The next meeting of the Board of the Graduate Research School will be held in the Old Senate Room (Irwin Street Building) on Tuesday, 09 March 2010 at 2.15p.m.

Parts I and II of the agenda are to be dealt with en bloc by motion of the Chair. Parts III and IV are for discussion. A member may request the removal of an item from Parts I or II to Part III.
1. CALL FOR DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST – REF: F34

The Chair will invite members to declare potential for conflict or perceived conflicts of interest, if applicable, with regard to items on the agenda.

2. MINUTES – REF: F36

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of the Board of the Graduate Research School held on Tuesday, 16th February 2010.

3. ITEMS/BUSINESS IN PROGRESS FOR NOTING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM/BUSINESS IN PROGRESS</th>
<th>ACTION BY:</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of format of printed thesis</td>
<td>GRSO</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of Supervisors</td>
<td>GRSO</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART I – ITEMS FOR COMMUNICATION TO BE DEALT WITH EN BLOC

There are no items

PART II – ITEMS FOR DECISION TO BE DEALT WITH EN BLOC

There are no items

PART III – ITEMS DISCUSSION AND DECISION

4. ISSUES RELATED TO THE SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS BEING APPROVED WHICH DO NOT COMPLY WITH CURRENT GUIDELINES

Members may recall that a meeting of the Board on the 9th of June 2009 it was resolved to approve significant changes to the Guidelines for Preparing Research Proposals. (See Attachment A1 – A2, Extract of the Minutes of a Meeting of the Board of the Graduate Research School on Tuesday 9 June 2009). At the centre of these amendments was the introduction of an additional section entitled Candidature Plan. The justification for the introduction of the Candidature Plan was to include in the Research Proposal a discreet section which would draw together all the points pertaining to time management and skills training. Previously, these elements were either not present in, or dispersed throughout, the Guidelines for Preparing Research Proposals and Research Proposal Coversheet documents.

The proposal for the introduction of a Candidature Plan was approved by the Board and subsequently became Section C in the Guidelines.

At the same meeting additional amendments were suggested by the Board and gained approval. These were that the text in section B (Research Plan) be reworded to be more inclusive of disciplines that are not hypothesis driven, and to request references. It was also approved to delete sections C and D which required the student to list some of the most prominent scholars in the field and include a bibliography of seminal works associated with the area of research.
The approved amendments to the Guidelines for Preparing Research Proposals document were made shortly after and made available to students on the Graduate Research School website http://www.postgraduate.uwa.edu.au/students/forms (See Attachment B1 – B2). In addition to this the guidelines made available to the Board to direct them in the review process was also updated and made available at http://www.postgraduate.uwa.edu.au/students/proposals/review/boardreview (See Attachment C1 – C6).

We have recently reviewed the Research Proposal approvals for the months of September, October and November of 2009 and found that of the 132 approvals made only 15 conformed to the new Guidelines. (See Attachment D1). Whilst we recognise that compliance with the new Guidelines should increase over time, the Graduate Research School is investigating ways to increase students’ awareness of the current Guidelines and the need to adhere to them. We also ask that when reviewing research proposals, Board members take into account the requirements that are set out in the current Guidelines.

For discussion – Should Board members, when reviewing research proposals, request that those not conforming to the current Guidelines be sent back to the student for revision and resubmission?