are appropriate for the award of the degree.

#### **Release of Examiner's Name and Comments to the Candidate**

The examiners' reports are released to the candidate once the examination is completed. An examiner may request that her/his name not be disclosed to the candidate at that time. Should an examiner prefer that his/her identity not be revealed, the inclusion of possible identifiers within the text of the report should be avoided. Notwithstanding the above, examiners should be aware that candidates have the legal right to apply for access to any and all documents relating to the examination of their work, including the names of examiners and assessors. Following such an application it is likely that the University would be required to release examiners' names, regardless of their wishes.

#### **Please Note**

The examination process is confidential. The University should be informed (with the submission of the examiner's report) of any consultation between the examiners. Note that the examiners' reports should still be independent.

Examiners should not disclose the contents of the thesis nor ask others to examine the material in the thesis on their behalf. In cases of multidisciplinary work, examiners may be appointed because of their expertise in a particular area of the research. In all other cases if the examiner feels unable to examine the thesis, the thesis should be returned immediately with a statement to that effect.

The University and the examiners have undertaken that the examiners' reports will be returned within two months of receipt of the thesis. If you are unable to meet this deadline, please return the thesis immediately. It is necessary to adhere to this deadline.

The University expects that a revised thesis will normally be examined by the original examiners. Irrespective of your recommendation, it would be appreciated if you could please indicate whether you are prepared to examine a revised thesis.

In some circumstances the University may also consider it appropriate that the reports of the examiners, together with the comments of the supervisor, be referred to all of the examiners for further comment before a final decision can be reached.

## **Agenda Item 3** **Business arising from the Minutes**

### **3.1 Treatise containing published work**

At its last meeting, the Graduate Studies Committee agreed to defer consideration of this item to this meeting.

The issue of a Master's candidate submitting a treatise containing published work had been raised with the Chair and members of the Committee are requested to consider the following points for discussion at the meeting:

- should a candidate be permitted to submit as a treatise, or part thereof, a published paper?
- what guidelines/restrictions should govern this?
- should possible guidelines follow the spirit of PhDs including predominately published work where an introduction and/or literature review would be required, and if so, what adaptations need to be made to make such guidelines applicable to treatises?
- what should be the examination process? Eg. if a published work has undergone peer-review, should the treatise be sent out for further examination? If so, should the reviewers' comments be included as an appendix?

#### ***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report relating to treatise containing published work, as set out in the report presented.*

### **3.2 Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor**

**19-20**

At its last meeting, the Graduate Studies Committee discussed the appointment of an additional examiner as assessor for a Doctor of Philosophy thesis and agreed that the item would lie on the table for further consideration at the next meeting and that comments should be forwarded to the Secretary prior to the meeting.

The Committee considered a report and noted that under the current resolutions, faculties were not required to obtain further comments from the supervisor if a fourth examiner was appointed to assess a thesis, or if the examiners' reports were referred back to the examiners for comments. The draft document circulated with the agenda sought to clarify the procedures to be followed by faculties in the appointment of an additional examiner as assessor, with particular regard to the level of consultation which should be undertaken with the supervisor.

The PhD Award Sub-Committee recommended through the Graduate Studies Committee that the Academic Board Resolutions relating to the Examination Process for the Doctor of Philosophy be amended to include reference to such consultation.

During discussion, the Committee noted the following points:

- there was an argument that the more information provided to an assessor, the easier their role would be;
- the proposed amendment would provide additional opportunity for expression on behalf of the candidate;
- there was concern however, that the supervisors comments could be adversely prejudicial to the candidate;
- it was proposed that only the thesis and the examiners reports be sent to the assessor; and
- the faculty and assessor needed to be considering the same information.

#### ***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee:*

- (1) *endorse the policy "Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor"; and*
- (2) *recommend that the Academic Board amend the Academic Board Resolutions relating to the Examination Process for the Doctor of Philosophy,*

*as set out in the report presented.*

### **3.2 Requirement to complete candidature within the University**

At its last meeting, the Graduate Studies Committee agreed to defer consideration of this item to this meeting.

The University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999 (as amended) provides, with Faculty approval, for a two year minimum candidature for students with a Master's degree, or equivalent.

The resolutions also require that "A candidate pursuing candidature outside Australia must also complete a minimum of two semesters of candidature within the university [but not necessarily immediately before submission, nor necessarily as a continuous two-semester period] before submission of the thesis".

However, the two semesters on campus prescribed by the resolutions assumes the "normal" minimum duration of candidature of three years. This can make it difficult for students for whom a two year candidature has been approved, to meet the residency requirements.

Should the residency requirement for students starting with a masters degree be varied in proportion to the minimum length of candidature? If so, then in such cases it would be  $(2/3)2 = 4/3$  semesters, which, for convenience, might be set as 1 semester.

Thus, the proposal is that the requirement that "A candidate pursuing candidature outside Australia must also complete a minimum of two semesters of candidature within the university [but not necessarily immediately before submission, nor necessarily as a continuous two-semester period] before submission of the thesis"

be changed to

"A candidate pursuing candidature outside Australia must also complete a minimum of two semesters of candidature within the university [but not necessarily immediately before submission, nor necessarily as a continuous two-semester period] before submission of the thesis. The corresponding period for candidates for whom the minimum length of candidature is four semesters is a minimum of one semester."

#### ***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend through the Academic Board that Senate amend the University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999 (as amended), as set out in the report presented.*

### **Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor**

The University seeks the recommendations of three examiners. In cases where the examiners' recommendations differ, the University attempts to determine whether the examiners have common concerns and, if so, considering comments from the Faculty and the academic unit, the appropriate response. In rare cases (for example, where the examiners' differences hinge on a technical point in an area in which the University lacks appropriate expertise) the University may appoint an additional examiner who may also be asked to act as an assessor of the examiners' reports.<sup>§</sup> The University makes this decision on the advice of the Faculty.

There are two stages during the examination process at which the University may decide to appoint an additional examiner who acts as an assessor. The first is following consideration of the examiners' comments and the report of the Head of Department by the Faculty. Alternatively, having decided to recommend to the PhD Awards Sub-Committee that the thesis be revised and resubmitted, or that the degree not be awarded, the Faculty must consider any comments of the candidate, any further comments of the Head of Department, any comments from the supervisor, the examiners' reports and the original report of the Head of Department. The Faculty may, at this stage, decide to recommend the appointment of an addition examiner to act as an assessor.<sup>†</sup>

The additional examiner considers the thesis, unidentified copies of the examiners' reports and comments of the supervisor.\* In the situation in which the Faculty originally determined to recommend either that the thesis be revised and re-examined or that the University not award the degree, then considered the comments of the candidate Head of Department and supervisor, and an additional examiner/assessor is then appointed, the Faculty must also determine whether the students' comments are forwarded to the additional examiner/assessor.

The Registrar advises the other examiners of the University's decision to appoint an additional examiner to act as an assessor, and of the name of that examiner/assessor.

---

<sup>§</sup> Note that the University may resolve to appoint an additional examiner, or to appoint an additional examiner to examine the thesis and act as an assessor (of the reports of the examiners and the comments of the supervisor (and, in some cases, of the candidate)). The two choices are quite distinct. In the case of the appointment of an additional examiner, the process essentially follows that involving the other examiners (the examiner examines only the thesis – unless the reports of all examiners, and comments from the supervisor, are referred to all of the examiners for comment). In the case of an examiner-as-assessor, the additional examiner is required both to examine the thesis and to comment on the reports of the (unidentified) examiners and any comments of the supervisor and, in some cases, the candidate. It is possible, that following the consideration of the report of an additional examiner, an additional examiner-as-assessor could be appointed.

<sup>†</sup> The Resolutions do not require that the Faculty seek comments from the supervisor (or the candidate) after the Faculty has resolved to recommend to the PhD Awards Sub-Committee that an additional examiner-as-assessor be appointed.

\* The Resolutions do not require that the University, having appointed an assessor, then seeks comments from the supervisor, only that the supervisor's comments be forwarded to the assessor. An assessor is most likely to be appointed if the examiners disagree. If the examiners disagree, the Head of Department is obliged to consult the supervisor and forward to the Faculty, with the Head of Department's recommendation, any written report from the supervisor. In addition, if the Faculty had resolved initially to recommend that the thesis be revised and resubmitted or that the degree not be awarded, the supervisor is given the opportunity to provide comments to the Faculty, in addition to any written comments supplied to the Head of Department and forwarded to the Faculty as above. Thus, in most cases in which an assessor is appointed, the Faculty may already have comments from the supervisor. One interpretation of the Resolutions, then, is that there is no need to seek additional comments from the supervisor. However, it is probably wise for the Faculty to offer the supervisor the (possibly extra) opportunity to comment, once the University has decided to appoint an additional examiner-as-assessor, given also that any earlier comments of the supervisor might not have anticipated such an appointment and/or may not have addressed the issues which were the reasons for the appointment of the examiner-as-assessor. Perhaps the Resolutions should be modified to reflect this? This would then reflect the existing procedure with respect to the situation in which the reports of the examiners, together with the comments of the supervisor are referred to all the examiners for their comment.

The report of the additional examiner-as-assessor is referred to the Head of Department for a recommendation to the Faculty, which considers the report of the examiner-as-assessor and the recommendation of the Head of Department.<sup>‡</sup> The Faculty forwards a recommendation to the PhD Awards Sub-Committee. Inasmuch as the Resolutions specifically comment that the Faculty shall report to the PhD Awards Sub-Committee any reasons for not resolving substantially in the terms recommended by the assessor, the Resolutions might be interpreted as containing an implicit expectation that the University would normally act as recommended by the assessor.

The additional examiner/assessor is asked to act both as an examiner of the thesis and to assess the reports of the other examiners (and the supervisor and, as appropriate, the candidate). If one of these functions is not fulfilled, the Faculty might consider requesting that the examiner-as-assessor address the other function.

## **Resolutions of the Academic Board**

### **Doctor of Philosophy**

#### **The Examination Process**

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

##### **Additional examiner as assessor**

(13) Where a faculty or college board resolves under section 4(3)(f) that an additional examiner be appointed to examine the thesis and act as an assessor of the reports of the other examiners, the provisions of sections 1, 2 and 3 of these resolutions shall apply as appropriate and the Registrar shall seek comments from the supervisor and then write to the examiner as provided in section 1(14) or 1(15), inviting the examiner to act as an assessor of the examiners' reports as well as an examiner of the thesis and shall provide copies of the unidentified examiners' reports, and the comments of the supervisor, whether or ~~not~~ not already an examiner. In cases where the faculty had previously formed the intention to resolve that the degree be not awarded, or the candidate be allowed to revise and resubmit, and the candidate's comments have been received, the faculty's Postgraduate Committee should determine whether the candidate's comments should be forwarded to the assessor. The Registrar shall also advise the previously appointed examiners of the name of the additional examiner who is also to act as assessor.

(14) A faculty or college board, having received a further recommendation from the head of department (with any written report provided by the supervisor) together with an additional examiner-as-assessor's report, may then resolve as provided in section 4(3)(a)-(c), (h) or (i), except that, where the faculty or college board does not substantially resolve in the terms recommended by the assessor, it shall include a report of the reasons for its decision with any recommendation to the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

---

<sup>‡</sup> There is no provision for the candidate or supervisor to comment on the report of the additional examiner-as-assessor, unless the Faculty resolves to recommend to the PhD Awards Sub-Committee that the thesis be revised and re-examined or that the degree not be awarded.

## Agenda Item 4 Report of the Chair

### 4.1 Research Policy Sub-Committee

At its meeting in April 2001, the Graduate Studies Committee confirmed the terms of reference and constitution of the Research Policy Sub-Committee.

The Committee later approved membership of the Sub-Committee, which has not yet met.

In light of changes since that time, I ask the Committee to reconsider the terms of reference and constitution of the Sub-Committee, set out below, for discussion at the meeting and I invite expressions of interest for membership of the Sub-Committee.

---

### Research Policy Sub-Committee

#### Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for the Research Policy Sub-Committee are to:

- (a) advise the Graduate Studies Committee on policies relating to all graduate research studies in the University, including:
  - (i) attraction and recruitment of students to graduate research programs;
  - (ii) admissions;
  - (iii) equity and access initiatives;
  - (iv) assessment and examinations, in conjunction with the PhD Award Sub-Committee;
  - (v) research components of coursework award programs, in conjunction with the Coursework Sub-Committee;
  - (vi) annual review processes;
  - (vii) provision of facilities and services;
  - (viii) approval of new graduate research programs; and
  - (ix) approval of changes to graduate research programs;
- (b) advise on policy matters relating to the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, higher doctorates, doctorates by research and advanced coursework and master's degrees by research;
- (c) advise on policy matters relating to the establishment of effective supervisory practices for postgraduate research students;
- (d) advise on policy matters relating to the provision of appropriate facilities for research students;
- (e) consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Graduate Studies Committee;
- (f) consider and report on any matters referred to it by the PhD Award Sub-Committee; and
- (g) obtain information or reports from any faculty, department, school or other academic unit relating to policy issues on graduate research studies.

#### Membership

The proposed membership of the Sub Committee is:

- (a) the Chair (or the Chair's nominee) of the Graduate Studies Committee
- (b) up to three (3) members of the Graduate Studies Committee drawn from the representatives of the faculties
- (c) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)
- (d) the Dean of Graduate Studies (when appointed)
- (e) the Chair (or the Chair's nominee) of the PhD Award Sub-Committee:
- (f) the Chair (or the Chair's nominee) of the Research Committee of Academic Board
- (g) the President (or the President's nominee) of the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association:
- (h) the Sub-Committee will have the power to co-opt additional members.

## Agenda Item 5 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee

### 5.2 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 14 May 2002

The Committee met on 14 May 2002 when there were present: The Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee (Associate Professor A F Masters) presiding, Professor A Brewer, Associate Professors J Christodoulou, B James and J Small. Ms M Kemmis was in attendance.

#### 5.2.1 Receipt of Report

The Sub-Committee **recommends** that the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 14 May 2002.

#### 5.2.2 First quarter report of 2002

24-26

The Sub-Committee noted the first quarter report of 2002 and raised the following issues:

- 11% of examinations had taken 9 months or more, a percentage that members agreed was unacceptable;
- the European system where candidates submitted shorter theses and underwent a mandatory oral examination was noted as a possible alternative to the current procedures; and
- it was noted that very lengthy theses were still being submitted for examination, and that such theses often resulted in a recommendation that the thesis be revised and resubmitted for examination.

Members suggested that faculties be encouraged to make more use of the option for an oral examination. The following suggestions were made:

- that faculties be advised that not all the examiners need to be physically present for an oral examination, and that examiners could submit written questions to be put to the candidate or video conferencing facilities could be used;
- that information on the video conferencing facilities currently available at the University be compiled and referred to facilities with other procedural information on the conduct of oral examinations;
- that, if faculties increase the number of oral examinations they conduct, the Institute for Teaching and Learning be consulted regarding the possibility of developing and introducing a course on oral examination skills for students.

Members also suggested that the above ideas be referred to the Dean of Graduate Studies (when appointed) and that the Dean should also be encouraged to undertake a review of the PhD process at the University.

#### **Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee:*

- (1) *note the first quarter report of 2002;*
- (2) *encourage all faculties to make greater use of the provisions for oral examinations and that appropriate advice on procedures for such examinations be circulated to the faculties; and*
- (3) *refer the review of the PhD process at the University of Sydney, including the conduct of oral examinations, to the Dean of Graduate Studies (when appointed).*

### **5.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee**

#### **(1) Doctor of Philosophy**

##### **(a) Award of the degree**

The Sub-Committee noted that the Chair had considered the examiners' reports, together with the recommendations of the head of department/school concerned and the faculty board of postgraduate studies, with respect to one candidate and resolved to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

##### **(b) Award of the degree with qualification**

The Sub-Committee noted that the Chair had considered the examiners' reports, together with the recommendations of the head of department/school concerned and the faculty board of postgraduate studies, with respect to six candidates and resolved to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, subject to emendations.

##### **(c) Cases referred to the Sub-Committee**

The Sub-Committee considered examiners' reports, together with the recommendations of the head of department/school concerned and the faculty board of postgraduate studies, with respect to eight candidates and resolved:

- (i) to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, subject to emendations, in one case;
- (ii) to require revision and resubmission for examination in four cases; and
- (iii) to defer consideration of three cases pending further information.

##### **(d) Appointment of Examiners**

The Sub-Committee noted that examiners had been appointed for fifty five candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

#### **(2) Doctor of Education**

##### **(a) Award of the degree with qualification**

The Sub-Committee noted that the Chair had considered the examiners' reports, together with the recommendations of the head of department/school concerned and the faculty board of postgraduate studies, with respect to one candidate and resolved to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Education, subject to emendations.

### First Quarter Report of 2002

#### (1) Awards at faculty level

The fourth quarter report from faculties to the PhD Award Sub-Committee on PhDs awarded at faculty level for the period January to March 2002 is tabulated below, with complete reports from faculties attached (23-53). No PhDs were awarded at faculty level for the period January to March 2002 by the Faculty of Nursing, the Faculty of Rural Management and the Sydney College of the Arts.

Faculty	Award	Award subject to		Percentages		
		Typographical corrections	Emendations	Award	Typographical corrections	Emendations
Agriculture	-	-	3	-	-	100%
AGSM	1	-	-	100%	-	-
Architecture	-	-	1	-	-	100%
Arts	2	3	5	20%	30%	50%
College of the Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium of Music	-	-	2	-	-	100%
Dentistry	-	-	2	-	-	100%
Economics	-	3	3	-	50%	50%
Education	-	-	1	-	-	100%
Engineering	-	-	4	-	-	100%
Health Sciences	1	1	4	16.6%	16.7%	66.7%
Law	1	-	-	100%	-	-
Medicine	1	7	13	4.8%	33.3%	61.8%
Nursing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pharmacy	-	1	-	-	100%	-
Rural Management	-	-	-	-	-	-
Science	-	2	13	-	13%	87%
Veterinary Science	-	-	1	-	-	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>22.7%</b>	<b>69.3%</b>

#### (2) Awards by PhD Award Sub-Committee

The first quarter report on PhDs considered by the Sub-Committee indicating the recommendation of the Sub-Committee forwarded to the faculty concerned for the period January to March 2002 is tabulated below:

Faculty	Award	Typographical corrections	Emendations	Revise and resubmit	Non-award
Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-
Architecture	-	-	-	-	-
Arts	-	1	1	-	-
College of the Arts	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium of Music	-	-	-	-	-
Dentistry	-	-	-	-	-
Economics	-	-	-	-	-
Education	-	-	-	-	-
Engineering	-	-	1	-	-
Health Sciences	-	1	1	1	-
Law	-	-	-	-	-
Medicine	-	-	2	-	-
Nursing	-	-	1	-	-
Pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-
Rural Management	-	-	-	-	-
Science	-	-	3	-	-
Veterinary Science	-	-	2	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**(3) Total awards first quarter 2002**

The total awards for the first quarter 2002 including PhDs awarded at faculty level or recommended by the PhD Award Sub-Committee is tabulated below:

Faculty	Numbers					Percentages				
	Award	Typographical corrections	Emendations	Revise and resubmit	Non-award	Award	Typographical corrections	Emendations	Revise and resubmit	Non-award
Agriculture	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
AGSM	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-
Architecture	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Arts	2	4	6	-	-	16.7%	33.3%	50%	-	-
College of the Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium of Music	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Dentistry	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Economics	-	3	3	-	-	-	50%	50%	-	-
Education	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Engineering	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Health Sciences	1	2	5	1	-	11.1%	22.2%	55.6%	11.1%	-
Law	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-
Medicine	1	7	15	-	-	4.3%	30.4%	65.3%	-	-
Nursing	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Pharmacy	-	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-
Rural Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Science	-	2	16	-	-	-	11%	89%	-	-
Veterinary Science	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>70.8%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>-</b>

**(4) Summary of examination times, first quarter 2002**

The summary below is for PhDs awarded directly at faculty level without further qualification, subject to typographical corrections or emendations. The time of examination is calculated as the number of days between the date that the thesis was submitted and the date that the candidate was informed of the result (that is, the date of the letter information of award or award subject to qualification).

Averaged over all faculties 13.3% of degrees were awarded in three months or less, 21.3% in four months, 21.3% in five months, 10.7% in six months and 33.4% took longer than six months.

Faculty	Number awarded within specified months from submission									Total
	≤2 mths	3 mths	4 mths	5 mths	6 mths	7 mths	8 mths	9 mths	>9 mths	
<b>Agriculture</b>	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	<b>3</b>
<b>AGSM</b>	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	<b>1</b>
<b>Architecture</b>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>1</b>
<b>Arts</b>	-	2	1	6	-	-	1	-	-	<b>10</b>
<b>College of the Arts</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0</b>
<b>Conservatorium of Music</b>	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	<b>2</b>
<b>Dentistry</b>	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	<b>2</b>
<b>Economics</b>	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	<b>6</b>
<b>Education</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	<b>1</b>
<b>Engineering</b>	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	<b>4</b>
<b>Health Sciences</b>	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	<b>6</b>
<b>Law</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	<b>1</b>
<b>Medicine</b>		1	1	4	6	2	2	2	3	<b>21</b>
<b>Nursing</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0</b>
<b>Pharmacy</b>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>1</b>
<b>Rural Management</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>0</b>
<b>Science</b>	-	4	4	2	-	3	1	-	1	<b>15</b>
<b>Veterinary Science</b>	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	<b>1</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>75</b>

## Agenda Item 6 Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee

### 6.2 Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee meeting held on Tuesday 21 May 2002

The Committee met on 21 May 2002 when there were present: The Chair (Dr M Boughton) presiding, Associate Professor W Julian, Dr M Rogerson and Mr K Barlow. Associate Professor R Ross and Miss K Neveltsen were in attendance.

#### 6.2.1 Receipt of Report

The Committee **recommends** that the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 21 May 2002.

#### 6.2.2 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

##### (1) Faculty of Engineering: Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics 29-33

At its meeting of 3 September 2001, the Coursework Sub-Committee considered a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering for the introduction of a Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics.

The Sub-Committee had been requested to approve dispensation for an 18 credit point requirement for the Graduate Certificate. The Sub-Committee did not feel that special dispensation for a lower credit point requirement was warranted in this instance and agreed that the Chair convey this to the Faculty and therefore the proposal was not commended to the Graduate Studies Committee for recommendation through the Academic Board for approval.

The Faculty had since revised the proposal to offer the Graduate Certificate with the required 24 credit points in line with Academic Board requirements.

The full proposal was available on the web at:

<http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/committees/CworkSC/meetings.html>

During discussion the Sub-Committee noted:

- the proposal highlighted broader issues regarding the proliferation of award courses across all faculties;
- postgraduate coursework proposals were often proposed on the basis of targeting niche markets;
- the proposal raised issues regarding nomenclature within the University;
- the maximum and minimum length of candidature expressed in the proposal should be expressed in semesters;
- it was suggested that the minimum length of candidature should be 1 semester to provide for flexibility if the Faculty were in future able to offer all units of study in one semester; and
- the appropriate definition of part-time and full-time students related to the number of units of study, and corresponding credit points, being undertaken.

#### **Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend through the Academic Board that Senate approve:*

- (1) *the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering for the introduction in 2003 of the new course, the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics;*
- (2) *the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degree, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Engineering, with effect from 1 January 2003, as set out in the report presented; and*
- (3) *the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the above course, with effect from 1 January 2003;*

*as set out in the report presented.*

**(2) Faculty of Health Sciences: Master of Health Science**

The Faculty of Health Sciences proposed to introduce an additional mode of study for the Master of Health Science courses in Gerontology, Education, and Child and Adolescent Health.

It was proposed to introduce an additional off-shore mode of delivery to the existing on-campus and off-campus delivery, and to restructure the courses to include 4 core units of study and 4 elective units of study. The off-shore delivery would be facilitated through the Singapore Institute of Management (SIM).

The proposal had been considered and endorsed by the Faculty of Health Sciences Graduate Studies Committee and the Standing Committee.

The Faculty's School of Behavioural and Community Health Sciences (BACHS) offered Master of Health Science courses by coursework in Gerontology, Education, and Child and Adolescent Health. These courses were offered in on-campus and off-campus delivery mode. The Faculty had been approached to offer these three courses in off-shore delivery mode through SIM, its long-term partner in Singapore.

The proposed commencement date for the three programs was Semester 2, 2002. SIM accepted the need for such courses for health professionals employed in the Singapore health care system and particularly the need for a more flexible delivery mode. To this end, all three courses had been re-structured to include a combination of face-to-face teaching, distance education materials and on-line support. The Ministry of Education in Singapore had examined the proposed structure and approval to proceed was given in December 2001.

As these are existing courses, no amendment to the Resolutions of the Senate were required.

The full proposal was available on the web at:

<http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/committees/CworkSC/meetings.html>

During discussion the Sub-Committee noted that the proposal presented by the Faculty was comprehensive and the library impact statement had been provided, but was not available electronically.

***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the additional mode of delivery for the Master of Health Science, as set out in the report presented.*

**3. Proceedings of the Committee**

**(1) Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses**

**(a) Faculty of Economics and Business and Faculty of Engineering: Master of Business in Technology**

The Sub-Committee considered a proposal from the Faculty of Economics and Business regarding a Master of Business in Technology to be offered in conjunction with the Faculty of Engineering.

The Sub-Committee noted that following correspondence with the faculties, further issues required clarification and resolved to refer the proposal to the faculties for further clarification, for consideration at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee.

## Resolutions of the Senate

### Faculty of Engineering

#### Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty Of Engineering

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Engineering (p259, *Calendar 2002*) are amended from 1 January 2003 to the following effect: Section 3 relating to the certificates in the Faculty of Engineering is amended by adding the following new entry:

Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics (GradCertAFR)  
and the subsequent re-numbering of the section

#### Master of Automation in Field Robotics (MAFR)

#### Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics (GradDiplAFR)

#### Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics (GradCertAFR)

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of Automation in Field Robotics and Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics in the Faculty of Engineering (pp265-267, *Calendar 2002*) are amended from 1 January 2003 to the following effect:

(additions indicated by underline, deletions indicated by strikethrough)

#### Master of Automation in Field Robotics (MAFR)

#### Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics (GradDiplAFR)

#### Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics (GradCertAFR)

The following Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of Automation in Field Robotics, ~~and~~ Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics and Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics are adopted from 1 January 2003.

#### Award of the degree, graduate diploma and graduate certificate in Automation in Field Robotics

1. The Master of Automation in Field Robotics (MARE), ~~and~~ Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics (GradDiplAFR) and Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics (GradCertAFR) shall be awarded in one grade, namely Pass.

#### MASTER OF AUTOMATION IN FIELD ROBOTICS

##### Eligibility for admission

2. Admission to candidature for the Master of Automation in Field Robotics may be granted:
  - (a) to an applicant who has completed the requirements for a degree of Bachelor of the University of Sydney; or
  - (b) to a graduate of another university or tertiary institution; or
  - (c) to any applicant who furnishes evidence which satisfies the Faculty that the person is qualified to enter upon the prescribed units of study in the subject matter of the degree concerned. Achievement of at least Credit average (65% weighted average mark, WAM) in the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics is considered sufficient qualifications for admission to candidature for the Master of Automation in Field Robotics.

##### Availability

3. Admission to the degree may be limited by quota.
  - (a) In determining the quota the University will take into account:
    - (i) availability of resources, including space, library, equipment and computing facilities; and
    - (ii) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
  - (b) In considering an application for admission to candidature the Faculty will take account of any quota and will select in preference applicants who are most meritorious in terms of past academic and professional achievements.

### **Method of progression**

4. A candidate for the Master of Automation in Field Robotics shall proceed primarily by coursework.

### **Time limits**

5. A candidate shall complete the requirements of the Master of Automation in Field Robotics within a minimum length of candidature of 12 months and a maximum length of candidature of 48 months. This period excludes the periods during which the candidature is deferred and is shorter when credit for prior learning is granted. However under no circumstances can the candidature period be less than 12 months.

### **Credit**

6. A candidate who before admission to candidature has spent time in advanced study in the University of Sydney or in another university or institution and has completed work considered by the Faculty to be equivalent to units of study prescribed for the Master of Automation in Field Robotics, may receive credit towards satisfying the requirements for the Master of Automation in Field Robotics, provided that no more than half the requirements are so met.

### **Requirements for the Master of Automation in Field Robotics**

7. A candidate shall complete such units of study and such essay or other written work as may be prescribed by the Department. For the Master of Automation in Field Robotics 48 credit points are required to be completed from Table 1.
8. A candidate may undertake some or all of his or her studies in approved distance and or off-campus study provided that University staff are able to give adequate direction to the candidate's work and that the candidate carries out such work under the control of the University.

### **Examination**

9. A candidate may be tested by written and oral examination, assignments, exercises and practical work or any combination of these.
10. On completion of the requirements for the Master of Automation in Field Robotics the results of the examination shall be reported to the Faculty which shall determine the result of the candidature.

### **Progress**

11. The Faculty may call upon any candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards completion of the Master of Automation in Field Robotics. Where, in the opinion of the Faculty, the candidate does not show good cause, the candidature may be terminated.

## **GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN AUTOMATION IN FIELD ROBOTICS**

### **Eligibility for admission**

12. Admission to candidature for the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics may be granted:
  - a) to an applicant who has completed the requirements for a degree of bachelor of the University of Sydney; or
  - (b) to a graduate of another university or tertiary institution; or
  - (c) to any applicant who furnishes evidence which satisfies the Faculty that the person is qualified to enter upon the prescribed units of study in the subject matter of the Graduate Diploma concerned.

### **Availability**

13. Admission to the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics may be limited by quota.
  - (a) In determining the quota the University will take into account:
    - (i) availability of resources, including space, library, equipment and computing facilities; and
    - (ii) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
  - (b) In considering an application for admission to candidature the Faculty will take account of the quota and will select in preference applicants who are most meritorious in terms of past academic and professional achievements.

### **Method of progression**

14. A candidate for a Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics shall proceed primarily by coursework.

### **Time limits**

15. A candidate shall complete the requirements of the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics within a minimum length of candidature of 12 months and a maximum length of candidature of 36 months. This period excludes the periods during which the candidature is deferred and is shorter when credit for prior learning is granted. However under no circumstances can the candidature period be less than 12 months.

### **Credit**

16. A candidate who before admission to candidature has spent time in advanced study in the University of Sydney or in another university or institution and has completed work considered by the Faculty to be equivalent to units of study prescribed for the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics, may receive credit towards satisfying the requirements for the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics, provided that no more than half the requirements are so met.

### **Requirements for the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics**

17. A candidate shall complete such units of study and such essay or other written work as may be prescribed by the Faculty. For the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics 36 credit points are required to be completed from Table 1.
18. A candidate may undertake some or all of his or her studies in approved distance and or off-campus study provided that University staff are able to give adequate direction to the candidate's work and that the candidate carries out such work under the control of the University.

### **Examination**

19. A candidate may be tested by written and oral examination, assignments, exercises and practical work or any combination of these.
20. On completion of the requirements for the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics the results of the examination shall be reported to the Faculty which shall determine the result of the candidature.

### **Progress**

21. The Faculty may call upon any candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards completion of the Graduate Diploma in Automation in Field Robotics. Where, in the opinion of the Faculty, the candidate does not show good cause, the candidature may be terminated

## **GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN AUTOMATION IN FIELD ROBOTICS**

### **Eligibility for admission**

22. Admission to candidature for the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics may be granted:
- (a) to an applicant who has completed the requirements for a degree of bachelor of the University of Sydney; or
  - (b) to a graduate of another university or tertiary institution; or
  - (c) to any applicant who furnishes evidence which satisfies the Faculty that the person is qualified to enter upon the prescribed units of study in the subject matter of the Graduate Certificate concerned.

### **Availability**

23. Admission to the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics may be limited by quota.
- (a) In determining the quota the University will take into account:
    - (i) availability of resources, including space, library, equipment and computing facilities; and
    - (ii) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
  - (b) In considering an application for admission to candidature the Faculty will take account of the quota and will select in preference applicants who are most meritorious in terms of past academic and professional achievements.

### **Method of progression**

24. A candidate for the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics shall proceed primarily by coursework.

### **Time limits**

25. A candidate shall complete the requirements of the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics within a minimum length of candidature of 12 months and a maximum length of candidature of 18 months. This period excludes the periods during which the candidature is deferred and is shorter when credit for prior learning is granted. However, under no circumstances can the candidature period be less than 12 months.

### **Credit**

26. A candidate who before admission to candidature has spent time in advanced study in the University of Sydney or in another university or institution and has completed work considered by the Faculty to be equivalent to units of study prescribed for the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics, may receive credit towards satisfying the requirements for the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics, provided that no more than half the requirements are so met.

### **Requirements for the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics**

27. A candidate shall complete such units of study and such essay or other written work as may be prescribed by the Faculty. For the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics 24 credit points are required to be completed from Table 1, all of which are core requirements, as specified in Table 1.
28. A candidate may undertake some or all of his or her studies in approved distance and or off-campus study provided that University staff are able to give adequate direction to the candidate's work and that the candidate carries out such work under the control of the University.

**Examination**

29. A candidate may be tested by written and oral examination, assignments, exercises and practical work or any combination of these.
30. On completion of the requirements for the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics the results of the examination shall be reported to the Faculty which shall determine the result of the candidature.

**Progress**

31. The Faculty may call upon any candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards completion of the Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics. Where, in the opinion of the Faculty, the candidate does not show good cause, the candidature may be terminated.