A meeting of the Board of Graduate Research was held at 2.00pm on Wednesday 13\textsuperscript{th} May 2015 in N54_2.06 and video-conferenced to G34_1.04.

MINUTES

PRESENT:  
Chair - Professor Sue Berners-Price  
Professor David Lambert  
Professor Gerard Docherty  
Professor Graham Cuskelly  
Associate Professor Sarah Baker  
Associate Professor Helen Blanchard  
Professor Kate Hutchings  
Professor Liz Conlon  
Professor Wendy Loughlin  
Professor Nigel McMillan  
Professor Greer Johnson  
Ms Courtney Wright

APOLOGIES:  
Dr Jahangir Hossein

Persons with Rights of Audience and Debate:  
Ms Cathy McGrath (for Ms Kathy Grgic)  
Ms Julene Finnigan  
Professor Andrea Bishop  
Ms Louise Howard  
Ms Alyson McGrath  
Dr Eliza Howard  
Ms Megan Hoffmann (acting secretary)

1.0 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

1.1 Associate Professor Sarah Baker declared a perceived conflict of interest with regard to her position as a member of the Board of Graduate Research. The conflict of interest raised by A/Prof Baker was that her partner is a doctoral candidate in the Griffith Business School. A/Prof Baker’s declaration was noted by the Board with the Chair advising that, as decisions of the Board are not made in respect of particular HDR candidates, a conflict of interest situation is unlikely to occur.

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

2.1 The minutes of the 2/2015 meeting of the Board of Graduate Research were taken as read and confirmed.

3.0 MEMBERSHIP
3.1 The Board welcomed Professor Andrea Bishop, Director of the Office of Research, to the Board.

SECTION A: RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS TO ACADEMIC COMMITTEE
Nil

SECTION B: ACTION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

4.0 HDR CONFERRALS
Resolution
4.1 The Board ratified the list of HDR Conferrals included with the agenda.

5.0 HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION ASSESSMENT AND AWARD POLICY
5.1 Members were asked to consider proposed changes to the Higher Degree Research Scholarship Application Assessment and Award Policy (2015/0000054). The policy has been amended in order to align with the Student Review and Appeals Policy. Amendments include reference to the scholarship conditions of award, particularly in regard to termination of scholarship and the decision makers, and the right of award holders to appeal against a decision made in respect to their scholarship.

5.2 Members approved the amendments and requested further amendment be made to the policy, specifically to the wording included in Research Outputs Standards Table in Section 6 (“Other Grounds for Honours Equivalence”) in order to address issues of clarity around the requirements for creative outputs.

Resolution
5.3 The Board resolved to approve tabled amendments to the Higher Degree Research Scholarship Application Assessment and Award Policy (2015/0000054), for immediate implementation.

5.4 The Board resolved that further amendments be made to the wording included in Research Outputs Standards Table in Section 6 (“Other Grounds for Honours Equivalence”) in order to address issues of clarity around the requirements for creative outputs, with the amendments to be considered at a future meeting of the Board.

SECTION C: RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS TO OTHER COMMITTEES
Nil

SECTION D: MATTERS NOTED, CONSIDERED OR REMAINING UNDER DISCUSSION

6.0 ACHIEVING HDR COMPLETION TARGETS
6.1 At the 2/2015 (March) meeting of BGR, members considered and endorse a proposal to implement strategies that will assist to achieve Higher Degree Research completion targets. An action plan to implement the strategies was developed, following this endorsement.

6.2 Members considered the Achieving HDR Completion Targets Action Plan and provided feedback as follows:
Item 1) vi. (‘Consider offering top-up scholarships to attract high quality applicants’) – anecdotal evidence from GBS suggests that this action may not be effective with regard to achieving completions. Members suggested that such a top up scheme has historically seemed more effective as a strategy for ‘poaching’ applicants within the University than attracting high quality external applicants. It was suggested that funding may be better spent at the end of candidature (i.e. completion scholarships/publication scholarships, both of which are schemes that the University has introduced). In terms of responsibilities, members suggested that if such a scheme was implemented it should be strategies as opposed to ad hoc and, as such, the SDCV may be accountable.

Item 1) – members suggested that this item as a whole must involve central marketing and recruitment in terms of accountability for implementation and it was agreed that an additional sub-item be included to address the coordination of a targeted approach to the marketing of higher degrees by research.

Item 2) i. – clarification was requested as to the ‘appropriate action’ to be taken against candidates who are identified as unlikely to complete on time. There was consensus that Griffith was very generous with our scholarship recipients and suggestion was made that we should consider tightening how we use funding from the budget for scholarships.

Supervisors are implicated in the issue of on-time completions. Inaccurate supervisor expectations as to the requirements and scope of completing a PhD thesis must be addressed. It was suggested to include a sub-item under Item 3) addressing the implementation of a training workshop for supervisors on HDR completion strategies.

The encouragement by some supervisors for candidates to take on significant workload outside of the research project needs to be addressed. Inclusion of Item 3) iii. (‘Investigate setting KPIs for Elements on HDR completion times’) should work to address this issue.

In Item 2) v. the status of “Under Review” is not specific enough and needs to be accompanied by specified action taken – to accomplish this we should develop an early intervention strategy and accompanying processes. It was suggested that we expand criteria and review processes around which candidates can be picked up for not making satisfactory progress as part of the early intervention strategy.

Item 2) xi – the GBS model of requiring candidates who are requesting a long period of leave to submit a detailed completion plan before leave is approved was discussed as a useful strategy to employ to target keeping these candidates on track.

Item 2) xii. – the School of Humanities implement a peer mentoring scheme where a newly commencing candidate is ‘buddied’ with a candidate who has passed confirmation.

Item 3) vi. – members suggested leaving this item in the draft action plan for executive consideration.

Resolution

6.3 The Board resolved that amendments be made to the Action Plan, as per the feedback outlined in 6.2, and that the Chair provide the amended plan to the Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor for discussion with Executive Group.

7.0 HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH POLICY

7.1 Members were asked to consider proposed changes to the Higher Degree Research Policy. The Chair noted that some amendments within the policy were yet to be finalised as feedback from Academic Services needed to be incorporated into the policy document. The sections requiring further revision were:

- Section 8.8 (Enrolment Status) – clarification required around how RTS requirements impact on the definition of academic load in order to finalise the representation in the policy of full-time and part-time load for HDR candidates.
• Section 8.13.2 (Sick Leave) – approval delegation for periods of leave to be clarified and simplified.
• Section 9.4 (The Examination) – the approval delegation for the decision to provide a fail outcome or award a Masters in lieu of a Doctoral Degree requires review.
• Section 10 (Eligibility to Graduate) – this section was amended to align with the Student Review and Appeals Policy however, further amendment is required to ensure that content is applicable for higher degree by research candidature and completion requirements.

7.2 Members suggested that an additional amendment be made to provide a definition of administering supervisor in the Definitions Section of the policy.
7.3 It was noted that the Credit for Prior Learning Policy will need to be updated to reflect amendments made to Section 7.6.3 (Credit for Coursework) of the Higher Degree Research Policy.

Resolution
7.4 The Board resolved to endorse amendments to the Higher Degree Research Policy, withstanding those sections requiring further amendment as set out in 7.1 and 7.2. Further amendments will be tabled at a future meeting of the Board for recommendation to Academic Committee.

8.0 SCHEDULE OF RESPONSIBILITIES

8.1 Members were asked to consider proposed changes to the ‘Schedule of Responsibilities and Authorisation for Research Training Matters’. The Schedule had been amended in order to align matters and decision makers with the Higher Degree Research Policy and the Higher Degree Research Scholarship Application Assessment and Award Policy. Further amendment has been made to include a summary of the approving authorities and their delegates.

8.2 The Chair noted, as per the Higher Degree Research Policy, some amendments within the Schedule were yet to be finalised as feedback from Academic Services needed to be incorporated into the document. Amendments to the Schedule would flow on from revisions made to the Higher Degree by Research Policy, as identified in 7.1 above.

Resolution
8.3 The Board resolved to endorse amendments to the ‘Schedule of Responsibilities and Authorisations for Research Training Matters’, withstanding those sections requiring further amendment as a result of revisions to the Higher Degree by Research Policy as set out in 7.1. Further amendments will be tabled at a future meeting of the Board for recommendation to Academic Committee.

9.0 HIGHER DOCTORATES BY PUBLICATION POLICY

9.1 At the 9/2014 Board meeting, members endorsed amendment to the Higher Doctorates by Publication Policy which were subsequently approved by Council.

9.2 Following this approval, members were asked to confirm the following matters in regard to the change of program name from PhD by Publication to PhD by Prior Publication as follows:
• Change of program name and the award title to the Doctor of Philosophy by Prior Publication
• Change of award abbreviation to PhDPriorPub
• Transition arrangements (5 candidates currently enrolled in the program). The new program and award title applies only to candidates admitted subsequent to the changes being approved. However, candidates currently enrolled in the
program at the time of the changes were approved may either remain in the existing program or transfer to the new program. Candidates who are admitted or transferred to the new program shall graduate with the new award title.

9.3 Members considered these matters. There was concern with regard to the effect on the appearance of the testamur if the award title was changed to Doctor of Philosophy by Prior Publication. Clarification was sought with regard to the wording on the current testamur for the PhD by Publication Program as there was conjecture as to whether the award listed currently was ‘Doctor of Philosophy’ or ‘Doctor of Philosophy by Publication’. Subsequent to the meeting, it was confirmed that the current wording on the testamur is ‘Doctor of Philosophy’ (without the inclusion of ‘by Publication’) however, this wording is not compliant with University policy which requires the award title (as reflected on the testamur) to be the same as the program title. This policy stipulation is in compliance with TEQSA requirements that program and award titles are transparent and easily matched.

Resolution

9.4 The Board resolved to recommend that the matters raised regarding the program name and award name for the current Doctor of Philosophy by Publication program be further considered for resolution at a future meeting of the Board.

10.0 CHAIR’S REPORT

10.1 HDR Training – Promoting Best Practice

The Chair reiterated that this will be a standing item on the agenda in order to use BGR as an avenue to promote best practice that is occurring in research training across the University. The Chair reported on initiatives that she was made aware of at a HDR Candidate Representative meeting the day before, specifically, the existence of a research student society in the School of Accounting, Finance and Economics and the development of a training program in AEL to assist particularly international candidates with their presentation skills by providing a safe practice environment for presentation rehearsal and feedback. The Menzies Health Institute provides similar training for presentation skills.

10.2 Implementing Good HDR Supervision Practices

The Chair, by invitation of Professor Adam Shoemaker, attended the Deans’ Forum recently and participated in a discussion about academic workload. The Chair then liaised with Mr Ken Greedy, Associate Director Strategic Services – Employment Strategy, to discuss how to approach the implementation of HDR Supervision as a criterion in academic performance review and promotion documentation. It was suggested that it would be useful to benchmark against other universities in order to develop an approach.

Professor Martin Betts has convened a working party that is looking at including the criteria of Engagement in academic performance review documentation. The outcomes of this working party may provide a useful model to assist with an approach to incorporating HDR supervision.

10.3 Student Review and Appeals Policy

The Student Review and Appeals Policy currently in effect was approved at Council, but bypassed the Board of Graduate Research on its way through approval channels. As a result of its approval, HDR policies need to be amended in order to ensure alignment (refer Agenda items 5.0, 7.0 and 8.0). The Chair asked members to note that this revised policy is in effect and highlighted features:

- A key focus in the review of the policy was clarity around the role of decision maker and reviewer of decisions.
- Revisions were brought in part on advice from the Qld Ombudsman
- With regard to HDR Admissions, Dean GGRS is the decision maker and it will no longer be possible for an application to be rejected at Dean (Research) level.
- Revision delineates between decisions that can be reviewed only and decisions that, following review, can be put forward to an appeal body.

10.4 DDoGS Conference, 20 – 21 April

DDoGS is now called the Australian Council of Graduate Research (ACGR) and it has now been incorporated. The Chair discussed key elements from the most recent DDoGS conference, including a presentation on doctoral training centres in the UK and what Australia can take from this model. There were also discussions around quality supervision and timely completions.

There was no attendance by a representative from the Department of Education and Training at this meeting however, a representative from the Department of Industry and Science attended for a discussion of the Boosting Commercial Concerns paper. As a member of the ACGR Executive, the Chair will be attending a meeting at the Department of Industry and Science regarding initiatives arising from this paper.

10.5 International Student Research Forum

The Chair provided a brief overview of the International Student Research Forum, including Griffith's participation in this year's forum. There are six delegates from Griffith Sciences and four delegates from the Health Group attending the forum. The Dean (Research) Health is in the process of organising a meeting with the delegates before they attend the forum to provide an opportunity to rehearse their presentations.

10.6 Accreditation of HDR Supervisors

There is anecdotal evidence to indicate that academic staff are being provided supervisor accreditation status without having attended the requisite development workshops to warrant this status. The Chair asked for feedback on this issue from members. Members provided feedback as follows:

- GBS have not seen evidence of this occurring within the Group – supervisors, regardless of number of completions, cannot be a sole Principal Supervisor without having attended the workshops (they can only be a Co-Principal).
- It was questioned as to whether we currently have a robust enough system in place to ensure supervisors are not 'slipping through the cracks' with regard to the requirements of accreditation.
- There is also evidence of transitionally accredited supervisors being added to supervisors teams for candidates in the final year of the program, apparently with the intention of allowing that supervisor to claim a completion.
- It was questioned as to what data is available to Groups to assist with regard to providing a supervisor's accreditation status when nominating panels. It was noted that, in the online application process, HDR Convenors can see a supervisor's accreditation status when they are selecting supervisors from the list.
- In terms of the EICP project, there is nothing currently in the pipeline specifically to address supervisor accreditation, however the Chair advise that if there are ongoing issues, they will be addressed in the next phase of the project.

10.7 HDR Scholarship Allocation Working Party

The Scholarship Allocation Working Party minutes for the March 2015 meeting are included as an attachment to the agenda. The development of a ranking system is continuing to progress through the direction of the working party however it is a very complex process and is taking time. It is proposed to implement training and further refinement of the scoring scheme and ranking process after the mid-year round by drawing upon the round to test the scheme and train HDR Convenors in the scoring process. After this process, the Working Party will reconvene to identify amendments to the scheme and refinements to the process as a result of the mid-year round process and post-round workshop with HDR Convenors.
The Working Party is also developing a proposal for the separation of domestic and international applicants in the ranking within current rounds and are reviewing our rounds system in general.

10.8 **Online Admissions**

The online admissions system has now gone live. Online forms are due to go later in August and then the HDR Portal in September but the EICP team may amalgamate these two activities and go live with them both in September.

11.0 **HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH STUDENT CENTRE REPORT**

11.1 The Manager, HDR Student Centre presented the HDR Student Centre report. Members were asked to note that numbers of scholarships applications are up compared to the same period last year. The Chair thanked the Higher Degree by Research Student Centre Manager for the inclusion in the report of the breakdown per Group in relation to scholarship applications. Members noted that, within the 2014-2015 period, 36 from 161 theses under examination were identified as having at least one conflict of interest in the appointment of examiners.

12.0 **OTHER BUSINESS**

12.1 **Nomination of Examiners Form**

The Nomination of Examining Panel Form has been amended to address the high number of conflict of interest cases in the appointment of examiners. It provides clarity in relation to accountabilities for identifying and responding to perceived and real conflict of interest cases. It will be the responsibility of the Dean (Research) to identify and address conflict of interest in the appointment of examiners.

Members considered the amended Nomination of Examining Panel Form and provided feedback as follows:

- Amend point 2.5 to include the wording “or has advised on the work” after the phrase “… any person who has made a contribution to the work”.
- Point 2.6 – the wording here is much softer than the policy in terms of the appointment of an international examiner. The wording could be tightened in line with the policy, but with the flexibility to make exceptions.
- Point 2.12 – “Supervisors must not informally” – this should be changed to “Supervisors must not formally”.
- There was suggestion that the identifying of conflict of interest in the appointment of examiners could occur through an audit process as opposed to a compliance process due to the lower risk and the fact that a compliance approach is onerous and resource intensive. There was agreement with approach with consideration given to the fact that the volume of examinations is much more than it was a couple of years ago and a compliance approach is unsustainable. An audit approach may be effective with further amendment to the form to assist in the management of the process.

12.2 Amendments as per the feedback detailed in 12.1 will be made to the Nomination of Examining Panel form, with the form to be implemented with immediate effect following these changes.

**DUE TIME CONSTRAINTS THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE NOT CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING AND WILL BE ADDRESSED AT FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE BOARD:**
13.0 **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY – HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH STUDENTS**

14.0 **HDR PATHWAY PROGRAMS – GRADUATE DIPLOMA OF RESEARCH STUDIES & GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN RESEARCH STUDIES PROGRAMS**

15.0 **NEXT MEETING**

15.1 Members noted that the next meeting of the Board of Graduate Research will be held on Wednesday 10 June 2015 at 2.00pm in N72_-1.18 and video-conferenced to G34_1.04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Allocated Venues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 March 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 May 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June 2015</td>
<td>N72_-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 September 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 October 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Meeting Scheduled for November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Allocated Venues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 December 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings are held from 2.00pm - 4.00pm and are video-conferenced at the Gold Coast and Nathan campuses.

Minutes confirmed by:

Professor Sue Berners-Price, Chair
15 April 2015
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