



Academic Board Agenda

Academic Board Officer: Keri Neveldsen

Secretariat, Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: admin@academicboard.usyd.edu.au

Web site: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/ab>

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

for the meeting on Wednesday 4 August 2004

	Pages
★ 1. Apologies Additional apologies have been received from: Professors E Blakely, M Field, D Grant, H Kendig, C Murphy, D Richmond and B Roufogalis, Associate Professor I Ramzan, Drs D Collins, N Gallery and M McKerchar and Mrs J Toner.	
12. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee	
12.3 Report of the meeting held by circulation in July 2004	2-5
12.3.1 Receipt of report	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Recommendation</i> That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held by circulation in July 2004.</p>	
12.3.2 Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPA): Method of Award	2, 3-5
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Recommendation</i> That the Academic Board amend the policy "Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPA): Method of Award", as set out in the report presented.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM 12
Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

12.3 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held by circulation in July 2004

The Committee met by circulation in July 2004.

12.3.1 Receipt of Report

The Committee recommends that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of the meeting held by circulation in July 2004..

12.3.2 Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPA): Method of Award

3-5

A special meeting of the Committee of Deans was held recently to discuss a number of issues concerning postgraduate research enrolments and funding. One of the issues addressed was scholarships. Out of that meeting has come a proposal for several changes to the method of award of APAs and UPAs.

The following two changes were recommended for the 2005 round:

1. The allocation of scholarships to Colleges to be based on 50% actual research enrolments of the current year and 50% of completions over the previous two years (Masters and PhD completions weighted 1:2). This compares to using weighted completions only in the 2004 round.
2. To maintain parity between overall standards of award between Colleges, scholarships will not be awarded to any candidates with a final mark more than five points below the highest of the three College cut-offs. This compares to applying the 5-point differential to the second offer round only. If there are insufficient applicants that meet this requirement within a College, scholarships initially allocated to that College shall be re-allocated to other Colleges using the formula as described above.

The proposal was discussed at the Committee of Deans and considered and approved by circulation by the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee. On the recommendation of the Sub-Committee, the Graduate Studies Committee considered the proposal by circulation. While some negative comments were received in relation to proposed change 2 above, the changes were supported by a clear majority of the Committee.

The proposed changes are set out in the attached policy – strikethrough indicates deletions and underline indicates additions.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board amend the policy “Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA) and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPA): Method of Award”, as set out in the report presented.



The University of Sydney

Australian Postgraduate Awards and University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards: Method of Award

Amended by: Academic Board on 4 August 2004

Approved by: Academic Board on 14 August 2002

Date of effect: ~~15 August 2002~~ 5 August 2004

1. Introduction

At its meeting of 14 August 2002, the Academic Board revised its policy relating to the formula for allocating APAs and UPAs to Colleges. There will be two offer rounds. In the first round, scholarships will be allocated to Colleges based 50% on completion rates over the previous two years (Masters and PhD completions weighted 1:2) and 50% on higher degree research load in the current year, subject to there being no more than a five point variance between the College cut-offs. If the variance between College cut-offs is greater than 5 points, second round scholarships will be re-allocated to the other Colleges to bring the variance within 5 points. The second round, which incorporates those offers rejected from the first round will be allocated on a College basis to reserve applicants, subject to there being no more than a five point variance between the College cut-offs. ~~If the variance between College cut-offs is greater than 5 points, second round scholarships will be re-allocated to the other Colleges to bring the variance within 5 points.~~

2. Guidelines

The following guidelines govern the allocation of awards and ranking procedures:

2.1 Allocation of Awards

- (1) After allowing 10 awards to be allocated centrally to cover anomalous cases (see below), the proposed allocation of awards for the 2002-2003 round is as follows:
 - (a) College of Health Sciences: 46;
 - (b) College of Humanities and Social Sciences: 55; and
 - (c) College of Sciences and Technology: 77,
- (2) This allocation is made on the assumption that there will be a total of 188 awards available.

2.2 Anomalous Cases

Anomalous cases will be provided for as follows:

- (1) these scholarships will be allocated by the Postgraduate Awards Subcommittee of the Graduate Studies Committee;
- (2) 10 scholarships will be initially held centrally to cover anomalous cases;
- (3) any of the 10 scholarships that have not been allocated will be distributed using the agreed formula; and
- (4) Anomalous cases would include:
 - (a) students who are already enrolled in higher degrees and whose strong candidature is evident through publications and presentations at national and international conferences; and
 - (b) students who, in exceptional cases, have shown that they would be very strong candidates for PhD study but who would not receive a scholarship through the order of merit system.

Note: The case for the potential for strong PhD candidature will have to be substantiated by a letter from the Head of Department in which the case is defended and justified. Where relevant, there must be a report from the thesis supervisor.

2.3 Ranking Procedures

A broadly similar method of calculating order of merit will be adopted across Colleges. Each College will produce criteria detailing the precise way in which applicants are to be evaluated. Detailed ranking procedures are as follows:

- (1) each Faculty is required to compile a ranking list of supported applicants according to the ranking procedures/protocols detailed by its College, which will be distributed by Research Training, Research Office. Such lists must contain the requisite information about each supported applicant and be ready for examination at the College ranking meetings;
- (2) each College Ranking Committee is to check and combine the faculty ranking lists of all supported applicants into a College Order of Merit list and to verify all anomalous cases put forward by its faculties;
- (3) the Chairs of the College Ranking Committees and Manager, Research Training to meet and discuss/determine:
 - (a) the College ranking lists;
 - (b) the anomalous cases; and
 - (c) the top 5 applicants (for consideration for the award of the A.E. & F.A.Q. Stephens Scholarship, if available)for consideration by the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee.
- (4) The Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee to meet and decide on:
 - (a) the University Order of Merit list;
 - (b) the allocation of awards to applicants under the provisions for anomalous cases;
 - (c) the number of first round offers to be made in each College; and
 - (d) the number of applicants to be put on each College reserve list.

3. Membership of College Ranking Committees and Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee

- 3.1 Each College Ranking Committee shall comprise of one representative from each of its member faculties. The chairperson shall be appointed from among these representatives by the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor (College).
- 3.2 The Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee shall comprise of:
 - (1) the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee who shall be the chairperson; and
 - (2) two members from each College nominated by the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor (College).

4. Responsibility

The Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee will be responsible for decisions about the offer of an APA or a UPA. In this way, flexibility will be maintained so that the University can best utilise the funding available through the APA scheme.

5. Administrative Arrangements

The Research Office will continue to provide administrative support by:

- 5.1 forwarding forms to and answering enquiries from intending applicants;
- 5.2 logging applications on a central database;
- 5.3 preparing sets of papers and forwarding them to departments for evaluation;
- 5.4 preparing the order of merit list and making first and subsequent round offers in accordance with the number of scholarships available to each College; and
- 5.5 preparing and submitting the final report to DEST.

6. **Timetable 2002** (to be confirmed after the dates of Semester 2, 2002 Honours Board of Examiners meetings are determined. For subsequent years, the dates will be adjusted accordingly)

31 October: applications close

by 15 November: applications distributed to faculties;

by 5 December: College ranking meetings;

6 December (morning): College ranking lists due at Research Office;

9 December (morning): meeting of Chairs of College Ranking Committee and Manager, Research Training;

10 December (afternoon): Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee meeting;

12 December: first round offer letters posted by close of business;

6 January 2003: last day to accept first round offers.

7. **Review**

The Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) shall review this policy annually in May and submit any recommendations for amendment to the Graduate Studies Committee for consideration and referral to the Academic Board.