



# The University of Sydney

---

## Graduate Studies Committee Agenda

Committee Secretary: Keri Neveltsen

Secretariat, Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: [K.Neveltsen@secretariat.usyd.edu.au](mailto:K.Neveltsen@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 6 May 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 Neveltsen at the above address. Enquiries concerning this meeting may also be directed to Miss Neveltsen.

*Keri Neveltsen*

for

Dr W Adams

**Registrar**

29 April 2002

---

### AGENDA

*Pages*

**1. Apologies**

Apologies have been received from:

Professor P Ramsden, Associate Professor G Gurr and Mr M Hall.

**2. Minutes of previous meeting**

**5-11**

***Recommendation***

*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 (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)**

**4. Report of the Academic Board** **12**

**Recommendation**

*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** **13-14, confidential attachment**

**5.1 Committee membership** **13**

**Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to Committee membership, as set out in the report presented.*

**5.2 Treatise containing published work** **14**

**Recommendation**

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

**5.3 Postgraduate Co-ordinators Workshop** **14**

**Recommendation**

*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** **14**

**Recommendation**

*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** **confidential attachment**

**Recommendation**

*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** **confidential attachment**

**Recommendation**

*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** **confidential attachment**

**Recommendation**

*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**

***Recommendation***

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

**6. Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee 15-29**

**6.1 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.*

**6.2 Report of the meeting held on 12 March 2002 15-19**

**6.2.1 Receipt of report**

***Recommendation***

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

**6.2.2 Annual report of 2001 15, 17-19**

***Recommendation***

*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 15-16**

***Recommendation***

*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 20-29**

**6.3.1 Receipt of report**

***Recommendation***

*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 Theses Containing Predominantly Published Work 20, 22**

***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee*

*(1) approve the policy "Submission of 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 PhD Theses 20, 23-25**

***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee approve the "Guidelines for Examiners of PhD Theses", as set out in the report presented.*

- 
- 6.3.4 Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor** 20, 26-28
- 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.
- 6.3.5 Thesis Document Checklist** 21, 29
- Recommendation**  
*That the Graduate Studies Committee note that the Thesis Document Checklist has been distributed 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** 21
- Recommendation**  
*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** 30
- 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.*
- 7. Report of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee** 32-34
- 7.1 Oral report of the Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee**
- Recommendation**  
*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** 32
- 7.2.1 Receipt of report**
- Recommendation**  
*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** 32-34
- Recommendation**  
*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** **35**  
**8.1 Faculty of Health Sciences: English Language Requirements** **35**

***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee 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** **36, separate attachment**

***Recommendation***

*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**

- 11. Next meeting**

The next meeting will be held on 3 June 2002 in the Western Tower Room.

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

### **Minutes of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on Monday 4 March 2002**

**There were present:** The Chair (Associate Professor R T Ross) presiding, Professors A Brewer, L Field, G Gill and F Nicholas, Associate Professors J Christodoulou, J Finkelstein, G Gurr, W Julian, A F Masters and M Prosser, Drs M Boughton, I Karpin, C Maher (for Associate Professor D Kenny) and R Walker and Mr K Barlow. Miss K Neveltsen was in attendance.

**1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from: Professors C Adam and P Ramsden, Associate Professor D Kenny and Dr E Baily.

**2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

**2.1 Resolution 05/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee adopt the minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2001 as a true record.

**2.2 Resolution 06/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee adopt the minutes of the meeting held in December 2001 by circulation as a true record.

**2.3 Resolution 07/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee adopt the minutes of the meeting held in February 2002 by circulation as a true record.

**3. Business arising from Minutes**

There was no business arising from the minutes.

**4. Report of the Academic Board**

**Resolution 08/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the decisions of the Academic Board, at its meetings of 13 December 2001 and 13 February 2002 in respect of the reports of the Graduate Studies Committee, as set out in the report presented.

**5. Report of the Chair**

**5.1 Higher doctorates**

**5.1.1 Deferment of public availability of thesis**

The Committee noted that the issue of deferment of public availability of theses needed to be re-examined in light of the recently adopted University of Sydney (Intellectual Property) Rule 2002. The University's increased involvement in commercial agreements and candidates undertaking research of a commercially sensitive nature and/or which could yield intellectual property were also issues relating to public availability of theses.

The Committee expressed concern that candidates needed to clearly understand their rights and responsibilities in relation to such matters and the implications in relation to theses. It was agreed that there needed to be increased liaison and discussion with the Business Liaison Office (BLO) regarding this.

It was also noted that such wider issues impacted on the work being undertaken by the working parties of the Committee, particularly in relation to PhDs.

**Resolution 09/02**

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

**5.2 Oral report**

The Chair welcomed new members to the Committee and congratulated Professor Ann Brewer on her appointment as Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Employee Relations).

The Chair advised members that applications for the position of Dean, Graduate Studies (DoGS) closed at the end of the week and that an appointment to the position had implications for the Committee. It was noted that the Chair and Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) were considering issues that would be undertaken by the DoGS.

It was noted that it would be expected that the DoGS would be a member of both the Graduate Studies and Research Committees and would be responsible for higher degrees by coursework, including oversight of such areas as research supervision and training, scholarships and management of the PhD process.

**Resolution 10/02**

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 A F Masters) highlighted the fourth quarter report of 2001 in the Sub-Committee's report.

Concern was again expressed about the length of thesis examination time with various reasons being offered by faculties for delays. The Committee discussed the examination process in relation to time frames. Particular discussion involved the appointment of a fourth examiner if one examiner did not return the report within the appropriate time period. The Committee agreed that the Chair would contact Deans regarding this issue.

The length of examination time was also discussed in relation to funding on completion rates and it was noted that the University did not get funded for more than four years of a PhD.

The Chair of the Sub-Committee drew the attention of members to the work being undertaken by the Sub-Committee noting that draft guidelines regarding examination of theses containing predominately published work were being developed and would be referred to the Committee.

**Resolution 11/02**

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 February 2002**

**6.2.1 Receipt of report**

**Resolution 12/02**

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

## **6.2.2 Fourth quarter report of 2001**

### **Resolution 13/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the fourth quarter 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 14/02**

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

## **7. Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee**

### **7.1 Oral report of the Chair of the Coursework Sub-Committee**

The Chair of the Coursework Sub-Committee (Professor A Brewer) advised members of the issue raised in relation to newly emerging terminology in course proposal documents. It was agreed that the Coursework Sub-Committee would consider the issue further and develop a consistent glossary for the use of faculties.

The Chair advised members of the work being undertaken in relation to the Postgraduate After Hours Survey. The Committee noted that further work was required, and faculties could be approached to clarify information, to present the findings in a manner that could be conveyed to students. While the Survey focussed on services available after 4.30pm, it was noted that services provided at weekends also needed to be investigated.

### **Resolution 15/02**

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

## **7.2 Report of the meeting held on 18 February 2002**

### **7.2.1 Receipt of report**

#### **Resolution 16/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the Coursework Sub-Committee meeting held on 18 February 2002.

### **7.2.2 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate coursework courses**

#### **(1) Faculty of Economics and Business: Master of Business, Graduate Diploma in Business and Graduate Certificate in Business**

The Committee noted that the introduction of the Master of Business and Graduate Certificate in Business in the Faculty of Economics and Business had been approved by Senate in principle, on its recommendation, through the Academic Board.

At the time of approval, it was agreed that the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the courses would be considered and approved at a later date. The Coursework Sub-Committee considered the proposed Resolutions and noted that the Faculty also wished to introduce a Graduate Diploma in Business as part of the articulated program as an exit qualification only.

The Sub-Committee noted the amendments made to the proposed Resolutions since their consideration at the Graduate Studies meeting. Particular areas of change included eligibility for admission, requirements of the degree, time limits and availability.

The Committee noted that it had been agreed that under the requirements for the degree, the unit of study requirement would be clarified and that there had been discussion about defining the term "capstone" in the event that other faculties employed the concept in the curriculum design of their programs.

**Resolution 17/02**

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

- (1) the proposal from the Faculty of Economics and Business for the introduction in 2003 of the new course, the Graduate Diploma in Business,
- (2) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degree, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Economics and Business with effect from 1 January 2003; and
- (3) the adoption of the new Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of Business, Graduate Diploma in Business and Graduate Certificate in Business, with effect from 1 January 2003,  
as set out in the report presented.

**(2) Faculty of Law and Faculty of Economics and Business: Master of International Business and Law**

On the recommendation of the Coursework Sub-Committee, the Committee considered a joint proposal from the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Economics and Business for the introduction in Second Semester 2002 of the new postgraduate course, Master of International Business and Law.

It was proposed that the degree would be a joint degree between the two faculties building on the existing strengths and reputations of both faculties in the area of postgraduate education.

The complementary strengths of each faculty and the existing joint offerings in the field of international business would form the foundation for the course and it was expected that the proposed degree would be very attractive to students wishing to study international business because of its interdisciplinary structure. The proposed program would be unique in Australia. It would be differentiated from courses offered at other universities because of its international focus

The full proposal was available on the web at:

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

It was noted that the Coursework Sub-Committee had identified that no consultation had occurred with the Planning Office and that while this may not be required it was advisable to keep them up to date on developments.

The Sub-Committee requested that the administration of the course be clarified to ensure students were aware of which faculty to contact with enquiries and that the credit for cross-institutional study be clarified.

**Resolution 18/02**

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

- (1) the proposal from the Faculty of Law and Faculty of Economics and Business for the introduction in 2002 of the new course, Master of International Business and Law;
- (2) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Economics and Business, with effect from 1 July 2002;
- (3) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degrees and Graduate Diplomas in the Faculty of Law, with effect from 1 July 2002;
- (4) the adoption of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of International Business and Law, with effect from 1 July 2002; and
- (5) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master's Degrees and Graduate Diplomas in the Faculty of Law, with effect from 1 July 2002, as set out in the report presented.

**(3) Faculty of Science: Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science**

**(a) Bioinformatics**

On the recommendation of its Coursework Sub-Committee, the Committee considered a proposal from the Faculty of Science for the introduction in Second Semester 2002 of the new subject area, Bioinformatics into the Applied Science program.

It was noted that the University currently offered a Bachelor of Science (Bioinformatics) and it was considered that the proposal to offer a postgraduate program was in response to a need to cater for the need for existing science professionals to update their skills in bioinformatics or to redirect their careers into this field and to provide advanced study opportunities for graduates.

The full proposal was available on the web at:

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

The Committee noted that the Coursework Sub-Committee had noted that the expressed student load was low due to its inclusion in the generic Applied Science programs which offered units of study for credit in a variety of disciplines. Provision for credit for study undertaken in the last three years was also noted and the Sub-Committee was advised that this was due to the emerging nature of the discipline.

**(b) Microscopy and Microanalysis**

On the recommendation of its Coursework Sub-Committee, the Committee considered a proposal from the Faculty of Science to incorporate the existing Microscopy and Microanalysis courses in the Applied Science programs.

It was proposed that the existing offerings of Master of Science (Microscopy and Microanalysis), Graduate Diploma

in Science (Microscopy and Microanalysis) and Graduate Certificate in Science (Microscopy and Microanalysis) be incorporated in the Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science to provide a more logical domicile for the courses and allow the sharing of units of study with other Applied Science coursework degrees. The course content had been restructured to facilitate this interchange.

The full proposal was available on the web at:

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

The Committee noted that the Coursework Sub-Committee had discussed the existing program, offered through the Electron Microscope Unit, and noted that at this stage there could only be speculation on the change in perception towards the courses with their incorporation into the Applied Science programs.

The Sub-Committee had also noted that incorporating the courses into the Applied Science programs would improve the administration of the courses and the ability of students to have queries answered. The Faculty had been asked to provide clarification in relation to modules vs. units of study.

**(c) Graduate Diploma in Applied Science (Psychology of Coaching)**

On the recommendation of its Coursework Sub-Committee, the Committee considered a proposal from the Faculty of Science to introduce a new course, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science (Psychology of Coaching).

It was proposed to extend existing offerings in the Psychology of Coaching area in the Applied Science program by introducing the Graduate Diploma to complement the existing Graduate Certificate.

The Graduate Diploma was designed to teach the applied science of human performance enhancement. It was noted that coaching psychology sat at the intersection of counselling, clinical psychology and organisational psychology. The Graduate Certificate was the first and only University-based course in Australia to offer specialised training in coaching psychology. It was anticipated that the new Graduate Diploma would build on knowledge learnt in the Graduate Certificate. It had been developed in response to student requests for advanced postgraduate study.

The full proposal was available on the web at:

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

The Committee noted that the Coursework Sub-Committee had discussed the external support for the Graduate Diploma and that students were able to enrol in related Masters programs through the Faculty of Economics and Business.

**Resolution 19/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science for the introduction in 2002 of the new subject areas, 'Bioinformatics' and 'Microscopy and Microanalysis', for the Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science; and
- (2) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science for the introduction in 2002 of the new subject area, Psychology of Coaching, for the Graduate Diploma in Applied Science; and
- (3) recommend that Senate approve:
  - (a) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees, Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates in the Faculty of Science, with effect from 1 July 2002; and
  - (b) recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science with effect from 1 July 2002,as set out in the report presented.

**7.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee**

**Resolution 20/02**

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the Coursework Sub-Committee, as set out in the report presented.

**8. General business**

There were no items of general business.

**9. Next meeting**

The Committee noted the next meeting would be held on 6 May 2002 in the Western Tower Room.

## **Agenda Item 4 Report of the Academic Board**

### **Report of the Academic Board meeting held on 13 March 2002**

The reports of the Graduate Studies Committees meeting held by circulation in February 2002 and held on 4 March 2002 to the Academic Board are available in the agenda for the meeting of the Academic Board on 13 March 2002. The agenda may be accessed on the web:

<http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/>

The Academic Board received and noted the reports and endorsed the Committee's recommendations in respect of the following new and amended courses:

- Faculty of Economics and Business      Master of Business, Graduate Diploma in Business and Graduate Certificate in Business
- Faculty of Law and Faculty of Economics and Business      Master of International Business and Law
- Faculty of Science      Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science:
  - Bioinformatics;
  - Microscopy and Microanalysis; and
  - Psychology of Coaching

## Agenda Item 5 Report of the Chair

### 5.1 Committee membership

On behalf of the Committee, I would like to welcome the following new members:

- Dr Balwant Singh Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources
- Professor David Hensher Faculty of Economics and Business

For the information of members, I also provide 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:

Member	Sub-Committee
Associate Professor Russell Ross, Chair	Deputy Chair Academic Board Alternate Chair, Academic Board Chair, Graduate Studies Committee Senate/SUPRA Liaison Committee
Dr Balwant Singh, Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources	
Associate Professor Warren Julian, Architecture	Coursework Sub-Committee
Associate Professor Joanne Finkelstein, Arts	
Professor David Hensher, Economics & Business	
Dr Richard Walker, Education	Show Cause Working Party
Associate Professor John Small, Engineering	PhD Award Sub-Committee
Associate Professor Dianna Kenny, Health Sciences	
Dr Isabel Karpin, Law	
Dr Maureen Boughton, Nursing	PhD Award Sub-Committee Coursework Sub-Committee (Chair)
Associate Professor Geoff Gurr, Rural Management	
Associate Professor Tony Masters, Science	Alternate Chair, Graduate Studies Committee PhD Award Sub-Committee (Chair), Coursework Sub-Committee, Senate/SUPRA Liaison Committee
Professor Frank Nicholas, Veterinary Science	PhD Award Sub-Committee
Professor Chris Adam, AGSM	
Dr Eril Baily, College of the Arts	
Associate Professor Peter McCallum, Conservatorium	Deputy Chair Academic Board Chair, Undergraduate Studies Committee Show Cause Working Party (Chair)
Associate Professor John Christodoulou, Dentistry, Medicine & Pharmacy	PhD Award Sub-Committee

## **5.2 Treatise containing published work**

The issue of a Master's candidate submitting a treatise containing published work has been raised and I ask members of the Committee 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? Is so, should the reviewers' comments be included as an appendix?

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

The annual workshop for Postgraduate Co-ordinators was held on Friday 19 April. It was very successful with approximately 60 attendees. My thanks to Professor Les Field and Associate Professor Tony Masters for their participation in learning the workshop.

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

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.

I have agreed that we will review the Guidelines over the next few months in time to make any decisions on changes to the Guidelines in time to advise applicants prior to September. I expect to do this review in several stages, and will keep the Committee informed of progress at each meeting, with a view to having a proposal finalised for the July meeting of this Committee.

## Agenda Item 6.2 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee

### 6.2 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 12 March 2002

The Committee met on 12 March 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, P Jones, B James and J Small and Dr M Boughton. Ms M Kemmis was in attendance.

#### 6.2.1 Receipt of Report

The Sub-Committee **recommends** that the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 12 March 2002.

#### 6.2.2 Annual report of 2001

The Sub-Committee noted the annual report of 2001 as set out in the report presented.

17-19

#### *Recommendation*

*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

##### (1) Resolutions Regarding PhD Examinations

##### (a) Examination of Theses Containing Predominantly Published Work

At its meeting of 12 February 2002 the Committee considered a tabled document from the Chair outlining guidelines for the examination of theses containing predominantly published work. The Committee agreed to amend the document before referring it to the Graduate Studies Committee.

##### (b) Examiner Guidelines for PhD Theses

The Committee considered a draft document prepared by the Faculties of Dentistry, Medicine and Pharmacy in consultation with the Chair. The Committee resolved to consider the document by circulation before recommending the Guidelines to the Graduate Studies Committee.

##### (c) Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor

The Committee considered a draft document outlining current procedures and practice. The Committee resolved to recommend amendments to the resolutions regarding the submission of supervisor's comments to an assessor and in cases in which the examiners' reports and the supervisor's comments are referred to the examiners. The Committee also resolved to consider the document by circulation before recommending the guidelines to the Graduate Studies Committee.

##### (2) Doctor of Philosophy

##### (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 Philosophy, subject to emendations.

**(b) 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 six candidates (one of which was reconsidered from the February meeting). The Sub-Committee resolved to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, subject to emendations, in five cases and referred one case back to the Faculty for further consideration.

**(c) Appointment of Examiners**

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

**(3) Doctor of Juridical Studies**

**(a) 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 one candidate and resolved to recommend that the degree not be awarded but that the thesis be revised and resubmitted for examination.

## Annual Report of 2001

### 1. Awards at faculty level

Faculty	Award	Award subject to		Percentages		
		Typographical corrections	Emendations	Award	Typographical corrections	Emendations
Agriculture	-	5	22	-	18.5%	81.5%
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-	-
Architecture	-	2	3	-	40%	60%
Arts	13	18	31	21%	29%	50%
College of the Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium	-	1	1	-	50%	50%
Dentistry	-	-	5	-	-	100%
Economics	4	3	8	-	-	-
Education	1	7	8	6.3%	43.7%	50%
Engineering	5	5	21	16.1%	16.1%	67.8%
Health Sciences	1	3	8	8.3%	25%	66.7%
Law	4	-	3	57%	-	43%
Medicine	8	18	52	10.3%	23.1%	66.6%
Nursing	-	3	-	-	100%	-
Pharmacy	-	-	1	-	-	100%
Rural Management	-	-	1	-	-	100%
Science	15	12	41	22%	17.6%	60.4%
Veterinary Science	-	-	6	-	-	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>64.1%</b>

### 2. Total awards by PhD Award Sub-Committee

	Award	Typographical corrections	Emendations	Revise and resubmit	Non-award
Agriculture	-	-	5	-	-
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-
Architecture	1	-	3	3	-
Arts	4	3	13	7	-
College of the Arts	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium	-	-	-	-	-
Dentistry	-	-	-	2	-
Economics	-	-	1	-	-
Education	-	-	6	2	-
Engineering	-	-	1	3	-
Health Sciences	-	-	2	-	-
Law	1	-	2	2	-
Medicine	-	-	13	-	-
Nursing	-	-	3	-	-
Pharmacy	-	-	1	-	-
Rural Management	-	-	-	-	-
Science	-	-	4	-	-
Veterinary Science	-	-	2	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>

### 3. Total awards

Faculty	Numbers					Percentages				
	Award	Typographic al corrections	Emendations	Revise and resubmit	Non-award	Award	Typographic al corrections	Emendations	Revise and resubmit	Non-award
Agriculture	-	5	27	-	-	-	15.6%	84.4%	-	-
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Architecture	1	2	6	3	-	8.3%	16.7%	50%	25%	-
Arts	17	21	44	7	-	19.1%	23.6%	49.4%	7.9%	-
College of the Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium	-	1	1	-	-	-	50%	50%	-	-
Dentistry	-	-	5	2	-	-	-	71.4%	28.6%	-
Economics	4	3	9	-	-	21.4%	14.3%	64.3%	-	-
Education	1	7	14	2	-	4.2%	29.1%	58.3%	8.4%	-
Engineering	5	5	22	3	-	14.3%	14.3%	62.8%	8.6%	-
Health Sciences	1	3	10	-	-	7.1%	21.4%	71.5%	-	-
Law	5	-	5	2	-	41.6%	41.6%	16.8%	-	-
Medicine	8	18	65	-	-	8.8%	19.8%	71.4%	-	-
Nursing	-	3	3	-	-	-	50%	50%	-	-
Pharmacy	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Rural Management	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Science	15	12	45	-	-	20.8%	16.7%	62.5%	-	-
Veterinary Science	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>16.9%</b>	<b>64.6%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>0%</b>

#### 4. Summary of examination times

Averaged over all faculties 17.4% of degrees were awarded in three months or less, 21.4% in four months, 24.1% in five months, 15.9% in six months and 21.2% took longer than six months.

Faculty	Numbers								
	≤2 mths	3 mths	4 mths	5 mths	6 mths	7 mths	8 mths	9 mths	>9 mths
Agriculture	-	6	6	7	5	2	-	-	-
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Architecture	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arts	-	7	16	18	7	6	1	6	1
College of the Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-
Dentistry	-	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	-
Economics	-	3	-	4	3	1	3	-	3
Education	-	1	1	2	6	5	1	-	-
Engineering	-	7	7	7	6	2	2	-	-
Health Sciences	-	3	3	2	2	1	1	-	-
Law	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	2	-
Medicine & Pharmacy	-	4	13	18	13	14	5	3	6
Nursing	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
Rural Management	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Science	2	19	25	17	9	4	-	2	-
Veterinary Science	-	1	1	4	-	1	-	-	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>

\*NB: While two degrees were awarded by the Conservatorium of Music, the time elapsed between the submission of the thesis and the examination of the thesis was known for only one.

## Agenda Item 6.3 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee

### 6.3 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 9 April 2002

The Committee met on 9 April 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, P Jones, B James and J Small. Ms M Kemmis was in attendance.

#### 6.3.1 Receipt of Report

The Sub-Committee **recommends** that the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 9 April 2002.

#### 6.3.2 Examination of Theses Containing Predominantly Published Work

22

The PhD Award Sub-Committee recommends 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 outlines procedures for the submission of theses which contain predominately published work of the candidate and has been developed in response to an increase in queries regarding this issue.

##### **Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee*

- (1) *approve the policy "Submission of 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 PhD Theses

23-25

The PhD Award Sub-Committee recommends that the Graduate Studies Committee approve the draft *Guidelines for Examiners of PhD Theses*.

##### **Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee approve the "Guidelines for Examiners of PhD Theses", as set out in the report presented.*

#### 6.3.4 Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor

26-28

Under the current resolutions, faculties are not required to obtain further comments from the supervisor if a fourth examiner is appointed to assess a thesis, or if the examiners' reports are referred back to the examiners for comments. The attached draft document seeks 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. It is 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, and proposed amendments are attached.

##### **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.*

### 6.3.5 Thesis Document Checklist

The attached Document Checklist is referred to the Graduate Studies Committee. The Checklist has been 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.

#### **Recommendation**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee note that the Thesis Document Checklist has been distributed 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

#### (1) Doctor of Philosophy

##### (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 two candidates and resolved to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, subject to emendations.

##### (b) 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 eleven candidates and resolved:

- (i) to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, subject to emendations, in three cases;
- (ii) to require revision and resubmission for examination in four cases;
- (iii) to not award the degree in one case;
- (iv) to recommend the appointment of a fourth examiner/assessor in one case; and
- (v) to defer consideration of two cases pending further information.

##### (c) Appointment of Examiners

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

#### (2) Doctor of Juridical Studies

##### (a) 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 one candidate and resolved to recommend that the degree not be awarded but that the thesis be revised and resubmitted for examination.

##### (b) Appointment of Examiners

The Sub-Committee noted that examiners had been appointed for one candidate for the degree of Doctor of Juridical Studies.

## Examination of 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, it is assumed 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 Awards Sub-Committee recommends the following policy for the examination of 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 the contribution of the work to the field 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 be presented in such a way that it satisfies the University's provisions regarding the presentation for examination and lodgement in the University Library .
- The material be 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

Note that 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 PhD Theses**

These guidelines have been developed to assist examiners in coming to their conclusions as to whether the degree of PhD should be awarded to the student for the body of research presented to the examiner, and if so under what conditions.

There are a number of options available to the examiner in giving their recommendation:

**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 necessary.

**2. Award Subject to Typographical Corrections**

In this instance the award of PhD is clearly appropriate, but there are a number of minor corrections which should be made, including errors in spelling, syntax, grammar, punctuation, capitalisation or in the references.

**3. Award Subject to Conditions**

For an examiner to make this recommendation, acknowledgment is being made that in the main the thesis is worthy of the award of PhD, but there are a number of changes or additions that need to be made that would be unlikely to substantially alter the conclusions of the thesis. As a general rule, the changes are of such a nature that the thesis would not need to be re-examined. With the provision of adequate details as to what is required, the Head of Department or Postgraduate Coordinator would be able to make an assessment as to whether the changes have been satisfactorily completed.

**(1) Minor Emendations**

The recommended changes, whilst more substantial than correction of typographical or grammatical errors, are still of a relatively minor nature, and could easily be evaluated by the Head of Department or Postgraduate Coordinator, following detailed advice from the examiner. Examples in this category would include modifications that might need to be made to the contents pages, tables or figures, appendices, etc.

**(2) Other Conditions**

In this category would be included major emendations, where more substantial changes need to be made, but again which would not need to go back to examiners for re-examination. Examples would 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 asked 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 and Postgraduate Coordinator). 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.

In cases where the examiner's report is sufficiently detailed that the Head of Department 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 appropriate.

**4. Revision and Resubmission**

The thesis in its current form is not worthy of being awarded the degree of PhD, but has many redeeming features. Deficiencies in the thesis may include inadequate or sloppy 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 cannot 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 very strong 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 journals, then the assessment by an examiner to recommend non-award may not be considered reasonable by the Board of Postgraduate Studies.

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 recommendation (4) or possibly (5) might be more appropriate.

**Oral Examination**

Students have the option requesting 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 PhD theses however do not include an oral examination as part of the normal examination procedure. In some circumstances an examiner may recommend an oral examination 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 can assume 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. Verification of this would be evidenced by the Head of Department, 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 PhD.

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

The examiners' reports are released to the candidate once the examination is completed. Although the examiner may request that his/her name not be released to the candidate, under Freedom of Information laws in this country, the University may be compelled to release the examiner's name to the candidate. It is recommended that examiners avoid including possible identifiers within the text of the report if the examiner wishes his/her name to be withheld. In addition, it is recommended that examiners refrain from using language in their reports that could be construed to be a personal attack on the candidate.

### **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 please indicate whether you are prepared to examine a revise thesis.

The University may consider it appropriate that the reports of the examiners, together with the comments of the supervisor, be referred to all of the examiners for comment. This is not often necessary.

### **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.

---

<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.

## **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.

**Checklist of documentation required with PhD examiner's reports**

<b>General documentation required:</b>		
<b>General</b>	3 examiner's reports (2 for SJD)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Assessor's report if appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Head of department/school's* report	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Faculty report	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Do examiners disagree?	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N
	If yes, evidence of consultation with supervisor	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Specific documentation required in support of Faculty recommendation:</b>		
<b>Award</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Award subject to correction of typographical errors to the satisfaction of the University</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
	List of typographical errors	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Award subject to the completion of emendations to the satisfaction of the University</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
	List of emendations suggested	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Award subject to conditions</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
	List of conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>An additional examiner be appointed</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>An assessor be appointed</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The reports be referred to all of the examiners for comment</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The thesis be revised and resubmitted for examination</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Copy of invitation for student's comment (with deadlines)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Copy of student's declaration of intention or otherwise to comment	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Student's comments	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Head of department/school's* response to student's comments	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Final Faculty resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>That the degree not be awarded</b>	General	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Copy of invitation for student's comment (with deadlines)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Copy of student's declaration of intention or otherwise to comment	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Student's comments	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Head of department/school's* response to student's comments	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Final Faculty resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*Head of department/school, or delegated member of staff (e.g. Postgraduate Co-ordinator) as per Academic Board Resolutions relating to the Examination Process for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Revised thesis

No

Yes

## Agenda Item 6.4 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee

### 6.4 Requirement to complete candidature within the University

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."

## **Agenda Item 7**

### **Report of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee**

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

##### **7.2.1 Receipt of Report**

The Sub-Committee **recommends** that the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 29 April 2002.

##### **7.2.2 2001-2002 Australian Postgraduate Awards with Stipend (APA) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPA)**

###### **(1) Number of applications**

A total of 606 applications (including 18 ineligible) were received for the 2001-2002 APA/UPA round. Compared to the previous year's figure of 550, the number of applications rose by 10%.

###### **(2) Number of applicants on the Order of Merit list**

341 applicants were supported by the faculties to be placed on the Order of Merit list and thus were eligible for an offer of an award. The corresponding figure for the 2001 awards was 355.

###### **(3) Number of awards available**

There are 148 APAs and 40\* UPAs available for 2002. The number of APAs allocated by DEST decreased by 2 compared to 2001 while the number of UPAs remained the same. The A.E. & F.A.Q. Stephens Scholarship (funded by bequest) and the Chancellor's Committee Research Scholarship were also offered for 2002.

The awards were allocated to the three Colleges using the formula approach approved by Academic Board in 1998. The formula consists of research higher degree load for the relevant year (50%) and weighted completions over two years (50%).

Initially, six awards were set aside to cover anomalous cases. After considering the four cases put forward by the Colleges, the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee accepted two under the agreed guidelines and these applicants were awarded UPAs. The four remaining scholarships were returned to the pool for allocation using the formula approach. The number of awards allocated to each College was as follows:

College of Health Sciences: 54 awards;

College of Humanities and Social Sciences: 60 awards and 2 anomalous cases; and

College of Sciences and Technology: 74 awards.

Nine awards from the College of Health Sciences were subsequently reallocated to the other two Colleges (Humanities and Social Sciences: 4, Sciences and Technology: 5) after all applicants on the Health Sciences Order of Merit list had received offers.

\* plus 27 awards (referred to as 'International Postgraduate Award') to international students who won the International Postgraduate Research Scholarships (funded by DEST for tuition fees only).

###### **(4) Number of offers and rejections**

Prior to offers being made, 19 applicants were removed from the College of Health Sciences ranking list as they had accepted offers for NH&MRC scholarships. A total of 193 APA offers were made, 45 of which were declined and resulted in an acceptance rate of 76.7%. The corresponding figures for UPA are 52 offers, 10 declined and an acceptance rate of 80.7%. The combined acceptance rate is 77.5% which is higher than the 2001 figure of 75%. The main reasons cited for

declining the offers are 'award at another institution', 'work' and 'travel/study overseas'.

**(5) Number of awards taken up**

As of 15 April 2002, all 190 scholarships were taken up. A breakdown of the awards by College and Faculties is shown in the attached table.

**34**

**(6) Review of the allocation formula**

From 2003, the Research Training Scheme formula will be fully applied by DEST in allocating APAs to institutions and hence the internal allocation formula will need to be reviewed before the 2003 round.

**Awards by College and Faculties**

College and Faculty	No. of Appl'nts	No. on Order of Merit List	Alloc. & Anom. Cases	Australian Postgraduate Awards					University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards				
				No. got offer	No. rejected offer	No. took up award			No. got offer	No. rejected offer	No. took up award		
						Total	Female	Male			Total	Female	Male
<b>HEALTH SCIENCES</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>54 Final - 45</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
Dentistry	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Sciences	20	8		7	0	7	6	1	1	1	0	0	0
Medicine (see Note)	97	44		32	10	22	8	14	12	3	9	5	4
Nursing	2	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy	14	8		8	1	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	0
Note: 1 was offered the A.E. & F.A.Q. Stephens Scholarship													
<b>HUMANITIES &amp; SOCIAL SCIENCES</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>60 + 2 Final - 64 + 2</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>
Arts	137	101		52	9	43	24	19	9	1	8	6	2
Conservatorium of Music	5	4		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1
Economics and Business	22	8		5	3	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	1
Education	13	3		1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law	8	6		4	1	3	1	2	1	0	1	1	0
Sydney College of the Arts	23	9		0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	3	2
<b>SCIENCES &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>74 Final - 79</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>
Agriculture	12	8		4	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Architecture	2	1		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Engineering (see Note)	39	21		8	4	4	3	1	7	3	4	1	3
Rural Management	2	2		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Science	151	110		67	13	54	23	31	13	1	12	8	4
Veterinary Science	16	8		5	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Note: 1 was offered the Chancellor's Committee Research Scholarship													
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>564 *</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>17</b>

\* plus 18 applicants who were ineligible and 24 who have withdrawn.

## **Agenda Item 8 Report from Faculties**

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

The Faculty of Health Sciences considered its English Language Requirements in respect of the Doctor of Health Science and recommends that the overall IELTS band be raised.

The Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Graduate Studies Committee, has determined that international applicants must either have a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary/tertiary studies in which the language of instruction was in English or must meet one of the set English language requirements as a condition of entry.

The overall band score of IELTS must be 6.5 (with a minimum of 6.0 in each band). The Faculty of Health Sciences recommends the following IELTS requirement for the Doctor of Health Science, with effect from 1 January 2003;

- overall IELTS band of 7.0, with individual band of speaking and writing of no less than 6.5.

#### ***Recommendation***

*That the Graduate Studies Committee approve the English Language Requirement for admission to the Doctor of Health Science, as set out above.*

## **Agenda Item 9**

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

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

*separate attachment*

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research)(Acting) have developed a survey directed at each postgraduate student.

The intention is that the survey should be completed annually and provide baseline data which, over time, will provide University-wide indicators for monitoring and managing the postgraduate cohort.

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

By attaching the survey to the report form, a reasonable response is expected. Some of the survey questions overlap with information normally included in the annual progress reports in some faculties. However, at present, there is not good uniformity in the annual progress reports across the University. Students are also asked to include their SID which will permit data to be aggregated to College, Faculty or Department level.

The survey is included with the agenda as a separate document.