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AGENDA

This is to confirm that the next meeting of the Board of Studies for the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) will be held on Wednesday 13 March 2013, 10.00 – 11.30am, in the Chancellor’s Room, Winthrop Tower.

Part 1 of the agenda is to be dealt with en bloc by motion of the Chair. Part 2 of the agenda has items for decision to be dealt with en bloc by motion of the Chair. Part 3 items are for discussion and decision. A member may request the transfer of an item from Parts 1 or 2 to Part 3.

Sylvia Lang
Executive Officer

______________________________________________________________________________

WELCOME
The Chair will welcome members to the first meeting of the Board of Studies for the Bachelor of Philosophy (Hons) degree course for 2013.

APOLOGIES
The Chair will record any apologies. Members are reminded that apologies should be forwarded to the Executive Officer prior to the meeting.

DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
The Chair will invite members to declare potential for conflict or perceived conflicts of interest, if applicable, with regard to items on the agenda.
PART 1 – ITEMS FOR NOTING

1 PRINCIPLES AND RULES FOR THE OPERATION OF COMMITTEES – Ref F12202

In early 2006 the Executive, Deans and Chair of the Academic Board accepted the recommendations in the report of a “Working Smarter Through Committees” working party commissioned by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the Executive Director (Academic Services and Registrar) to investigate ways of streamlining and improving committee processes without compromising collegiality.

In accordance with Recommendation 9 of the working party’s report – That the University’s principles and rules for the operation of committees are distributed (as part of the agenda) to all committee members and the Chair explicitly address these at the first meeting of each year – the principles and rules are attached together with the University Committee Members’ Code of conduct. (Attachment A)

For noting.

2 ENROLMENT DATA: COMPARISON OF DEGREE-SPECIFIC MAJORS AND SECOND MAJORS

Attached for members’ information are details of degree-specific major (MJD) and second major (MJS) choices of BPhil(Hons) students in 2012 and 2013 (correct to 22 February 2013). (Attachment B)

3 GLOBAL CHALLENGES, RESEARCH AND LEADERSHIP GCRL1000

Attached for members’ information are the following:

- GCRL1000 2012 Analysis of Outcomes
- GCRL1000 2012 Focus Group Report (Dr Elaine Lopes)
- GCRL1000 2012 Report for Teaching and Learning Committee
- GCRL1000 2013 Unit Outline

(Attachment C)

4 BPHIL(HONS) RESEARCH TRAINING THROUGH THE RESEARCH PLACEMENT AT LEVEL 2

Attached for members’ information are the following:

- BPhil(Hons) Research Training through the Research Placement at Level 2 Background Paper
- BPhil(Hons) Level 2 Research Placement Guidelines

(Attachment D)

5 RESEARCH INITIATIVES: IN THE ZONE CONFERENCE

Attached for members’ information is a summary report of participation by BPhil(Hons) students in the In the Zone Conference.

(Attachment E)

6 STUDY ABROAD SEMESTER/EXCHANGE PROGRAMS IN THE BPHIL(HONS)

Attached for members’ information is a briefing paper entitled Study Abroad Semester/Exchange Programs in the BPhil(Hons) provided by Associate Professor Jenna Mead.

(Attachment F)
PART 3 – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION

7 PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE COURSE RULE 15 AND DEVELOPMENT OF TERMINOLOGY CONCERNING PROGRESS STATUS – REF F

At its meetings held on 7 December and 10 December 2012, the Academic Progress Review sub-Committee recommended as follows:

(a) that Rule 15 as set out in the attachment (Attachment G) be revisited and in particular section 15(1); and

(b) that appropriate terminology concerning progress status be developed for the BPhil(Hons).

In relation to recommendation (a), the Board expressed the view that the introduction of a Credit grade as the primary criterion for progression, evidenced by its position in the rule, conflicts with Rules 15(2) in which the criterion is a WAM from the best six results. The Board also pointed out that, at its September 2012 meeting, it was argued that the criterion in 15(2) acknowledges that broadening units may not represent a student’s strengths. Further, in the view of the Board, the Board’s acceptance that the criterion in 15(2) be used over a two year period, to enable students to adapt and mature in the context of university learning, adds weight to that criterion being the primary one for progression.

In relation to recommendation (b), the Board pointed out that the categories nominated in Rule 15 are not the same as those applied in mainstream degrees.

Attached are the minutes of the meeting of the Academic Progress Review sub-Committee held on Friday 7 December and Monday 10 December 2012 (Attachment H).

8 PROPOSED NEW UNIT: BPHL3000 Ref F37916

Attached for members’ consideration is a new unit proposal form for BPHL3000. (Attachment I)

9 SUMMER RESIDENCE 2013

The Academic Coordinator for Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours), Associate Professor Jenna Mead, will be invited to report on the 2013 Summer Residence for BPhil(Hons) students.

Attached are:

Schedule of Events (Attachment J)
Student Evaluation (Attachment K)
Principles for the Operation of Committees

While the committee structures provide a suitable framework, it is the members of the committees who determine whether good governance and better practice standards are actually achieved and ensure that the committee is adding value.

General:

1. *Collegiality*: The Committee system is transparent and consultative, and all staff have the opportunity to provide meaningful input into decisions that significantly affect them.

2. *Working Smart*: Committee time is used in ways which make the most efficient and effective use of staff time to deliberate on significant issues and policies.

3. *Good Conduct*: Committee members abide by a Code of Conduct that requires them to be appropriately informed and prepared before the meeting so that they can contribute to the decisions of the committee.

4. *Review*: All committees are regularly reviewed in relation to both the performance of committee business and committee members.

Functional:

5. *Policy Decisions*: Committees are, wherever possible, engaged in establishing policies and rules within which individual staff can manage and administer University business.

6. *Management Decisions*: Committees are involved in management and administrative decisions as close to the activity as is compatible with legislative requirements.

7. *Communication*: Committees are used to provide a contextual framework within which University policies are developed and decisions are made.

8. *Membership*: Committee membership ensures the broad University community, in all its diversity, is reasonably represented. However, individual committees are not constituted to represent every possible interest group and the number of members should be kept as low as practicable.

*Revised on 16/02/2006*
Academic Policy Services

Rules for the Operation of Committees

Establishment and Review of Committees:

1. Committees are to have a constitution that clearly describes the purpose and operation of the committee including membership, Chair, function, decision-making and communication lines, quorum and conduct of meetings.

2. Mechanisms for reporting the business of each committee should be made clear at the time of establishment of the committee.

3. Committees should establish a review regime addressing the frequency and nature of the review process and the allocation of responsibility for conducting and acting on the review.

Conduct of Meetings:

4. Meetings should only commence with the appropriate quorum. If the meeting is inquorate the meeting can be cancelled and business dealt with by circulation or discussion can take place in committee mode with recommendations ratified at the next meeting or by circular.

5. Meetings should be held in accordance with constitution. However, the committee should not meet simply because a meeting has been scheduled rather only when there is important business to transact. If business is limited, consideration should be given to circulating items with the Chair’s recommendation rather than to deferring items to a later meeting.

6. Items brought to the committee for a decision for noting or for communication should be relevant to the business or role of the committee. Consideration should be given to holding a joint meeting of two committees when there is an item of interest for more than one committee. When it is clear that the committee has insufficient knowledge to add value to a decision, then other means of processing the decision should be found within existing policy and legislative provisions.

7. Where decisions are to be referred to other University committees then meeting dates should be scheduled to facilitate the efficient flow of business to these committees.

8. There should be an opportunity at the start of each meeting for members to declare any potential or perceived conflict of interest in respect of any item and where appropriate to absent themselves from discussion and/or the room while the item is being considered.

9. Documentation for committees should be written precisely, accurately, clearly and succinctly. The level of formality and detail should match the purpose and readership of the document.

10. Agendas of meetings should:

   • Contain or have attached any background material necessary to enable members to make informed decisions. If items have been discussed previously a chronology of key elements of the discussion should be attached.
   • Be divided into three parts (Attachment C):

   Part 1. Items for Communication to be dealt with En Bloc - only items for communication that require no decision or discussion, but are relevant to the business of the committee or its future decision-making, or require dissemination by members to staff within their areas;

   Part 2. Items for Decision to be dealt with En Bloc - only items for decision with clear recommendations by the Chair that are likely to require no further discussion;

   Part 3. Items for Discussion and Decision.

   • Include an Item/Business in Progress List providing an update of actions since the last meeting, where appropriate
   • At the discretion of the Chair allow items of ‘Other Business’ provided there is advance notice to the Chair and the item is not a major policy item.
   • Be distributed to members at least three working days before the meeting and items perceived by the Chair to be key issues should be highlighted. Deadlines for placing formal items on the agenda should be enforced by the Chair and the Executive Officer. Rather than delay the distribution of an agenda because one item is not ready, the use of supplementary agendas should be considered.
   • Be posted on the Web, with attachments where possible and available to all staff on the University’s intranet, unless issues of confidentiality preclude this.

11. Minutes of meetings should:

   • Contain a summary or précis of events, in dot form wherever possible, rather than a detailed account of every contribution. In general names of individuals should not be recorded in the discussion.
   • Contain all resolutions and agreements, whether reached formally through motions or through general
consensus, and a clear statement of the action to be taken in relation to each item including the person responsible for the action and a timeline for completion, where appropriate.

• Be distributed to committee members within 10 working days of the close of the meeting.
• Be posted on the Web and available to all staff on the University’s intranet, unless issues of confidentiality preclude this.

Role of Members:

12. Members are required to conduct themselves in accordance with the University’s Code of Conduct and the University Committee Members’ Code of Conduct.

13. Members are required to participate actively in committee business and provide appropriate contributions to decision making for the betterment of the University as a whole.

14. University members should only nominate for committees for which they feel they are well placed and appropriately informed to contribute to the business of that committee.

15. Members who represent constituents on a committee should make every attempt to canvass the views and opinion of that group to bring back to the discussion of the committee and report committee decisions back to their constituents.

Role of Chair and Executive Officer:

16. Chairs and Executive Officers are responsible for ensuring these rules for the operation of committees are followed including the appropriate recording of decisions and actions.

17. Chairs should conduct meetings with the degree of formality appropriate to the committee. Generally, greater formality is needed with major committees, committees with a larger membership and where it is required by constitutional and statutory provisions.

18. Chairs should ensure meetings are conducted fluently so members understand the matters at hand and have the opportunity to discuss them, and the voting processes and resolutions are clear. Chairs should try to ensure the active participation by all members of the committee.

19. Chairs and the Executive Officers have a responsibility to ensure the business of the committee is either referred for a decision to the relevant committee or is communicated effectively to relevant areas of the University.

20. Committees should make provision for delegating responsibilities to the Chair and Executive Officer as far as possible, ensuring accountability for these delegations.

21. Chairs and Executive Officers should meet to discuss the draft agenda so both understand the purpose and possible outcomes of the meeting.

22. Executive Officers should familiarise themselves with the working of the University committee system as a whole, and as much as possible work with Executive Officers of other committees to ensure smooth transition of business through the committee system.

23. Executive Officers should work with the Chair to provide all new members with induction briefing material and appropriately induct new members into the committee. Where possible, this should occur well before the member’s first attendance at a meeting of the committee. It is recommended that briefing material provided to new members includes:

• The constitution of the committee including information on the position of the committee in the University committee structure (namely maps with pathways for decisions and communication).
• The Principles and Rules of the Operation of Committees.
• The Code of Conduct of committee members.
• Committee meeting dates.
• Major items of business of the committee of the previous year.
• Commonly used acronyms and abbreviations which might be used in the conduct of the committee’s business.
• Effective Meetings - A Guide to Good Practice

Any enquiries relating to the rules for the operation of committees may be directed to the Academic Policy Services.

Revised 16 February 2006
University Committee Members' Code of Conduct

1. **Personal Conduct:** All members of University committees are required to conduct themselves at all times in accordance with the University's Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct. A copy is available at: [http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/publications/code_of_ethics](http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/publications/code_of_ethics)

Members of committees are also required to:

- Understand the committee’s role and purpose within the University.
- Stay informed about relevant matters affecting the committee’s business.
- Attend all committee meetings or where attendance is not possible, submit an apology.
- Participate actively and work cooperatively with other committee members and University staff.
- Prepare for all committee meetings by reading and considering the agenda items, papers circulated and other relevant documents.
- Not improperly influence other committee members.
- Make new points succinctly without reiterating at length points already made.

2. **Accountability.** All members have a responsibility to ensure efficient and effective operations of the committee, avoid extravagant and wasteful use of resources and ensure actions are consistent with the role and purpose of the committee.

Members of committees are also required to:

- Participate constructively in committee activities in a lawful, ethical and justifiable manner.
- Ensure decisions are consistent with any statutory and legal requirements.
- Ensure resources, funds and staff are used effectively and economically for committee business.

3. **Record Keeping and Use of Information:** All documentation produced by the committee forms part of the University records and should be maintained in accordance with University’s Record Keeping Plan ([http://www.archives.uwa.edu.au/information_about/uwa_record_keeping_plan](http://www.archives.uwa.edu.au/information_about/uwa_record_keeping_plan)).

In conjunction with specific responsibilities of the Executive Officer, members of committees are also required to:

- Ensure adequate procedures are followed for documenting decisions and actions of the committee.
- Maintain confidentiality of committee business where necessary, ensuring confidential records are subject to appropriate storage and access procedures.
- Respect confidential discussions and not misuse any information obtained through membership of the committee.
- Openly declare any matters of private interest and record any issues with the potential for conflict or perceived conflict to ensure they are transparent and capable of review.
- Where appropriate, disqualify themselves from committee discussions and decisions where a conflict of interest occurs.
- Be aware of the FOI Act 1992 and that access may be sought to all records under this legislation.

Where members are unsure of their obligations or responsibilities under the University Committee Members’ Code of Conduct, the member should contact the Chair or Executive Officer of the Committee for assistance.

Revised on 16/02/2006
Choice of MJD MJS in BPhil (Hons)

Panarettos Accounting 21295853
Mallal Anatomy and Human Biology 21309036

Mathews Anatomy and Human Biology 21295853
Mallal Anatomy and Human Biology 21309036

Ferdjik Biochemistry and Molecular Biology 21297103
Ellis Biochemistry and Molecular Biology 21290936

Ferdjik Biochemistry and Molecular Biology 21297103
Ellis Biochemistry and Molecular Biology 21290936

Molloy Mencshelyi Business Law 21302562
Kurnov Turner Biophysics and Molecular Biology 21302562

Molloy Mencshelyi Business Law 21302562
Kurnov Turner Biophysics and Molecular Biology 21302562

Group 1 2012

21134962 21070087 21150349 21152624 21075098 21111153 21107248 21150739 21136357 21137248 21149733

21150301 21150238 21150381 21150908 21154962 2115001 2111826 21152034 21110059 21140001 21112893 21113826 21152034 21150301

Group 1 2013

21134962 21070087 21150349 21152624 21075098 21111153 21107248 21150739 21136357 21137248 21149733

21150301 21150238 21150381 21150908 21154962 2115001 2111826 21152034 21110059 21140001 21112893 21113826 21152034 21150301

Group 2 2013

2109699 21111153 21123378 21136375 21137248 21147351 21150301 21150238 21150381 21150908 21154962 2115001 2111826 21152034 21110059 21140001 21112893 21113826 21152034 21110059 21140001 21112893 21113826 21152034
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 2012</th>
<th>Group 1 2013</th>
<th>Group 2 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2088691 Perrone Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>21301699 Ridden Physics</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21065783 Lake Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>21305649 Lymburn Physics</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21110059 O'Shea Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>21308254 Crowe Physics</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21149733 Twigger Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>21312876 Sidi Physics</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21152034 McKelvie Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>21315365 Davidson Physics</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21152624 Kuster Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>21323356 Gansemer Physics</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21152624 Kuster Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>21326604 Phan Physics</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21112893 Davidson Population Health</td>
<td>21328438 Chew Physics</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21141367 Price Psychological Science</td>
<td>21295138 Badgeri Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21151978 Shelton Psychological Science</td>
<td>21304061 Staltari Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21152535 Thuijs Psychological Science</td>
<td>21315786 Lockhart Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21141367 Price Psychology in Society</td>
<td>21319253 Kirke Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21151978 Shelton Psychology in Society</td>
<td>21327674 Viska Psychological Science</td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21152535 Thuijs Psychology in Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21137148 McCormick Sport Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Group 2 2013]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOBAL CHALLENGES, RESEARCH AND LEADERSHIP GCRL1000
ENSURING QUALITY

INTRODUCTION
GCRL1000 is a Category B broadening unit offered only to BPhil (Hons) students. This unit provides undergraduate research training at Level 1 and, thus, acts both as a foundation for the degree and as a platform for the research-intensive experiences in BPhil (Hons) (http://units.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/units/gcrl/gcrl1000).

The unit “is designed to provide you with a solid basis for your ongoing undergraduate studies and beyond by training you to think like a researcher” (Unit Outline) through integrating an interdisciplinary context, the basics of academic research and skills and ways of thinking that are transferable to discipline-specific contexts.

It facilitates access to leaders in research across a variety of fields, investigation into challenges with global dimensions and the opportunity of exploring the nature of research and the role of leadership.

The unit is designed around practicing and developing team-based and project management skills and self- and peer-assessment though undertaking to completion a research project involving planning, data collection and analysis, and reporting of findings in both written and oral formats.

These aims are implemented through the BPhil (Hons) Undergraduate Research Training model (BURT) developed by Professor Sally Sandover and Assistant Professor Lee Partridge from their innovative co-curricular program ULTRIS (http://www.student.uwa.edu.au/learning/resources/ultris).

TEACHING TEAM
Associate Professor Jenna Mead (Unit Co-ordinator)
Professor Sally Sandover, Academic Director, Educational Strategies Office
Assistant Professor Lee Partridge, Higher Education Development, CATL
Dr Wayne McGowan, Project Officer (ULTRIS - Undergraduate Learning and Teaching Research Internship Scheme), CATL

LEARNING OUTCOMES identified in the Unit Outline.

Broad Outcomes (These outcomes are not specifically assessed in this unit.)
As you work through the unit you will begin to develop an understanding of and the skills to:
1. identify and analyse trends in global challenges.
2. identify distinct disciplinary approaches to global challenges.
3. apply interdisciplinary perspectives to analyse global issues.
4. identify and assess distinct models of leadership practices.
5. work collaboratively to produce and present research in written and oral forms.
6. conduct and present independent research.
*Broad Outcomes 1-4 will mainly be derived from interaction and discussions with research leaders during the summer residence. Outcomes 5 and 6 will result from the BURT program.

**Specific Learning Outcomes** *(These outcomes will be assessed in this unit.)*

On completion of this unit, you should be able to:

1. apply knowledge gained to develop a well formulated research proposal.
2. acquire introductory knowledge about a range of research methodologies in order to select the most appropriate for their project.
3. use a range of research skills to successfully complete their project.
4. demonstrate a capacity to think at a deeper and more critical level when evaluating and using a diverse range of information resources.
5. work collaboratively with a research supervisor, other academics and your research group in the formulation and progression of the research project.
6. participate and contribute to a community of practice.
7. communicate the results of the research to a wider audience through the production of an academic paper.
8. orally present the results of your research to a wider audience of peers, academics and researchers
9. be able to identify and use a range of transferable research skills in your other undergraduate studies.

**BENCHMARKING AGAINST CURRICULUM (F28852)**

The Unit Outline identifies both formative and summative elements in the assessment mechanism (excerpted below). These elements are crossed-referenced to the learning outcomes (above).

### Summative Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Specific Learning Outcomes being assessed (see page 2)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research proposal</td>
<td>1,2,5,6,7,8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday 14th March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>4,6,7,8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday 18th April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice presentation</td>
<td>3,4,5,6,8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday 30th May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic paper</td>
<td>3,4,5,6,7</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Friday 1st June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Essay</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Friday 1st June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Presentations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday 30th May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Ongoing TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These items are completed in groups

These items are completed by individuals
Formative Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Individual/Group Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Blog</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Draft Proposal</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tuesday 28th Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Oral Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presentation of research proposal</td>
<td>G/I</td>
<td>Wednesday 14th March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presentation of literature review</td>
<td>G/I</td>
<td>Wednesday 18th April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharing of research findings</td>
<td>G/I</td>
<td>Wednesday 23rd May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Practice Group Presentation</td>
<td>G/I</td>
<td>Wednesday 30th May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self assessment of group work written submissions</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Ongoing TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer assessment of group work written submissions</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ongoing TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Peer Assessments of oral presentations</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ongoing TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum (F28852) identifies learning outcomes for research-intensive and communications experiences across Levels 1-4 in BPhil (Hons). These outcomes, excerpted below, are cross-reference against the assessment mechanism in GCRL1000. Elsewhere, specific criteria and assessment rubrics from assessment within the unit are cited.

In relation to some learning outcomes identified in the Curriculum, GCRL1000 has provided research and communications experiences and these are noted in the appropriate places.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Level 1: Beginning</th>
<th>Level 2: Developing</th>
<th>Level 3: Advanced</th>
<th>Level 4: Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Research communication:** Written presentation of research | BPHL1000 group written presentation  
  ſ: Research proposal  
  ſ: Literature review  
  ſ: Academic paper  
  BPHL1000 individual essay  
  ſ: Reflective blog  
  ſ: Reflective essay | BPHL1000 group written presentation  
  ſ: Research proposal  
  ſ: Literature review  
  ſ: Academic paper  
  BPHL1000 individual essay  
  ſ: Reflective blog  
  ſ: Reflective essay | Written assessment of the BPHL3000 Research Project  
  Extensive & sustained engagement with feedback & evaluation tools at project, unit & course levels: surveys, SURF, SPOT, SALG, focus group | Honours dissertation written work  
  Abstract or poster presentation on their research thesis for the B.Phil (Hons) website |
| **Research communication:** Oral presentation of research | BPHL1000 group oral presentation  
  ſ: Practice group presentation  
  ſ: Presentation of proposal, literature review  
  ſ: Colloquium presentation | Discussions at the research mentor meetings  
  Interaction with supervisor over semester-long project | Short presentation on the BPHL3000 Research Project to the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series  
  ſ: Jigsaw comprised short presentation to members of other groups; ſ: Colloquium | Detailed seminar presentation on the BPHL3000 Research Project to the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series |
| **Research conduct:** Individual research | BPHL1000 group and individual research work  
  ſ: Reflective blog  
  ſ: Self-assessment written work  
  ſ: assessment via SPARKplus tool | Short research tasks as set by the research mentor  
  Analysis & feedback on drafts of paper elements | Guided research undertaken for the BPHL3000 Research Project  
  Negotiation with project supervisor | Independent research undertaken for the Honours dissertation project |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research conduct:</th>
<th>BPHL1000 group work</th>
<th>Discussions with the research mentor sharing research practices</th>
<th>Attendance and posing appropriate questions at the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series</th>
<th>Developed questions and ability to respond to seminar presentation at the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research in a collaborative environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>F: Peer-assessment of written work</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>S: Research paper elements produced by group</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>S: Group work SPARKplus tool</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peer and supervisor feedback sessions on development &amp; progress of research project</strong></td>
<td><strong>High level Q &amp; A at Summer Residence &amp; F: Colloquium</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and posing appropriate questions at the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series</td>
<td>High level Q &amp; A at Summer Residence &amp; F: Colloquium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed questions and ability to respond to seminar presentation at the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communication-intensive experiences [F28852 p. 5] Specific assessment rubrics cited from unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Level 1: Beginning</th>
<th>Level 2: Developing</th>
<th>Level 3: Advanced</th>
<th>Level 4: Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students demonstrate **writing** that is clear, well structured and appropriate to audience and purpose | BPHL1000 group written Presentation  
Research paper of publishable standard;  
appropriate academic conventions;  
demonstrate critical thinking, rigorous research practices, valid and reliable findings, as well as recommendations for practice and/or future research. | Short reflective statement on Level 1 experience for B.Phil (Hons) website  
F: Reflective blog  
S: Reflective essay | Transcription and editing of interview with professional leader  
Preparation, collection, transcription, analysis & coding of quantitative data for research project  
Detailed understanding of Human Ethics Clearance process | Executive summary of Honours research for professional presentation |
| Students give **oral presentations** that are clear, well structured and appropriate to audience and purpose | BPHL1000 group oral Presentation  
See Oral Presentation Skills rubric (below)  
Foreign language unit  
See individual study plans | Public presentation to Year 12 cohort on the experience of the B.Phil (Hons)  
Group presentations;  
Colloquium (public) presentation | Interview with professional leader  
Collection of quantitative data for research project incl. interview with senior UWA staff | Brief appropriate professional audience on their honours research |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students demonstrate <strong>critical information literacy skills</strong> that are appropriate to context</th>
<th>BPHL1000 group and individual research work</th>
<th>Preparation of reflective statement and public speaking</th>
<th>Identification of and preparation of appropriate questions for interview</th>
<th>Independent research undertaken for the Honours dissertation project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria for research proposal: rationale for conducting this research; b) situates research in relation to scholarship; c) identifies sources of data; d) justifies selected data collection tools; e) considers limitations and d) considers the ethical implications of the research.</td>
<td>Group presentations; Colloquium (public) presentation</td>
<td>Preparation, collection, transcription, analysis &amp; coding of quantitative data for research project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign language unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students demonstrate <strong>interpersonal skills</strong> that are sensitive and appropriate to the context</th>
<th>BPHL1000 group work</th>
<th>Public presentation and response to questions to Year 12 cohort on the experience of the B.Phil (Hons)</th>
<th>Conduct of the interview</th>
<th>Developed questions and ability to responses to seminar presentation at the B.Phil (Hons) research seminar series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self- and peer assessment via SPARKplus tool</td>
<td>Q + A at Colloquium</td>
<td>Preparation, collection, transcription, analysis &amp; coding of quantitative data for research project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Oral presentation skills rubric — for assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students give <strong>presentations</strong> that are clear, well-structured and appropriate to audience and purpose</td>
<td>Demonstrate and reflect on a limited range of basic speaking and presenting concepts and skills with extensive structured guidance</td>
<td>Demonstrate and reflect on a moderate range of competent speaking and presenting concepts and skills with limited structured guidance</td>
<td>Demonstrate and reflect on an extensive range of advanced speaking and presenting concepts and with little or no structured guidance</td>
<td>Demonstrate and reflect on a comprehensive range of professional speaking and presenting concepts and with no structured guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate sound public speaking and presentation skills which demonstrate effective use of voice, body language, structure, word choice, presentation technologies, etc</td>
<td>1.1 Demonstrate basic use of voice, body language and language, with extensive structured guidance.</td>
<td>1.2 Prepare and present an oral presentation demonstrating effective use of voice, body language, structure, words and use of technologies to a class/tutorial group with limited structured guidance.</td>
<td>1.3 Prepare and present a compelling argument that demonstrates effective use of voice, body language, structure, word choice and presentation technology with little or no structured guidance.</td>
<td>1.4 Prepare and present an oral presentation demonstrating effective use of voice, appropriate language, body language, and use of technologies to an audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop and present a clear, well-structured message appropriate to audience and purpose</td>
<td>2.1 Demonstrate a basic ability to develop and present a clear, well-structured message that is appropriate to audience and purpose with extensive structured guidance.</td>
<td>2.2 Demonstrate a competent ability to develop and present a clear, well-structured message that is appropriate to audience and purpose with limited structured guidance.</td>
<td>2.3 Demonstrate an advanced ability to develop and present a clear, well-structured message that is appropriate to audience and purpose with little or no structured guidance.</td>
<td>2.4 Demonstrate the ability to develop and present a clear, well-structured message that is appropriate to audience and purpose with no structured guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide clear and accurate explanations of key concepts and processes</td>
<td>3.1 Provide basic clear and accurate explanations of key concepts and processes with</td>
<td>3.2 Provide competent clear and accurate explanations of key concepts and processes</td>
<td>3.3 Provide advanced clear and accurate explanations of key concepts and processes</td>
<td>3.4 Provide explanations of key concepts and processes that are clear and accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes</td>
<td>extensive structured guidance.</td>
<td>with limited structured guidance.</td>
<td>with little or no structured guidance.</td>
<td>with little or no structured guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message</td>
<td>4.1 Demonstrate a basic ability to use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message with extensive structured guidance.</td>
<td>4.2 Demonstrate a competent ability to use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message with limited structured guidance.</td>
<td>4.3 Demonstrate an advanced ability to use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message with little or no structured guidance.</td>
<td>4.4 Demonstrate skills to use spoken and visual tools effectively to convey a message with no structured guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Background

In 2012, as part of the new courses of study restructure, the University of Western Australia (UWA) instituted a Bachelor of Philosophy (BPhil) program. This program is intended to provide the opportunity for top performing students to excel in their studies and extend themselves.

Throughout Semester 1 the BPhil program coordinator, Associate Professor Jenna Mead, conducted a range of evaluation procedures including a SPOT survey. In June she requested that Elaine Lopes of the STUDY Smarter team conduct two focus group interviews with representatives of the BPhil cohort. The focus groups were conducted on Monday June 18th (Focus Group 1, FG1) and Tues June 19th (Focus Group 2, FG2). There were five participants in each group and each student represented the group that they worked with on their research project. There were 10 questions (see Appendix A) which guided the discussion and each interview lasted approximately 75 minutes. The focus groups were intended to provide rich detail about the experiences of the students and to provide more information about some aspects of the program which, based on feedback in the SPOT survey, the students were not entirely satisfied with.

2 Focus Group Discussion

2.1 Sense of Improvement as a Researcher

Overall, the students had a very strong sense of development of themselves as researchers, however they felt they needed to learn more about the research process. They felt slightly hampered by the subject matter was not interesting, this was a point which was agreed upon by all of the participants in FG1. It was, however, acknowledged that one of the research groups had been able to specialize in their area of study. A number of participants in FG1 indicated that they felt that the program had provided them with a good start and that they were still keen to pursue further research, or even a career in academia. The students reported that at the beginning of the summer residence they had felt quite lost and that over the course of the program there had been a definite increase in their skills and an improvement in their ability to think as researchers. They added that they now have a better understanding of the breadth of research that is possible and now better understand how to identify and phenomenon which needs to be investigated. Previously they hadn’t understood the practicalities of research or the research process. In particular, they found working on the literature to be instructive – developing an understanding of where the boundaries lie. They also now know that research can be collaborative, that it doesn’t have to be a solitary process or task.

2.2 Group Skills

There was general agreement that the opportunity to work in a “functional group”, one in which all members were motivated to contribute to the work, made a “pleasant change”, although this was not true for all groups. It was also reported that in working with highly motivated students each person then felt responsibility for working harder to avoid letting the team down. The students felt that they had developed their skills in listening to others, working with others and learning from them. They reported that working in a group helped them to “stay on track”, to stay focused on the task at hand. Furthermore, when they were unsure of how to proceed with something other members of the groups often knew what to do. They received and gave realistic and honest feedback which was perceived to be a good learning experience. The students enjoyed the opportunity to work with others who they considered to be performing at a similar academic level to them, something which provided them with confidence in the ability of the group. They highlighted that they had learnt the importance of good organisation and communication skills for groups to function effectively. Comparing their experiences in GCRL1000 and other units the students recognised the value of having scheduled group meetings every week (in other units) and suggested that such a structure would be helpful in GCRL1000.
2.3 Course Structure

The students had a number of suggestions for improving the structure of the course, most related to the timing of information workshops and assignment deadlines. It was felt that there was time at the beginning and then too much stress at the end, this was particularly the case for the discussion of results where it was felt that there was too much time allocated to planning and then the writing up of the results was too rushed.

The students suggested that the deadlines created a degree of stress as they came up so quickly. In particular, it was felt that the literature review workshop and the deadline for submitting the literature review were too close together. The students suggested that the literature review workshop should have been held earlier, that they were all waiting for it and then the deadline was just a couple of days later. In regard to this it was considered that the feedback came too late (at the workshop). For example, the workshop on the literature review was held on the 16th of April and the students' literature reviews were due on the 18th. There was general agreement that the literature review could be due earlier so that there would then be more time for the data gathering process, which the students found to be rather rushed. They suggested that there was time for this after the submission of the proposal and that there was a need for more guidance on how to select literature to read as it was an entirely new task for all of the students.

In regard to the literature review, the students also felt that they required more practical input as to what academic writing looked like. They suggested that they required a better understanding of where they were in terms of academic writing, that they needed to develop an understanding of academic writing before they could produce their literature reviews. It was further suggested that after the literature review the progress of the project felt very rushed. This was particularly the case for students whose study participants took time getting back to them. The students who chose option had a sense that “100% of the assessment was conducted almost in one week”, the practice presentation was on the 30th of May, the final paper was due on the 1st of June and the reflective essay was also due on the 1st of June and some students had work due in other units at the same time. Both focus groups commented that they would have preferred the literature review workshop to be held earlier and for the literature review itself to be due earlier which would then provide more time for the following aspects of the unit.

Overall, it was felt that the basic structure of the course was good. In relation to this, it was reported that the group sessions with Jenna and the supervisors were very helpful and that the students had a good rapport with both Jenna and their supervisors.

2.4 Assessment

2.4.1 Assessment Options

The groups had two options in regard to assessment and final marks. In Option 1 the students received marks for their research proposal, literature review and final paper whereas students who selected Option 2 received feedback on their research proposal and literature review and had all their marks allocated for their final paper. Overall, option 1 was approximately twice as popular as option 2. Having the choice was considered to be very stressful and in general the students indicated that they would rather not have a choice. This was particularly so as they felt that they didn’t really know what they were making a choice about, they felt that they didn’t know enough about research or working in groups or assessment at university. A number of the students indicated that they wasted time at the beginning of the program trying to decide what was the better option, others decided quickly, one group by “the toss of a coin” indicating the difficulty the students had in making a well-informed decision. For the groups which chose option 1, the decision was largely made based on a fear of “putting all [their] eggs in one basket”. The students who chose this option found the ongoing deadlines and the desire for good marks kept them very motivated. On the other hand, it was felt that option 2 enabled the students to focus on the process rather than the marks and that this provided them with an opportunity to concentrate on developing their skills. In general, it was considered that option 1 better supported the aims of the course but that there should be more weighting given to the final paper. As it was, students who chose option 1 felt that they received their marks when their work was at a less developed stage and when they were still developing their understanding of the standard of work which was expected and they felt that this worked against them. One suggestion was for the
marks to be calculated both ways and for the best mark to be awarded to compensate for having to make an uninformed decision.

FG1 considered that the reflective essay was worth too much and that what was required was not made clear. However, some students reported learning a lot from writing the reflective essay and considered it to be a helpful process. They suggested that it would perhaps be better to time this task so that it was due after everything else had been finished. In regard to this the students found the 1 week extension for the deadline for this task to be helpful.

Submitting drafts of the tasks was found to be useful as instructive feedback was provided, however FG1 thought that it would be more motivational if a tentative mark were provided. This would also indicate whether the students were on track or not.

2.4.2 SPARK

Both focus groups agreed that SPARK (Self and Peer Assessment Resource Kit) was not appropriate for the BPhil program. It is designed for a particular cohort and is designed to be motivational however the students suggested that it did not work in this way with this group of students. It was considered that SPARK “skewed the marks” and that it was an imprecise instrument, however it was also it was pointed out that the difference in rating was too small to make a significant difference to the marks. SPARK was considered to be a good learning tool but not ideal for ascertaining marks. Furthermore, it was considered that some of the questions were irrelevant to the BPhil program.

Some students enjoyed the peer feedback and suggested that the comments were useful. It was agreed that it would be good to have more feedback although it was noted that some students weren’t happy with their feedback and would in all probability not want more.

It was agreed that SPARK could be good for motivating students who weren’t contributing to group work but that it wasn’t useful in functional motivated groups such as those in the BPhil. It didn’t work well with such small groups providing an imprecise measurement. Generally not considered to be useful and that it should not be used for generating marks.

2.4.3 Number of Assessments

Overall, the focus group participants agreed that there were not too many assessments in the program and that the range of assessment tasks was useful and that they introduced the students to the whole research process. It was, however, considered strange that no marks were allocated for the colloquium (the final presentation) and that no or limited feedback was received on the mock presentation. It was suggested that the students were more comfortable and better prepared for the colloquium and that they felt they did well in these presentations and as a result would have liked to have marks allocated for the task.

2.5 Learning Activities

2.5.1 Self and Peer Review of Literature Review and Proposal

In general, engaging in self and peer review of the literature review and proposal was thought to have provided opportunities to learn more about research and improve the quality of their work. The students didn’t think the self-review was particularly useful, especially for the proposal as they did not think they were knowledgeable enough. In general they considered that it was essentially editing. Others thought the self-review was useful in that it provided the students with an opportunity to compare their own work to that of others. Overall the students preferred reading and reviewing others’ papers as it helped them to get a sense of the standard of work that other groups were producing, however, they found it difficult to give useful feedback and didn’t feel they had appropriate experience to do so. It was however suggested that it made them look at their own work in a different way. They felt that it would be more useful to see others’ final papers. They also commented that the self and
peer review process only required minimal time and effort. Overall, however, they agreed that they favoured the feedback provided by the supervisors.

2.5.2 Jigsaw Presentation

The students thought this was a good primer or practice run for the final presentation. They found it useful in clarifying their projects, refining their presentations and improving their comfort in presenting to an audience. However, they didn’t feel that it helped them to improve their presentation skills as it was too informal and they received little or no feedback on their presentations.

2.5.3 Colloquium/Group Presentation

The colloquium was not assessed and the students didn’t receive any feedback on their presentations and therefore they did not find it especially useful. They did say that they felt quite relaxed, that there was little pressure associated with the activity. This was not just because it wasn’t marked but also because there had been more time to prepare for it and this was useful as it provided the opportunity for the students to reflect on the content and structure of their presentations. In regard to this, the public speaking session/workshop was useful in preparing the students. The students liked being asked questions by academics as this helped them to further clarify their projects and they felt that this helped them to expand their understanding of the topic.

2.6 GCRL1000

It was generally agreed that the unit took more than 150 hours. This included the summer school, sessions, group meetings and research. FG1 suggested that GCRL1000 took up more time than their other units combined and that this was in part because they knew their supervisors and felt more connected to the unit and in part because they were trying to overachieve.

2.7 BURT

The students particularly enjoyed the summer residence component of the unit. The summer residence was generally considered to be very good but also very intense and perhaps too “packed”. Throughout the residence they felt sleep deprived and a bit overloaded. The students were focused on getting to know each other and found it to be a very fun and social time and a great opportunity for developing friendships. The sense of community and collaboration with like minded people were particularly valued.

The students also appreciated the strong relationships they formed with their supervisors. In particular, the students found the feedback provided by their supervisors to be of tremendous value and they appreciated the opportunity to draw on the experience of their supervisors.

On the guest lecturers the students commented that many were very interesting and inspirational but it was felt that others didn’t understand the BPhil and that their presentations weren’t relevant to the students and that they then lost focus. The students also noted that only two presentations at the summer residence were from the humanities yet the topic of their project was humanities based.

The students commented on feeling a sense of responsibility and independence in participating in the unit and that they felt privileged to be on the project. On completion of the final paper the students reported feeling extremely satisfied and had a real sense of achievement.

2.8 The Research Topic

Initially the students hated the topic. This was in part because they didn’t know much about the topic (sustainable education). They expected to be provided with more background information on the topic they would study. The topic was heavily grounded in the social sciences and was not considered relevant for some of the students, however they acknowledge that it was still helpful in developing their
knowledge and skills and that it helped them to understand an alternative ways of conducting research. The students felt hampered in that they always had to go through the supervisors and couldn’t take the initiative directing their research focus but reported that over time it made more sense. FG2 commented that in the end they thought it was a clever topic as they were themselves getting a sustainable education and so it actually was relevant to them and this enabled them to find the topic interesting. It was also noted that there was limited scope for impact as they couldn’t see implement their findings (gender and Engineering).

Initially the students said that they found it difficult to find literature on the topic but that in the end this was beneficial as it helped them hone their literature research skills. The representative of one group commented that it wasn’t until the literature review that they really knew what it was that they wanted to do in the project.

It was acknowledged in FG2 that it was good that the topic had limits, as without these the students would have been tempted to overreach and may have struggled with the project.

One group found it annoying that their topic was stolen by one of the supervisors to give to another group which was struggling to come up with a focus.

2.9 Provision of Feedback

In the SPOT report one aspect which received a relatively low rating was the provision of timely feedback (only 37% of students agreed that they had received timely feedback while 39% disagreed resulting in a mean of 2.92). The facilitators were surprised about this as they felt that there had been ongoing feedback provided throughout the course and wanted to find out why the students had responded to this question in the way they had. During the focus group discussions the students commented that the sufficiency of the feedback was not the problem but rather the timeliness of it. At a number of points during the unit the students felt that there was not enough time between the feedback and the submission date for completed tasks, for example, in the case of the literature review there was not enough time to act on the feedback before submitting the final paper – feedback was given on one day and the paper was due the next. The students thought that there needed to be more of a gap. Although the students thought the whole unit was fast paced they commented that this was particularly the case at the end (the last week) and there was no time to improve on prior tasks.

On the whole the students commented that the supervisors provided very good feedback and that they were always available, however, at times there was little opportunity to implement suggested improvements. Some students also suggested that the feedback from their supervisor was “a bit vague, especially about conceptual issues”. It was also noted that the groups received feedback from their supervisors which they addressed and then after submitting their work they received more feedback and the students felt frustrated by this as they thought they had made all necessary improvements to their work. This perhaps points to a misunderstanding of the research and academic writing process.

In regard to the draft paper the students commented that the feedback from their supervisors was helpful but the feedback from their peers was more critical and they found this very worrying.

The one area where the students felt that feedback wasn’t provided was after the colloquium and they commented that this would have been valuable, however, they did receive informal feedback in the form of comments and questions from academics.

2.10 SPOT Ratings

Another item on the SPOT is ‘The teachers are well prepared’. 53% of students agreed and 21% disagreed. When asked to provide other feedback on the SPOT ratings the students commented a perceived lack of preparedness on the part of the presenters at times. FG2 suggested that some of the workshops could have been presented in a more efficient and focused manner. They did, however, comment that the teachers were “good”, “motivated” and “keen”.
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The participants in FG1 suggested the SPOT was conducted at a particularly bad time as it was extremely busy for them and they were tired and that this may have impacted on the feedback provided.

They also pointed out the problem of the very small sample which (n 38) completed the SPOT and that it is a fairly blunt instrument which is not necessarily designed for the particular cohort or unit and is perhaps not relevant.

On a positive note, it was noted that this was the first time the unit had been run and that this was done so to a high level overall.

2.11 Final Comments

The students noted that they enjoyed the unit much more than it would seem from the feedback. They attributed this to the fact that their feedback is focused on improving the unit/program rather than highlighting the existing strengths. Overall they found the unit to be very satisfying to complete and added that they are very happy now that it is done.

One suggestion was that it was important to find a way to keep the group going and to keep the strong connections with peers that had been built over the course of the program.

It was also suggested that the students would like the opportunity to submit their papers to a journal as this would contribute to their sense of academic achievement.
3 Appendix 1

In addressing the following questions please give specific examples where possible.

1. Thinking like a researcher-
   Think back to day 1 of the summer residence. How would you rate yourself in ‘thinking like a researcher’ now compared to then.

2. Collaboration-
   What group skills have you learned

3. Course structure-
   What worked well and suggestions for change

4. Assessment-
   - Which assessment option did your group choose? Why did you choose that option and do you think it assisted the way you approached your learning.
   - Is there too much assessment?
   - Did you think the range of assessments was useful?
   - Is SPARK useful in terms of managing group dynamics? Do group work and the SPARK tool have a place in generating a mark?

5. Did the following activities assist your learning (If “yes” in what way?: If “no” please elaborate)
   - Self and Peer review of the proposal
   - Self and peer review of the Lit review
   - Jigsaw presentation (when each of you had to individually speak to a small group about your project)
   - Group presentation

6. Did GCRL1000 take more than 150 hours to complete?

7. What were the best things about the research training unit (BURT)?

8. Did you feel restricted with what you were able to do in the research training unit? Please elaborate.

9. At the end of the colloquium on June 5 Jenna addressed the SPOT feedback provided by the BPhil cohort. Of particular surprise was the low rating given to the timely provision of feedback in the BURT unit. Considering how much feedback was provided (supervisor and peer) throughout the unit can you elaborate or explain why students may have perceived this as being insufficient?

10. Is there anything else that you can add to better explain the SPOT ratings?
Grant
In 2012 the Teaching and Learning Committee contributed $5,000 to resourcing teaching in the Level 1 unit in the Bachelor of Philosophy (Hons) unit Global Challenges, Research and Leadership (GCRL1000). This is a 6-pt unit and is classified as a Category B broadening unit. GCRL1000 is open only to BPhil (Hons) students; usually students enrol in their first year of study (http://units.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/units/gcrl/gcrl1000). Group 2 students, selected to enter BPhil (Hons) after completing 48 points and achieving a Weighted Average Mark of 80+, will be given the opportunity to complete this unit (6.7 http://www.universitypolicies.uwa.edu.au/search?method=document&id=UP11%2F15).

Project
GCRL1000 commenced with a Summer Residence in the week before Orientation Week (14-19 Feb 2012) (http://www.unistart.uwa.edu.au/crawley/summer-residence-online-registration-form) and ran through semester 1 with students meeting for a weekly seminar (Wed 11:00-12:45), participating in a 2-day Writing Workshop (14-15 April) and a 1-day Colloquium (5 Jun).

The Unit Outline addresses students directly and describes the content as providing students “with a solid basis for your [sic] ongoing undergraduate studies and beyond by training you to think like a researcher.” Further,

[i]n an interdisciplinary context, GCRL1000 will introduce you to the basics of academic research and help you to develop skills and ways of thinking that are transferable to discipline-specific contexts. You will have access to leaders in research across a variety of fields that will benefit you as you start to think about challenges with global dimensions, the nature of research and the role of leadership. With your peers, you will practice and develop team-based and project management skills as you carry out and complete a research project involving the vital steps of planning, data collection and analysis, and reporting of your findings in both written and oral formats. (http://www.lms.uwa.edu.au/course/view.php?id=2815)

Undergraduate research training in GCRL1000 is provided through a model developed from ULTRIS by Assistant Professor Lee Partridge and Professor Sally Sandover and delivered in collaboration with Dr Wayne McGowan and Associate Professor Jenna Mead acting as Unit Coordinator. ULTRIS is recognized internationally as a successful model for undergraduate research training (http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol7/iss2/4/). The challenge was to develop what had been a co-curricular program into one suitable for a mainstream undergraduate unit in UWA’s New Courses 2012 structure: ULTRIS became BURT (BPhil Undergraduate Research Training model).

Particular features included the use of SPARKPlus to facilitate self and peer assessment and a purpose-built Moodle site to support teaching and learning in the unit through a wide range of
tools (project led by Assistant Professor Shannon Johnston, CATL) and provide a virtual home for a degree that has no Faculty.

**Evaluation**
GCRL1000 was evaluated through SURF and Dr Greg Marie (IRU) advises that this is a blunt instrument to survey this particular cohort, chiefly on the grounds that GCRL1000 is a research unit in the context of predominantly content-based Level 1 units, delivered to a homogeneous cohort rather than the broad-based cohorts in mainstream Level 1 units; this is also a new unit, with a new cohort, in a new degree.

The unit was also evaluated through SALG (quantitative online survey; [http://www.salgsite.org/](http://www.salgsite.org/ open until 25 Jun) and focus groups (2 x 5 students, 1 student nominated by each research group) for qualitative data, facilitated by Dr Elaine Lopes (Student Support Services, Mon 18, Tues 19 Jun). Results are pending. Two reviewers, external to the unit, Winthrop Professors Grady Venville and Helen Wildy, agreed to attend the Colloquium (Tues 5 Jun) and provide feedback.

**Research outcomes**
Presentations/unpublished papers

BPhil (Hons) Colloquium, Sustainable Education, 5 Jun 2012

- Tania Loke, William McKelvie, Liam O’Shea, Lucy Sharpe, Simon Thuijs: *A shared sustainable vision: Staff and student perceptions of UWA as a sustainable institution*
- Adarsh Das, Alexander Khor, Michelle Larg, Zaccary Molloy Mencshelyi: *Sustaining Indigenous Culture at UWA: Indigenous Studies at UWA as a means of affecting Student perceptions towards Indigenous Culture*
- Thea Lendich, Rachel McCormick, Andrew Pham, Mark Shelton: *Bridging the gender gap: The institutionalisation of the deficit and structural models in improving the participation and retention of female engineering students at UWA*
- David Kuster, Annabel Price, Adam Tynas, Pearl Wong: *Leadership development in UWA’s Faculty clubs and societies: A study of intra-Faculty clubs and Societies at UWA*
- Arash Arabshahi, Wesley Cox, Lucy Davidson, Xin Zheng Tan: *Individualism collectivism and community-mindedness at UWA*
- Georgina Carson, Ashwin D’Cruz, Samuel Fleming, Ni Xiangyang: *Community in education: Investigating the effectiveness of UWA’s extracurricular and co-curricular programs*
- Thomas Drake-Brockman, Nguyet Minh Duong, James Panaretos, Rajiv Venkatraman: *The effects of Faculty societies on postgraduate research perspectives*
- Calum Braham, Luke Frewer, Jordan King, Ben Luo: *“Being excellent in all areas:” the impact of UWA’s educational principles in providing a sustainable education*
- Ken Foo, Kaylin Hooper, Rohan Mehra, Emily Twigger: *Student perceptions of education for sustainability and student voice*
Patrick Davis, Ryan Huynh, Daniel Ortlepp, Gaeleen Perrone, Tanuj Ruhal: UWA student perceptions of the role of non-Faculty student-led societies in developing sustainable leadership skills


Jenna Mead, “BPhil (Hons) Powered by Moodle,” eLearning Expo, 11 May, UWA


Concluding remarks
On behalf of BPhil (Hons) students, the BURT team and colleagues who contributed to GCRL1000, I would like to thank the Teaching and Learning Committee for their support. I am confident that BPhil (Hons) students have a secure platform on which to develop their “thinking like a researcher” in whatever disciplines they will focus their attention. As Unit Co-ordinator, I am now in the position to take GCRL1000 onto the next stage of its development.

Associate Professor Jenna Mead
18 June 2012
Global Challenges, Research & Leadership GCRL1000

6 Credit points

Semester 1, 2013

Unit Co-ordinator Assoc. Prof. Jenna Mead

www.lms.uwa.edu.au
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CONTACT DETAILS

Unit Co-ordinator

- name: Associate Professor Jenna Mead
- email: jenna.mead@uwa.edu.au
- phone: Ext. 1869
- consultation hours: Mon 2:00 – 4:00 pm
  
  If you need another time, please make an appointment through Reception 6488 2423
- location: Rm 1226 Student Services, first floor

Lecturer

- name: Ms Iva Glišić
- email: iva.glisic@uwa.edu.au
- phone: Ext. 1869
- consultation hours: Wed 3:00-5:00 pm
  
  Also by arrangement
- location: Rm 1226 Student Services, first floor

Alert

Information in this Unit Outline is correct at time of publication but students should be aware that changes may become necessary. Please ensure that you check LMS and your email regularly.
UNIT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

This unit is designed to provide you with a basis for your experiences in the Bachelor of Philosophy (Hons) course by training you to think like a researcher.

Research produces new knowledge in any field and socialises it by sharing with the broader community. UWA is a research-intensive university with a strong collaborative research culture that contributes to local and global communities.

— W/Prof. Robyn Owens, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), UWA

Learning to be a researcher is a long process and this unit is just the beginning. We aim to give you some exposure to the complex interaction between the questions that drive research, the processes available to pursue those questions and the ways in which new knowledge can be shared. You’ve already made a start: you all come with ideas about research from your own experience; you’ve all competed the Summer Residence where researchers talked about their work and their experience.

Research is always specific to a discipline but increasingly researchers are being are to consider the new knowledge they are producing in the context of global challenges that necessitate the interaction of more than one discipline and the sharing of more than one kind of knowledge.

One of the challenges of research is to accept that knowledge may be without limits; that there may be no final answer, only partial solutions and contingent responses; that knowledge is dynamic and changes; that new questions demand new approaches.

It’s important too to understand, at the outset, that research is an iterative process. Whatever the discipline, your research will necessitate that you reread, revise, re-check, re-draft: in some circumstances, collecting data will depend on repetition.

Your journey as a researcher is one of ambition and hope, frustration and disappointment. It’s a journey that will require your concentration and commitment but one that’s always a shared journey. And so here, at the outset, we need to be clear about our expectations.

Unit content

This unit has three topics that interact in different ways in different contexts: the phenomenon of global challenges, the nature of research, the aspect of leadership. We will be thinking about these topics interrogatively, that is as questions: What is a ‘global challenge?’ What is the nature of research and, specifically, in the context of global challenges? What is leadership and how does it make a difference? We will
investigate these questions from different perspectives with the expectation that our analyses will enable us to develop an understanding, if only provisional, of these topics.

We will investigate global challenge, research and leadership through the following portals; some will be familiar from the Summer Residence tours and others will be new:

**Shaping Tomorrow’s World** is ‘a platform for re-examining some of the assumptions we make about our technological, social and economic systems . . . generate informed and constructive debate’ and maintained by a collaboration between UWA, Curtin and Murdoch Universities. http://www.shapingtomorrowsworld.org/

**ICRAR** International Centre for Radio Astronomy Research, a collaborative research centre with research, industry and Federal and State government partners based in Perth, and aimed at ‘achieving research excellence in astronomical science and engineering . . . On Friday the 25th of May it was announced that Australia-New Zealand, together with South Africa, would share hosting of the SKA.’ http://www.icrar.org/

**SymbioticA** ‘is the first research laboratory of its kind, enabling artists and researchers to engage in wet biology practices in a biological science department . . . With an emphasis on experiential practice, SymbioticA encourages better understanding and articulation of cultural ideas around scientific knowledge and informed critique of the ethical and cultural issues of life manipulation.’ http://www.symbiotica.uwa.edu.au/

**Journal for Artistic Research** ‘an international, online, Open Access and peer-reviewed journal for the identification, publication and dissemination of artistic research and its methodologies, from all arts disciplines.’ http://jar-online.net/


**Oceans Institute** ‘brings together the strength of UWA’s marine researchers into a multidisciplinary, integrated research focus. The goal is to capitalise on UWA’s existing research strengths – in areas such as oceanography, ecology, engineering, resource management, and governance – and utilise them to deliver Ocean Solutions for Humanity’s Grand Challenges.’ http://www.oceans.uwa.edu.au/
Plant Energy Biology Strategic priorities

- ‘To generate new knowledge through research and ultimately, rationally design plants for the benefit of Australian agriculture.
- To engage Australia with plant science and create dialogue between scientists, growers and the general public through education, training and outreach activities .’,

http://www.plantenergy.uwa.edu.au/

These portals are all multi-disciplinary but in different ways; each draws together and disseminates ‘research’ in a range of formats; each identifies and responds to ‘global challenges’ of different kinds and dimensions; each depends upon and exemplifies modes of ‘leadership’ that shape and direct the new knowledge they socialize by sharing it with local and global communities.

The projects

GCRL1000 also initiates your training as researcher by offering you two research experiences: first, that of conducting a (small scale) research project as a member of a collaborative research group and then sharing the outcomes of your research through a Colloquium.

As a member of a research group, you will practice and develop team-based and project management skills as your group designs and carries out its research project. Your group will need to decide on the kind of project you want to conduct, choose an area, develop a research question, complete Human Ethics Clearance, carry out your research and then report your findings in both written (research paper) and oral (presentation at a Colloquium) formats. Your first step will be to agree on your expectations.

This project will be an investigative one using research protocols from the Humanities and Social Sciences that you will find transferrable whatever the discipline of your major. For example, this project will require a literature review: a standard element of research papers in the Sciences as well as the Social Sciences. You’ll be asked to conduct an interview: qualitative data is common in the Social Sciences, the Humanities and disciplines like Psychology. This project is designed to offer your group the opportunity to investigate multi-disciplinary research to facilitate an appreciation of the connections between disciplines focused on complex problems.

The experience of working in a group — as many of you already know — requires organizational as well as inter-personal skills and you’ll be asked to evaluate your own performance as a collaborator as well as that of your peers in the group.

Second, you’ll be invited to write a critical essay on an aspect of leadership. The essay — like the research paper or the report — is a standard format for recording, analyzing and disseminating research. The essay is an individual research project and you’ll find that it requires you to conceptualize and conduct research in different ways compared with your work in the collaborative group. Research, of course, usually
Combines both collaborative and individual modes.

**Collaborative project rubric: Investigating the nature of research**

Select one of the research portals listed above (linked on LMS): identify one project and investigate the nature of research disseminated through this portal.

Your group’s investigation should consider (but not be limited to) to following aspects:

- What is the research question or questions of this project?
- In what ways, if at all, does this research address a global challenge?
- In what ways and to what effect, if at all, does this research draw on multi-disciplinary expertise?
- What is the evidence for collaboration in this research?
- What evidence is there for the impact or effectiveness of this research?

Conduct an interview with a member of the research team under investigation: what can be learned about this research project from your informant? How does your informant contribute to your understanding of the research project?

**Individual research project rubric: Investigating leadership**

We will offer you some topics to focus your research for this essay in Week 3; please check LMS.

**Learning outcomes**

On completion of this unit, we hope you will:

- Be able to identify and respond to questions formulated around the three topics of global challenge, research and leadership in both oral and written formats.
- Have an understanding of some key terms in the research areas (discipline, discourse, globalization, critique, leadership, model), research practice (methodologies, ethics clearance, qualitative and quantitative data), in forms of reporting (paper, report, essay, citation style) and the elements of research formats (abstract, literature review, discussion, bibliography).
- Have devised, developed, undertaken and completed a research project as a member of a collaborative group.
- Be able to present your research, in collaboration with your peers, in a public forum that includes a question and answer session.
- Be able to formulate, reflect on and communicate your experience of different aspects of the production of new knowledge and its socialization.
Use of student feedback

UWA takes student feedback on and evaluation of teaching and learning seriously. We pay particular attention to your feedback because BPhil (Hons) and the GCRL1000 unit are still very new in the undergraduate program and thus under development.

For example, last year’s student evaluation targeted particular activities (such as producing posters) as over-used and feedback being provided too late for incorporation in subsequent work. So, this semester, while your research group may choose to produce a poster to disseminate research data or findings, posters won’t feature in summative assessment. Similarly, feedback has been simplified and rescheduled to ensure sufficient time for its usefulness.

We will ask for feedback in various forms including through the University’s formal evaluations: SPOT and SURF (http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/evaluation/student-teaching/surf). But there are other less formal means of giving feedback such as in your research journal (blog), the Conversation tool in LMS, in seminars, by email, by consultation.

Remember too that when you give feedback to your peers, your comments are also relevant to the context in which you’re responding to work. So GCRL1000 may be important to the kind of feedback you give to peers.

Class times & locations

- Seminars are held on Wednesday 11:00-12:50 and Friday 2:00-3:50 pm in Arts Lecture Room 8.
- Research Group Meetings may be scheduled for Friday 2:00-3:50, also in Arts Lecture Room 8, when this time is not required for seminars.

Unit resources

- www.lms.uwa.edu.au is the primary resource for this unit.
- For assistance with the LMS select the ‘LMS Help: STUDENTS’ link at www.lms.uwa.edu.au or contact SISO at support@student.uwa.edu.au or 6488 3814 or in person at the Reid Library and the Science Library
- Or, browse answers online anytime or ask a question through askUWA available at: http://ipoint.uwa.edu.au
Expectations

- You’re expected to maintain UWA’s standards of ethical scholarship and academic literacy and avoid academic misconduct. See below for details.

- If you’re not able to attend either a seminar and/or a group meeting please notify your group members and a member of staff.

- Please come to classes prepared. Readings and other resources will be uploaded to LMS.

- You’re also expected to maintain your research blog: it’s where you keep track of your research and you’ll find it an invaluable resource. You and your group will be expected to generate your own research resources as part of your project.

- Announcements about the unit will be made through LMS. Check the text block on the home page; an email will also go to your student account. This is important: you’re all in different Faculties and so there’s no one noticeboard we can use for this unit.
## CLASS SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week # seminars</th>
<th>Wed Seminar &amp; presenter</th>
<th>Fri Seminar &amp; meeting time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wk 1</strong> 27 Feb 1 Mar</td>
<td>• Introduction to the unit Jenna Mead &amp; Iva Glišić • Unit outline, research portals &amp; projects • Review of Summer Residence presentations</td>
<td>Group meeting: confirm membership identifying an area; organizational matters; post rules for your group; managing your research journals; stating your expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wk 2</strong> 6 Mar 8 Mar</td>
<td>• Globalization &amp; its meanings: lecture 1 Ms Kelly Gerard Readings</td>
<td>Managing the scholarship (bibliography) Managing expectations Drafting a proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wk 3</strong> 13 Mar 15 Mar</td>
<td>• Globalization &amp; its meanings: lecture 2 Ms Kelly Gerard Readings • <em>Dirty Business: How mining made Australia</em> Screening <em>tbc</em> Readings on leadership</td>
<td>Questions &amp; Creative thinking SymbioticA seminar <em>tbc</em> Critical essay topics uploaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wk 4</strong> 20 Mar 22 Mar</td>
<td>• Research and ethics Prof. Mark Israel Readings • Case study dingoes &amp; ethics Mr Michael Wysong</td>
<td>Giving &amp; receiving feedback How to use SPARKPLUS W/Prof. Phil Hancock Group meeting: Developing questions &amp; drafting a proposal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wk 5</strong> 27 Mar 29 Mar</td>
<td>Writing, narrative, language: research formats &amp; genres Readings</td>
<td>GOOD FRIDAY UWA closed Group meeting <em>tbc</em>: Working through an ethics case study 1. Proposal due at 4:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 Apr</td>
<td>Non-teaching Week</td>
<td>(S) Critical essay on leadership due 4:00 pm Mon 8 Apr (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wk 6  | 10 Apr  | • Qualitative research (1)  
Dr Wayne McGowan  
[2:00-2:50 pm]  
Readings  
2. Peer assessment exercise due 4:00 pm | Wk 6  | 12 Apr  | • Qualitative research (2)  
Dr Wayne McGowan [2:00 – 3:50 pm] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wk 7  | 17 Apr  | RESEARCH  
No classes  | Wk 7  | 19 Apr  | (S) Ethics clearance due before interviews; groups to nominate date  
Group meeting  
Proposals returned |
| Wk 8  | 24 Apr  | RESEARCH  
No classes  | Wk 8  | 26 Apr  | 3. Draft literature review due 4:00 pm  
Critical essay returned  
Group meeting |
| Wk 9  | 1 May  | RESEARCH  
Check in & give brief report on progress  | Wk 9  | 3 May  | Draft literature review returned  
Group meeting |
| Wk 10 | 8 May  | RESEARCH  
No classes  | Wk 10 | 10 May | 4. Draft research paper due 4:00 pm  
Group meeting |
| Wk 11 | 15 May | No class on Wed  | Wk 11 | 17 May | Class for feedback  
Draft papers returned  
5. Peer assessment of papers due 4:00 pm |
| Wk 12 | 22 May | Revise paper this week  
Presenting an academic paper  
Jigsaw activity  | Wk 12 | 24 May | Practice Presentation  
5 min per paper as a group  
Provide feedback |
| Wk 13 | 30 May | (S) Deliver paper at Colloquium (combined 60%)  | Wk 13 | 1 Jun | (S) Written paper due  
360° feedback on semester’s work  
Evaluations |
ASSESSMENT

Assessment in GCRL1000 can be divided into two categories although there’s also some overlap between them since you’ll receive feedback on both types.

**Formative assessment** assists in the formation of knowledge. It’s oriented around learning and allows you to develop and practice skills. It’s usually accompanied by feedback showing you how to improve. Formative assessment is required to complete the unit but won’t be assigned a mark or grade.

**Summative assessment** is about certifying learning and generally takes place at the end of a period of instruction. Summative assessment will be assigned both a mark and a grade.

**Submitting assessment**

Assessment will usually be submitted online, through LMS. Make sure that you check the rubric or instruction to see what’s required and that you attach a signed cover sheet.

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formative assessment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research proposal</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 29 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer assessment</td>
<td>Students to give feedback</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 12 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercise SPARKplus</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 26 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft literature</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 10 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review</td>
<td>Students to give feedback</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 17 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft research paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer assessment of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative assessment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical essay 40%</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Mon 8 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 words ±10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ethics Clearance 10%</td>
<td>UWA HREO</td>
<td>Must be submitted before interview or data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group presentation  [5 mins + 3 mins Q &amp; A] at Colloquium 25%</td>
<td>Invited panel of assessors</td>
<td>Colloquium Wed 30 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written research paper 25% 3000 words ± 10%</td>
<td>JM &amp; IG</td>
<td>4:00 pm Fri 1 Jun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHING AND LEARNING RESPONSIBILITIES

Charter of student rights and responsibilities

This Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities upholds the fundamental rights of students who undertake their education at the University of Western Australia.

It recognises that excellence in teaching and learning requires students to be active participants in their educational experience. It upholds the ethos that in addition to the University’s role of awarding formal academic qualifications to students, the University must strive to instil in all students independent scholarly learning, critical judgement, academic integrity and ethical sensitivity.

Please refer to the website the full charter of student rights and responsibilities, located at http://www.secretariat.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/charter

Student Guild contact details

The University of Western Australia Student Guild
35 Stirling Highway
Crawley WA 6009
Phone: (+61 8) 6488 2295
Facsimile: (+61 8) 6488 1041
E-mail: enquiries@guild.uwa.edu.au
Website: http://www.guild.uwa.edu.au

Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct

[Ethical scholarship] is the pursuit of scholarly enquiry marked by honesty and integrity.

Academic Literacy is the capacity to undertake study and research, and to communicate findings and knowledge, in a manner appropriate to the particular disciplinary conventions and scholarly standards expected at university level.

Academic misconduct is any activity or practice engaged in by a student that breaches explicit guidelines relating to the production of work for assessment, in a manner that compromises or defeats the purpose of that assessment. Students must not engage in academic misconduct. Any such activity undermines an ethos of ethical scholarship. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to cheating, or attempting to cheat, through:

- Collusion
- Inappropriate collaboration
- Plagiarism
- Misrepresenting or fabricating data or results or other assessable work
- Inappropriate electronic data sourcing/collection
- Breaching rules specified for the conduct of examinations in a way that may compromise or defeat the purposes of assessment.
Penalties for academic misconduct vary according to seriousness of the case, and may include the requirement to do further work or repeat work; deduction of marks; the award of zero marks for the assessment; failure of one or more units; suspension from a course of study; exclusion from the University, non-conferral of a degree, diploma or other award to which the student would otherwise have been entitled. Refer to the Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct policy.

**Appeals against academic assessment**

If students feel they have been unfairly assessed, they have the right to appeal their mark by submitting an Appeal Against Academic Assessment form to the Head of School and Faculty Office. The form must be submitted within **twenty working days** of the release of the formal result. It is recommended that students contact the Guild Education Officers to aid them in the appeals process. They can be contacted on +61 8 6488 2295 or education@guild.uwa.edu.au. Full regulations governing appeals procedures are available from Academic Policy Services, available online at http://www.aps.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/appeals

**Unit Rules**

http://units.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/units/gcrl/gcrl1000

**Educational Principles**

In this unit, you will be encouraged and facilitated to develop the ability and desire to:

1. to develop disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge and skills through study and research-based enquiry, at internationally recognised levels of excellence
   
   - to think, reason and analyse logically and creatively
   - to question accepted wisdom and be open to innovation
   - to acquire the skills needed to embrace rapidly changing technologies.

2. to further develop the skills required to learn, and to continue through life to learn, from a variety of sources and experiences
   
   - to develop attitudes which value learning
   - to acquire skills in information literacy.

3. to develop personal, social, and ethical awareness in an international context
   
   - to acquire cultural literacy [1]
   - to respect Indigenous knowledge, values and culture
   - to develop ethical approaches and mature judgement in practical and academic matters
   - to develop the capacity for effective citizenship, leadership and teamwork.

4. to communicate clearly, effectively and appropriately in a range of contexts
   
   - to develop spoken and written English communication skills at high levels
   - to acquire skills in critical literacy and interpersonal communication.
**BPHIL (HONS) RESEARCH TRAINING THROUGH THE RESEARCH PLACEMENT AT LEVEL 2**

**Introduction**

Global Challenges, Research and Leadership (GCRL1000) provides the platform for undergraduate research training in BPhil (Hons). Placement with a research mentor at Level 2 extends that experience by preparing students for further research placements (e.g. as part of a SAS/Exchange program or an individual placement) and the independent research project, undertaken as a unit, at Level 3.¹

The Research Placement extends a primary aim of GCRL1000 — “learning to think like a researcher” — by enabling BPhil (Hons) students to practice the sequence of research “elements” along with “discipline content” of a Cycle 1 degree at an advanced level. That is, BPhil (Hons) students will experience:

A. The evolution of the discipline, including its history, philosophy and theorising.
B. The methods of enquiry that the discipline uses, including methods of research ethics.
C. The practice of enquiry-based thinking relevant to the discipline.
D. The discourse conventions of the discipline.²

in the context of an active research team.

Students entering BPhil (Hons) through the Group 2 intake will, necessarily, have different experiences but a number of broadening units³ and Level 1 units in degree-specific majors include some elements found in GCRL1000. ENSC1001, for example, is available as a broadening unit, is required for Level 1 in the Engineering Science major and includes some research method and collaboration elements of GCRL1000.⁴

**Background**

Three documents are relevant:
Honours and B.Phil Working Party Report Future Framework Implementation (F26593) [July 2009], 5 University Policy on: Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) Date approved 01/06/2011 6 and Interim Board of Studies: Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) Curriculum (F28852) (2009).7

There is broad agreement among these documents. Academic requirements for the Level 2 research placement are suggested rather than specified in Curriculum (F28852) thus providing flexibility to align students’ interests, mentors’ current research projects and disciplinary protocols.

In semester 1, 2012, GCRL1000 students satisfied a number of learning outcomes beyond those identified for Level 1 in Curriculum (F28852),8 primarily as a result of the pedagogy adopted in this unit (see Attachment A), and suggesting that the academic content can be increased. Thus, a requirement such as, “prepare a short reflective statement on Level 1 experience for B.Phil (Hons) website (500 words max)” (Communications experience, endnote 3) represents a minimum rather than a limit.

Models
Undergraduate research placements are widespread in UWA comparators — e.g. Undergraduate Research Opportunities offered through Universitas 219 — and UWA itself provides a model in the successful UWA-USTC Research Training Program.10 Students’ views on the value of such research placements are also variously attested — e.g. BBSRC’s Review of Research Experience Placements 201011 — and in the scholarship around teaching and learning.12

Best practice
Descriptions of undergraduate research placements vary, often depending on whether they are located within a program (e.g. via U Connecticut’s Office of Undergraduate
Research\textsuperscript{13} or individually negotiated (e.g. University of Cambridge’s university-wide system where individual students sign up for individual projects)\textsuperscript{14}, rolled into assessment or free-standing as not for credit.

The most comprehensive survey of best practice in undergraduate research training is compiled in \textit{Characteristics of Excellence in Undergraduate Research (COEUR)} (2012), edited by Nancy Hensel and published by the Council on Undergraduate Research\textsuperscript{15}. Rowlett, Blockus and Larson’s lead chapter identifies 12 such characteristics ranging from “1. Campus Mission and Culture” to “12 Strategic Planning;” each section describes a characteristic’s individual features and places it within the overall context. “Campus Mission and Culture,” for example, includes discussion of institutional commitment, scholarly faculty, faculty commitment, broad disciplinary participation, accessible opportunities for undergraduates and integration with other engaging and high-impact opportunities (2-4). This survey would provide a valuable framework both for reviewing the Research Placement in BPhil (Hons) at an appropriate time and refining the current model.

More narrowly focused guidelines for research experience placements usually include the following elements to “scaffold” both the students’ and mentors’ experience: selecting a suitable undergraduate student, identifying a suitable project and then ensuring that

- appropriate supervisory arrangements are in place.
- any necessary ethical committee approvals and requirements of regulatory authorities are completed before the work begins and maintained during the duration of the work.
- the identification and protection from exploitation of any intellectual property rights arising from the work are effected.
- all facilities, agreements about access and collaborations necessary for the work are in place and can be ensured through the period of the work.
- support costs provided and used are also audited.
- outcomes from the project are reported.\textsuperscript{16}
In the wider context, UWA has a number of relevant guidelines in place: Code of Conduct for the Responsible Conduct of Research;¹⁷ a Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct;¹⁸ for Human Research Ethics;¹⁹ Guidelines for Graduate Research Supervisors;²⁰ a Student Charter of Rights and Responsibilities.²¹ University Policy provides a Best Practice Guide for Honours Supervision as part of the policy on Honours Award; ²² individual Faculties provide guidance on Honours programs²³ and advice and support for Honours students;²⁴ in addition, discipline-specific academic advice is available within individual Schools;²⁵ the Honours Hub²⁶ provides generic resources.²⁷

Further, BPhil (Hons) students will come to the Level 2 placement with some research experience. GCRL1000 students, for example, will have applied for Human Research Ethics clearance as part of their research projects; all students are familiarized with the Student Charter through the Current Students webpage.²⁸

Guidelines
These guidelines seek to balance the imperatives of curriculum, implementation and parity. The curricular imperative of research training within specific disciplines, potentially ranging across the 76 majors offered in New Courses 2012, requires flexibility in the selection of activities, tasks and outputs suitable for an undergraduate student within the context of an ongoing research project.

Organizing the Research Placement acknowledges the

- reality that the Research Placement, while not being a formal unit, is undertaken in addition to a student’s normal course load and so the workload of both student and Mentor needs to be monitored;
- existing policies and guidelines supporting undergraduate research, usually at Honours level but not invariably so (e.g. ULTRIS and Matariki), providing guidance at all stages of the placement and in specific instances such as dispute resolution;
• prior knowledge of and training in ethical dimension of research provided by GCRL1000 may not be shared by Group 2 entrants to the degree and may not be sufficient once students are in discipline-specific research contexts. Thus, a workshop, presented by specialists prior to placement addressing Human Ethics, Animal Ethics and Bio-Safety, as well as issues around the Code of Conduct of Research, Data Management, Open Access etc. will be required.
• value of engaging students in investigating the options as a way of familiarizing themselves with research at UWA;
• ongoing research conducted by high-profile and highly successful researchers and their teams;
• appropriateness of placing BPhil (Hons) students with these researchers;
• need (before the next cohort’s placements) to formalize the networks of available researchers and projects;
• requirement to track students’ research placements to ensure completion and thus progression and effectiveness in terms of research experience and training;
• need to provide support to both students and research mentors;
• need to foreshadow review within a reasonable time to ensure that research placements align with best practice, on the one hand, and BPhil (Hons) students’ requirements, on the other.

Ensuring parity aims to ensure students achieve comparable educational experiences across a diversity of research locations. A number of outcomes are described below that will provide some structure for comparability; students’ evaluation of their experience/s will add another dimension; as will feedback from Research Mentors. But the terms in which “parity” is understood and the criteria against which it is measured will — realistically — remain a challenge. Parity may be less a matter of terms to be audited and better evaluated first, by ensuring students have equal access to the research placement and second, by investigating the use students make of their research experience, for example, in relation to the Level 3 independent research project and/or a further research placement either at UWA, as an individual placement or as part of a SAS/Exchange program. Students’
experience of research placements in the BSc (Advanced Science) suggest that one of the most powerful outcomes is the intangible experience of being part of a research team.

Academic descriptors

The Research Placement offers BPhil (Hons) students the opportunity, “in the course of at least three meetings” with the Research Mentor, “to discuss research activities, practices and culture of the relevant discipline.”

Choice of Mentor

The choice of Research Mentor, schedule of meetings and choice of research activities appropriate to student’s abilities and development will need to be signed-off by both student and mentor and lodged with the Academic Co-ordinator.

Outcomes

Students on Research Placement may engage in a variety of activities and, without being limited to the following outcomes, will need to:

• **Undertake a discipline-wide survey** identifying three suitable researchers with whom the student might undertake the Research Placement; assisted by research tools in Moodle (see Attachment B); submitted to the Academic Co-ordinator in the preceding semester.

• **Develop a text/digital object** that may take the form of a research journal to record research activities, develop appropriate research outputs conforming to discursive conventions the particular discipline and a researcher’s curriculum vitae.

• **Participate in a research meeting** — conference, seminar, poster session, presentation, 3-Minute Thesis format — selected from a range of professional academic and undergraduate options convened on-campus at UWA (e.g. Institute of
Advanced Studies, School/research centre seminar series) or off-campus (national or international).  

- **Build a web presence** in the BPhil (Hons) Centre for Undergraduate Research, accessed through LMS. This site will provide access to eLearning and ePortfolio tools, research resources and a workspace for each student.

### Organizational details

**Name**  
BPhil (Hons) Research Placement: neither a special unit nor a practicum

**Level**  
Level 2

**Duration**  
Normally 1 semester

**Assessment**  
Nil

**Recording**  
Research Placement will need to be recorded on academic transcript

**Workload**  
By agreement: no unit criteria apply; students need to attend specialist workshop in ethics training.

**Placement**  
Curriculum (F28852) recommends the “choice of mentor would be arranged by negotiation of the B.Phil (Hons) Course Co-ordinator and the relevant discipline area of the student’s major.” While students will usually be placed with leading UWA researchers whose grants and projects offer the scope to train and support undergraduate researchers, students commence their placement by undertaking a discipline-wide search to nominate 3 preferred researchers.

**Resources**  
including insurance and access should be agreed and in place before the placement commences and extend for an appropriate length.

**Intellectual property**  
should be protected under the University Policy on Intellectual Property where appropriate, for example, 2.1.2.1.

**Support**  
Mentors and students will have the support of the Academic Co-ordinator as well as the University Policy on: Honours Award, which includes a Best Practice Guide to Supervision of Honours students.
Review 2013 Research Placements will reveal a network of research colleagues and projects suitable for BPhil (Hons) students, by analogy with the UWA-USTC project. This network will need to be tracked, supported and aligned for subsequent BPhil (Hons) cohorts. There are a number of models — for disciplines in the Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences and Business — to inform how UWA formalizes this network but it will be essential to the success of this element in BPhil (Hons). A review would be appropriate after 2 cohorts’ placements.

Assoc. Prof. Jenna Mead
Academic Co-ordinator, BPhil (Hons)
Sept 2012
Aim
Placement with a research mentor at Level 2 extends Level 1 research training by preparing students for further placements (e.g. as part of a SAS/Exchange program or an individual placement) and the independent research project at Level 3. This placement is normally for one semester. Students may also undertake volunteer placements or work experience either on a stand-alone basis or part of a SAS/Exchange program.

Background
The Research Placement extends a primary aim of GCRL1000 — “learning to think like a researcher”— by enabling BPhil (Hons) students to practice a sequence of research “elements” along with “discipline content” of a Cycle 1 degree at an advanced level. That is, BPhil (Hons) students will experience:

A. The evolution of the discipline, including its history, philosophy and theorizing.
B. The methods of enquiry that the discipline uses, including methods of research ethics.
C. The practice of enquiry-based thinking relevant to the discipline.
D. The discourse conventions of the discipline.¹

in the context of an active research team.

Students entering BPhil (Hons) at Level 2 intake will have different experiences but a number of broadening units and Level 1 units in degree-specific majors include some elements found in GCRL1000.²
Outcomes
Students on Research Placement may engage in a variety of activities and, without being limited to the following outcomes, will need to:

• *Undertake a discipline-wide survey* identifying three suitable researchers with whom the student might undertake the Research Placement; assisted by research tools in Moodle (see Attachment B); submitted to the Academic Coordinator in the preceding semester.

• *Attend comprehensive seminar on* Human Ethics, Animal Ethics and Bio-Safety, as well as issues around the Code of Conduct of Research, Data Management, Open Access, etc. conducted by DV-C (Research) or nominee. Attendance is a requirement and students will be formally notified about this seminar.

• *Meet with the mentor* at least THREE times during the semester.

• *Agree on a series of research activities* appropriate to the research being conducted by the team and the student’s level of training. Both parties to sign-off.

  Complete a research placement application; available online.

• *Develop a text/digital object* that may take the form of a research journal to record research activities, develop appropriate research outputs conforming to discursive conventions the particular discipline. Resourced through BPhil (Hons) Centre for Undergraduate Research (BCUR).

• *Participate in a research meeting* — conference, seminar, poster session, presentation — selected from a range of professional academic and undergraduate options convened on-campus at UWA (e.g. Institute of Advanced Studies, School/research centre seminar series) or off-campus (national or international).³

• *Attend BPhil (Hons) Research Seminar* held in weeks 3, 7 and 11. Students will nominate to present a 3-minute presentation at ONE seminar. The presentation needs to present some aspect of the work of the research team in which students are working. Presentations will be followed by 2-3 minutes’
question and answer. Judges, selected at each session, will provide feedback and there may be prizes.

- **Develop a research profile** appropriate for a researcher. The profile may be a web presence in the BCUR, a curriculum vitae or another appropriate format.

- **Participate in an evaluation process** for the Research Placement, conducted online through BCUR.

**Assessment**

The Research Placement has no formal assessment as it’s a placement rather than a unit. However,

- both mentor and student will need to sign-off on the agreed outcomes.

- The digital object and curriculum vitae both need to be submitted to the Academic Co-ordinator to formalize completion.

**Insurance, Resources, Intellectual Property, Research Ethics**

- Standard insurance arrangements should be completed where required, for example, in clinical settings.

- Resourcing is at the research mentor’s discretion; it would be helpful to record resource requirements where appropriate.

- **University** policies on intellectual property and the Conduct of Research; the Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct; for Human Research Ethics also apply in this setting.

**Concluding remarks**

I’d like to thank research colleagues who have agreed to act as mentors. The Research Placement is being trialed in 2013 and I’d be grateful for feedback from both mentors and students. The model used here has been adapted from the UWA-USTC Research Training Program and the erstwhile Advanced Science degree. If problems occur, please let me know immediately.

Best wishes,
Assoc. Prof. Jenna Mead
Academic Co-ordinator, BPhil (Hons)

2 ENSC1001, for example, is available as a broadening unit, is required for Level 1 in the Engineering Science major and includes some research method and collaboration elements of GCRL1000.
3 E.g. First Australasian Conference of Undergraduate Research, Macquarie University, 20 Sept 2012,
IN THE ZONE Conference
26-27 November 2012
UWA

Project initiated by Academic Co-ordinator, 7 Oct 2011
Supported by Rio Tinto-UWA Education Partnership, Aug 2012

Masterclass attendees with Vinay Venkataraman

- Daniel Ortlepp
- Rajiv Venkatraman
- Thea Lendich
- Michelle Larg
- Tania Loke
- Andrew Pham
- Gaeleen Perrone
- Emily Twigger
- James Panarettos
- Arash Arabshahi

Report by BPhil (Hons) participant, James Panarettos, 28 Oct 2012 [excerpt]

Thank you so much for the wonderful opportunity to attend this event. More than anything, it was an opportunity for networking and becoming immersed in the business world for the first time. A bonus was the insightful and varied perspectives on our future relationship with the Asia-Pacific. No doubt, this will influence many of our choices in the future, such as which language to study, which country to complete our study abroad requirement in and which units we should take.

DAY 1:
- China’s growth may in fact be 0% (or negative) when inflation of 10% is deducted. Colin Barnett and others stated that while these figures may be correct, growth is not the only factor that affects Australia. For example, many Chinese people have moved into the middle-class, making them demand more protein (as they can now afford it). China will soon not be able to meet the demand and that is where Australia must “jump on the dragon” (as opposed to the sheep) before the US and other countries get there. The ITZ focused on Aus’s "comparative advantage" (this term being used incessantly) as we are "in the [same] time zone as 60% of the world’s population" give or take 2 hours. It was also mentioned that much of our future expectations ride on the back of the assumption that this comparative advantage will actually have a profound effect …
- Gala dinner was fab-o! Was chatting to a country scholarship donor as well as a few Fogarty scholars :)
• Day 2 commenced with more talk on "Capacity Building". Vinay Venkataraman commenced with a highly engaging talk on "Innovation Dichotomies for the Zone". 3 catalysts were identified: Deal makers (biz acumen and connections), Supernodes (large connections) and Angel investors (recycle - his example is where computer monitors were thrown out by an Indian government office, and an organization refitted them at low-cost, turning them into TV's). Other notables in his speech were: [Developing new competencies and IP, based on by-products of a traditional industry (e.g. mining software)] [learning how to extrapolate market needs and adapt to different cultures] [a systematic policy driven approach to creating the right kind of ecosystem] . . .

• Colin Barnett’s speech was a scathing review of the objectivity and key focus areas of the White Paper . . .

• A Summary panel gave the following statement: 1 big issue: how crowded it is going to be on the back of the big Chinese "dragon". We won’t be competing against China but the rest of the world. So we need to fix government policy.

\[BPhil (Hons) students Alex Khor, Zac Molly-Mencshelyi and Gaelen Perrone In the Zone\]
STUDY ABROAD SEMESTER/EXCHANGE PROGRAMS in BPhil (HONS)
Feedback from Kelly Smith, Director, International Centre
Milly Ingate, Associate Director (Study Abroad and Student Exchange), International Centre
Carolyn Wood, Coordinator, Student Exchange and Study Abroad, International Centre
Eva Chye, Principal Adviser, International Relations (North and Southeast Asia)

SUMMARY
SAS/Exchange programs, research placements and/or a combination of these experiences are integral to BPhil (Hons). In the wider context of increasing and reciprocal internationalization of study, primarily at undergraduate level, the academic, personal, cultural, economic and institutional benefits of this experience will become more nuanced, visible and meaningful.

UWA has a well-established and highly successful program for SAS/Exchanges and joint research opportunities suitable for BPhil (Hons) students with a range of partners; new opportunities are developing. There is, however, no University Policy on the purpose of international study: this paper offers a framework for international study in BPhil (Hons).

Maximizing such opportunities within the degree will depend on tracking student feedback, maintaining liaison with academic/research colleagues to develop a network of appropriate research mentors, co-ordination with International Centre and Faculty colleagues, preparedness to manage both successes and challenges. There are strong arguments for extending institutional research undergraduate programs to the BPhil (Hons) cohort.

BPHIL (HONS) AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE
The Bachelor of Philosophy (Hons) degree is distinguished by particular research-intensive and high-level communications elements, in addition to those included in units contributing to the other mainstream degrees. BPhil (Hons) also emphasizes UWA’s commitment to educating global citizens who are able to value both their own and different cultures. These
features are codified in the rules around the degree: for example, **Degree Rule 10 for BPhil (Hons)** states “[a] semester of study outside of Australia (that may include a research placement) must normally be undertaken after the Level 1 units are completed and before the Level 3 units are completed.”¹ There is also, potentially, a combination to be made between Degree Rule 10 and **Degree Rule 7 for BPhil (Hons)** which states “[a]t least one of the units in the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course must normally involve the study of a language other than English.”²

**PURPOSE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDY**

There is, currently no University Policy specific to international study at UWA: there is a very successful set of processes, operated by the International Centre, to manage academic international placements for students. BPhil (Hons) poses a question about the purpose of such study within the context of an undergraduate research degree.³

In addition to the academic, employment and personal benefits of studying overseas study identified for UWA students,⁴ this experience of learning supports “a requirement to study aspects of the globalised and culturally diverse environment in which graduates will live and work” that is emphasized in *Education for Tomorrow’s World: Courses of Action Report of the Review of Course Structures The University of Western Australia* (Sept 2008).⁵

In fact, *Education for Tomorrow’s World* conceptualizes the BPhil (Hons) course with the Study Abroad experience as integral:⁶ requiring appropriate educational preparation as well as financial support.⁷ Less overtly, but perhaps just as important, is UWA’s recognition that “[s]tudents who avail themselves of the opportunity to study abroad can enlarge their sense of community so that it includes immersion in a foreign culture and allows them to develop peer networks in an international context.”⁸

More recently, the Vice-Chancellor’s “UWA Futures” paper⁹ includes as **Proposal 4: That the University develop its study abroad program, with the goal of doubling the participation of undergraduate students by 2020.**
BACKGROUND

In 2011, a paper titled Facilitating Study Abroad For Undergraduate Students (F31167)\(^\text{10}\) noted the requirement to balance two principles in relation to SAS/Exchange programs: the impetus “to provide better opportunities for students to develop an international outlook” in NC 2012 while acknowledging that “it is also vital that arrangements for studying overseas should not weaken the integrity of a student’s chosen major.” This paper identifies the benefits of international study as, primarily academic and, thus, Section 3 details constraints on SAS/Exchange programs and proposes rules for guiding the management of academic structures and international study programs.

Another dimension to the purpose of international study was canvassed in 2009 when Universities Australia commissioned The Nature of International Education in Australian Universities and its Benefits.\(^\text{11}\) This report argues, “of the many benefits of international education, its effect on Australia’s international relations has been least researched” and “includes an attempt to remedy this by providing some original research on the impact of international education on Australia’s public diplomacy” (3). The report uses “international education” to refer to the billion-dollar industry ($15.5 in 2008) that brings international students into the Australian tertiary sector. The argument — that firsthand experience is a building block of public diplomacy — readily applies to domestic students studying overseas as much as to international students studying in Australia. There is “simply no substitute” for domestic students studying in other global locations to enable young Australians to “make up their own minds” about the world outside their national borders (1).

CURRENT DRIVERS

There is a wider context here that is worth noting. The Financial Review (Education, Mon 8 Oct) carries two front-page articles on the internationalization of the tertiary sector: Tim Dodd reports on an address by UWA’s Chancellor, Michael Chaney, delivered at the International Education Advisory Council (IEAC), Fri 5 Oct\(^\text{12}\) and, separately, on Alan Olsen’s analysis of increasing international study undertaken by domestic students.\(^\text{13}\) These two
articles represent two sides of the same phenomenon that provides the context for SAS/Exchange programs at UWA, in general, and BPhil (Hons), in particular.

Internationalization is a reciprocal process despite the economic differentials: international students studying at Australian universities represent a $bn industry (Financial Review, 24) whose current downturn is causing considerable consternation; domestic students’ international study is up (4.6% in 2007 to 7.6% in 2010) with 32.7% of students choosing Asia as their academic destination in 2011. While researchers, like Olsen, are quick to point to the support provided by the federal government’s OS-HELP scheme ($25.3M in 2011 up from $8.6M in 2007) and the expected impetus from Dr Ken Henry’s Australia in the Asian Century report\textsuperscript{14}, analysis of the economic benefits of domestic students’ international educational experience are less visible.

**DYNAMIC FACTORS**

BPhil (Hons) will be in its first iteration between 2012-2015. During this time, 2-3 cohorts will plan and undertake SAS/Exchange programs. The first BPhil student to undertake such a program has enrolled in CHIN2801 China Field Study for Dec-Jan 2012-13. Feedback from students will expand our understanding of the benefits and challenges posed by international study for undergraduate research students. Challenges for the degree are emerging as the current students progress. For example, the potential for congestion at L3 has become visible; so too the potential difficulty of finding equivalents within the tight 8-unit structure for degree-specific majors and 14-unit structure for the Biomedical Science double major.

Students’ thinking about SAS/Exchange will also be influenced by their experiences here at UWA. For example, students’ participation in events such as the In The Zone Conference (26-27 Nov 2012),\textsuperscript{15} sponsored by Rio Tinto, and meeting Chinese students in the UWA-USTC Research Training Program (10 Aug 2012)\textsuperscript{16} will provide a more nuanced framework for decision-making.
The 2012 BPhil (Hons) cohort includes 4 international students and the number will increase incrementally; as well, some students have already had international study experience.

BPhil students have a strong cohort identity and have been keen to explore opportunities to develop and extend their connections within the cohort. Conversation within the cohort will be an important factor in deciding about SAS/Exchange programs.

**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS**

BPhil (Hons) might usefully explore the option of a SAS/Exchange program that focuses on research, for small cohorts as well as individuals, with institutional partners.

A number of opportunities are already being developed for which BPhil (Hons) students might be applicants. For example, the University of Alberta Research Internship Program\(^{17}\) for which one BPhil (Hons) student intends to apply in 2014. The National University of Singapore has also developed an undergraduate research program.\(^{18}\)

Joint research laboratories, at which BPhil (Hons) students might undertake research placements, are already established: for example, Joint Research Laboratory in Genomics and Nutriomics (2004-05, Zhejiang University);\(^{19}\) Centre of Excellence for Ecohydrology (2011, Zhejiang University);\(^{20}\) in Geomechanics (Modelling Pipe Pile in Clay project conducted by A/Prof Barry Lehane and Xiangtao Xu, n.d. HoHai University).\(^{21}\) Although there are some disadvantages in the disjunction between highly specialized and specific projects and BPhil (Hons) students whose research knowledge and training will, necessarily, be both more general and more limited. However, the model offered by these joint laboratories is useful.

One project that recommends itself for development is to facilitate student exchange with UWA partners in China offering select-entry undergraduate degree programs that focus on research. Colleagues in International Relations (Eva Chye) and the International Centre (Milly Ingate, Kelly Smith, Margaret Anderson) have identified the following universities:

1. Zhejiang University
2. Nanjing University
3. Harbin Institute of Technology
4. University of Science and Technology China
5. Tsinghua University
6. Shanghai Jiaotong University
7. Peking University
8. Xi’an Jiaotong University
9. Fudan University

This project requires detailed planning, a staged schedule for implementation and resources. However, student feedback confirms that it is an attractive option. But there is added impetus to develop partnerships for select-entry degrees since, as is emerging, BPhil (Hons) students have an advantage in being selected for placements made on a competitive basis; especially given the need, on the one hand, for equity of access for all UWA students and, on the other hand, the benefit of maintaining exchange agreements.

RESOURCES

Financial and staff resources will be critical to developing and maintaining regular SAS/Exchange programs, international research placements and (very likely) programs that combine both elements for BPhil (Hons) students. The International Centre has a highly developed set of processes and staff with extensive knowledge and experience in place; Carolyn Wood has already been designated as the contact for BPhil (Hons) students. The Faculties have, similarly, developed processes to manage SAS/Exchange programs, often with designated administrators to manage students’ requests for approval.

While BPhil (Hons) is not envisaged as a large degree (full cohort approximately 200 students), co-ordinating approvals for SAS/Exchange and/or research placements managed by the International Centre and Faculties with requirements of the BPhil (Hons) Degree Rules, University Policy and the best educational outcome for students will require development and resourcing of appropriate processes. For example, the more complex such
international experiences become, the more prepared UWA will need to become to manage both the successes and potential difficulties of such programs.

Assoc. Prof. Jenna Mead
BPhil (Hons) Academic Co-ordinator
8 Oct 2012; revised 25 Feb 2013

1 http://rules.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/rules/UGDegreeCourseRules/Part4

2 http://rules.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/rules/UGDegreeCourseRules/Part4

3 This gap is noted in Undergraduate Course Administration: Issues For Consultation (New Arrangements as approved by Academic Council – R89/11) Process for Implementation Proposed by Academic Policy Services. Page 5 notes that Academic Policy Services to monitor progress of discussion papers through the committee system with a view to formulating a University Policy on Student Exchange and Study Abroad, in consultation with the International Centre and the BPhil co-ordinator.

4 The benefits of studying overseas are many:

Academic benefits

- You can take courses related to your degree that are not available at UWA, for example The University of Otago offers courses in Native Title Law.
- You’ll study at universities that are leaders in their areas of research.
- You may find that exchange is an opportunity to improve rapidly at a foreign language (depending on where you go), because of both everyday exposure and intensive language programs that are offered.

Employment benefits

- Your achievement in a different academic and cultural environment will show to employers that you are flexible, that you are adventurous and are a self-starter.
- You’ll be able to gain invaluable experience for future employment through vacation internships in your area of study offered by some universities.
- Exchange will allow you the opportunity to establish not only friendships, but also a global network of students, many of whom will be entering the professional world very soon. These friends you make may be able to provide you with local knowledge on professional and educational opportunities in their home country.
Personal benefits

- You’ll be able to travel within the host country and further afield with local students or other international students.
- You’ll meet people from around the globe and develop new friendships.
- You’ll gain independence and confidence.

http://www.studyat.uwa.edu.au/study-abroad-and-exchange/study-overseas

5 Education for Tomorrow’s World: Courses of Action Report of the Review of Course Structures The University of Western Australia (Sept 2008), Executive Summary, point 3

6 Recommendation 4 [re BPhil (Hons)]

d. That it provide support arrangements for a Study Abroad experience; (vol. 1 34)

Recommendation 15

d. That the Board of Coursework Studies ensure that the structure of every undergraduate course will permit the possibility of at least a semester of study abroad.

Education for Tomorrow’s World: Courses of Action Report of the Review of Course Structures The University of Western Australia (Sept 2008), (vol. 1 37)

7 Features of BPhil (Hons) course “The “Study Abroad opportunity” needs not only scholarship assistance and academic affiliation arrangements but also appropriate educational preparation.” Education for Tomorrow’s World: Courses of Action Report of the Review of Course Structures The University of Western Australia (Sept 2008), (vol. 2 46)

8 Education for Tomorrow’s World: Courses of Action Report of the Review of Course Structures The University of Western Australia (Sept 2008), vol. 1 11-12


10 Prepared by the Senior Academic Reviewer, BCS, October 2011

http://committees.intranet.uwa.edu.au/_data/page/42357/102011_BCS_Agenda.pdf and
http://committees.intranet.uwa.edu.au/_data/page/42359/102011_BCS_Minutes.pdf This paper and BCS notes provide guidance on approving unit choice, structure and assessment in SAS/Exchange programs and WAM calculations.


12 Program at
https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:7SCl9b0VHG0j:www.aiec.idp.com/pdf/AIEC2012%2520Program%2520OVERVIEW.pdf+&hl=en&gl=au&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESinsdlIe7iM3pgQg8vcrgdOsfrR70AVCUjuXxu75pdy79bNpxNsnqNhnr31OUA9MrHK6BBRBFrdMXae72aPutaikXkE8WWSjOl_hHVts3pcvoLeKz x33o5o80gxxO188Nms0pru&sig=AHIEtbSw8DCxnCCob2efxjWjGbtxNA2tLQ

The Terms of Reference for this report might apply equally to all international destinations, as well as those in Asia. See http://asiancentury.dpmc.gov.au/terms-of-reference

http://www.emi.uwa.edu.au/collaborations/international/zone


http://special.comp.nus.edu.sg/urop/

http://www.plantenergy.uwa.edu.au/research/Associated_Centre_Websites/china.html

http://www.ecohydrology.uwa.edu.au/

http://www.civil.uwa.edu.au/research/geomechanics
Part 1—Preliminary

1. Title
These rules are the Undergraduate Degree Course Rules.

2. Terms used
(Note: The Glossary provides a fuller explanation of the terms used in these rules.)

In these rules:

*area of knowledge* means a group of associated disciplinary fields corresponding to a particular undergraduate pass degree;

*broadening units* means the units referred to in rule Rule 5(5)(c):

*Category A broadening units* means broadening units that—

(a) have as their main focus some aspect(s) of the globalised and culturally diverse environment; and

(b) are approved by the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Board of Coursework Studies, as Category A broadening units;

Note: Details of units that have been approved by the Academic Board as Category A units are provided at http://handbooks.uwa.edu.au/page/56205.

*complementary unit* means a unit that is approved by the Academic Board as a complementary unit in relation to a degree-specific major;

*course* means a plan of study, approved by the Academic Board, that a student must successfully undertake before qualifying for a degree;

*degree-specific major* means one of the majors that are approved by the Academic Board as degree-specific majors;

Note: Details of majors that have been approved by the Academic Board as degree-specific majors are provided at http://handbooks.uwa.edu.au/page/55399.

*LOTE units* means units that are approved by the Academic Board as language other than English units;

*normally*, in relation to a statement made in these rules, means the statement applies subject to one or more
exceptions approved by the Academic Board;

relevant board means a Board of the University relevant to the case in point;

undergraduate degree course means an undergraduate pass or honours degree course or the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course;

undergraduate pass degree course means the course for the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Commerce or Bachelor of Design pass degree;

unit means a discrete element in a course that normally represents six credit points.

3. Range of undergraduate enrolments
A student who is an undergraduate must be enrolled in—

(a) an undergraduate pass degree course; or

(b) an honours degree course referred to in Rule 10; or

(c) the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course referred to in Rule 13.

4. Nomination of degree-specific major for undergraduate degree course
A student enrolled in an undergraduate pass degree course or the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course must nominate a degree-specific major for the course in which the student is enrolled.

Part 2—Undergraduate pass degree courses

5. Undergraduate pass degree courses
(1) An undergraduate pass degree course consists of 24 units.

(2) The units must include a degree-specific major in the form of either a single major or a double major.

(3) A single major consists of eight units from the same disciplinary field with, normally—

(a) two Level 1 units; and

(b) two Level 2 units; and

(c) four Level 3 units.

(4) A double major consists of 14 units with, normally—

(a) two Level 1 units that are acceptable to each major; and

(b) four Level 2 units; and

(c) eight Level 3 units.

(5) An undergraduate pass degree course—

(a) must not include more than 12 Level 1 units; and
must include at least four Level 3 units; and

must include four units (broadening units) from one or more areas of knowledge that, except as stated in Rule 6(2) and (3), do not include the area of knowledge in which a student's degree-specific major is offered.

6. Broadening units

(1) Subject to (3), at least one of the broadening units in an undergraduate pass degree course must be selected from Category A broadening units.

(2) Rule 5(5)(c) does not prevent a student enrolled in the Bachelor of Arts degree course from including LOTE units as broadening units as long as those units do not form part of the disciplinary field of the student's degree-specific major.

(3) Permissible substitutes for Category A broadening units are—

(a) an approved Study Abroad/Student Exchange program for credit; or

(b) a LOTE unit except if it forms part of the disciplinary field of the student's degree-specific major.

7. Academic Conduct Essentials, Communication and Research Skills and Indigenous Studies Essential modules

(1) Except as stated in (2), a student who enrolls in an undergraduate pass degree course of the University for the first time, irrespective of whether they have previously been enrolled in another course of the University, must undertake modules called Academic Conduct Essentials (the ACE module), Communication and Research Skills (the CARS module) and Indigenous Studies Essentials (the ISE module) in the teaching period in which they are first enrolled.

(2) A student who has previously achieved a result of Ungraded Pass (UP) for the ACE module, the CARS module or the ISE module is not required to repeat the relevant module.

8. Satisfactory progress

(1) Subject to (2), to make satisfactory progress in a calendar year a student must pass units to a value of at least half the total value of units in which they remain enrolled after the final date for withdrawal without academic penalty.

(2) A student who has not achieved a result of Ungraded Pass (UP) in one or more of the ACE module, the CARS module or the ISE module when their progress status is assessed will not have made satisfactory progress.

(3) A student who fails a unit twice is not permitted to enrol again in that unit unless the relevant board approves otherwise.

9. Progress status

(1) A student who makes satisfactory progress is assigned the status of 'Good Standing'.

(2) Unless the relevant board determines otherwise because of exceptional circumstances—

(a) a student who does not make satisfactory progress for the first time is assigned a progress status of 'On Probation';

(b) a student who does not make satisfactory progress for the second time is assigned a progress status of 'Suspended';
Part 3—Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Commerce, Bachelor of Design and Bachelor of Science honours degree courses

10. Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Commerce, Bachelor of Design and Bachelor of Science honours degree courses
(1) The honours degree course consists of the equivalent of eight units.

(2) The honours degree course includes a research dissertation that is normally—

(a) equivalent to four units; and

(b) required to be completed, whether on a full-time or part-time basis, within two consecutive semesters.

(3) Except as stated in (4), a student who enrols in the honours degree course for the first time, irrespective of whether they have previously been enrolled in another course of the University, must undertake modules called Academic Conduct Essentials (the ACE module), Communication and Research Skills (the CARS module) and Indigenous Studies Essentials (the ISE module) in the teaching period in which they are first enrolled.

(4) A student who has previously achieved a result of Ungraded Pass (UP) for the ACE module, the CARS module or the ISE module is not required to repeat the relevant module.

11. Satisfactory progress
(1) Subject to (3), to make satisfactory progress in a calendar year a student must pass all units in which they remain enrolled after the final date for withdrawal without academic penalty.

(2) For the dissertation component of the honours degree course the relevant board determines whether satisfactory progress has been made having regard to the report of the student's supervisor.

(3) A student who has not achieved a result of Ungraded Pass (UP) in one or more of the ACE module, the CARS module or the ISE module when their progress status is assessed will not have made satisfactory progress.

12. Progress status
(1) A student who makes satisfactory progress is assigned the status of 'Good Standing'.

(2) A student who does not make satisfactory progress in terms of Rule 11(3) is assigned the progress status of 'On Probation'.

(3) Unless the relevant board determines otherwise because of exceptional circumstances a student other than one described in (2) who does not make satisfactory progress is assigned the progress status of 'Excluded'.

Part 4—Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course

13. Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course
(1) The Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course consists of 32 units.

(2) The units must include—
(a) no more than 12 Level 1 units; and
(b) at least four Level 3 units; and
(c) four units (broadening units) from one or more areas of knowledge that do not include the area of knowledge of the degree-specific major; and
(d) the equivalent of eight Level 4 units; and
(e) a degree-specific major in the form of either a single major or a double major; and
(f) a research dissertation component equivalent to four Level 4 units.

3 LOTE units are broadening units as long as those units do not form part of the disciplinary field of the student’s degree-specific major.

4 Permissible substitutes for Category A broadening units are—
(a) an approved Study Abroad/Student Exchange program for credit; or
(b) a LOTE unit except if it forms part of the disciplinary field of the student’s degree-specific major.

5 A single major consists of eight units from the same disciplinary field with, normally—
(a) two Level 1 units; and
(b) two Level 2 units; and
(c) four Level 3 units.

6 A double major consists of 14 units with, normally—
(a) two Level 1 units that are acceptable to each major; and
(b) four Level 2 units; and
(c) eight Level 3 units.

7 At least one of the units in the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course must normally involve the study of a language other than English.

8 A unit that is a complementary unit in relation to a student’s degree-specific major must be included in the student’s degree course.

9 Students are normally required to undertake a residential program approved by the Academic Board before the Level 1 units are completed.

10 A semester of study outside of Australia (that may include a research placement) must normally be undertaken after the Level 1 units are completed and before the Level 3 units are completed.


1 Except as stated in (2), a student who enrols in the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) degree course for the first time, irrespective of whether they have previously been enrolled in another course of the University, must undertake modules called Academic Conduct Essentials (the ACE module), Communication and Research Skills (the CARS module) and Indigenous Studies Essentials (the ISE module) in the teaching period in which
they are first enrolled.

(2) A student who has previously achieved a result of Ungraded Pass (UP) for the ACE module, the CARS module or the ISE module is not required to repeat the relevant module.

15. Satisfactory progress

(1) Subject to (2) to (4) inclusive, to make satisfactory progress in a calendar year a student must achieve at least a credit pass in all units in which they remain enrolled after the final date for withdrawal without academic penalty.

(2) A student must normally achieve a weighted average mark of at least 80 calculated as an average of the student’s best six unit results in each of their first two academic years, subject to (3), and a weighted average mark of at least 75 for the student’s best six unit results in their third academic year.

(3) If a student has completed more than a full-time load in the period for which the weighted average mark is calculated, the weighted average mark is calculated using the student’s lowest scoring units that permit progression and the remainder, if the student is in their first or second academic years, contribute to the weighted average mark calculation for the next period.

(4) A student who has not achieved a result of Ungraded Pass (UP) in one or more of the ACE module, the CARS module or the ISE module when their progress status is assessed will not have made satisfactory progress.

16. Progress status

(1) A student who makes satisfactory progress is assigned the status of ‘Good Standing’.

(2) A student who does not make satisfactory progress in terms of Rule 15(4) is assigned the progress status of ‘On Probation’.

(3) Unless the relevant board determines otherwise because of exceptional circumstances or (4) applies, a student who does not make satisfactory progress is assigned the progress status of ‘Excluded’.

(4) A student who has a weighted average mark below 80 in their first academic year but who, in the opinion of the Board of Studies for the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours), has a reasonable prospect of attaining a cumulative weighted average mark of 80 by the time their progress is next assessed, is assigned the progress status of ‘On Probation’ and appropriate conditions are applied to allow close monitoring of the student’s progress in the next period with a view to course transfer if appropriate.

(5) To be awarded the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) a student must achieve an Honours classification of 2A or above.

(6) A student who is awarded an Honours classification below 2A is awarded the degree to which their degree-specific major belongs with the relevant classification of Honours.
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ACADEMIC PROGRESS REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE
BACHELOR OF PHILOSOPHY (HONS)

MINUTES
Meeting Fri 7 Dec 2012, Student Services
Meeting Mon 10 Dec, by arrangement

PRESENT
Meeting 1
Ms Lisa Beckley, Manager, Student and Academic Support, Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics
Dr Barbara Goodwin, Student Advisor (Undergraduate), Science Student Office
Mr Paul Lloyd, Sub-Dean, Faculty of Business
Ms Sabbia Tilli, Student Advisor, Faculty of Arts
Assoc. Prof. Jenna Mead, Academic Co-ordinator, BPhil (Hons) (Presiding)

Meeting 2
Winthrop Professor Ian McArthur, nominee of BPhil (Hons) Board of Studies
Ass. Prof. Jenna Mead, Academic Co-ordinator, BPhil (Hons)

BACKGROUND
In accordance with BOARDS OF STUDIES AND ADMINISTRATION OF NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSES (F28106), s 1.1.3 and 1.2.1, the Academic Progress Review Sub-committee convened to consider results in BPhil (Hons) under Rule 15.1 Two meetings were convened to accommodate W/Prof. McArthur’s absence from UWA.

DOCUMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION
The Academic Review Sub-committee considered the
1. Completions Register, provided by Student Administration and the
2. Report for Current BPhil Students, provided by Ms Kerry Clohessy, Information Analyst, IRU.

Both documents were circulated by email; both documents are attached here.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Members worked through the sections in Rule 15 and its application through Rule 16.

Bearing in mind that 2012 sees the introduction of Degree Rules for BPhil (Hons) and that amendments on the basis of operationalizing those Rules are to be expected, members recommend:

1 http://rules.handbooks.uwa.edu.au/rules/UGDegreeCourseRules/Part4
1. That Rule 15 be re-visited and, in particular, section 15(1)². Members acknowledged the need for an exclusionary mechanism in any rule for progression but considered 15(1) to be problematic:

   a. This section is a recent addition and doesn't appear in any of the policy, Board, or public documents surrounding BPhil (Hons) from 2008 onward.

   b. The introduction of a Credit grade as the primary criterion for progression, evidenced by its position in the Rule, conflicts with s 15(2) where the criterion is a Weighted Average Mark from best_6 results. At the September 2012 meeting, the Board argued that this criterion acknowledges that broadening units, required by new Courses, may not represent a student’s strengths. Further, the Board accepted using this criterion over a 2-year period to enable students to adapt and mature in the context of university learning, adding weight to this criterion’s being the primary one for progression.

   c. The consequence of 15(1) is that the BPhil (Hons) student achieving and generating a best_6 WAM of 88.50 (and an all_8 WAM of 83.63) would be EXCLUDED from the degree on the basis that CLAN1101 Latin 1 — the LOTE required by Rule 7 — result was 59: 1 mark short of a Credit. The student would need to re-apply for entry to UWA having not applied to transfer to another degree.³

   d. This result is especially egregious since the result would have been quarantined from WAM calculations altogether had it been undertaken as part of an approved SAS/Exchange program.

   e. A “work-around” can be retrieved from Rule 16(3) — “because of exceptional circumstances”⁴ — where the clearly aberrant mark is regarded as “exceptional.” Rule 16(4) would require the student to

² (1) Subject to (2) to (4) inclusive, to make satisfactory progress in a calendar year a student must achieve at least a credit pass in all units in which they remain enrolled after the final date for withdrawal without academic penalty.
⁴ (3) Unless the relevant board determines otherwise because of exceptional circumstances or (4) applies, a student who does not make satisfactory progress is assigned the progress status of ‘Excluded’.
be placed on “probation” which, in this case where the student will not enrol in another language unit (having satisfied both a Cat A broadening unit and Rule 7), would not improve the student’s educational experience.

2. that appropriate terminology be developed for BPhil (Hons) since the categories nominated in Rule 15 are not the same as those applied in mainstream degrees, following University policy. See, for example, “Excluded” “Probation.”

that steps be taken to ensure that Progress Standing that appears on the student’s transcript is both transparent and doesn’t disadvantage the student. For example, “Excluded,” meaning “not permitted to re-enrol in the course,” in the context of BPhil (Hons), may mean “not permitted to re-enrol in UWA’s highest progression criteria” rather than “student has failed for the third time in more than half the units in which the student remained enrolled.”

FURTHER ACTION

1. Winthrop Professor McArthur reviewed both the discussion and results in the cohort and signed off on the BPhil Progression Committee Recommendations for Students Not Meeting All Criteria; (attached here).

2. Academic Co-ordinator met with Mr Harvery von Bergheim, Associate Director, Student Services, Ms Leandra Corich, Examinations Officer and Ms Tanya Aquino, Admissions Co-ordinator (Mon 10 Dec) to discuss processes for implementing academic progression.

3. There are a number of points here:

a. Assessment results, progression and academic records are managed through the Callista system whereas progression in BPhil (Hons) is assessed by a separate program managed through IRU; essentially because Callista isn’t able to generate best_6 WAMs in an appropriate format.

b. At present, BPhil students’ internal records and final transcripts will show data generated by Callista, rather than IRU. Thus, WAMs shown will be all_8 rather than best_6 and it may not be immediately obvious how a student has progressed, given differences in the scores.

c. Similarly, the terminology showing on documentation generated by Callista doesn’t indicate conditions relevant to BPhil, e.g. terms of Probation or, in the case of 2 Exclusions, a comment will be

---

6 http://www.universitypolicies.uwa.edu.au/search?method=document&id=UP10%2F11 at page A8. For more details, see this document, Appendix 3, Undergraduate Course Administration: Summary Report to the Board of Studies
added specifying Rule 15(2) and facilitating students’ applications for transfer.

d. Some adjustment will need to be made here: interim solutions, proposed by colleagues in Student Administration and Admissions, will be implemented. Colleagues here concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Review Sub-committee at 2 and 3 (above).

CONCLUSION

At its Sept meeting, the Board of Studies considered SATISFACTORY PROGRESS IN THE BACHELOR OF PHILOSOPHY (HONOURS) COURSE (F27161) 7. This paper asserted

As a context for estimating the likely scale of exclusions, the following data supplied by the IRU may be illuminating. WAM figures for Year 1 UWA students in 2009, based on their best 6 unit results, show that 38% of those with an ATAR of 99.5 or above were unable to achieve a WAM of 80 or more. It seems probable that some of those would have slipped below the 80 WAM threshold in subsequent years. 8

The Sub-committee’s judgment is that of 10 students not fulfilling the criteria for progression,

- 2 should be awarded Good Standing (ie. Satisfactory Progression),
- 6 students should be placed on Probation (ie. Required to consult with the Academic Co-ordinator about unit selection prior to enrolment ie. the minimal condition for probation):
  - 1 student applied for transfer before assessment; didn’t meet 15(2);  
  - 2 have not met 15(1) but have best_6 WAM > 80 and
  - 3 have not met 15(2) ie. best_6 WAM < 80.
- 2 students should be Excluded; 1 has already applied for transfer.

That is, 8/42 students (19.04%) have not progressed satisfactorily under Rule 15; 5/42 (11.9%) didn’t meet 15(2) best_6 WAM > 80.

It’s noteworthy that 3 students, whose all_8 WAMs at the end of semester 1, were < 80 have achieved satisfactory progression (on both best_6 and all_8 criteria).

Signed

Academic Co-ordinator
BPhil (Hons)


8 Footnote 2, page A6
Proposed New Unit:
BPHL3000 BPhil (Hons) Independent Research Project

Please note that this unit is not yet approved.

Unit Information

Title: BPhil (Hons) Independent Research Project
Level: 3
Type: Undergraduate as unattached elective in BPhil

Intended courses:

Faculty: Arts
Resp. Org. Entity: Arts (00109)
Contact: Associate Professor Jenna Mead (jenna.mead@uwa.edu.au)
Proposed: 24/02/2013

First year of offer: 2014
Credit points: 6
Workload hours per 6 pts: 150

Broadening categories: Not broadening category B: BPhil special unit.

Academic information

Unit Content: This unit is the third element in undergraduate research training in BPhil (Hons). Students will undertake a small-scale research project under the direction of a supervisor. The project will usually be in the discipline of the major. Learning Outcomes should be aligned with disciplinary protocols and concomitant with the requirements of Level 3. Where appropriate, students should complete Human Ethics Clearance procedures. Students should complete an appropriately scaled research project from draft proposal to completed written paper (5000 words or equivalent) in an appropriate academic format. The research project should be agreed by supervisor and student before commencement.

Outcomes: Students are able, with the direction of a supervisor, to (1) design and conduct an appropriately scaled research project within the relevant disciplinary protocols and produce an academic paper (2) suitable for submission to a graduate or undergraduate research journal. Students are not precluded from seeking a more ambitious publication. (3) Students should aim to submit an abstract, from the project, to an appropriate conference such as the Australasian Undergraduate Research Conference, the British Conference for Undergraduate Research or an equivalent. Students are not, however, precluded from participating in conferences with academic colleagues.

Assessment items: This comprises a research paper suitable for submission to an appropriate journal and an abstract suitable for submission to a appropriate conference venue.

Assessments tied to outcomes: Students are able to (1) conduct an appropriately scaled research project within the relevant disciplinary protocols and produce an academic paper; (2) prepare the paper for submission to an appropriate undergraduate or graduate research journal; and (3) develop an abstract or poster from the paper for submission to an appropriate undergraduate research conference.

Assessment has two elements: grading of the final paper and satisfactory completion of performative elements. Grading should aim to recognize both undergraduate marking criteria in the relevant discipline and Satisfactory Progression in BPhil (Hons) where Rule 15 requires a WAM for best 6/8 units of 75+.

The final paper should be assessed by TWO (2) suitably qualified academic colleagues; selected on advice from the supervisor. The paper should be graded according to UWA’s generally accepted scale of HD = 80+, D = 70 - 79, CR = 60 - 69 and P = 50 - 59. The expectation is that the paper will be assessed in the context of BPhil (Hons)’s undergraduate research training sequence (Level 1 GCRL1000, Level 2 Research Placement) and with a view to the candidate’s progression to fourth-year Honours. Satisfactory completion of performative elements — submission of paper to an appropriate journal and abstract to an appropriate conference venue — should be sign-off by the supervisor. The BPhil (Hons) Academic Co-ordinator has overall responsibility for administration of this process.

Offerings

Quota: Yes, proposed quota: BPhil(Hons) students.
Reason for quota: Enrolment will be limited to candidates enrolled in BP005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Period</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1, 2014</td>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>face to face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Unit rules**

**Prerequisites:** Enrolment in BP005 Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours).

**Corequisites:** Nil.

**Incompatibilities:** Nil.

**Advisable Prior Study:** GCRL1000 Global Challenges, Research and Leadership or comparable unit. Level 2 Research Placement or comparable research experience.

### Teaching Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Teaching Org</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Proposing faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee endorsements and approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review committee</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Endorsed</td>
<td>Associate Professor Jenna Mead</td>
<td>24/02/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies (BPhil)</td>
<td>Not yet endorsed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Coursework Studies</td>
<td>Not yet endorsed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Council</td>
<td>Not yet approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imported from the excel New Unit Proposal form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>12th February</th>
<th>13th February</th>
<th>14th February Valentine’s Day</th>
<th>15th February</th>
<th>16th February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>Arrive; set up office in Library</td>
<td>07:00-08.15am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>07:00-08.15 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-9:30 AM</td>
<td>Arrival and sign in Cloisters</td>
<td>08:15-08.30 am</td>
<td>Daily housekeeping Jenna</td>
<td>08:15-08.30 am</td>
<td>Daily housekeeping Jenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Students to deliver bags to rooms</td>
<td>08:30-9.30 am</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
<td>08:30-9.30 am</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Convene 9:20 am Dining Hall</td>
<td>09:00-10.00 am</td>
<td>W/Prof Robin Owens DVC (Research)</td>
<td>09:00-10.00 am</td>
<td>W/Prof Mark Sparkman Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (RSAS) 2013 Gregori Aminoff Prize in Crystallography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30 AM</td>
<td>Rev. Cedric Jacobs Welcome to Country [C by txt]</td>
<td>10:00-10.30 am</td>
<td>Intro from Head of College, tour with Senior Residents [C]</td>
<td>10:00-11.30 am</td>
<td>Prof John Bamberg, Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00 AM</td>
<td>W/Prof. Krishna Sen, Chair, BiS [C]</td>
<td>10:00-10.30 am</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
<td>10:00-11.30 am</td>
<td>Dr Michael Small &amp; Prof. Gordon Royle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30 AM</td>
<td>Mentors to register &amp; allocate rooms</td>
<td>10:00-11.00 am</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
<td>11:00-11.30</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:30 PM</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Jenna Mead to chair</td>
<td>11:00-12.00 am</td>
<td>Prof Melane Jacquand European Languages &amp; Studies [C]</td>
<td>11:30-12.30 pm</td>
<td>W/Prof Karen Simmer, School of Paediatrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:00 PM</td>
<td>Prof David Day School of Business: Research in Social Sciences &amp; dynamics of working in groups [C]</td>
<td>12:30-12.30 pm</td>
<td>LUNCH at Trinity College</td>
<td>12:30-01.30 pm</td>
<td>LUNCH includes walk to new venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:00 PM</td>
<td>Mentors on BPhil(Hons) Outline Summer Residence &amp; research questions</td>
<td>1:00-1:30 pm</td>
<td>Recap on sessions so far (Jenna)</td>
<td>01.30-02.30 pm</td>
<td>Prof. Alec Cameron, DV-C (Education) [C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:30 PM</td>
<td>Ms Carolyn Wood, International Centre [C]</td>
<td>2:00-3:00 pm</td>
<td>Time to Trinity College; Mentors to arrive</td>
<td>03.30-5.00 pm</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:30 PM</td>
<td>Prof. David Day School of Business: Research in Social Sciences &amp; dynamics of working in groups [C]</td>
<td>3:30-4:30 pm</td>
<td>Music Workshop Dr Jonathan McIntosh [C]</td>
<td>03.30-5.00 pm</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Walk back to St George’s</td>
<td>4.30-5:00</td>
<td>Afternoon tea meet at CRAR &gt; Sunken Garden</td>
<td>05.00-5.15 pm</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-6:00 PM</td>
<td>Communication: Ms Julie Millias &amp; askUWA [C] + task</td>
<td>5:00-6:00 pm</td>
<td>Walk back to St G; &amp; free time</td>
<td>06:00 pm</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-6:30 PM</td>
<td>BPhil(Hons) dinner</td>
<td>6:00-6:30 pm</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
<td>06.00 pm</td>
<td>BBQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-7:30 PM</td>
<td>BBQ Please respect parallel event</td>
<td>6:30-7:30 pm</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
<td>08.30 pm</td>
<td>Bump out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>12th February</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>13th February</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>14th February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.00 AM</td>
<td>Arrive, set up Elsey &amp; Georgian Rooms</td>
<td>07.00-08.15 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>07.00-08.15 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.30-9.30 am</td>
<td>Registration in Georgian Room</td>
<td>08.15-08.30 am</td>
<td>Daily housekeeping</td>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td>08.15-08.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene 9:20</td>
<td>Convene in Dining Hall</td>
<td>09.00-10.30 am</td>
<td>Session in Dining Hall</td>
<td>08.30 am</td>
<td>Walk to Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30 am</td>
<td>Jenna to MC</td>
<td>10.30-11.00 am</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
<td>10.00-11.30 am</td>
<td>Session in Dining Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00 am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>12.30-01.30 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>12.30-01.30 pm</td>
<td>Students leave St George’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-12.30 pm</td>
<td>Session in Dining Hall</td>
<td>2.00-04.30 pm</td>
<td>2.00-04.30 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>12.30-01.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-01.30 pm</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>4.30-5.00 pm</td>
<td>Walk back to St George’s</td>
<td>05.00-05.30 pm</td>
<td>Pre-dinner reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.30-02.30 pm</td>
<td>Session in Dining Hall</td>
<td>5.00-6.30 pm</td>
<td>Late afternoon tea and Mentor activity</td>
<td>5:30-6:30 pm</td>
<td>BPhil(Hons) dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.30-03.30 pm</td>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td>06.30-07.30 pm</td>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td>06.30-07.30 pm</td>
<td>7.30 Students leave St Georges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.30-04.00 pm</td>
<td>AFTERNOON TEA</td>
<td>07.30-09.00 pm</td>
<td>Georgian Room plus outdoor spaces</td>
<td>08.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.00-05.30 pm</td>
<td>Georgian room and outdoor spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.00-06.30 pm</td>
<td>FREE TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.30-07.00 pm</td>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.30-09.00 pm</td>
<td>Georgian room and outdoor spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS &amp; TOURS</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information supplied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH SPEAKERS &amp; PRESENTERS</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of topics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information supplied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENUE &amp; ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of mentors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors’ activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>