



## CONFIRMED MINUTES

MEETING **CHM/COS HDR Committee**

MEET No. 2/2020

VENUE via Zoom

DATE/TIME Wednesday 27 May 2020, 2pm

PRESENT Anna Cowan (Chair), Helmut Jerjen, Spencer Whitney, Luke Connal, Stewart Fallon, Anne Bruestle, Diana Perriman, Christopher Cvitanovic, Andini Pramano, James Borger, Mark Edwards, Lan Fu, Vivien Silvey, Philip Gibbons, Spencer Whitney, Richard Burns, Patrick Kluth, Cathy Banwell, Mark Krumholz.

APOLOGIES Libbie Dinn, Andrew Almonte, Ben Polkinghorne.

IN ATTENDANCE Emma Sams, Liudmila Mangos

CONTACT Liudmila Mangos, x54520

### ITEM 1 Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed all members in attendance. Anna and Lan introduced Prof Patrick Kluth who will commence the role of the AD HDR at RSPHys from 1 August 2020.

### ITEM 2 Previous minutes Meeting 1, 18 March 2020

The minutes from Meeting 1, 2020 were accepted as an accurate record.

### ITEM 3 Matters arising from the previous meeting

ACTION ID	DETAILS	RESPONSIBILITY	STATUS	NOTES
Meeting 4/2017 Item 5.1 & Meeting 2/2018 Item 4.1	eForms	Committee Members	Ongoing	Any issues with the eForm system to be passed to Luda Mangos, or <a href="mailto:science.hdr.sa@anu.edu.au">science.hdr.sa@anu.edu.au</a>
Meeting 1/2018 Item 4.1 & Meeting 4/2018 Item 4.1	Visa delays	Committee Members	Ongoing	Any significant visa delays should be passed to Luda for collation – to be passed to Dean HDR.
Meeting 2/2019 Item 5.1	Academic Leadership Roles in CHM/COS	Committee Members	Ongoing	Alison to investigate possibility of addition of a visual representation of roles and responsibilities.  Alison to ensure information is available on HDR Community

				Wattle site.
Meeting 2/2019 Item 5.2	Candidate Supervisor Agreement	Committee Members	Ongoing	Continual feedback on the use and usability of the agreement should be sent to Luda Mangos, or <a href="mailto:science.hdr.sa@anu.edu.au">science.hdr.sa@anu.edu.au</a>
Meeting 4/2019 Item 6.2	eForms and engagement with supervisors.	HDR Project Officer	Ongoing	Alison to find out ETA of change request to modify email notifications for overdue milestones.
Meeting 4/2019 Item 6.3	Examination eForm (Divergent reports)	HDR Project Officer	Closed	Alison to send policy link to Committee members regarding Divergent reports procedure.
Meeting 4/2019 Item 6.4	iThenticate License	Chair	Closed	Anna to check with Ann Evans regarding decision to purchase an ANU license for iThenticate.
Meeting 3/2019 Item 5.1	Open Access Thesis Policy discussion	Chair & HDR Project Officer	Pending	It is important that a discussion is held between the student and supervisor regarding IP before Thesis Restriction is requested. ( <a href="https://anulib.anu.edu.au/research-learn/publishing-sharing/open-access">https://anulib.anu.edu.au/research-learn/publishing-sharing/open-access</a> ) Anna to raise this with Ann Evans.
Meeting 1/2020 Item 6.1	Delays with processing of offers in GRO.	Chair	Pending	Anna to check with Ann Evans.

Anna will follow up on pending items with Ann Evans.

#### **ITEM 4 Reports**

##### **4.1 Report from Chair / Deputy Dean (Education)**

Report provided under New Business

##### **4.2 Report from PARSA**

No report provided.

#### **ITEM 5 New Business**

##### **5.1 3MT – online process (for noting)**

It is likely that the University 3MT will go ahead this year in a different format. Students will be asked to record their presentation and submit a video for the judges' consideration. There will be no College final this year. The Committee were asked to consider whether there should be an internal College version of 3MT later this year. It was suggested that Schools can put forward their candidates and buddy them up with other Schools' representatives. It was also noted that the feedback from the students indicated that they would prefer to give 3MT a miss this year. The Research Development team have reported that there has been no interest in 3MT training this year. The Chair proposed that 3MT or an alternative event be reconsidered later in the year.

## **5.2 Oral Exam Pilot (for discussion)**

Anna reported on the decisions from the University HDR Committee regarding the discussion points below.

### **1. Should the Chair of panel be optionally included, or excluded all together?**

Chair of Panel should not be included in the oral examination. It was noted that there is a diverse range of practices across other universities with regards to including Chair of Panel on the oral examination panel.

### **2. Should the Oral Examination Chair be nominated by the DA, or is the DA the Oral Examination Chair for the purposes of the pilot.**

The Delegated Authority or their nominee should be the Chair of the Oral Examination panel. To ensure it is not an additional significant burden for the DA, an HDR Convenor or another person familiar with HDR supervision can be appointed as Chair.

*ACTION:* Anna to discuss with Ann Evans whether Chair of Oral Examination panel should be a level D or E academic.

### **2. How exactly do we make a decision on the outcome?**

**What is your position on the following points:**

- a. The Associate Dean can pre-approve an outcome of pass with corrections to the satisfaction of the DA.**
- b. Pass with no corrections can be made on recommendation of Oral Exam Chair to Associate Dean**
- c. 'Major revisions (re-submit)' can be a recommendation of Oral Exam Chair to Associate Dean**
- d. 'Fail' can be a recommendation of Oral Exam Chair to Associate Dean**

Associate Deans cannot pre-approve the outcome even if it is clear from the written examiner reports. Chair of the Oral Examination committee will recommend an outcome to the Associate Dean.

It was noted that if Chair of the Oral Examination committee is a nominee of the Delegated Authority, they may require training. One on one training can be offered by the R&D team.

### **4. Should the candidate be notified of the outcome on the day of the oral if a pass, or minor corrections are pre-approved?**

To maintain the process of approval, candidates should not necessarily be notified of the above outcome during the oral examination as the Associate Dean who approves the outcome is not part of the Oral Examination committee. The Associate Dean will approve the outcome in the shortest possible timeframe following the oral examination.

### **5. Should the candidate be notified of the recommendation to be made in the case of a resubmit or fail or should they not be notified of the outcome until the Associate Dean has made a decision?**

The Associate Dean needs to make a decision on the outcome of the written examination first. If the written reports recommend "Revise and Resubmit", no oral examination will be undertaken until the thesis has been resubmitted.

Start date of the Oral Examination pilot was originally planned for semester 2 2020 but is likely to be delayed and run in 2021.

Students will opt in to undertake the oral examination with the agreement from their supervisor.

The process for notifying of students opting-in has not yet been developed. Spencer suggested that CoS/CHM provides input into the development of this process.

Oral examinations can be undertaken online via video conferencing means.

An oral examination will take place only if the outcome of the written examination is “Award” or “Award with Corrections”. If corrections have been recommended by the examiners, there is no expectation that the candidate will address every single comment noted in the written reports during the oral examination.

A question was raised about the incentive for students to undertake the oral examination and if students who opt in to do an oral examination would need to complete the Final Oral Presentation milestone. The latter is not yet clear. It was noted that the Final Oral Presentation should be done for expert feedback to improve the submitted thesis and because it also provides an opportunity for the student to give a talk as they should be doing every year as part of their progression.

Some students want an oral examination. One of the advantages is written reports coming back in a timely manner. It also provides the students with a sense of closure and a finite point that they could celebrate with family and friends. A question was asked about training for the examiners and providing them with guidance on what needs to be included in the reports. It is unlikely that such training will be provided and will depend on the Chair.

Concerns were raised about the independence of the examiners. Anna noted that this concern was discussed at the University HDR Committee. The current process of written examination is independent as examiners do not know what other examiners have said in their reports. If examiners have contact during the examination process this can potentially avoid divergence of the reports but at the same time can influence some examiners’ decisions.

Another concern is that there is a risk of the outcome potentially being influenced by Examiners who are more senior and prominent academics. The Delegated Authority makes a recommendation on the outcome of the oral examination to the Associate Dean. If this recommendation is very different to that in the written reports, it would need to be carefully considered.

A question was raised about the option of recording the oral examination. This can be potentially useful for appeals but students may not be comfortable with having the oral examination recorded. All of these questions would need to be considered if the pilot is to go ahead and a broader group would need to be involved in the discussions. It was noted that the decision on introducing the oral examination was made by the University Research Committee rather than HDR Committee.

Vivien noted that students are welcome to approach ASLC if they have any concerns.

### **5.3 Policy: Higher Degree by Research -Candidature (amended version, for noting)**

This policy has been approved and areas have been notified.

### **5.4 Procedure: Higher Degree by Research -Candidature (amended version, for noting)**

This procedure has been approved and areas notified.

### **5.5 Guideline: Minimum allocation of resources (amended version, for noting)**

This guideline has been approved and areas notified.

### **5.6 HDR Admissions Project (amended timeline, for noting)**

The completion timeline for the HDR Admissions project has been pushed back to next year or later. Progress has been affected by the original project manager’s departure from the university. A new project manager has been appointed.

### **5.7 Researcher Development Report (for noting)**

Research Development report has been provided to the committee members. R&D have noted good student engagement with their online courses.

### **5.8 Supervision Development Framework (for discussion)**

The number of Primary Supervisors and Chairs who completed registration training is low – approximately 23% and Colleges are encouraged to improve these numbers. Current unavailability of face to face workshops could be contributing to low engagement. Peter Kanowski will contact the Schools in semester 2 to arrange workshops.

Schools have reported very positive responses from the academics to the face-to-face workshops and that supervisors are starting to pay more attention to HDR processes and procedures. RSPHys normally encourages new supervisors to attend new student orientation sessions but have noticed that now more senior and experienced supervisors are joining these sessions as well.

The feedback from the committee members was that the Pulse Supervisor Training modules were very good and supervisors should be encouraged to complete them.

However:

- Some Schools have had a negative response to the reminders sent to the supervisors, with some supervisors saying that conflicting information was provided.
- Some Schools noted that online modules were adding to overload in the current circumstances.

RSB encourages academics to “reply all” when they respond to the Associate Director to share their opinion about the Supervisor Development training.

It was suggested that it would be helpful to receive statistics on supervisor training completion rates in individual Schools. Emma noted that this information may be coming from Peter Kanowski’s team and will follow up with Justin Wood.

*ACTION:* Emma to follow up with Justin Wood on statistics for each School.

## **ITEM 6 Any Other Business**

### **6.1 COVID-19 Extension Scholarship**

Anna has received several of the COVID-19 extension scholarship applications.

In most cases Schools considered the applications thoroughly. However, in some cases that came to Anna for approval, the case was less convincing and were returned to the Schools, or endorsed but with a reduced period of scholarship.

These applications need careful and equitable consideration. These are difficult times and funding for these scholarships comes from the same pool of money as other university funded scholarships.

Although this scholarship is called a COVID-19 scholarship, some applications were cases where severe disruption was caused by a combination of hail, bushfires and COVID-19.

Schools should submit applications directly to GRO initially and they are then sent to Anna for consideration and endorsement.

The turnaround of the applications by GRO – appears to be quite fast, but Emma will check with GRO.

### **6.2 Information on the process for submitting corrections to the thesis.**

This information is outlined in the eform.

### **6.3 Change of the Associate Director HDR at RSPHys.**

This was the last meeting for Lan who will be stepping down from the role of AD HDR at RSPHys at the end of July to focus on her research and Centre of Excellence. The Committee thanked Lan for her contributions over the years and wished her all the best.

Committee members have been encouraged to email any questions to Anna.

Meeting closed at 3.08pm.

**ITEM 7      Next meeting 5 August 2020**