



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

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 16 June 2003** in the Western Tower Room.

(Room S 495, first floor of the Western Tower of the Quadrangle 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

12 June 2003

Agenda

Pages

1. Apologies

2. Minutes of previous meeting

6-13

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 May 2003 as a true record.

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

4. Report of the Academic Board

14-15

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting of 14 May 2003, as set out in the report presented.

5. Report of the Chair

- 5.1 The use of parallel teaching of postgraduate and undergraduate students in postgraduate courses** 16, 17-18

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to the use of parallel teaching of postgraduate and undergraduate students in postgraduate courses, as set out in the report presented.

- 5.2 Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG): Executive Master of Public Administration** 16

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to the Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) Executive Master of Public Administration, as set out in the report presented.

- 5.3 Postgraduate Co-ordinators Workshop** 16

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 Payment of costs to external examiners** 16

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to the payment of costs to external examiners, as set out in the report presented.

- 5.5 Higher degrees**

- 5.5.1 Award of degree** *confidential attachment*

Recommendation

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

- 5.5.2 Deferment of public availability of thesis** *confidential attachment*

Recommendation

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.

- 5.6 Oral report**

Recommendation

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

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 3 June 2003

19-24

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 3 June 2003.

6.2.2 First quarter report of 2003

19, 21-24

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee:

- (1) note the first quarter report of 2003 of the PhD Award Sub-Committee; and*
- (2) refer the issue of performance indices such as the length of time taken to nominate examiners to the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee for consideration of the development of guidelines for good supervisory practice; and*
- (3) request faculties to advise departmental/school heads and supervisors that statistical information on examination results and times are regularly collated and that this information is seen by both the Academic Board and Senate; and*
- (4) give consideration to the issue of ensuring that external examiners are prompt in returning their reports, as set out in the report presented.*

6.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee

19-20

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting of 3 June 2003, as set out in the report presented.

7. Report of the Postgraduate Coursework Sub-Committee

7.1 Oral report of the Chair of the Postgraduate Coursework Sub-Committee

Recommendation

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

7.2 Report of the meeting held on 2 June 2003

25-26

7.2.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the Postgraduate Coursework Sub-Committee meeting held on 2 June 2003.

- 7.2.2 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses**
(1) Faculty of Medicine: Master of Medical Education, Graduate Diploma in Medical Education and Graduate Certificate in Medical Education 25-26

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report relating to the Faculty of Medicine proposal, as set out in the report presented.

- 7.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee** 26

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the Postgraduate Coursework Sub-Committee meeting of 2 June 2003, as set out in the report presented.

8. Report of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee

- 8.1 Oral report of the Chair of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee**

Recommendation

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

- 8.2 Report of the meeting held on 27 May 2003** 27-28

- 8.2.1 Receipt of report**

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee meeting held on 27 May 2003.

- 8.2.2 Termination of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) candidature** 27

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee require faculties to report to the Dean of Graduate Studies on decisions to terminate a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) candidature, as set out in the report presented.

- 8.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee** 28

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee meeting of 27 May 2003, as set out in the report presented.

9. General business

10. Next meeting

Unless there is urgent business necessitating a July meeting, the next meeting will be held on 18 August 2003 in the Western Tower Room.

Agenda Item 3 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Minutes of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on Monday 19 May 2003

There were present: The Chair (Associate Professor R Ross) presiding, Professors C Adam, M Behnia, L Field, R Graycar, F Nicholas, M O'Connor and L Zhang, Associate Professors J Christodoulou, W Julian, A F Masters, P McCallum and M Prosser, Drs A Elias, S Forsyth and B Singh. Professor J Sachs (Chair, Academic Board), Associate Professor C Maher and Miss K Neveltsen were in attendance.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from: Professors J Carter and P Ramsden, Associate Professors G Gurr, D Kenny and L Unsworth and Drs M Boughton and M Rogerson and Mr M Hall.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

Resolution 34/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 March 2003 as a true record.

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

3.4 Payment of costs to external examiners

At its March meeting the Committee discussed the payment of expenses for external examiners and agreed that the Chair would investigate the background of the issue and discuss matters further with the Sydney College of the Arts, Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) and Dean of Graduate Studies (Resolution 08/03 refers).

The Chair advised the Committee that this meeting had not yet occurred but that it was anticipated this would take place before the June meeting of the Committee.

4. Report of the Academic Board

The Chair drew the attention of members to the report item relating to the calculation of Weighted Average Marks (WAMs) and Yearly Average Marks (YAMs) noting that these changes would directly impact on the APA/IPRS process.

Resolution 35/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting of 12 March 2003, as set out in the report presented.

5. Report of the Chair

5.1 Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee membership

The Committee was reminded that the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee acted for the Academic Board in awarding specific postgraduate scholarships and advised the Graduate Studies Committee on Resolutions, policy, procedures and selection criteria relating to the award of specific postgraduate scholarships.

Appointed members were currently drawn from College Postgraduate Awards Committees and the Chair advised that he had approved changes in the Sub-Committee's membership to reflect changes at the College level. From 2003, there were two new positions on the Sub-Committee - the Dean of Graduate Studies (ex officio), and one person nominated by the Chair of Academic Board.

Resolution 36/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the change of membership of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee, as set out in the report presented.

5.2 Timeframe for completion of emendations

The Chair advised that he had been involved in discussions regarding the length of time in which thesis emendations should be completed and asked the Committee to consider whether a maximum time should be imposed for completing emendations.

During discussion, the Committee noted:

- faculties should technically be advising candidates of the timeframe in which emendations were required to be completed;
- a candidate could wait until the end of candidature to complete emendations and therefore the maximum length of candidature, including any possible extensions, needed to be included in considerations;
- the threat of termination of candidature could assist in encouraging the completion of emendations;
- there would need to be procedures for where a candidate did not meet the deadline for completion of emendations;
- a proactive approach was encouraged; and
- students would normally be encouraged to complete emendations within three months however a process for monitoring and possibly a progress report could be considered.

The Committee agreed to refer the matter to the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee for further discussion and advice.

Resolution 37/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to the timeframe for completion of emendations, as set out in the report presented and refer the matter to the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee for consideration and advice.

5.3 Moratorium on new off-shore programs

The Committee noted that the Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor had advised that following discussion at the Senior Executive Group (SEG), a moratorium had been placed on the introduction of any new or proposed off-shore teaching program. This decision would not affect any existing course or formally approved agreements that had been entered, although these would be reviewed as part of the Review of Internationalisation.

The moratorium would remain in place until the Review was completed in second semester 2003. It was also suggested that faculties not enter into any international memorandums of understanding while the Review was being undertaken.

Resolution 38/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair relating to the moratorium on new off-shore programs, as set out in the report presented.

5.4 Postgraduate Co-ordinators Workshop

The Committee noted that the first workshop for 2003 was held on Friday, 4 April and that attendance had been pleasing with about 60 people attending. The Chair judged the workshop as a success, with the quality and diversity of questions and level of discussion once again demonstrating the value in the Committee hosting the workshops.

The Chair thanked the Dean of Graduate Studies (DOGS) and the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee for their contributions to the workshop. The DOGS advised that he would have liked a longer time for discussion amongst participants. Members also provided feedback that those attending had found sections repetitious from previous workshops. The Chair informed members that the format for the second semester workshop was being considered and was likely to be separated into two sessions – for new members and for an update on policies, rules and regulations, and funding arrangements etc.

At the workshop the DOGS had advised participants that the University was under-enrolled and was asked to explain how under-enrolment was calculated in individual faculties. The DOGS advised that to date this had only been examined from a University perspective and that there was no current formula to identify this at a faculty level.

Members were reminded that the workshop for second semester would be on Friday 29 August.

Resolution 39/03

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.

5.5 Oral report

The Chair had nothing further to report.

Resolution 40/03

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 matters of particular interest to the Sub-Committee. Members were reminded that where an “unusual” examiner had been appointed, the Sub-Committee required an explanation for the appointment which would normally include a rationale and an explanation of the examiner’s experience in examining PhDs.

The Chair also advised members that the Sub-Committee did not refer items back to faculties without strong reasons. Recently the Sub-Committee had referred items particularly relating to oral examinations and appointments of assessors.

The Committee was reminded that the appointment of an assessor was not undertaken lightly and it would be difficult for a faculty to recommend other than what the assessor had recommended. Similarly, the convenor of an oral examination was in a position to normally reach a consensus amongst examiners and a faculty would not normally be expected to recommend differently.

Members agreed that faculties needed to have further internal discussions relating to the conduct of oral examinations. It was also noted that faculties were not required to report the method of examination and that the Committee might find it useful to know the number of examinations being conducted in this manner.

Resolution 41/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee and request faculties to report annually on the number of oral examinations conducted and the number of theses submitted electronically for examination.

6.2 Report of the meeting held on 1 April 2003

6.2.1 Receipt of report

Resolution 42/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 1 April 2003.

6.2.2 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee

Resolution 43/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting of 1 April 2003, as set out in the report presented.

6.3 Report of the meeting held on 6 May 2003

6.3.1 Receipt of report

Resolution 44/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 6 May 2003.

6.3.2 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee

Resolution 45/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting of 6 May 2003, as set out in the report presented.

7. Report of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee

7.1 Oral report of the Chair of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee

The Chair of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee, Associate Professor R Ross, advised members that the Sub-Committee was continuing to work on issues particularly relating to associate supervisors and accreditation of supervisors, which it hoped to recommend to the Graduate Studies Committee shortly.

Resolution 46/03

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

7.2 Report of the meeting held on 25 March 2003

7.2.1 Receipt of report

Resolution 47/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee meeting held on 25 March 2003.

7.2.2 Earliest date for submission of a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis

The Committee considered the proposal from the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee to amend section 78 of the *University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999* (as amended) to provide for the Chair of the Academic Board to accept for examination, in exceptional circumstances, a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis submitted by a candidate enrolled for less than the minimum length of candidate.

The Sub-Committee had noted that the Rule prescribed that a thesis could not be submitted for examination before the completion of the sixth semester of candidature. The current exceptions were for candidates who had completed certain degrees being eligible to submit at the end of four semesters, and for candidates who had made exceptional progress being eligible to submit one semester earlier than prescribed.

There was no provision to vary the requirements and it had been recommended that this be reconsidered to permit some level of flexibility while ensuring the University's standards were maintained.

There had been previous instances where the candidate, supervisor and faculty felt the thesis was ready for submission but this had not been able to occur due to the prescribed timeframes. It could be argued that the current provisions (students who have completed a masters by research and specified degrees with honours) discriminated against degrees not listed.

The Committee noted that a minimum time had not been recommended, allowing for the discretion of the Chair of the Academic Board and consideration of applications on a case-by-case basis. Members discussed the Sub-Committee report, noting that the proposed changes were not seen as speeding up the normal process, and that the Chair of the Academic Board would determine what constituted exceptional circumstances.

The proposed amendment would still require that all PhD requirements be met, including that the work submitted had to be undertaken during candidature, and an application from a Dean would normally include supporting advice from the supervisor and postgraduate co-ordinator that they believed the thesis was of the appropriate standard.

The Chair of the Academic Board expressed support for the recommendation advising members that the University had already had to hold back exceptional candidates due to the inflexibility of the rules.

Resolution 48/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend through the Academic Board that Senate amend the University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule to amend the provisions relating to the earliest date for submission of a Doctor of Philosophy thesis, as set out in the report presented.

7.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee

Resolution 49/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the proceedings of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee meeting of 25 March 2003, as set out in the report presented.

8. Report of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee

8.1 Oral report of the Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee

The Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee, Associate Professor R Ross, informed new members of the purpose and activities of the Sub-Committee.

Resolution 50/03

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

8.2 Report of the meeting held on 7 May 2003

8.2.1 Receipt of report

Resolution 51/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee meeting held on 7 May 2003.

8.2.2 Australian Postgraduate Awards (APAs) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPAs)

The Committee considered the report relating to the award of Australian Postgraduate Awards (APAs) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPAs), noting in particular the number of applications, the order of merit list, the number of awards available, number of offers and rejections, and the number of awards taken up.

During discussion the Committee noted:

- a reduction in the number of ineligible applications received due to improvements in the wording on the application forms;
- a proportion of offers were rejected therefore more offers were made than accepted;
- the timing of availability of honours grades had an impact on the ranking process however the University's processes were not out of line with other institutions, although it was noted that UNSW was later than other universities in having their grades available.

Members also discussed the provisions relating to anomalous cases and were advised that the Sub-Committee rejected more applications than it accepted. The Chair advised that reasons for anomalous cases being accepted could include that circumstances outside a candidates control in the honours year had affected performance, or the time from the completion of undergraduate work could mean that a different grading system had been used. Professional standing could also be taken into account and the Sub-Committee particularly looked at research potential and this was assisted candidates demonstrating a record of undertaking research projects professionally.

Resolution 52/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the report on Australian Postgraduate Awards (APAs) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPAs), as set out in the report presented.

8.2.3 Co-funded University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPAs)

The Committee considered the proposal from the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee for the introduction from second semester 2003 of co-funded University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPAs).

Members were advised that it was proposed to offer an additional 40 UPAs co-funded by the office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) and departments/schools or faculties.

It was noted that the tenure and conditions of awards, eligibility rules and the application and ranking procedure would be the same as for the regular UPAs. This meant that applications still needed to meet the College cut-off mark for the 2003 APA/UPA round and applicants would not be able to defer the scholarship.

Recipients of co-funded UPAs would be eligible to apply for a 2004 APA or regular UPA. If successful, the co-funding arrangement for the student would cease, however the department/school or faculty would be expected to continue their financial commitment by making the scholarship/s available to 2004 APA/UPA applicant/s who missed out on a first round offer.

During discussion the Committee noted:

- the scholarships were being offered as a bid to improve enrolment numbers;
- the second semester offerings fitted with the two semester model allowing candidates some flexibility over their commencement date;
- it was likely that other universities would follow suit over the next couple of years;
- there had been demand from the faculties for more than the 40 scholarships;
- this offer would give an indication of how the University should approach scholarships offerings annually;
- quality and standards would be maintained with the same cut-off requirements as for the APAs/UPAs; and
- there could be some shift of students between APAs and UPAs but this was likely to balance out within the next couple of years.

Resolution 53/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the policy Co-funded University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPAs): Method of Award, as set out in the report presented.

9. Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

9.1 Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG): Executive Master of Public Administration

At its meeting of March 2003, the Chair advised members that the University of Sydney had joined a collaborative venture of five governments (Australia, New Zealand, NSW, Victoria and Queensland) and eight other tertiary education institutions (Melbourne, Monash, ANU, Canberra, UNSW, Queensland, Griffith, and Victoria University of Wellington), to establish the Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG).

The Committee noted that a proposed Executive Master of Public Administration (EMPA) would be ANZSOG's primary offering comprising core subjects provided by ANZSOG and electives offered by the participating universities. Students would be public servants nominated and funded by participating governments, subject to university selection processes and would be awarded the degree from their home university.

Members were advised that the Faculty of Economics and Business had been asked to review the unit of study proposals submitted by ANZSOG and the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee had been asked to review the overall course proposal. Other faculties had also been asked to identify, from existing units of study, possible electives to be offered by this University.

The Chair invited Professor Judyth Sachs, Chair of the Academic Board, to speak to the proposal. Members were advised that the Vice-Chancellors and Chairs of Academic Boards at the University of Sydney and University of New South Wales had discussed the ANZSOG proposal and had recommended to the respective Academic Boards and Senates that the universities offer a jointly-badged degree, collaborate on the units of study offered towards the degree, and establish a joint committee of the respective Academic Boards to oversee the course.

The Committee noted that the University of Sydney and UNSW Academic Boards had both approved the establishment of the Joint Committee and the Graduate Studies Committees was asked to consider the proposal and provide feedback to the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee would then provide a recommendation through each Academic Board to the respective Senates.

During discussion, the Committee noted:

- some concerns were expressed about the process under which the proposal was being considered by the Committee;
- both the AGSM and the Faculty of Economics and Business had expressed some reservations regarding the proposal;
- candidates were selected by government, however host institutions could impose additional selection criteria;
- there would be no University of Sydney control over the content of the core units;
- there was some similarity in the core units of existing University offerings;
- identification of the electives students could undertake required careful consideration and negotiation between the University of Sydney, UNSW and the AGSM;
- the proposed core units of study had been developed by senior academics in comparable institutions;
- employees of the University could be contracted to teach core units of study;
- faculties required clarification on how elective units of study would be paid for;
- a library impact statement was still required even though ANZSOG could engage with the Library in a separate service agreement;
- the proposal did not address some University requirements particularly in relation to assessment, and the management and evaluation of teaching;
- a more comprehensive statement relating to graduate attributes should be requested;
- there needed to be identification of how University policies linked with the proposal e.g. that student evaluations comply with the requirements of the host institution;
- further information relating to assessment and grade descriptors would be desirable;
- clarification of progression and rules, particularly in relation to the *University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000* and appeal provisions was required; and
- the governance and administration was likely to be undertaken by the Director of the University of Sydney Graduate School of Government which was currently being established.

The Committee agreed that a recommendation be made to the joint committee asking that it address the concerns expressed by members.

Resolution 54/03

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the ANZSOG Joint Committee address the concerns identified by the University of Sydney Graduate Studies Committee relating to the proposed introduction in 2003 of the new course, the Executive Master of Public Administration, jointly-badged with the University of New South Wales prior to making a recommendation to the respective Academic Boards, as set out in the report presented.

10. General business

No items of general business were raised.

11. Next meeting

The Committee noted that the next meeting would be held on 16 June 2003 in the Western Tower Room.

Agenda Item 4 Report of the Academic Board

4. Report of the Academic Board meeting held on 14 May 2003

The agenda for the meeting of the Academic Board on 14 May 2003 may be accessed on the web: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/>

4.1 Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG)

The Academic Board approved the establishment of the Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) Joint Committee of the University of Sydney and University of New South Wales (UNSW) Academic Boards to oversee the proposed Executive Master of Public Administration (EMPA) and recommended that Senate approve in principle the proposal to jointly award the degree with UNSW.

The Academic Board had previously been advised of the University's membership of ANZSOG and the proposed degree, noting that the Faculty of Economics and Business had been asked to review the unit of study proposals, and the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee had been asked to review the overall course proposal.

The Joint Committee would recommend to the respective Academic Boards and Senates that the universities offer a jointly-badged degree, collaborate on the units of study offered towards the degree, and establish the selection criteria for candidates.

4.2 Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the examination process for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The Academic Board approved the amendment of the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the Examination Process for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy to provide for the Sub-Committee to provide for the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee, or in the absence of the Chair the Chair's nominee, to have the Sub-Committees power under section 4(21) where the faculty recommendation was that the candidate be required to revise and resubmit the thesis for examination and, following the required consultation process, the candidate had agreed with the faculty recommendation.

4.3 Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase Two

The Academic Board agreed to include the processing of higher degree theses for examination as an item in the Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase Two.

4.4 Cessation of PhD Candidature

The Research Committee of the Academic Board provided a report relating to the cessation of PhD candidature in response to an issue raised at a previous meeting.

At the February 2003 meeting of the Academic Board, a query was raised about when PhD candidates ceased to be enrolled, and at what stage the completion of a PhD was counted. The Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) agreed to seek confirmation about the status of a PhD candidate once a thesis had been submitted for examination and whether enrolment ceased at that point.

The Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) advised that for the purposes of reporting the University student load to DEST, a student's enrolment automatically ceased on the date they submitted their thesis. However DEST only monitored load at the census dates at the end of March and August so if a student handed in their thesis mid semester, they still contributed to the University's enrolment statistics for that semester. Due to DEST reporting requirements, a student was unable to remain enrolled until they were granted their PhD or Masters (Research). This meant that students were not liable for various fees to cover the examination period.

For some other purposes eg. the award of Sesqui postdoctoral fellowships, the University considered thesis examination must be complete and finalised (i.e. an applicant must have been formally notified by the Dean of the Faculty that the degree had been awarded) before an applicant was considered to have completed.

It was also noted that external granting agencies for example the ARC, considered the date that the degree was finally conferred as the point at which the degree was complete for the purpose of identifying applicants for postdoctoral fellowships and for determining eligibility for Early Career Status.

Agenda Item 5 Report of the Chair

5.1 The use of parallel teaching of postgraduate and undergraduate students in postgraduate courses

The issue of the use of parallel teaching of postgraduate and undergraduate students in postgraduate courses has recently been raised again.

I provide for your information:

- Email from Dean of Graduate Studies to Deans of faculties
- Email from Chair of Graduate Studies Committee to Deans of faculties

17

18

Please note that we will revisit this issue and I will ask each faculty representative to give a brief report on compliance with the policy at the meeting.

5.2 Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG): Executive Master of Public Administration

At its last meeting, the Graduate Studies Committee discussed the proposal for the new course in association with the Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG), the Executive Master of Public Administration.

The Committee agreed to recommend that the ANZSOG Joint Committee address the concerns identified by the University of Sydney Graduate Studies Committee relating to the proposed introduction in 2003 of the new course, the Executive Master of Public Administration, jointly-badged with the University of New South Wales prior to making a recommendation to the respective Academic Boards, and that the report to the Joint Committee be circulated to members for comment.

Some feedback was received and minor amendments were made to the report before it was referred to the Joint Committee.

5.3 Postgraduate Co-ordinators Workshop

I remind members that the second semester workshop is on Friday 29 August. The format for the workshop will be revised based on feedback received and previous discussions.

5.4 Payment of costs to external examiners

At its March meeting, the Graduate Studies Committee discussed the payment of expenses for external examiners and agreed that the Chair would investigate the background of the issue and discuss matters further with the Sydney College of the Arts, Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) and Dean of Graduate Studies (Resolution 08/03 refers).

At the last meeting, I advised that this meeting had not yet occurred but that it was anticipated that it would take place before this meeting of the Committee.

I can now report that this meeting will occur in mid-July.

Email from Dean of Graduate Studies to Deans of faculties

From: DOGS

Sent: Tuesday, 10 June 2003 8:11 AM

To: Deans, PVC(R), PVC(CST), PVC(CHASS), PVC(CHS), Chair Academic Board, Chair GSC

Dear Colleagues

I have been informed by SUPRA that there is some 'rumbling' amongst our postgraduate coursework students concerning co-teaching of postgraduate courses. This means delivering undergraduate material to students as part of a postgraduate program.

My understanding is that this matter is of great concern to the Academic Board and it has been raised at the Academic Board reviews of some Faculties. Professor Les Field has written to Professor Judyth Sachs (Chair, Academic Board) and has raised this issue with her, in particular in relation to its potential to become a Quality Assurance issue.

I would be most grateful if you could look into this matter and ensure that the Academic Board policies are strictly adhered to.

Many thanks and kindest regards

Masud

Professor Masud Behnia
Dean of Graduate Studies
University of Sydney

Email from Chair of Graduate Studies Committee to Deans of faculties

From: Russell Ross

Sent: Tuesday, 10 June 2003 10:21 AM

To: Deans, PVC(R), PVC(CST), PVC(CHASS), PVC(CHS), Chair Academic Board, DOGS

Dear Deans,

I have no idea of the extent of the 'rumbling' from SUPRA, however, the Academic Board has had since 1998 a very clear policy on this issue. It is possible that the rumblings come from students unaware of the University's policy on parallel teaching of undergraduates and postgraduates.

It is also possible that some Faculties are not complying with the policy, in which case we do need to rectify the situation urgently.

Given that there are some rumblings, it may be helpful to you to recall that there are very tight guidelines on when undergraduates and postgraduates can be taught in the same classroom. These were adopted by the Academic Board in 1998.

The focus of the policy is to ensure that postgraduates are not taught via undergraduate units of study, a practice known as "parallel teaching".

The policy does not have a concern about undergraduates being allowed to join a postgraduate unit of study provided they satisfy prerequisites. The policy also explicitly limits "undergraduate" to exclude honours year classes.

In brief, the policy does not allow parallel teaching except with prior approval of Academic Board's Graduate Studies Committee. Even then, there are very tight upper limits on what Graduate Studies can approve. The following extract from the policy states these limits:

Approval will be at the Committee's discretion and where that discretion is exercised, and subject to section (d) below, the following upper limits be prescribed for the amount of undergraduate coursework that may be included, viz, 25% for Graduate Certificate programs, 12.5% for Graduate Diplomas and nil% for coursework Master's. For students who progress through an articulated set of programs, these limits will apply at the first stage of their articulation, and in the subsequent levels of articulation the limits will be nil%.

The full policy can be found at:

http://db.usyd.edu.au/policy/policy_index.stm

I shall also put this on the agenda for the next meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee and ask your colleagues who represent each Faculty to give a brief report on compliance.

Regards

Russell

Associate Professor Russell Ross
Chair, Graduate Studies Committee
Academic Board

Agenda Item 6 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee

6.2 Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting held on 3 June 2003

The Committee met on 3 June 2003 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, M Harding, P Jones 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 3 June 2003.

6.2.2 First quarter report of 2003

21-24

The Sub-Committee considered the First quarter report of 2003 and that there were still a significant number of examinations taking longer than four months, and that the major reasons given were delays in appointing examiners and delays in receiving reports from external examiners. It was also suggested that department and school heads and supervisors should be informed that statistical information was collated on examination results and times and that this information was seen by both Academic Board and Senate.

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee:

- (1) *note the first quarter report of 2003 of the PhD Award Sub-Committee; and*
- (2) *refer the issue of performance indices such as the length of time taken to nominate examiners to the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee for consideration of the development of guidelines for good supervisory practice; and*
- (3) *request faculties to advise departmental/school heads and supervisors that statistical information on examination results and times are regularly collated and that this information is seen by both the Academic Board and Senate; and*
- (4) *give consideration to the issue of ensuring that external examiners are prompt in returning their reports,*
as set out in the report presented.

6.2.3 Proceedings of the Sub-Committee

(1) Report of the Chair

Members noted that an issue had been raised regarding the timing of submission of appointment of examiner forms and the dispatch of theses for examination. It was agreed that this issue would be raised at the next series of forums for postgraduate students and supervisors.

(2) Report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting

Members noted the following items from the report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting of 19 May 2003:

- faculties were to be asked to report annually on the number of oral examinations conducted and the number of theses submitted electronically;
- amendments had been recommended to section 78 of the *University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999* to allow the early submission of a thesis in exceptional cases; and
- the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee was considering whether a maximum timeframe should be introduced for the completion of emendations.

(3) Doctor of Philosophy

(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 seven candidates and resolved:

- (i) to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, without further qualification, in one case;
- (ii) to approve the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, subject to emendations, in two cases;
- (iii) to require revision and resubmission for examination in three cases; and
- (iv) to recommend the appointment of a fourth examiner/assessor in one case.

(b) Appointment of Examiners

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

(4) Doctor of Education

(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 revision and resubmission for examination.

First quarter report of 2003

1. Awards at faculty level

The first quarter report from faculties to the Sub-Committee on PhDs awarded at faculty level for the period 1 January to 31 March 2003 is tabulated below, with complete reports from faculties attached (pages 21 – 57). No PhDs were awarded at faculty level for this period by the faculties of Architecture, Nursing, Rural Management, and Veterinary Science, the Australian Graduate School of Management, the Sydney College of the Arts and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music.

Faculty	Award	Award subject to		Percentages		
		Typographical corrections	Emendations	Award	Typographical corrections	Emendations
Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources	1	-	-	100%	-	-
Architecture	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arts	4	5	14	17%	22%	61%
Dentistry	-	-	-	-	-	100%
Economics & Business	5	-	2	71%	-	29%
Education & Social Work	2	3	1	33%	50%	17%
Engineering	1	4	8	8%	31%	61%
Health Sciences	1	-	4	20%	-	80%
Law	2	-	-	100%	-	-
Medicine	1	1	18	5%	5%	90%
Nursing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pharmacy	-	-	1	-	-	100%
Rural Management	-	-	-	-	-	-
Science	-	2	14	-	12%	88%
Veterinary Science	-	-	-	-	-	0
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCA	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	17	15	63	18%	16%	66%

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 1 January to 31 March 2003 tabulated below:

Faculty	Award	Typographical corrections	Emendations	Revise and resubmit	Non-award
Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources	-	-	-	-	-
Architecture	-	-	-	-	-
Arts	1	1	5	2	-
Dentistry	-	-	-	-	-
Economics & Business	-	-	1	-	-
Education & Social Work	-	-	-	-	-
Engineering	-	-	-	1	-
Health Sciences	-	-	-	1	-
Law	-	-	-	-	-
Medicine	1	-	2	1	-
Nursing	-	-	1	-	-
Pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-
Rural Management	-	-	-	-	-
Science	-	-	-	-	-
Veterinary Science	-	-	-	-	-
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-
SCA	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	2	1	9	5	0

3. Total awards year to date

The year-to-date report on PhDs awarded at faculty level or recommended by the 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, Food & Natural Resources	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-
Architecture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arts	5	6	19	2	-	16%	19%	59%	6%	-
Dentistry	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Economics & Business	5	-	3	-	-	63%	-	37%	-	-
Education & Social Work	2	3	1	-	-	33%	50%	17%	-	-
Engineering	1	4	8	1	-	7%	29%	57%	7%	-
Health Sciences	1	-	4	1	-	17%	-	66%	17%	-
Law	2	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-
Medicine	2	1	20	1	-	8%	5%	83%	4%	-
Nursing	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Pharmacy	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-
Rural Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Science	-	2	14	-	-	-	13%	87%	-	-
Veterinary Science	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	19	16	72	5	0	17%	14%	64%	4%	0%

4. Summary of examination times, first quarter 2003

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 17% of degrees were awarded in three months or less, 18% in four months, 32% in five months, 13% in six months and 20% 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, Food & Natural Resources	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Architecture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arts	-	-	7	7	4	4	-	1	-
Dentistry	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Economics & Business	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	1	1
Education & Social Work	-	2	2	1	1	-	-	-	-
Engineering	-	1	1	6	1	2	-	-	1
Health Sciences	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	-
Law	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Medicine	1	8	1	3	2	2	1	1	1
Nursing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Rural Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Science	-	3	2	7	3	1	-	-	1
Veterinary Science	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AGSM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conservatorium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1	15	17	31	11	10	1	3	5

Agenda Item 7

Report of the Postgraduate Coursework Sub-Committee

7.2 Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee meeting held on 2 June 2003

The Committee met on 2 June 2003 when there were present: The Chair (Dr M Boughton) presiding, Associate Professor A F Masters and Dr M Rogerson. Drs G Ryan and S Willcock (proponents) and Miss K Neveltsen were in attendance.

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 2 June 2003.

7.2.2 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

(1) Faculty of Medicine: Master of Medical Education, Graduate Diploma in Medical Education and Graduate Certificate in Medical Education

The Faculty of Medicine proposed to introduce the new courses Master of Medical Education, Graduate Diploma in Medical Education and Graduate Certificate in Medical Education from 1 January 2004.

The courses were designed to equip students with the knowledge and understanding to meet the changing global environment of medical education. This would be achieved in the broader context of teaching and learning for change within higher and continuing medical education.

The academic rationale arose from changing expectations in health professional education and reflected the wider changes that were occurring globally within the higher and continuing professional education sectors. These included: changes in healthcare delivery systems and their implications for learning and teaching; public and professional demand for more relevance in educational programs for the health professions; demands from funding bodies and government for accountability and quality education; new approaches to curriculum.

Radical changes in medical education meant that many of the current teachers were unfamiliar with philosophical and practical changes in educational delivery. Examples were the widespread use of problem based learning, the engagement of students in interprofessional learning and the early involvement of undergraduate students in clinical settings.

The Department of Medical Education had participated in a working group of the College of Health Sciences Education Committee to ensure consultation with all Faculties in the College. This had been a critically important step in light of the College Education Committee's intention to foster development of collaborative masters programs with exchangeable units of study across the College, in order to promote interprofessional learning.

External and internal consultation had taken place. In particular discussions had been held within the University including with the Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) to ensure consistency in approach to complement the Institute's Higher Education Program, especially since some medically qualified students undertaking the ITL Grad Certificate were expected to move into the Masters program in the Faculty of Medicine.

The Deans of the faculties of Nursing, Pharmacy, Dentistry and Health Science had indicated in-principle support. The Acting Dean of the Faculty of Education and Social Work and Social Work, Associate Professor Gerard Sullivan, had organised a consultative group to ensure that opportunities for cross-listing relevant units of study were maximised.

The full courses proposal is available on the University's intranet at:

<http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/committees/CworkSC/2003docs/MMedEd%20proposal.pdf>

During discussion, the Sub-Committee discussed in particular, the issue of introducing a College-wide suite of courses as had been initially indicated in the proposal.

Members noted particular issues including nomenclature, administration, proliferation of courses, discipline-specific demand and course structure. It was agreed that the Sub-Committee would raise the issue of College-wide courses with the Deans of the faculties concerned and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Health Sciences) for further consideration, but that if a consensus was not reached, the current proposal would be recommended to the Graduate Studies Committee.

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report relating to the Faculty of Medicine proposal, as set out in the report presented.

7.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

The Sub-Committee had no other proceedings to report.

Agenda Item 8

Report of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee

8.2 Report of the Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee meeting held on 27 May 2003

The Committee met on 27 May 2003 when there were present: The Chair (Associate Professor R Ross) presiding, Professors M Behnia, J Carter, L Field and R Graycar and Associate Professors J Christodoulou, A F Masters and L Unsworth. Miss K Neveldsen was in attendance.

8.2.1 Receipt of Report

The Sub-Committee **recommends** that the Graduate Studies Committee receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 27 May 2003.

8.2.2 Termination of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) candidature

The Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee recommends that the Graduate Studies Committee require faculties to report to the Dean of Graduate Studies on decisions to terminate a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) candidature.

At present the provision of the *University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999* (as amended), the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the examination procedures of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and the procedures outlined in the Postgraduate Research Studies Handbook allow for the consideration of a candidate's progress by the faculty.

The determination of whether a candidate's progression is satisfactory or not is made by the faculty or college board and is subject to the University's guidelines. There is no explicit requirement for a faculty to advise the Graduate Studies Committee of a decision to terminate a student's candidature.

The Sub-Committee was asked to consider whether procedures should be put in place requiring faculties to report on decisions to terminate a student's candidature and/or decisions to require the student to show good cause.

During discussion, the Sub-Committee noted:

- unless an appeal was lodged, the Graduate Studies Committee was not aware a candidature had been terminated, nor was it advised of discontinuations;
- once an effective database was in place information relating to candidature across all faculties would be able to be produced;
- along with the requirement to know that a candidature had been terminated, the Graduate Studies Committee should be advised of the reasons for the termination; and
- the Dean of Graduate Studies should receive and consider the information and provide annual reports to the Graduate Studies Committee, identifying policy issues where necessary.

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee require faculties to report to the Dean of Graduate Studies on decisions to terminate a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) candidature, as set out in the report presented.

8.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

(1) International Postgraduate Student Application Process

The Dean of Graduate Studies (DoGS) has been working with the International Office to review the application forms and procedures for international postgraduate student applications and proposed amendments to the current process.

The Sub-Committee discussed the proposed process and revised application forms, providing feedback to the DoGS and suggested amendments, and noted that further consultation would take place before the new forms and procedure were finalised in July.

(2) International Postgraduate Student Application Fee

The Dean of Graduate Studies (DoGS) has investigated introducing an application fee for international postgraduate students. Consideration was given to practices at other Group of Eight universities and the benefits and drawbacks of introducing a fee. The Sub-Committee noted that the DoGS proposed to introduce a \$100 application fee which would be deducted from the final fees of those students enrolling.

(3) Postgraduate student induction date

The Dean of Graduate Studies (DoGS) advised that the University-wide postgraduate student induction day would take place on Thursday 14 August 2003. Deans from campuses other than Camperdown were being encouraged to provide transport for students in a bid to ensure all new students, and continuing students who were interested, attended.

(4) Appointment of associate supervisors

The Sub-Committee considered the consistency of information relating to the appointment of associate supervisors, particularly the information contained in the *University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999* (as amended), the Code of practice for supervision of postgraduate research students, the Glossary of terms and the Postgraduate Research Studies Handbook 2003: Chapter 8: Supervision – roles and responsibilities and amended sections of the Postgraduate Research Studies Handbook accordingly.

(5) Accreditation of supervisors

The Sub-Committee considered a revised version of the proposal relating to accreditation of supervisors and supervision requirements.

Particular areas of discussion included possible disciplinary issues where a supervisor was not a member of staff of the University; supervisors with conjoint appointments and clinical titles; memorandums of understanding with various institutes; provision of information to external supervisors; training in supervisory practices; and expectations of new staff.

The Sub-Committee agreed that further revision be undertaken and considered at its next meeting.