GRiFFiTH UNIVERSITY

BOARD Of GRADUATE RESEARCH

A meeting of the Board of Graduate Research was held at 2.00pm on Wednesday 22 October 2014 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 Wendy Loughlin
Professor Rod Barrett
Dr Christopher Klopper
A/Professor Helen Blanchard
Ms Courtney Wright

APOLOGIES:
Professor David Shum
Professor Brad Sherman
Professor Kate Hutchings
Professor Nigel McMillan
Dr Jahangir Hossain

Persons with Rights of Audience and Debate:
Mr Tony Sheil (on behalf of Dr Vicki Pattemore)
Ms Julene Finnigan
Ms Alyson McGrath
Dr Eliza Matthews
Ms Loree Joyce (secretary)

Professor Sarah Todd
Ms Kathy Grgc
PVC Information Services

Invitees:

1.0 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

1.1 No conflicts of interest were declared.

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

2.1 The minutes of the 7/2014 meeting of the Board of Graduate Research were taken as read and confirmed.

3.0 MEMBERSHIP

3.1 Nil

SECTION A: RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS TO ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

4.0 HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH POLICY

4.1 Proposed amendments to the Higher Degree Research Policy previously endorsed at the 5/2014 BGR meeting were considered at the 7/2014 (September) Programs Committee (PC) meeting. PC requested further amendment to the policy, including revisions to the review and appeal procedures for admission and termination of candidature decisions.
Members considered the proposed changes to the *Higher Degree Research Policy* based on feedback provided by PC, as well as changes to accommodate variations in Masters Degree (Research) program proposals. Members provided the following feedback:

- Section 9.2 Submission of the Thesis - remove the words ‘…stating that the thesis has been read in its final form…’ as this was also recently removed from the *Code of Practice for the Supervision of Higher Degree Research Students*.
- Section 9.3 Appointment of Examiners - remove the option for Masters Degree (Research) to be examined by two internal examiners. Members advised that the Masters programs should comply with the policy’s minimum requirements for one internal and one external examiner for a Masters thesis. It was also requested that the meaning of internal/external be made explicit i.e. external to the University.
- Section 9.4 The Examination – remove the sentence ‘Where Masters Degree (Research) programs require a grade to be awarded to the research component, this will be specified in the program requirements and examiners advised accordingly’. Members advised that applying a grade would then have policy implications for review of grade, responsibilities of Dean, L & T in this process etc. Members also reiterated that Masters programs should comply with the policy’s requirements for examination outcomes and that exceptions should not be made.
- Amend the next scheduled review year for the policy which currently states 2015.
- Further feedback may be provided by the Manager, Academic Services within the next 7 days.

**Resolution**

4.2 The Board resolved to recommend to Academic Committee that the amended *Higher Degree Research Policy* be approved, subject to further changes as noted in 4.1, for implementation in 2015.

**5.0 NSC NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

**5667 MASTER OF SCIENCE**

5.1 Members, on the recommendation of Programs Committee (7/2014) and the Griffith Sciences Group Board (15 August 2014), considered the proposal to introduce a new Master of Science (5667), as contained in 2014/0004914, for introduction in Semester 2, 2015.

5.2 The School of Natural Sciences proposes to introduce a new 2-year full-time (160CP) Master of Science, designed for both the domestic and international market to provide in-depth training in the student’s area of specialisation. The existing Master of Science with Honours program was deemed to be invalid with regards to the AQF, both in terms of award title and program structure and has been withdrawn. However there remains considerable interest from the open market as well as four different Chinese partner institutions to develop a Masters level program to offer training in the proposed specialisations.

5.3 To be eligible for admission to the *Master of Science* program, a student must hold:

**Clinical and Molecular Microbiology specialisation**

- A BSc with major studies in microbiology in a biological science discipline (biochemistry; biomedical science; biotechnology; molecular biology; genetics; plant science) with an equivalent GPA of 5.0 or better OR
- the Graduate Diploma of Clinical Microbiology (4167) with an equivalent GPA of 5.0 or better. These students will be eligible for 30 credit points of advanced standing towards the Clinical and Molecular Microbiology major in lieu of first year coursework.

**Food Security specialisation**

- A BSc in a relevant science discipline (chemistry, microbiology, food science, plant science) with an equivalent GPA of 5.0 or better.
Medicinal Chemistry specialisation

- A BSc with major studies in chemistry or biological chemistry (biochemistry; organic, analytical, or physical chemistry) with an equivalent GPA of 5.0 or better.

Nanoscience specialisation

- A BSc in a relevant science discipline (chemistry, physics, materials engineering, chemical engineering) with an equivalent GPA of 5.0 or better.

5.4 To be eligible for the award of Master of Science (MSc), a student must acquire 160 credit points as prescribed below:

Clinical & Molecular Microbiology Major

- gain 10 credit points for the prescribed courses;
- gain 30 credit points for the listed elective;
- successfully complete the 120 credit point dissertation.

Food Security Major

- gain 40 credit points for the prescribed courses;
- successfully complete the 120 credit point dissertation.

Medicinal Chemistry Major

- gain 30 credit points for the prescribed courses;
- gain 10 credit points for the listed elective;
- successfully complete the 120 credit point dissertation.

Nanoscience Major

- gain 30 credit points for the prescribed courses;
- gain 10 credit points for the listed elective;
- successfully complete the 120 credit point dissertation.

5.5 In considering the proposal, members provided the following feedback:

- The proposal specifies that the masters research project thesis will be examined by two internal staff members and may include an oral defence. As the examination requirements as detailed in the amended Higher Degree Research Policy will apply to this program, the masters research project will require one internal and one external examiner and to be examined in accordance with the policy.
- Two Griffith staff members are to be appointed to supervise each candidate instead of one as per policy.
- The masters research project thesis maximum word length of 80,000 it quite high noting that an MPhil thesis is up to 50,000 words and a PhD is 100,000 words. It was recommended that the 5,000 words per 10 CP guide should apply, i.e. 60,000 words.
- The admission approval process is to be clarified, as this normally includes the HDR Convenor and Dean (Research) recommendation and Dean, GGRS approval. For this program, the Program Convenor recommendation may also be required, or alternative this responsibility could be delegated to the HDR Convenor.
- Members noted the requirement for both confirmation of candidature and the mid-candidature milestone to be completed by candidates, given that the program is of 2 yrs (160 CP) duration.
- The Chair advised that the implementation of fee-paying domestic HDR places will be considered by Executive Group and upon endorsement the fee bands will be determined thereafter.
- Members discussed the resourcing implications for introducing this program, noting that section 6 advises the administrative resources are to be allocated to the School. As a HDR program, this program will be administered by the HDR Student Centre from admission through to examination. As such resourcing implications for the HDR Student Centre need to be considered and resources allocated accordingly. Due to timing implications it was agreed that resource implications do not need to be addressed prior to endorsing the program proposal but that this should occur at a later date.
5.6 Members provided additional feedback in regard to HDR program proposals:

- The program proposal template requires amendment to include additional information/amended information relevant to HDR programs.
- HDR program proposals need to address administrative resource implications for the HDR Student Centre.
- As previously requested, Deans (Research) need to endorse HDR program proposals prior to progressing to Programs Committee for consideration (either to be considered via Group Boards, or as a separate endorsement).
- A strategy to package Masters Research and PhD program offer letters should be implemented to attract further admissions.

**Resolution**

5.7 The Board resolved that the issues raised as noted in 5.5 are to be addressed in a revised proposal for consideration by the Chair, BGR. Following executive endorsement by the Chair, BGR, a recommendation will be made to Academic Committee to approve:

- the proposal to introduce a new Master of Science (5667), as detailed in the revised proposal (new document number to be provided), in Semester 2, 2015; and
- the program to be accredited by the University for a period of 5 years up to December 2019.

5.8 The Board resolved to recommend that the program proposal template be amended to address the issues raised as noted in 5.6.

5.9 The Board resolved to implement packaged Masters Research and PhD program offer letters.

6.0 **HLS MAJOR CHANGE PROPOSAL**

5626 **MASTER OF MEDICAL RESEARCH**

6.1 Members, on the recommendation of Programs Committee (7/2014) and the Dean (Learning & Teaching), Griffith Health (21 August 2014), considered the proposal for changes to the Master of Medical Research (5626), as contained in 2014/0004619, for introduction in Semester 1, 2015.

6.2 The Griffith Health Executive proposes changes to the Master of Medical Research to resolve a number of issues identified in a recent review of the program. The new Master of Medical Research was approved at the 10/2013 meeting of Programs Committee, but no applications, international or domestic, have been received for the program to date. It is felt that the more involved HDR application process may be discouraging some applicants, particularly international students, from applying for the program. Other issues include the reclassification of the program as a HDR program and the general program structure; which does not provide appropriate recognition in supervising Master of Medical Research students within their Schools. The changes proposed are as follows:

- The program Host will change from the School of Medical Science (MSC) to the Griffith Health Executive (HLS) because of the need to carefully review dissertation proposals prior to approval.
- Additional information be added to attendance mode to clarify coursework requirements and campus locations.
- Admission requirements be amended to clarify Dissertation Supervision requirements.
- A revised program structure.
- The inclusion of the dissertation title on each student’s academic transcript, as approved by Programs Committee as part of the original program proposal, is to remain, as this will clearly identify the student’s area of research to potential employers, HDR assessors etc.
6.3 To be eligible for admission to the Master of Medical Research, a student must fulfil the following criteria:

- hold a Bachelor degree in medical science, biological science, pharmaceutical science or a related health discipline from Griffith University or from another university or institution which is of equivalent standard with:
  - a GPA of at least 4.5 (using a 7.0 scale) over the second and third year of the Bachelor degree OR
  - a GPA of at least 5.0 (using a 7.0 scale) over the final year of the Bachelor degree; OR
  - a GPA of least 4.5 (using a 7.0 scale) over the entire degree with evidence of a completed research project course.

- A candidate whose GPA is below the level prescribed in the admission requirements may apply in writing to the Program Convenor for special consideration for admission to the program.

6.4 No changes are proposed to degree requirements.

6.5 In considering the proposal, members provided the following feedback:

- The requirements as detailed in the amended Higher Degree Research Policy will apply to this program and as such significant amendment to the proposal is required in order to comply with the policy. This includes the admission approval requirements, additional admission criteria, candidature milestones, and thesis examination.
- The admission requirement of varying GPA’s calculated over varying periods of a Bachelor degree requires amendment. A Bachelor degree with a GPA of at least 5 is required.
- As per policy the research thesis will need be examined in accordance with the Higher Degree Research Policy, which specifies one internal and one external examiner and an outcome of pass/fail for this course. The thesis word limit and assessment requirements need to be clarified.
- Two Griffith staff members are to be appointed to supervise each candidate.
- The admission approval process is to be clarified, as this normally includes the HDR Convenor and Dean (Research) recommendation and Dean, GGRS approval. For this program, the Program Convenor/Masters Advisor recommendation may also be required, or alternatively this responsibility delegated to the HDR Convenor.
- The program structure includes the option to complete a part of the research thesis or a listed elective in certain semesters. Clarification is required if this allows candidates to complete a research thesis of varying size. If so this is not recommended as it will produce dissertations of varying length/scope for the same award.
- As the program is of 1.5 yrs (120 CP) duration confirmation of candidature and the mid-candidature milestone should be completed by candidates.
- The Chair advised that the implementation of fee-paying domestic HDR places will be considered by Executive Group and upon endorsement the fee bands will be determined thereafter.
- It was noted that this program change has not yet received Dean R endorsement.
- It was noted that this program may be completed in intensive mode via inclusion of summer semesters in the program structure. Whilst no HDR programs currently offer summer semester enrolment, no issues were identified with this structure.
- Progression rules need to be added to the program (i.e. not permitted to repeat failed courses).
- Are there any implications with the program being hosted by Health executive rather than an Element? How will this work with the separate course structures for the three contributing elements (MSC, MED, PHM)?
- As a HDR program, this program will be administered by the HDR Student Centre from admission through to examination. As such resourcing implications for the HDR Student Centre need to be considered.

Resolution

6.6 The Board resolved that the issues raised as noted in 6.5 are to be addressed in a revised proposal for consideration by the Chair, BGR. Following executive endorsement by the Chair, BGR, a recommendation will be made to Academic Committee to approve
the proposal for changes to the Master of Medical Research (5626), as contained in the revised proposal (new document number to be provided), for implementation in semester 1, 2015.

7.0 EDN MAJOR CHANGE PROPOSAL (2014/0004195)
5608 MASTER OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES RESEARCH
5633 MASTER OF ARTS RESEARCH

7.1 Members, on the recommendation of Programs Committee (8/2014), and the Dean (Learning & Teaching), Arts, Education and Law (15 September 2014), considered the proposal for changes to the Master of Education and Professional Studies Research (5608) and Master of Arts Research (5633), as contained in 2014/0004195, for implementation in Semester 1, 2015.

7.2 The School of Education and Professional Studies proposed changes to the admission requirements for entry into the Master of Education and Professional Studies Research and Master of Arts Research. These changes were proposed as a result of a request from staff from the Higher Degree Research Student Centre, who have asked that the admission requirements for these programs be amended to cater for those students wishing to apply for the program who have completed a coursework Masters degree.

7.3 An applicant for admission to the Master of Education and Professional Studies Research or Master of Arts Research program is required to hold:

- a [Graduate Certificate or Graduate Diploma postgraduate qualification](https://www.griffith.edu.au/committees) with a GPA of at least 5.0 in a related discipline; OR
- a bachelor degree with at least Second Class Honours (Division B) in a related discipline.

7.4 No changes are proposed to degree requirements.

7.5 Members considered the change proposal and endorsed the amendments.

Resolution

7.6 The Board, on the recommendation of Programs Committee (8/2014) and the Dean (Learning & Teaching), Arts, Education and Law (15 September 2014), resolved to endorse the proposal and to recommend to Academic Committee that changes to the Master of Education and Professional Studies Research (5608) and Master of Arts Research (5633), as contained in 2014/0004195, be approved for implementation in Semester 1, 2015.

SECTION B: ACTION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

8.0 HDR CONFERRALS

Resolution

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

9.0 SCHOLARSHIP ROUND SCHEDULE OF DATES

9.1 Members were asked to consider the proposed schedule of dates for the 2015 scholarship rounds. The Chair advised members that they must ensure their availability for the proposed scholarship ranking and selection meeting dates. Members were asked to advise of any issues with the proposed dates within 7 days.
Resolution

9.2 The Board resolved to approve the proposed schedule of dates for the 2015 scholarship rounds one week from the date of this meeting to allow members additional time to confirm their availability.

SECTION C: RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS TO OTHER COMMITTEES

Nil

SECTION D: MATTERS NOTED, CONSIDERED OR REMAINING UNDER DISCUSSION

10.0 DOCTORATES AND HIGHER DOCTORATES BY PUBLICATION POLICY

10.1 At the 7/2014 BGR meeting a prior decision to withdraw the PhD by Publication program (6002) from offer was overturned at the request of the Health Group, on the condition that the Doctorates and Higher Doctorates by Publication Policy be amended. The policy was amended to ensure that only established researchers with substantial international standing in their respective fields are admitted by making explicit the admission and candidature requirements for this program. The program name was also amended in order to avoid any further confusion with the PhD program completed as a series of published or unpublished paper.

10.2 Members considered proposed changes to the Doctorates and Higher Doctorates by Publication Policy and provided feedback as follows:

- The policy name should still be Doctorates and Higher Doctorates by Publication as the PhD by Publication is not a Higher Doctorate i.e. is equivalent to a PhD. Members were advised that AQF advises that another type of Doctorate, the Higher Doctorate, may be awarded by an issuing organisation on the basis of an internationally recognised original contribution to knowledge rather than through the process of supervised independent study. As such the PhD by Publication is a Higher Doctorate.
- Section 1 - Add a statement that the Higher Doctorate programs are not HDR programs i.e. not eligible for RTS, do not count as an HDR completion etc.
- Section 1.2 and 3.1.2 - The statement regarding admission based on research in areas of strategic importance to the University needs to be more explicit i.e. also aligned with supervision expertise/appropriate supervision available. It also needs to be clear who makes the decision about whether an applicant’s research is of strategic importance. Members agreed that the Dean (Research) should provide a recommendation about the applicant’s strategic importance to the Dean, GGRS.
- Section 2.2 - The policy needs to be explicit as to what constitutes principal authorship. Change this to first or primary author with an explanation as to what this means. Also amend the sentence ‘…published in top quality outlets…’ to ‘…published in high quality outlets.’
- Section 2.2 – Amend the sentence ‘…the candidate will normally be advised to complete the PhD program’, to ‘…the candidate will normally not be admitted and will be advised to apply for admission to the PhD program.’
- Section 5.2 – Instead of requiring an ‘introductory statement’, this needs to be more substantial, change to ‘substantial narrative or exegesis’.
- Section 4.4 - Members discussed the candidature duration for this program, noting that income is only generated through payment of fees for each semester of enrolment. Members agreed that the 12 month fee rate should always apply irrespective of whether a candidate duration is shorter than 12 months. Further investigation as to whether this can be applied is required.

10.3 Members were advised that further amendment to this policy will occur for consideration at the next meeting of BGR based on feedback provided by members, as well as any feedback from the Dean (Research) Health who was an apology for this meeting.
Resolution

10.4 The Board resolved to recommend that the Doctorates and Higher Doctorates by Publication Policy be further amended based on feedback provided for consideration at the next meeting of the Board.

11.0 PRINCIPLES TO PROMOTE EXCELLENCE IN HDR SUPERVISION PRACTICES

11.1 The ‘Principles to Promote Excellence in HDR Supervision at Griffith University’ were endorsed at the 7/2014 meeting of the Board. Members were asked to consider how the principles will be applied and what strategies should be implemented to embed the principles in various University processes. The Chair advised that feedback and recommendations from BGR regarding the strategies to embed the principles will be conveyed to the Senior DVC.

11.2 Members considered implementation strategies detailed in the ‘Principles to Promote Excellence in HDR Supervision at Griffith University’, as well as HDR Supervision Peer Review discussion document titled ‘Enhancing the Quality of Griffith University HDR Supervision through Standards, Processes, and Responsibility: HDR Supervisor Peer Review’ developed by the HDR Director GBS and the Director (L&T) Science. Members were advised that a summary of strategies implemented at other institutions could not be provided as there were no examples obtained of other institutions conducting formal supervision reviews. The Chair advised that supervision practice is on the agenda for the next meeting of the Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies (DDoS) to be held in November and as such she will report on the outcomes of this item at the December meeting of BGR.

11.3 Members discussed the strategies and provided the following feedback:

- Supervision practices vary considerably and perhaps this is why such strategies have not been implemented at other institutions. You cannot be prescriptive as to what is a measure of good supervision as this would need to allow for different supervision styles, differences across disciplines etc. It is also not appropriate to make judgements on relationships between students and supervisors where, for example, a poor personal relationship is not necessarily a reflection of poor supervision practices. The Science Group already has a process to provide peer feedback. Strategies to embed or measure supervision practices is not supported, other than for supervision training purposes.

- Embedding the principles is also about providing positive feedback to supervisors, not just negative feedback. Further, in discussing supervision practices with candidates they are clear as to what makes a good supervisor and the criteria are quite generic.

- How will supervisors benchmark themselves against best practice when they don’t know what best practice is. We need to start with the principles and implement strategies to be able to establish what is occurring in the Groups so that discussions can occur regarding the practices that are to be encouraged etc. We also need to add value to the supervision team and not individual supervisors, or individual supervisor and candidate relationships.

- The principles are useful, especially for new supervisors, in providing guidelines and concepts of what needs to be considered when recruiting or supervising HDR candidates. However the principles should not be implemented as ‘best practice’ as this will not suit all supervision models or styles and it is too difficult to define and measure what best practice is i.e. a tyrannical supervisor with a difficult candidate is not the best supervision model but the model that is needed in that case. Even if metrics are used as a measure of supervision i.e. completion times, publications produced etc., it is still difficult to judge a supervisor’s performance based on this as there are too many variables and possible circumstances beyond the control of the supervisor. If supervisors are to be required to address their HDR supervision performance as part of their ASPR or promotion criteria based on something
prescriptive, it is likely that supervisors would just develop/copy some standard text to comply with what a good supervisor looks like.

- The principles are great for training purposes and encouraging good supervision practice, particularly for new supervisors. It would be useful to add descriptors about some good supervision models for training purposes, however if and how the principles can be embedded is not clear.

- What makes a good supervisor is quite generic, for example it is someone who is adaptable and flexible and considers the candidate’s needs, and there is a good fit between the supervisor and candidate’s research. Agree with the principles and in terms of guiding and training the principles are fantastic. However there are certain principles that a candidate would place more emphasis on. In measuring supervision performance there would need to be a differentiation based on the supervisor’s role i.e. principal, associate. Any feedback to be provided by candidates should not be a tick box, but instead candidates should provide descriptive feedback based on the principles. There would be an issue in cases where candidates do not have a good relationship with their supervisor and would therefore not feel comfortable providing feedback – particularly where supervisors are not supervising many candidates and anonymity could not be maintained. Instead of candidates providing feedback, supervisors themselves could justify/reflect on how they have met each of the principles.

- Parallels should not be drawn between the ‘Principles to Promote Excellence in HDR Supervision at Griffith University’ and the ‘Principles to Promote Excellence in Learning and Teaching Practices at Griffith University’, and how these principles are implemented as they are not the same.

- Diversity of supervision practices is acknowledged in the introduction to the principles. They are meta level principles that should be able to be applied at the generic level and need to be applied within this context. The principles provide a broad guide or framework to be able to reflect on supervision practices and measure performance. To assess if you are a good supervisor you would need to write some narrative and support it with evidence. The principles are generic enough to cater for all supervisors, however it is applying the principles in context to cater for various supervision styles, models, relationships etc. that is critical.

- The goal is to embed good supervision practices at the University, whether this be to embed the principles or for another strategy to be adopted. Performance as a HDR supervisor should be taken into account for staff review or promotion and should include either a reflective statement, metrics or both. It is not possible to promote and develop a culture of good supervision at the University unless it is incorporated into University processes.

- Further discussion needs to occur as to how good supervision practices can be considered as part of staff performance review and promotion processes. If this is to occur the language used is important and should be about ‘reflection’ or ‘review’ and not ‘monitor’. Principle 6 to ‘Monitor & Improve’ should be amended to ‘Review & Improve’.

- Immediately following the meeting the Chair recommended that the Excellence in HDR Supervision Working Party reconvene to discuss the strategies to embed good supervision practice at the University. The Chair of the working party supported this recommendation. As an initial task the ASRP and Performance criteria documentation should be reviewed to determine if or how HDR supervision practices are currently addressed, and to recommend amendment to such templates as appropriate.

**Resolution**

11.4 The Chair, BGR on behalf of the Board resolved that the Excellence in HDR Supervision Working Party reconvene to discuss strategies to embed good supervision practice in University processes. Recommendation(s) of the working party will progress for consideration by either BGR or the Senior DVC as appropriate.
12.0 MINIMUM FACILITIES AND RESOURCES TO BE PROVIDED TO HDR CANDIDATES

12.1 The minimum facilities and resources provided to HDR candidates requires review to ensure that HDR candidates are resourced appropriately and to ensure the requirements reflect current practice and can be accommodated within each Group.

12.2 Members noted the current HDR candidate minimum facilities and resources requirements as well as the facilities and resources provided at some other institutions. The Chair advised that the Senior DVC wants to ensure the Groups are providing HDR candidates with the support required and for the minimum requirements to be very explicit as to what the support should be. She further advised that the current requirements will be amended for consideration at the next meeting of the Board. Members were invited to provide comment in regard to the minimum requirements in order to inform amendments.

12.3 The Dean (Research) AEL advised that we need to ensure the capacity to support HDR candidates in the Groups can be achieved. The space available in each of the Groups and determining capacity for growth it critical. In the future, admissions should be directed to areas where there is capacity for growth.

Resolution

12.4 The Board resolved that the minimum facilities and resources provided to HDR candidates is to be amended for consideration at the next meeting of the Board.

13.0 LOAD AND COMPLETION DATA – SECTOR COMPARISON

13.1 Members considered an analysis of the number of Griffith HDR completions compared to the HDR Load against select Go8 and IRU Universities. The Chair asked members to note Figure 3 which shows completions vs load as a linear pattern. Each institution is sitting on this line except for Griffith as our number of completions are proportionally lower to our load. As such, the focus should be to increase the number of completions rather than continuing to increase load. It was noted that there are underlying issues resulting in a proportionally lower number of completions at Griffith such as our high part time load as well as the recent substantial increase in load. However we can still extract from this analysis the approximate load we need to achieve to produce x number of completions. Strategies in place to support completions such as milestones, scholarships, and the EICP HDR Lifecycle project will all assist in supporting completions. The strategy to continually increase load may instead shift to a steady load state with a strategy for directing student admissions into particular research areas/elements, along with continuing to support timely completions.

14.0 CHAIR’S REPORT

14.1 Compliance with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)

There are items on the agenda relevant to AQF compliance (HDR Policy and Program Changes).

14.2 Sanctions Compliance Policy & Process Flowchart

Training workshops for staff assessing HDR candidates from sanctioned countries were held on 20 and 21 October. The workshops consisted of a morning information session targeted at staff in those areas of research where there is risk, and an afternoon workshop to assess HDR applicants with staff who currently have, or are likely to have, applicants from sanctioned countries.
14.3 Conference Travel Grant Round 2, 2014 Selection Meeting

The round 2, 2014 Conference Travel Grant Round selection meeting was held on 14 October 2014. The revised guidelines implemented with effect from this round resulted in a lower number of eligible applicants being received due to the amended criteria, including the requirement to have completed two years of full-time candidature. This allowed all applicants to be awarded a grant, as opposed to prior rounds where the success rate was very low. This was also assisted by Global Mobility who provided $250 for each applicant. Many of the grants were also awarded on the condition that their Element also provide some support for their travel. The travel grant guidelines will be further revised for implementation in 2015 and will include the requirement for all applicants to be co-funded by their Element (as well as by GGRS and Global Mobility). Further amendment may also be required to ensure candidates are being funded to attend good quality conferences only.

14.4 Fees for Domestic HDR Candidates

The HDR Program Pathways Working Party recommendation to introduce domestic HDR fee-paying places will be considered at the 22 October meeting of Executive Group. Following endorsement the fee bands will be then be determined.

14.5 PhD Employment Experience Program – Media Release

The Department of Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts (DSITIA) media release to promote the outcomes of the PhD Employment Experience Program reported on the positive experiences of candidates as well as those involved in supervising the projects for this pilot scheme. This scheme will now be offered to additional institutions and extended to industry. Agreements to establish the program with industry are currently being developed.

14.6 Griffith University Indigenous Australian Postgraduate Research Scholarship

The Griffith University Indigenous Australian Postgraduate Research Scholarship (GUIAPRS) scheme will now be funded 100% by GGRS instead of the prior requirement for a 50% contribution by the relevant Group. There is also no set number of GUIAPRS to be awarded each year and will be determined based on the number of quality applications received each year.

14.7 Three Minute Thesis Competition

The winner of Griffith’s 2014 Three Minute Thesis Competition was Leah Coutts, PhD candidate in the Queensland Conservatorium. The runner up was Helen Leung, PhD candidate in the School of Languages and Applied Linguistics. The undergraduate award went to Honours student Madison Kelly from the School of Medical Science, and the People’s Choice Award went to Jane Remington-Gurney, PhD candidate in the School of Human Services and Social Work.

15.0 HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH STUDENT CENTRE REPORT

15.1 The Manager, HDR Student Centre presented the HDR Student Centre report. She also tabled a document detailing the scholarship application data for the annual scholarship round. It was noted that there has been a slight increase in the number of domestic applications received from the previous year (increase of 4.6%) and overall a reduction in the number of applications received (decrease of 3.6%). It was also noted that the number of applications received for the Health Group have increased by 65.6% from last year. This may be due to strategies implemented to target Health research areas, such as the additional scholarships offered by the Health Group.
16.0 HDR CONVENOR MEETINGS

16.1 Members noted the minutes of the GBS HDR Convenor Committee meeting held in July 2014.

17.0 HDR SCHOLARSHIP ALLOCATION WORKING PARTY

17.1 Members noted the minutes of the 2/2014 HDR Scholarship Allocation Working Party meeting held on 16 September 2014.

18.0 OTHER BUSINESS

19.0 NEXT MEETING

19.1 Members noted that the next meeting of the Board of Graduate Research will be held on Wednesday 10 December 2014 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></td>
<td>Nathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Meeting Scheduled for November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 December 2014</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
10 December 2014
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans, Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Gerard Docherty</td>
<td>Ex Officio (AEL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor David Shum</td>
<td>Ex Officio (HTH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor David Lambert</td>
<td>Ex Officio (GSC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christopher Klopper</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Kate Hutchings</td>
<td>Appointed (BUS)</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Rod Barrett</td>
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<td>Two years, up to 31 December 2015</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Professor Nigel McMillan</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Brad Sherman</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Career Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jahangir Hossain</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>Two years, up to 31 December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Courtney Wright</td>
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<td>Two years, up to 31 December 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Academic Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Loree Joyce</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Alyson McGrath</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Vicki Pattemore (or nominee)</td>
<td>Director, Office for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Dr Eliza Mathews</td>
<td>Graduate Education Officer, GGRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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