A meeting of the Board of Graduate Research was held at 2.00 pm on Wednesday 23 September 2015 at 2.00 pm in N54_2.06 and video-conferenced to G34_1.04.

Megan Hoffman
Acting Secretary

MINUTES

PRESENT:
Chair - Professor Sue Berners-Price
Professor Graham Cuskelley
Professor David Lambert (3-4pm)
Professor David Shum
Professor Wendy Loughlin
Associate Professor Sarah Baker
Associate Professor Helen Blanchard
Professor Nigel McMillan
Professor Christine Smith
A/Professor Sarojni Choy (on behalf of Prof Greer Johnson)
Ms Courtney Wright
Professor Liz Conlon
Professor Gerard Docherty
Professor Greer Johnson
Dr Jahangir Hossein

APOLOGIES:

Persons with Rights of Audience and Debate:
Ms Louise Howard
Mr Adam Jones (on behalf of Ms Alyson McGrath)
Professor Andrea Bishop
Ms Megan Hoffman (Acting Secretary)
Ms Kathy Grgic
Dr Eliza Howard
Ms Alyson McGrath
Professor Sarah Todd
Ms Julene Finnigan

Invitees:
Ms Barbara Buckley

1.0 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS
1.1 No conflicts of interest were declared.

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
2.1 The minutes of the 6/2015 meeting of the Board of Graduate Research were taken as read and confirmed, subject to amendment to section 10.6 (Plagiarism Detection Software) and Resolution 10.9 to read: The Director, Library and Learning Services, in conjunction with the Secretary, BGR, as part of the wider framework for managing plagiarism will investigate and provide a technical workflow for the use of Turnitin, for consideration at a future meeting of the Board.

3.0 MEMBERSHIP
3.1 The Board were informed that due to the planned amalgamation of GGRS and the HDR Student Centre, as noted in the Chair’s report, the HDR Student Centre Manager role will be replaced by a new GGRS Director role. Ms Alyson McGrath is no longer in the role of Manager, HDR Student Centre and as such this position will be represented at the Board by the Acting Manager, HDR Student Centre for the remainder of 2015.
3.2 The Board recognised Ms Alyson McGrath’s substantial contribution to the BGR as the Manager, HDR Student Centre, noting that Ms McGrath has been instrumental in driving the system improvements for the management of HDR candidates.

4.0 PRESENTATION – EICP PROJECT: SUPPORTING RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM

4.1 Ms Barbara Buckley and Ms Michelle Wano provided an update on the HDR Lifecycle Project. Ms Buckley detailed the training that has so far been provided to stakeholders leading up to the project release. She advised that feedback from the training sessions has been positive.

Ms Buckley also briefed members on the remaining training activities planned, including one-on-one training sessions to be held with each of the Deans (Research) and the Dean, GGRS. Supplementary training material has also been made available, including training videos.

Ms Buckley also discussed the My Griffith portal which is due to be released on 1 October. She advised that feedback has been provided by Ms Courtney Wright, HDR Student Representative on how best to engage with candidates upon implementation. Members were informed that training videos for frequently used forms are being developed and a number of promotional events are planned.

Members discussed the roll out of the HDR Lifecycle Project and provided feedback as follows:

- It is anticipated that there will be an increase in enquiries from supervisors once they view details of their HDR candidates via their portal, for example if they are no longer supervising a candidate. Such enquiries should be referred to the relevant officer in the HDR Student Centre in the first instance.
- Issues have been raised in regard to online thesis submission as a result of a changeover from the manual process with paper based forms, to the on-line system. The issues are currently being addressed through further consultation.
- In the week leading up to the go-live date, candidates have been advised by the HDR Student Centre to hold off handing in their Intention to Submit form where possible in order to assist the transition to the new on-line process.
- There is a plan in place for the completion status of the early and mid-candidature milestones to be updated by the HDR Student Centre, who will be contacting the Elements/Groups to obtain completion data. This data audit is a priority in order to ensure candidates are not prevented from lodging their Intention to Submit form.
- As the thesis is now submitted on-line, the requirement for candidates to meet with the Dean (Research) upon submission was queried. The Chair recommended that this meeting should still remain as part of the process as it is an important way of recognising and celebrating the candidate’s achievement. The purpose of this meeting could be amended to also be a mechanism for candidates to provide formal feedback on their HDR experience at Griffith.
- The option for thesis examiners to request a printed copy of the thesis was discussed. Members agreed that examiners should have the option to request a hard copy of the thesis. The process, including the responsibility for the cost of printing, will need to be addressed. Members suggested that printing should occur at Griffith to ensure a complete thesis is provided, as opposed to examiners being asked to print it themselves. A review of the processes adopted by other institutions with an on-line thesis examination system was suggested in order to inform our process.

The Chair formally acknowledged the excellent work undertaken by Ms Buckley and her team in progressing the HDR Lifecycle project.

Resolution
4.2 The Chair will work with the EICP team to revise the wording around the thesis submission process on the online system regarding the revised purpose of the meeting between the Dean (Research) and the candidate that currently takes place at the time of thesis submission.

4.3 The Chair will meet with the EICP team to make sure there is capability in the online system to provide a hard copy of a thesis to an examiner upon request.

SECTION A: RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS TO ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

SECTION B: ACTION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

5.0 HDR CONFERRALS

Resolution

5.1 The Board ratified the list of HDR Conferrals included with the agenda.

SECTION C: RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS TO OTHER COMMITTEES

6.0 MINIMUM FACILITIES AND RESOURCES TO BE PROVIDED TO HDR CANDIDATES

6.1 A review of the guidelines for the ‘Minimum Standard of Resources, Facilities and Other Support’ has been undertaken by the Griffith Graduate Research School with the rationale of ensuring that:
   • HDR candidates are appropriately resourced; and
   • The standards are in line with best practice across the sector; and
   • The standards are able to be implemented by the Groups.
   This review has encompassed Group HDR candidate financial models and recommendations resulting from this review have been drafted.

6.2 The Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor is engaged in ongoing discussion through Executive Group regarding the budget and funding implications in moving towards finalising and implementing the recommendations. The Board was advised that, as such, its role in considering the review document, recommendations and amended ‘Minimum Standard of Resources, Facilities and Other Support’ document is to review the recommendations in relation to their alignment with best practice and their potential provision of a financial support system that is fair and consistent, where appropriate, to HDR candidates.

6.3 Members were asked to consider the ‘Review of HDR Candidate Financial Support Models’ document and included recommendations. Members provided feedback as follows:
   • In terms of a financial model, it would be strange to find complete consistency across all fields within a University. However, there are baseline figures that should be consistent.
   • At admission, the HDR Convenor signs off on the section relating to the Element possessing the resources to support the candidate through to completion. Given financial delegations, should the Head of Element be involved in this process?
   • It would be beneficial to learn more about the Sciences model for research allowance allocation as identified in Recommendation Two, particularly how it is administered (including the responsible officer signing off on allowance amounts) and potential difficulties in implementation.
   • There is the potential in the Sciences model for research allowance allocation for the supervisor team to ‘expand’ the vision of what is actually necessary for the project.
• The Sciences model may be hard to calculate costs in advance in terms of budget allocation.
• Calculation in advance of research allowance on the basis of the expected cost of the research project is problematic in terms of the sorts of projects often undertaken in the humanities and social sciences.
• It would be important that each Group develop their own guidelines for allocation of research allowance that could stem from the Sciences model but with Group-specific features.
• With regard to Recommendation Three, GBS includes computer provision in the research allowance amount as a way of offering choice to their candidates, as often candidates do not wish to use a University asset, and could spend that allowance on other costs. However, there are licensing issues with regard to the practice of candidates to ‘bring their own’ computer – some software is licensed to only be available on Griffith assets.
• Recommendation Four should also state that a co-ordinated approach to this co-funding is required, to address current inconsistencies across Elements in terms of distribution of funding.

6.4 Members endorsed the recommendations as contained within the ‘Review of HDR Candidate Financial Support Models’, subject to:
• Recommendation Two is to be amended to include ‘It is recommended that Group-specific guidelines be developed to support this model.’
• Recommendation Five (first sentence) is to be amended to read ‘A coordinated approach for conference funding be adopted within Groups to ensure that all candidates are provided an opportunity to apply for such support.’

6.5 Feedback to the amended ‘Minimum Standard of Resources, Facilities and Other Support’ document was received in advance of the meeting and included the following comments:
• Clarification is required with regard to the process of implementing amendments to the minimum standard document – will changes (including to financial support) apply to commencing candidates, or to all candidates irrespective of the stage of their candidature?
• If substantial amendments to financial support arrangements are agreed to, is there a case for phasing these changes in over a couple of years?
• the research allowance allocation per candidate is on the basis of maximum candidature time periods. Should we default instead to periods of time that are more in line with our expectations for thesis submission or allocated on a yearly basis?
• It is suggested that HDR candidates include in their confirmation document a budget for proposed expenditure for the remainder of their enrolment but the HDR Convenor may not be the appropriate officer to sign off on this.
• The reference to remote candidates in the Research Allowance section of the document suggests that they may use the allowance for ‘travel associated with the program’ – is it appropriate that they use this to fund costs to travel to meet supervisors here or should this allowance be for other purposes than that?
• Clarification requested regarding the statement that ‘the allowance… is normally allocated annually with any unused funds rolling over to the next year’ – does this mean that the allocation is to be split by year and only the sum for each year is allocated in that year?
• Regarding the conference attendance section, it perhaps should be highlighted that funding may also be available from Research Centres and Institutes (however any allocation would need to be made in consultation with the Element or Group.
• With regard to the reference in the conference travel funding section to masters candidates being supported for conference attendance at the discretion of the Group, should this be amended to stating that if a masters candidate wants to use her/his research allowance for conference attendance they will need approval of the Dean (Research) – given that there is no funding provision at Group level to support this.
- It is suggested that the wording ‘candidate’s entitlements’ in the Orientation section be amended to ‘the resources and facilities to which the candidate will have access’.
- Under the Compliance and Performance section, greater clarification is requested with regard to the form that the proposed annual report will take? There is a concern regarding the onerous nature of this kind of reporting.
- The question was raised as to the requirement of having a compliance section in the document – this is included as a best practice function and there needs to be a mechanism for feedback in the process to ensure both that standards are being maintained and that they continue to be achievable in terms of implementation for all Groups.

Resolution

6.6 The Board resolved to endorse the recommendations as contained within the ‘Review of HDR Candidate Financial Support Models’ and as amended based on feedback from the Board, for consideration by Executive Group.

6.7 The Board resolved that the ‘Minimum Standard of Resources, Facilities and Other Support’ document be further amended to incorporate feedback, for consideration at the next meeting of the Board.

SECTION D: MATTERS NOTED, CONSIDERED OR REMAINING UNDER DISCUSSION

7.0 THESIS AS A SERIES OF PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED PAPERS

7.1 The information on the HDR website pertaining to the inclusion of publications within the body of a HDR thesis was amended following feedback received by the Board (6/2015). The information has been amended to include more explicit requirements for candidates, supervisors, and thesis examiners.

7.2 Members were asked to consider and provide any feedback on the proposed changes to the HDR website ‘Thesis as a series of published and unpublished papers’. Members were also asked to provide feedback on the template to be used for additional or varied Group/Element requirements. Members provided feedback as follows:

- The requirements for the inclusion of papers should refer to the expectation of what the thesis is required to demonstrate, i.e. independent research. If inclusion of papers does not support this, for example if there are several co-authors for each paper, then it may not be appropriate to present the thesis in this format.
- Amend order for status of papers to read ‘A thesis may include papers that have been submitted, accepted for publication, or published’.
- Further clarity on the authorship requirement for the candidate to have made a substantial contribution to the intellectual content of co-authored papers is required.
- A sector scan is required in order to determine if jointly authored papers should require just the corresponding author, or all authors, to sign the authorship declaration.
- Further amendment to the copyright section required, as per feedback provided by the Director, Library and Learning Services.
- Further information on ‘predatory journals’ should be added, not just open access journals.
- A range of example Table of Contents should be included. Whilst it would be preferred to use Griffith examples, it was noted that examples do not exist for all Groups. As such we should create our own exemplar table of contents, similar to the University of Melbourne examples.
- Each of the Groups will need to develop their own Group/Element requirements through their HDR Convenor meetings.

Resolution
7.3 The Board resolved that the information on the HDR website pertaining to the inclusion of publications within the body of a HDR thesis be further amended to incorporate feedback provided, for consideration at the next meeting of the Board.

7.4 The Board resolved that Groups use the template for the provision of Group-specific requirements for the content and formatting of a thesis that includes published papers to document draft Group requirements for consideration at the next meeting of the Board.

8.0 HDR PUBLICATIONS

8.1 The agenda item pertaining to the number of Griffith HERDC eligible outputs where a HDR candidate is listed as an author was held over for discussion at the next meeting of the Board.

9.0 CHAIR’S REPORT

9.1 GGRS and HDR Student Centre Workplace Change
The Chair updated members on the planned amalgamation of GGRS and the HDR Student Centre. She advised that the HDR Student Centre Manager role will be replaced by a new GGRS Director role. The restructure will occur following the appointment of the GGRS Director.

9.2 PhD Industry Experience Program
Businesses are now invited to submit details of proposed projects for the PhD Industry Experience Program by Wednesday 30 September. Groups were requested to liaise with their industry contacts to invite them to submit a proposal through the EoI process. The program will be launched to HDR candidates on 8 October and is open to domestic candidates only.


9.3 Advance Qld PhD scholarships
Advance QLD top-up scholarships have been advertised with a closing date of 23 October 2015. Eligibility includes the requirement for candidates to spend at least 50 per cent of their PhD physically located with an industry/end user organisation. Griffith has not been involved in the development of this initiative and as such the terms and conditions of the top-up scholarship will now be considered by the Legal Services Unit. Once this has been completed, the scheme will be advertised on the HDR website.

9.4 Tropical Research Network Conference
The Tropical Research Network Conference will be held in Cairns from 2-5 November 2015. We are planning on sending up to three candidates to the conference. Information for candidates will be placed on the HDR website shortly.

9.5 International Student Barometer (ISB) Presentation (2/09/2015)
The ISB presentation in 2013 provided some negative feedback about HDR management and the GGRS. Change stemmed from this feedback including the new induction process. This year there was only a 17% response rate to the survey. Results indicated that the propensity to recommend Griffith to others has decreased slightly from 2014. For the question ‘How long do you think it takes from applying to receiving a response’, the average number of days given was 69, which is ahead of the national average and the IRU. For overall satisfaction, the average was 86%, which is higher than the national average and the IRU.

Members were asked to note the institutional response to the consultation questions that was submitted to ACOLA. Members were advised that the ACOLA review panel will be attending the ACGR meeting being held in November.

9.7 Scholarship Overpayments
As an action from the HDR Student Lifecycle internal audit, supervisors are to be made aware, and to educate their candidates, of a candidate’s responsibility to notify the HDR Student Centre if they are being overpaid their scholarship. If an error has been made, the candidate will be required to pay back any overpayment. The HDR Student Centre are reviewing processes to best ensure that administrative errors do not occur.

10.0 HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH STUDENT CENTRE REPORT

10.1 The Acting Manager, HDR Student Centre presented the HDR Student Centre report.

11.0 HDR CONVENOR MEETINGS

11.1 Members noted the minutes of the AEL HDR Convenor Committee meetings held in July 2015.

12.0 HDR LOAD REPORT

12.1 Members noted the HDR Load Report as at 17 September 2015.

13.0 OTHER BUSINESS

13.1 The agenda item pertaining to the extension to maximum submission date approval process was held over for discussion at the next meeting of the Board.

14.0 NEXT MEETING

14.1 Members noted that the next meeting of the Board of Graduate Research will be held on Wednesday 28th October 2015 at 2.00pm in N54_2.06 and video-conferenced to G34_1.04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Allocated Venues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 October 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G34_1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Meeting Scheduled for November</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 December 2015</td>
<td>N54_2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G34_1.04</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
28 October 2015
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