

School of Social Sciences and Psychology

Honours Award Level Guidelines 2013

| COURSE TITLE (HONOURS) | HONOURS COORDINATORS CONTACT DETAILS |
|---|---|
| 1500 Bachelor of Psychology (Embedded Honours) 1504 Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Psychology | Dr Karen Mattock Building 24 Room 1.57, Bankstown Campus Phone: (02) 9772 6619 Email: k.mattock@uws.edu.au |
| 4610 Bachelor of Social Science (Honours) 4599 Bachelor of Social Work (Embedded Honours) - only available part-time, started in the second half of 3rd Year and completed over 18 months. | Dr Russell Staiff Building P Room G.42, Kingswood Campus Phone: (02) 4736 0146 Email: r.staiff@uws.edu.au |

Table of Contents

2013 Honours Award Level Guidelines 2

Application Process 2

Criteria for Admission 2

Appointment of a Principal and or Co Supervisors 5

Ethics and/or Other Required Approvals 5

Procedures for Dealing with Supervision issues 6

Honours Progression 6

Procedure for Applying for an Extension of Submission Date 6

Lodgement of Thesis 7

Examination Procedures 7

Processing Honours Award Levels 9

Processing and finalizing Honours Marks and Level of Award 9

Psychology Key Dates 2013 - Summary 10

Social Science Key Dates 2013 - Summary 11

Appendix A: Honours Applications Summary Form 12

Appendix B: Recommendation for Honours Examiners 13

Appendix C: Summary of Quality assurance Processes for Appointment of Honours Examiners 14

Appendix D: Notification of Honours Grade and Level 14

Appendix E: Criteria and Standards for Assessing Social Science Honours Work 15

Appendix F: Criteria and Standards for Marking a Quantitative Honours Thesis in Psychology 21

Appendix G: Criteria and Standards for Marking a Qualitative Honours Thesis in Psychology 30

Appendix H: Requirement for Ethics Approvals 38

2013 Honours Award Level Guidelines

The *Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy* describes the framework for all Honours courses, both end-on and embedded, at UWS: <http://policies.uws.edu.au/view.current.php?id=00156>

These School Honours Award Level Guidelines contain procedural information specific to Honours degrees in the School of Social Sciences and Psychology. Some guidelines are specific to the discipline of Psychology, whose Honours programs must comply with the Accreditation Standards of the Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (APAC).

Application Process

Students applying for the **Bachelor of Psychology Honours** (embedded) need to complete an online application to the School of Social Sciences and Psychology: SSAP-Psychology_honours@uws.edu.au. Applicants must have satisfactorily completed all units (i.e., 240 credit points) of the first three years of the Bachelor of Psychology, and must have achieved a minimum of a Credit average in second and third year units, including a credit in the majority of the psychology units.

Students applying for **Social Work Honours** (embedded) apply via a Statement of Intent in April of their 3rd year (full-time). Admission to Social Work Honours during the 3rd year (full-time) is provisional. Full admission occurs in the 4th year (full-time).

All other (end-on) Honours applicants need to complete the on-line application found on the UWS website: <https://applyonline.uws.edu.au/connect/webconnect>

All applicants for psychology Honours must have previous successful completion within the last 10 years, of an APAC accredited three-year sequence in psychology, with a minimum of a Credit average in second and third year units, including a credit in the majority of the psychology units

The final date for applications to be submitted for 2014 is October 31, 2013.

Procedures for assessing applications

Consistent with Clause 20 of the *Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy* applications are considered by the relevant "School Honours Coordinator to determine eligibility against Honours policy admission criteria; the Dean of the School then approves or declines admission and advises the Academic Registrar".

Where the number of applicants exceeds the availability of supervised places, the relevant School Honours Coordinator ranks applicants on the basis of Admission Average Marks (AAMs) and the other admission criteria and offers are made on the basis of the ranking process recommended by the School Academic Committee (see Appendix A) and the number of supervised places available in a given year.

Criteria for Application

The criteria for application to an end-on or embedded Honours Programme are as required by the *Honours in the Bachelors Award Policy*, Clause 21.

- a. Achievement of a threshold Admission Average Mark (AAM) equal to, or above, the minimum of 65; and
- b. *Statement of Intent* or School equivalent (for social science applicants this should be written in consultation with a member of academic staff); and

- c. Appointment of a Principal Supervisor by the Dean of the School;
- d. Demonstrated satisfactory academic writing skills appropriate to the discipline; and
- e. For social science applicants, a supporting letter from your nominated supervisors may be required to confirm the proposed project is suitable as an Honours project and supervision is available. Please consult with the Social Sciences Honours Coordinator to determine if a supporting letter is required.

All students intending to apply for admission to Honours should consult with the relevant School Honours Co-ordinator before submitting their applications.

Calculation of the Admission Average Mark (AAM)

1. Following Clause 23 of the *Honours in the Bachelors Award Policy*, the AAM will normally be calculated on the basis of all units from program commencement.
2. For the purposes of Clause 23 an applicant with an AAM < 65% due to lower relative results in their first year of undergraduate study may be considered for admission if:
 - The applicant has demonstrated a marked improvement in their academic performance in recent semesters; and
 - A supporting letter from the applicant's potential supervisor regarding the applicant's ability to undertake Honours is supplied.
3. Where advanced standing impedes the calculation of a whole of program AAM, results from a minimum of 80 UWS credit points chosen with the approval of the School Academic Committee, on the recommendation of the School Honours Coordinator, may be used.

Statement of Intent or School equivalent

The *Statement of Intent* is a brief statement (up to 1000 words) or research proposal describing the proposed research the applicant wishes to undertake as an Honours student. It allows applicants to demonstrate their ability to plan a research project, to demonstrate their academic writing skills, and to indicate their area of research interest.

Psychology applicants should ensure that the topic of their proposed research falls within the area of expertise of potential supervisors.

For social science applicants, where this may be the first time they have written a research proposal and undertaken research, the *Statement of Intent* is also a 'work in progress' that will continue to be developed and refined throughout the early stages of their Honours program. It needs to be written clearly so that others can understand what the applicant wishes to research, why it is important, and how the research will be conducted. It should ideally be written in consultation with the intended supervisor(s).

For all applicants, the following six areas need to be included in the *Statement of Intent*.

1. **Research Title:** A research title (While the title you nominate is provisional, it is important to try to be as precise as possible in order to clarify the research project to others.)
2. **Research Question:** A research question and an overview of the research topic, as well as why you consider this to be an interesting and significant area to study.

3. **Readings:** The identification of 6-10 scholarly sources relevant to the topic area, demonstrating some engagement with this existing scholarship.
4. **Method:** A brief statement on how the research will be conducted.
 - a. **For Psychology** this comprises an indication of your research design, for example, experimental, nonexperimental survey design, or qualitative design (specify type of qualitative design and methodology).
 - b. **For Social Science disciplines**, indicate whether you will be doing interviews, a focus group, a document analysis, a survey, or another method, or some combination of these approaches? Consultation with your intended supervisor(s) may help you decide on the most appropriate approach to your question in the time frame you have to complete your research.
5. **Theoretical Framework:** Identification of a theoretical framework that is linked to the research design and methodology, and the data analysis. This should also relate to your set of scholarly sources.
6. **Ethics Requirement:**
 - a. **Psychology:** For research with human participants you will need to complete an ethics application (See information below on Ethics Approval). Your research proposal will need to identify areas of ethical concern and describe how those concerns should be addressed when conducting the proposed study.
 - b. **Social Science disciplines:** You need to specify whether your research requires you to apply for ethics approval in order to undertake your research. If you are conducting research with human participants (e.g., interviews, focus groups, surveys and so on) you will need to complete an ethics application (See information below on Ethics Approval). You will need to seek the advice and support of your intended supervisor(s) about ethics and the development of an ethics approval application (NEAF). If you are required to complete an ethics application, once you are admitted to Honours, you will need to complete your application early in your program, as it can be a time consuming process.

Additional Information in the Statement of Intent for Psychology Applicants

In the *Statement of Intent* applicants should also give brief examples of their commitment to the discipline of psychology, and an indication of their future goals in the field.

Applicants can also indicate their preference for a specific supervisor. While there is no guarantee of allocation to any particular supervisor, this will be taken into consideration when supervisors are allocated.

If you have any questions about developing your *Statement of Intent* please seek the advice of the Psychology Honours Coordinator.

Additional Information in the Statement of Intent for Social Science Discipline Applicants

Please also identify your intended supervisor(s) of your Honours research project

If you have any questions about developing your *Statement of Intent* please seek the advice of your intended supervisor(s) or Social Sciences Honours Coordinator.

Appointment of a Principal and or Co Supervisors

Appointment of supervisors will take place at the conclusion of the application phase, as admission to the degree is subject to the availability of suitable supervisors and other resources. All Honours candidates must have a principal supervisor, and may have co-supervisors.

Principal supervisors should be qualified at the PhD or Masters (Honours) level, or have equivalence in professional standing, as well as having an established publishing and research track record. The minimum level of academic award required to supervise an Honours project is one at or above Honours level.

Ethics and/or Other Required Approvals

All research carried out at UWS involving human participants must be in accordance with the [Research Code of Practice](#) that is guided by the following national guidelines:

[Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research \(2007\)](#), and the [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans \(2007\)](#).

Any Honours research that involves undertaking experiments, surveys, interviews, focus groups, or any other methodological approach involving human participants, requires ethics approval, the first step of which is submission to the appropriate Peer Review Committee. This Committee examines the research merit and integrity of applications to undertake Honours research (as well as all other unfunded research, excluding Higher Research Degree candidates). Your supervisor(s) can advise you about the submission of your ethics application.

It is essential that you submit your application for ethics approval as a matter of **priority** at the earliest possible time during the Honours program, if not prior to the start of the official academic year. No experiment or fieldwork can be undertaken without the appropriate ethics approvals. UWS uses the National Ethics Application Form (NEAF). Guidance on completing this form can be obtained from [Guidance on applying for ethical review at UWS](#). In order to complete the application you will need to work closely with your supervisor (s), who will actually be the "Applicant" named on the NEAF application submitted for your research.

In some instances students will conduct a study based on a model for which their supervisor has already received ethics approval. In most cases this will only require the submission of an amendment to the original at HREC level.

Ethics training associated with the completion of the NEAF form is included as part of the psychology Honours coursework unit *100983 Research Methods Seminar*. For social science disciplines the unit *101760 Honours Pathway* is offered to Honours students. In this unit students learn to draft an ethics application.

In addition, there are UWS workshops available to focus on research methods and completion of the NEAF application. For further information about workshops relevant to Honours students please speak to your supervisor (s) or to the Psychology or Social Sciences Honours Coordinator. It is highly recommended that you attend these workshops if possible.

Further information about ethics can be found at: <http://www.uws.edu.au/research/researchers/ethics>

Procedures for Dealing with Supervision issues

As per Clause 29 of the *UWS Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy*: “ Where a student is experiencing supervision problems, he/she will in the first instance approach their supervisor and/or co-supervisor, then if required the [relevant] School Honours Coordinator who will facilitate management of supervision issues. In cases where the [relevant] School Honours Coordinator is involved in supervision or supervision problems, the student may approach the relevant Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) for advice.”

Honours Progression

Part G of the *UWS Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy*, which deals with progression can be found at: <http://policies.uws.edu.au/view.current.php?id=00156#p7>

The normal period of candidature for students enrolled in an end-on Honours course is one year full-time, or its part-time equivalent. The timeframe for the examination process for Honours theses is restricted to ensure all School Honours candidates are allocated an equitable amount of time to complete candidature requirements and to ensure that all candidates' grades are processed in time for consideration of higher degree scholarships.

The 2013 submission dates for Honours theses in the School of Social Sciences and Psychology are:

- For psychology, **October 4**
- For social science disciplines, **September 27**

Procedure for Applying for an Extension of Submission Date

Extensions for submission of an Honours thesis are only granted under unforeseen, extenuating circumstances, and in compliance with the *UWS Special Consideration Policy*:

<http://policies.uws.edu.au/view.current.php?id=00205>

Although students may apply for an extension for this purpose up to 3 working days before the original due date for submission of the thesis, the *Special Consideration Policy* Clause 37 states: “the application should be submitted as soon as the student is aware that he (s)he has extenuating circumstances that will affect studies for the session.”

Please note the following clauses from the *UWS Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy* regarding applications for an extension to submit an Honours thesis:

(33) A student may apply for an extension of time for thesis submission up to three working days before the student's originally approved submission date. Extensions can only be granted in exceptional and compelling circumstances consistent with the provisions of the [Special Consideration Policy](#).

(34) The principles and procedure of that policy should be followed in making the application, but the application must be submitted to the School Honours Coordinator. The School Honours coordinator will recommend to the Dean or Deputy Dean of the School whether or not the extension should be granted, and in making that recommendation he/she will consult with the primary supervisor and/or co-supervisor. The Dean or Deputy Dean of the School will advise the student and the School Academic Committee in writing of the decision.

(35) Where an extension has been granted and the work is not submitted by the census date for the following semester teaching period, the student will normally be required to re-enrol in a non award 20 credit point unit. The student's enrolment in the unit will not consume additional Student Learning Entitlement, but will incur a tuition fee liability.

Honours students should note that extensions are not normally granted beyond the end of semester 2H in 2013, and cannot extend beyond the census date for the following semester (i.e., Autumn 2014), except in the most extreme of circumstances. Students and supervisors also need to be aware that regardless of circumstances, late submission may make a student ineligible for consideration for a postgraduate scholarship determined at the December meeting of the University Research Committee.

The Request for Extension application form can be found at:

[http://www.uws.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/118273/Request for Extension RO 00205 011 2.pdf](http://www.uws.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/118273/Request_for_Extension_RO_00205_011_2.pdf)

Lodgement of Thesis

Honours theses are to be submitted to the relevant School Honours Coordinator before the submission date as follows:

- For psychology, 4 print copies (soft bound) plus electronic submission through Turnitin on vUWS.
- For social science disciplines, 2 print copies (soft bound) and two electronic copies in PDF format on CD-R.

Examination Procedures

Appointment of Examiners

Examiners should typically hold a research Masters, PhD or Professional Doctorate, or equivalence in terms of professional standing and research experience in the field relevant to the thesis. As per Clauses 37 to 39 of the UWS *Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy* two examiners are recommended by the School Academic Committee and approved by the Dean or Deputy Dean of the School

- For psychology, the two examiners are normally internal to the School (except where the specialised nature of the topic requires the appointment of an external examiner), and an independent moderator is used to assure the quality and consistency of the internal examination. The recommended examiners are determined by the Psychology Honours Coordinator in consultation with the Psychology Undergraduate Director of Academic Program, and forwarded to the School Academic Committee (See Appendices B and C)
- For social science disciplines, the two examiners (one internal and one external to UWS) are recommended by supervisor(s) in consultation with the Social Sciences Honours Coordinator and forwarded to the Social Science Honours Committee for approval. and then to the School Academic Committee (see Appendices B and C).

As per Clause 39, "Examiners will not be supervisors or co-supervisors; examiners will make independent determinations on the significant research component and will each award a mark out of 100, which will be averaged to give a total score". Ideally examiners should not know students, or should have had minimal contact with the student in terms of their recent degree or Honours program.

Materials Sent to Examiners

Materials forwarded by Schools to examiners include:

- a letter inviting the examiner to formally examine the thesis;
- a 150-200 word abstract of the thesis to be examined that contains the title and author of the work;
- an explanation as to which components of the degree contribute to the determination of the Honours Award and, specifically, the weight given to the research component;
- specific information concerning the School's expectations of the nature, structure, length and presentation requirements of the research component of an Honours degree;
- information concerning the School's expectations of the examiner (e.g., time frame by which examination needs to be completed, typically 2 weeks;, what materials need to be forwarded back to the School to complete the examination process, how the examiner can advise the School as to whether they do or do not give their permission for their name to be released to the student at the conclusion of the examination process);
- the criteria and standards by which the examiner is expected to evaluate the research component with a sheet that summarises the examiner's score out of 100 (See Appendices F and G for psychology, and Appendix E for social science disciplines).

The Use of Third Examiner (Arbiters)

As per the Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy, Part I clause (40), where there is a mark discrepancy of 10 or more marks between significant research component examiners, or a difference in the examiner-recommended "grade", the following provision applies:

(40) Where there is a mark discrepancy of 10 or more marks between significant research component examiners, or a difference in the examiner-recommended "grade", the School Honours Coordinator may take one or more of the following actions:

- a) invite the examiners to confer with each other and/or with the School Research and High Degrees Committee with a view to presenting a consolidated recommendation;
- b) appoint an experienced marker of bachelor (honours) theses as a third examiner who will act as an arbiter; following review of the thesis and the other examiners' reports the arbiter determines the mark and grade on the basis of the published criteria and standards for the thesis; this is the final examination result for recommendation to the School Academic Committee.

Appointment of Arbiters

In the School, the procedures for the arbitration/third examiner processes vary according to the size and specialization of the program (see Arbitration Process below).

Arbiters in Large Programs

Arbiters should be specialists in the thesis area, or be eminent, experienced academics with a strong background in supervising and examining Honours work.

Arbiters in Small Specialised Programs

The arbiter is selected on the basis of her/his seniority (level C, D or E) and is not necessarily a specialist in the thesis area but should have a strong background in supervising and examining Honours work.

Arbitration Process and Outcomes

Materials forwarded by Schools to examiners include:

- specific information concerning the School's expectations of the nature, structure, length and presentation requirements of the research component of an Honours degree;
- information concerning the School's expectations of the examiner (e.g., time frame by which examination needs to be completed),
- the criteria and standards by which the arbiter is expected to evaluate the research component with a sheet that summarises the examiner's score out of 100 (See Appendices A and B for psychology, and Appendix C for social science disciplines).

The arbiter reads a clean copy of the thesis determining an independent mark. After having determined an independent mark, the arbiter is given copies of the reports completed by examiners 1 and 2. After reading the reports, the arbiter reassesses all three marks determining a final mark for the thesis within the limits of the marks given by Examiners 1 and 2. The arbiter then prepares the standard report on the quality of the thesis as well as a brief report explaining the decision in relation to the reports of examiners 1 and 2. The arbiter forwards the reports to the relevant Honours Coordinator who is responsible for submitting them to the School Academic Committee (in the case of social science disciplines they are submitted to the Social Science Honours Committee prior to being forwarded to the School Academic Committee).

Arbiters should be specialists in the thesis area, or be eminent, experienced academics with a strong background in supervising and examining Honours work.

Processing Honours Award Levels

The total score across the thesis and the course work components received by the candidate determines the level of award for Honours. Graded coursework units only have marks proportionally added then averaged, before addition with the thesis mark. The relevant Honours Coordinator completes the School's *Notification of Honours Grade and Level* summary sheet (Appendix D) providing a final mark out of 100 for each candidate, a detailed statement as to the calculation of the scores, and a breakdown of all award component scores. **However, the award of Honours Class I requires both a mark of 85-100% for the Honours Research component and a mark of 85-100% for the combined Research and Coursework components.**

| Honours Class | Final Honours Mark |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Class 1 | ≥ 85 |
| Second Class Division 1 | ≥ 75 |
| Second Class Division 2 | ≥ 65 |
| Third | ≥ 50 |

The School Academic Committee undertakes the final endorsement of Honours.

Processing and finalizing Honours Marks and Level of Award

The relevant Honours Coordinator considers examiner reports, marks, and other information as specified in the School Honours Award Level Guidelines and recommends the level of award to the School Academic Committee, which approves the Honours award outcome.

After each teaching session in which Honours awards are made, the School Academic Committee sends a written report to the Bachelor (Honours) Committee of Academic Senate, including a summary of the approved honours results, any significant variability, anomalies and trends, any extensions on thesis submission dates, and any recommendations about assessment policies and practices.

Psychology Key Dates 2013 - Summary

| | |
|----------------|--|
| March 2013 | Confirm student enrolment in relevant Autumn semester Honours units. (HECS census) |
| August 2013 | Confirm student enrolment in relevant Spring semester Honours units. (HECS census) |
| September 2013 | Confirmation of examiners |
| October 2013 | Submission of Honours thesis |
| November 2013 | School Academic Committee meeting |
| December 2013 | University Research Committee meeting |


| Date | Requirements |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Late August | The Psychology Honours Coordinator allocates each thesis to the most appropriate first examiner and second examiner from among that year's Psychology Honours supervisors (excluding the student's supervisor). Finally an external moderator with a broad understanding of the discipline is identified. The role of the external moderator is to review all theses and the marks of the first and second examiner and submit a report to the Psychology Honours Coordinator. |
| Early September | Before sending through the recommendations for the examiners and moderator to the School Academic Committee (SAC) for endorsement, the Psychology Honours Coordinator has the option of discussing the recommendations with the School Research Committee in an advisory capacity. Recommendations of examiners are then submitted to SAC for endorsement. |
| Mid-September | Once endorsed by the SAC, the Psychology Honours Coordinator forwards recommendation of examiners to the Dean. |
| 5th October | The candidate lodges hard copies of the thesis with the Psychology Honours Coordinator, who receipts submission of thesis. The candidate also lodges an electronic copy on the unit vUWS site. |
| 6th October | The Psychology Honours Coordinator forwards a copy of the thesis to examiners and requests that the examination process be finalised within 2 weeks. The examination results need to be back no later than the end of October. |
| Last week of October | Examiners' reports received. Arbiter / or arbitration panel engaged to deal with results requiring third marker or arbitration. The Psychology Honours Coordinator prepares and submits <i>Notification of Honours Grade and Level</i> summary sheet (Appendix D) to the School Academic Committee (SAC). |
| End of first week of November | The SAC meets to determine the level of Honours to be awarded and reports results. The School's Research and Higher Degree Committee meets to rank scholarship applications. |
| Second week of November | Final grades lodged with the Registrar's Office. |

Social Science Key Dates 2013 - Summary

| Date | Requirements |
|---|---|
| <p>Late August</p> <p>Early September</p> <p>Mid-September</p> | <p>Supervisors recommend potential examiners to School Social Sciences Honours Coordinator. Examiners are contacted by the Principal Supervisor in writing to seek a formal agreement to examine the thesis/research product. Once examiners have agreed to examine the thesis / research product, the Principal Supervisor sends the appropriate documentation to the Social Sciences Honours Coordinator.</p> <p>Before sending through the recommendations to the School Academic Committee (SAC) for endorsement, the Social Sciences Honours Coordinator discusses the recommendations with the Social Science Honours Committee who make the final decision. Recommendations of examiners are endorsed by the School Academic Committee.</p> <p>Once endorsed by the SAC, the Social Sciences Honours Coordinator forwards recommendation of examiners to the Dean.</p> |
| <p>28th September</p> <p>2nd October</p> | <p>The candidate lodges copies of the thesis/research product with the appropriate School Administration Officer, who receipts submission of thesis/research product.</p> <p>The School Administrative Officer forwards a copy of materials to examiners and requests that the examination process be finalised within 3 weeks maximum including postage time. The examination results need to be back no later than the end of the third week of October.</p> |
| <p>Last week of October</p> <p>End of first week of November</p> | <p>Examiners' reports received. Arbiter / or arbitration panel engaged to deal with results requiring third marker or arbitration.</p> <p>The provisional overall results are discussed by an expanded Social Science Honours Committee that includes internal examiners and supervisors. Recommendations of the Level of Honours and of final marks are decided.</p> <p>The Social Sciences Honours Coordinator prepares and submits <i>Notification of Honours Grade and Level</i> summary sheet (Appendix D) to the School Academic Committee (SAC).</p> <p>The SAC Committee meets in the first week of November to determine the level of Honours to be awarded and reports results, The School's Research and Higher Degree Committee meets to rank scholarship applications.</p> |
| <p>Second week of November</p> | <p>Final grades lodged with the Office of the Academic Registrar.</p> |

Appendix A: Honours Applications Summary Form

Example of form as generated from SharePoint List

| School of Social Sciences and Psychology | |  University of Western Sydney Bringing knowledge to life | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------|
| Honours Applications Summary | | | | | | | | |
| For ratings of Statement of Intent, and Applicant Quality: 1=Excellent, 2=Very good, 3=Satisfactory, 4=Marginally satisfactory, 5=Poor. | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant Name | UWS ID | AAM (Must be >65) | Rating: Statement | Rating: Applicant | Proposed Supervisor | Schod Recommendation | Reject Reason | SAC Recommendation |
| Count = 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Year: 2013 (2) | | | | | | | | |
| Count = 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Course: 1500 Bachelor of Psychology - Embedded Honours (2) | | | | | | | | |
| Count = 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Another Applicant | | 67.5 | 4 | 5 | | Reject | Shows little evidence of aptitude for independent research | Reject |
| Test Student | | 86.5 | 3 | 2 | Dr John Jones | Accept | | Accept |

Appendix B: Recommendation for Honours Examiners

Example of form, data for which is generated from SharePoint Lists

School of Social Sciences and Psychology



Honours Applications Summary

Guidelines: Examiners typically hold a research Masters, PhD or Professional Doctorate, or equivalence in terms of professional standing and research experience in the field relevant to the thesis. Two examiners are recommended by the School Honours Coordinator and forwarded to the School Academic Committee. In keeping with the UWS Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy, Schools will either appoint two external examiners, or one external and one internal, or two internal to UWS with a mandatory independent moderation process to assure quality and consistency of the internal examination.

1. Student and Thesis Details

Student
Student ID
Course
Supervisor
Thesis Title
Examiner 1
Examiner 2

2. Proposed First Examiner

Name
Qualification
Position
Telephone
Fax
Email
Time-frame Yes, agreed to examine in time-frame available
Conflict No Conflict of Interest
Expertise

3. Proposed Second Examiner

Name
Qualification
Position
Telephone
Fax
Email
Time-frame Yes, agreed to examine in time-frame available
Conflict No Conflict of Interest
Expertise

4. Certification

I acknowledge that the nominated examiners have not participated in the research and development of the submitted thesis.

Supervisor Signature:

Date:

5. Approval of Examiners

The School Academic Committee recommends that:

Examiner 1 is approved

Yes

No

Examiner 2 is approved

Yes

No

Signed:

Date:

Dean (or nominee):

Appendix C: Summary of Quality assurance Processes for Appointment of Honours Examiners

Example of form as generated from SharePoint List, where:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Status | Internal or External |
| Qualifications | Highest academic qualification |
| Examiner Rationale | Rationale if School has been unable to appoint an internal and external examiner or if an examiner has been approved that does not hold either an Honours 1st Class, M (Hons), Professional Doctorate, or PhD qualification in the substantive area |

School of Social Sciences and Psychology



University of
Western Sydney
Bringing knowledge to life

Summary of Quality Assurance Processes for the Appointment of Honours Examiners


Register of Students ▼

| Student | Student ID | Ex1 Status | Ex1 Qualifications | Ex2 Status | Ex2 Qualifications | Ex3 Status | Ex3 Qualifications | Examiner Rationale |
|--|------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Year: 2012 (38) | | | | | | | | |
| Course: 1500 Bachelor of Psychology - Embedded Honours (27) | | | | | | | | |

Appendix D: Notification of Honours Grade and Level

Example of form as generated from SharePoint List

School of Social Sciences and Psychology



University of
Western Sydney
Bringing knowledge to life

Notification of Honours Grade and Level

Register of Students ▼

| Student | Student ID | Unit 100983 | Unit 101420 | Unit 100981 | Coursework | Examiner Status | Mark 1 | Mark 2 | Mark 3 | Thesis Final | Final Mark | Honours Grade | Comments |
|--|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| Year: 2012 (38) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Course: 1500 Bachelor of Psychology - Embedded Honours (27) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix E: Criteria and Standards for Assessing Social Science Honours Work

A thesis is an extended and integrated record of independent research undertaken in the Honours program of either the BSS or the SSW. It is assessed for its overall coherence, disciplinary (or cross-disciplinary) competence, conceptual depth, originality, evidence of research expertise and the level of academic writing. Assessment also considers the student's potential to pursue further research at a postgraduate level.

The standards are as follows:

85% +: Honours Class I

A first class Honours thesis is an outstanding piece of research in which a comprehensive grasp of the topic and related issues is displayed; arguments are well formulated and consistent, with a sound application of research method; and a strong capacity for critical analysis is displayed. Originality and conceptual sophistication is a characteristic of the writing. The thesis conforms to peer-review publication standards in the Social Sciences for presentation and referencing, and the standard of written English. The overall quality of the thesis should indicate the student's ability to pursue a research higher degree at Masters or Doctoral level.

75 - 84% Honours Class II, Division I

A second class, division one Honours thesis will possess most of the positive qualities identified with first class Honours above. While it will contain some limitations or weaknesses in its overall conception and execution not evident with a first class degree, these will be insufficiently serious to suggest that the student is not capable of pursuing a research higher degree. It is a very good thesis.

65 - 74% Honours Class II, Division II

A second class, division two thesis is a generally a competent piece of work. It contains some very respectable research and discussion, but also several deficiencies (for example, of theoretical knowledge and understanding, methodological technique, structural coherence, analytical originality or textual precision). There is some evidence, although sometimes questionable, that the student may be capable of pursuing a research higher degree.

50 - 64% Honours Class III

A third-class thesis is only barely satisfactory. However, there is sufficient academic merit in the thesis to achieve a pass.

- 49% Fail

A failing thesis is unsatisfactory. Its weaknesses of knowledge, theory, conceptualisation, method, analysis and/or presentation are such that it has not reached the required standard for admission to an Honours degree.

Criteria for Marking of the Thesis

Examiners are asked to consider the following when assessing the thesis:

- The title of the thesis should reflect the problem area.
- The title should be clear, concise and sufficiently descriptive of the topic.
- Thesis should contain a section that provides a rationale for the thesis and a clear statement of the problem to be investigated.
- If appropriate, the thesis should outline relevant sub-problems or research objectives.
- If appropriate, hypotheses should be clearly articulated and relevant to the overall problem area.
- Limitations of the research should be clearly stated.

- If relevant, assumptions and definitions of terms should be stated early in the thesis.
- Relevant literature should be thoroughly and critically reviewed and the relationship of the thesis to existing literature made clear.
- A careful balance should be struck between describing and analysing the relevant literature.
- Any gaps or flaws in the existing research literature should be identified as part of the rationale for the thesis.
- The approach and methods of the research should be justified and clearly explained.
- If primary and/or secondary data collection are involved, the selection, development and application of particular techniques should be explained and any weaknesses discussed.
- Any inferences or generalisations to a larger population must be clearly justified.
- Any interpretation of findings should be consistent with the scope and procedures of the research.
- Conclusions should be relevant to the problem statement and should demonstrate a relationship to the relevant literature.
- Questions worthy of further investigation should be presented and pathways to future research highlighted.
- Referencing style can be any system that conforms to the usual academic conventions, such as Harvard or APA or the Commonwealth Government Style Manual, but must be consistent.
- A full reference list must be included.
- University policies on plagiarism must be strictly observed.
- All figures and tables must be appropriately titled and numbered and any cumbersome or voluminous data should be placed in appendices, which must be titled, numbered and referred to in the body of the thesis.
- The thesis should be free of grammatical, spelling and typographical errors.
- The thesis should include a title page, a table of contents with at least chapter and first-order headings, a list of tables, figures and plates if applicable, and all numbering should be consistent with the body of the thesis.
- The thesis must include an abstract of 250 to 300 words.

Examiners will be assessing *overall* performance in terms of the following:

- Original and significant contribution to the discipline commensurate with Honours level.
- Demonstrated competency in research.
- That the presentation is in a satisfactory manner with appropriate standards of expression.
- An awareness and understanding of the relevant literature.

The assessors will prepare a report to identify strengths in the above domains.

In addition to the above, the assessment criteria are set out for the examiners in the following format:

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN SYDNEY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND PSYCHOLOGY

Social Sciences Honours Program

**HONOURS ASSESSMENT SHEET
(CONFIDENTIAL)**

CANDIDATE:

THESIS TITLE:

NOTES FOR EXAMINERS

Rate the thesis on the selected criteria using the following scale.

Please feel free to add comments to the Social Science Honours Committee at the end of this report.
Please write a report of the thesis for the student (maximum 1 page on a separate sheet).

| CODE | RATING |
|-------------|---------------------|
| SD | = Strongly Disagree |
| D | = Disagree |
| U | = Uncertain |
| A | = Agree |
| SA | = Strongly Agree |
| NA | = Not Applicable |

CRITERIA

RATINGS

Circle the appropriate code

1. An appropriate scope for the thesis was set and followed through.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

2. The thesis had a clear focus.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

3. A coherent narrative was developed in the thesis.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

4. The research question provided a central co-ordinating theme in the thesis.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

5. The literature was reviewed critically.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

6. Essential, relevant literature was covered.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

7. A structured theoretical argument was developed.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

8. The research question(s)/hypotheses were addressed.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

9. An appropriate methodology was selected.

SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

10. The ability to analyse information was demonstrated. SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

11. The ability to interpret information was demonstrated. SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

12. Research findings were appropriately described. SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

13. Conclusions drawn reflected the presented data and findings. SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

14. Pertinent and appropriate implications were drawn. SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

15. The thesis has the potential to make a contribution to theory and/or practice. SD D U A SA NA

Comments:

16. The thesis was technically sound (grammar, spelling SD D U A SA NA

Appendix F: Criteria and Standards for Marking a Quantitative Honours Thesis in Psychology

A research report or thesis is an integrated work that must ultimately be judged for its *overall* coherence, technical competence, conceptual depth, originality, professionalism, and academic writing sophistication. It is also a capstone piece of work in the fourth year of an accredited psychology degree, and, as such, serves to demonstrate the overall standard of professional knowledge and skill that has been attained by the student, and the student's capacity to perform *academically* as an emerging psychological scientist, or scientist-practitioner.

This also applies to a thesis produced for a coursework Masters degree, with the added demonstration of a capacity to undertake and evaluate research that advances and informs clinical or professional practice.

The criteria for each of the sections of the research report or thesis are provided from page 4. They have been derived from the *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed., pp. 25-37). It is hereby acknowledged that there is the occasional verbatim quote that has not been identified as such (i.e., by quotation marks) in order to keep the text as simple as possible.

The criteria are in the form of anchors with required criteria for a first class thesis on the left, and criteria that would be apparent in a failed work on the right. Each section is judged according to the standards on the next page, with no further indication on the criteria pages, given it is not possible to cover the many possible ways to depart from first class criteria. Examiners may indicate particular weaknesses on the criteria pages when examining the thesis.

The final grading of the report or thesis is derived from the standards achieved in the various sections, and, importantly, on the overall integrity, sophistication, and originality of the work. Section gradings would be expected to correspond generally with the final mark, although a weakness in some areas may be compensated for by more outstanding work in others, and strengths in some areas may be diminished by more serious weaknesses elsewhere. It is not a simple additive process, because of the importance of the work as a coherent whole.

Standards by Which a Research Report or Thesis is Evaluated

| HD or Honours Class 1 | | D or Honours Class 2-1 | | C or Honours Class 2-2 | | P or Honours Class 3 | Fail/ Honours Not Awarded |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Band 1a 95%+ | Band 1b 85% – 94% | Band 1 80% – 84% | Band 2 75% -79% | Band 1 70% - 74% | Band 2 65%- 74% | 50% - 64% | 0% - 49% |
| <p>The criteria are met at the highest level of technical accuracy, conceptual depth, critical and creative thinking, and/or originality that can be expected for an Honours level thesis.</p> <p>Clarity, precision, sophistication, and excellent structural and logical development, and presentation (including adherence to APA style) characterise the written work.</p> <p>Perfection is not expected (not even possible), however, any weaknesses are atypical and so minor as not to detract from the overall quality.</p> | <p>The work has similar characteristics to 1a, but with minor weaknesses in some aspects.</p> <p>It rarely achieves the level of excellence, polish, and/or originality that typifies 1a.</p> | <p>The criteria are met at a level that is conceptually and technically competent, but not outstanding.</p> <p>Logical continuity is evident most of the time. Conceptual and critical depth, creative thinking, and/or originality are often evident, but not as consistently as for HD/Class 1.</p> <p>The work is well structured and clearly written, with a high standard of presentation. (including APA style)</p> <p>There may be some minor weaknesses. Any more serious weakness is offset by competence otherwise.</p> | <p>The criteria are met at a level that is technically competent, perhaps with some conceptual limitations, but none that are significant.</p> <p>Logical continuity is evident more often than not, but may lack elegance at times. There is at least the odd instance of conceptual and critical depth, creative thinking, and/or originality.</p> <p>The work is mostly well structured and clearly written, with a high standard of presentation. (including APA style).</p> <p>There may be a number of minor weaknesses. Any more serious weakness is offset by competence otherwise.</p> | <p>The thesis demonstrates basic competence in meeting most of the criteria, but generally lacks, conceptual and critical depth, creative thinking, and/or originality, or high-level technical skill.</p> <p>The writing may tend to be more naive (less scholarly); and/or may not always be well structured, clear, or exhibit logical continuity.</p> <p>There may be a number of errors, some more serious, but none so serious as to entirely undermine the overall integrity of the research or its interpretation.</p> <p>Presentation and APA style may be wanting at times.</p> | <p>The thesis demonstrates basic competence in meeting most of the criteria, although there are clear inadequacies in the handling of one or more aspects.</p> <p>Conceptual and scholarly sophistication is not apparent. Technical skill may be deficient in places; originality is absent.</p> <p>There may be critical misconceptions, inconsistencies, omissions, or failings in one or more areas. The work should retain a degree of overall integrity.</p> <p>Writing, structure, presentation, and/or APA style may be unsophisticated, with various errors.</p> | <p>The thesis demonstrates only a basic grasp of the criteria, with little if any evidence of proficiency, and many inadequacies.</p> <p>While the various sections are basically intact, they contain a number of misconceptions, inconsistencies, omissions, or unrecognized deficiencies.</p> <p>Writing, structure, presentation, and APA style will be at minimum standards throughout, or highly variable, making the thesis generally difficult for the marker to read and understand.</p> | <p>The work cannot be considered as a serious attempt to complete the basic requirements of an Honours standard thesis.</p> <p>Deficiencies are general and many, and neither the thesis nor the research upon which it reports have credibility.</p> <p>Structure, presentation and use of APA style may be unacceptable.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Thesis or Research Report For | 100488 Empirical Research Project (Fourth year group project, year-long, written independently) | | | |
| | 100980 Psychology Honours Thesis (Individual project, year-long) | | | |
| | 101239 Applied Research Project (Individual project, year-long) | | | |
| Thesis or Project Title | | | | |
| Student Name | | | Student ID: | |
| Examiner | | | Date examined: | |
| <i>Using the categories below, and based on evaluations on the following pages, which are made available to the student, I award this Thesis/Project a Grade of</i> | | | <i>With a numeric mark of</i> | % |

| HONOURS GRADE | FOURTH YEAR/MASTERS GRADE | MARK RANGE |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| First Class Honours | High Distinction | |
| 1+ | HD+ | 95-100 |
| 1 | HD | 85-94 |
| Second Class Honours (Level 1) | Distinction | |
| 2-1+ | D+ | 80-84 |
| 2-1 | D | 75-79 |
| Second Class Honours (Level 2) | Credit | |
| 2-2+ | C+ | 70-74 |
| 2-2 | C | 65-69 |
| Third Class Honours 3 | Pass P | 50-64 |
| Honours Not Awarded F | Fail F | 0-49 |

Criteria for Evaluating a Research Report or Thesis (According to the Standards on Page 2)

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| Student Name | | Student ID: | |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|--|

| | Passing Criteria | | Failing Criteria |
|--|--|--|---|
| Abstract | Clear and concise, yet comprehensive summary of entire study; correct word length. | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> | Generally lacking key elements |
| Introduction | | | |
| Introduce the problem area under investigation and indicate why it deserves further research | Clear and focused statement of the problem area under investigation; compelling, highly original, or creative indication of why the general area deserves further research attention. | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> | Vague, generalised indication of research area, if any at all; token, if any, indication of why it deserves further research attention. |
| Provide the theoretical and empirical background and context for the study | <p>Clear and relevant theoretical framework with thorough and <i>critical</i> review of both <i>relevant</i> theory and <i>relevant</i> empirical literature – Identifying strengths, weaknesses, pertinent findings, relevant methodological issues, and major conclusions.</p> <p>Logical continuity throughout, and between previous and present work.</p> <p>Sophisticated, professional expression of ideas.</p> | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Body of introduction not coherent, and may also include some or all of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omission of key theoretical perspectives Major omission of relevant empirical work Inclusion of irrelevant or peripheral literature Lack of logical continuity or direction, or diffuse sequencing of ideas Descriptive list of studies with little or no critical review Poor understanding of the literature, or many misconceptions Very poor written expression |
| Statement of research question(s) or hypotheses and their correspondence to research design | <p>Clear and integrated statement of hypotheses or research question(s) , and their rationale (i.e., how they are derived from or logically connected to previous argumentation.)</p> <p>Primary or secondary (exploratory) hypotheses/questions are clearly identified as such.</p> <p><u>Indication</u> (not detailed description) of the research design and <u>how it permits the inferences</u> needed to examine the hypotheses or provide answers to the research question.</p> | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> | Hypotheses or research question(s) are not coherent, and/or have no defensible rationale, and /or the research design is absent or is decidedly unable to permit the inferences needed to examine the hypotheses or provide answers to the research question. |

| | Passing Criteria | | Failing Criteria |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Method | | | |
| Participants | <p>Comprehensive description of all relevant sample parameters (eligibility and any exclusion criteria, relevant demographic characteristics, group descriptions).</p> <p>Comprehensive description of sampling procedure, whether systematic sampling used, numbers who declined, data collection settings and context, any inducements or payments, ethical standards met, ethical safeguards in place.</p> <p>Clear account of how any assignment to condition (groups) occurred.</p> <p>The appropriateness of the sample (and group) sizes in terms of power or precision (i.e., confidence intervals) are noted, with brief indication of any practical limitations to achieving desired sample size.</p> <p>Clarity and precision in reporting all aspects.</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, incomplete, uninterpretable, erroneous, or not understood.</p> <p>The reporting may be rambling, disjointed, and/or incoherent.</p> |
| Research Design | <p>Detailed <u>description</u> of the research design (being as clear and concise as possible).</p> <p>Clear indication of distinction between manipulated and observed variables.</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>The research design is not described, has significant missing elements, is clearly not understood, and/or is not coherent.</p> |
| Materials /Instruments /Apparatus | <p>Clear and precise description of any physical materials, software, or equipment that was used, including the psychometric properties of any instruments used (and their cultural appropriateness).</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, incomplete, uninterpretable, erroneous, or not understood.</p> <p>The reporting may be rambling, disjointed, and/or incoherent.</p> |
| Procedure | <p>Full, yet clear and concise, description of the procedure, including any procedures undertaken to deal with ethical issues present in the research.</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Important aspects of the Procedure are absent, incomplete, uninterpretable, or not appropriate.</p> <p>The reporting may be rambling, disjointed, and/or incoherent.</p> |

| | Passing Criteria | Failing Criteria |
|--|--|---|
| Results Accurate, unbiased, complete, and insightful reporting of the analytic treatment of the data | <p>Accurate and complete reporting (but not discussion) of the results of statistical tests to address all hypotheses, including estimates of appropriate effect size and confidence intervals; and details of any manipulation checks.</p> <p>Clear mastery of quantitative analysis techniques used.</p> <p>So as to allow the reader to properly interpret the results, there is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An appropriate indication of the status of test assumptions, and of the treatment of any missing data and outliers. • An accurate and complete set of appropriate supporting descriptive statistics. <p>Clarity and precision throughout, with absolute adherence to APA style (including use of Table and Figures).</p> <p>All relevant results are reported, including nonsignificant findings (“Do not attempt to hide uncomfortable results by omission”).</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Any evidence of cheating, falsifying of data, or deliberate misrepresentation of the results will result in a fail grade for the entire thesis.</p> <p>A capacity to analyse research data is fundamentally lacking, through evidence such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of inappropriate analyses; • Conducting the analyses incorrectly; • Inaccurate interpretation of the results of analyses; • Inaccurate reporting of analysis results, ignorance or misunderstanding of the relevant assumptions, failure to provide appropriate supporting statistics or to use them correctly. • Significant departures from APA reporting style. • Rambling, disorganised, and/or incoherent write up of the results. |

| | Passing Criteria | Failing Criteria | |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
| Discussion | | | |
| Opening | <p>Opens with a clear statement of the support or non-support of original hypotheses, or outcome of research question(s), distinguished by primary and secondary hypotheses/questions.</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Opening statement absent, uninterpretable, or completely erroneous.</p> |
| Body | <p>Relevant post hoc explanations are provided for unsupported hypotheses</p> <p>The implications of the results are evaluated and discussed in the light of previous work by others, including similarities and differences in findings.</p> <p>The results are interpreted appropriately in the light of any threats to internal validity (i.e., causal inference) arising from the measures used, methodological or procedural problems, effect sizes and power, number of tests performed and familywise error, etc.</p> <p>There is accurate acknowledgment of limitations of the research, consideration of alternative explanations, and of the generalisability of the findings.</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, uninterpretable, erroneous, or unjustified from the findings.</p> <p>Wild and unjustified speculation may be present, with interpretations that go beyond what the data and findings allow.</p> |
| Conclusion | <p>A reasoned and justifiable commentary on the importance of the findings – tightly reasoned, self-contained, and not overstated – with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the theoretical, methodological, practical, and/or clinical significance of the findings. • What problems remain or have arisen from the findings, and any (precise) suggestions for how they might be addressed by future research. | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, uninterpretable, erroneous, or unjustified from the findings.</p> <p>Wild and unjustified speculation may be present, with interpretations that go beyond what the data and findings allow.</p> <p>Suggestions for future research may be irrelevant, unjustified, or unrealistic.</p> |

| Coherence and academic quality of the work as a whole, and in view of the relative importance of its strengths and weaknesses: | |
|---|--|
| <p>The overall impact of the thesis as a whole, through integration of the level of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual depth, critical capacity, intellectual sophistication • Original and independent thinking and interpretation • Sophistication of writing and logical construction • Technical competence and mastery | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> Fail <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>Comments on any other considerations to be taken into account in awarding the final grade. These may include the overall level of complexity of the project, the resources available to the student (e.g., capacity to access a highly relevant sample of sufficient size); amount of time and effort required to conduct the project; level of supervisor assistance/support; or limitations affecting the quality of the data as might arise in the context of group projects. (Note: Students must always demonstrate appropriate awareness of the implications of any limitations, particularly for the interpretation of the results.)</p> | |

Appendix G: Criteria and Standards for Marking a Qualitative Honours Thesis in Psychology

A research report or thesis is an integrated work that must ultimately be judged for its *overall* coherence, technical competence, conceptual depth, originality, professionalism, and academic writing sophistication. It is also a capstone piece of work in the fourth year of an accredited psychology degree, and, as such, serves to demonstrate the overall standard of professional knowledge and skill that has been attained by the student, and the student's capacity to perform *academically* as an emerging psychological scientist, or scientist-practitioner.

This also applies to a thesis produced for a coursework Masters degree, with the added demonstration of a capacity to undertake and evaluate research that advances and informs clinical or professional practice.

The criteria for each of the sections of the research report or thesis are provided from page 4. They have been derived from the *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed., pp. 25-37). It is hereby acknowledged that there is the occasional verbatim quote that has not been identified as such (i.e., by quotation marks) in order to keep the text as simple as possible.

The criteria are in the form of anchors with required criteria for a first class thesis on the left, and criteria that would be apparent in a failed work on the right. Each section is judged according to the standards on the next page, with no further indication on the criteria pages, given it is not possible to cover the many possible ways to depart from first class criteria. Examiners may indicate particular weaknesses on the criteria pages when examining the thesis.

The final grading of the report or thesis is derived from the standards achieved in the various sections, and, importantly, on the overall integrity, sophistication, and originality of the work. Section gradings would be expected to correspond generally with the final mark, although a weakness in some areas may be compensated for by more outstanding work in others, and strengths in some areas may be diminished by more serious weaknesses elsewhere. It is not a simple additive process, because of the importance of the work as a coherent whole.

Note: Qualitative researchers are obliged to attend to issues that impact on the *soundness* or *trustworthiness* of their research. In this respect, start by referring to: Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 200-207. However, wider reading on these issues is strongly recommended prior to commencing the study. Constructs associated with demonstrating soundness are included in the marking criteria on page 7 (i.e., in Discussion Body section).

| Standards by Which a Qualitative Research Report or Thesis is Evaluated | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---------------------------|--|
| HD or Honours Class 1 | | D or Honours Class 2-1 | | | C or Honours Class 2-2 | | P or Honours Class 3 | Fail/ Honours Not Awarded | |
| Band 1a 95%+ | Band 1b 85% – 94% | Band 1 80% – 84% | Band 2 75% -79% | Band 1 70% - 74% | Band 2 65%- 74% | 50% - 64% | 0% - 49% | | |
| <p>The criteria are met at the highest level of technical accuracy, conceptual depth, critical and creative thinking, and/or originality that can be expected for an Honours level thesis.</p> <p>Clarity, precision, sophistication, and excellent structural and logical development, and presentation (including adherence to APA style) characterise the written work.</p> <p>Perfection is not expected (not even possible), however, any weaknesses are atypical and so minor as not to detract from the overall quality.</p> | <p>The work has similar characteristics to 1a, but with minor weaknesses in some aspects.</p> <p>It rarely achieves the level of excellence, polish, and/or originality that typifies 1a.</p> | <p>The criteria are met at a level that is conceptually and technically competent, but not outstanding.</p> <p>Logical continuity is evident most of the time. Conceptual and critical depth, creative thinking, and/or originality are often evident, but not as consistently as for HD/Class 1.</p> <p>The work is well structured and clearly written, with a high standard of presentation. (including APA style)</p> <p>There may be some minor weaknesses. Any more serious weakness is offset by competence otherwise.</p> | <p>The criteria are met at a level that is technically competent, perhaps with some conceptual limitations, but none that are significant.</p> <p>Logical continuity is evident more often than not, but may lack elegance at times. There is at least the odd instance of conceptual and critical depth, creative thinking, and/or originality.</p> <p>The work is mostly well structured and clearly written, with a high standard of presentation. (including APA style).</p> <p>There may be a number of minor weaknesses. Any more serious weakness is offset by competence otherwise.</p> | <p>The thesis demonstrates basic competence in meeting most of the criteria, but generally lacks, conceptual and critical depth, creative thinking, and/or originality, or high-level technical skill.</p> <p>The writing may tend to be more naive (less scholarly); and/or may not always be well structured, clear, or exhibit logical continuity.</p> <p>There may be a number of errors, some more serious, but none so serious as to entirely undermine the overall integrity of the research or its interpretation.</p> <p>Presentation and APA style may be wanting at times.</p> | <p>The thesis demonstrates basic competence in meeting most of the criteria, although there are clear inadequacies in the handling of one or more aspects.</p> <p>Conceptual and scholarly sophistication is not apparent. Technical skill may be deficient in places; originality is absent.</p> <p>There may be critical misconceptions, inconsistencies, omissions, or failings in one or more areas. The work should retain a degree of overall integrity.</p> <p>Writing, structure, presentation, and/or APA style may be unsophisticated, with various errors.</p> | <p>The thesis demonstrates only a basic grasp of the criteria, with little if any evidence of proficiency, and many inadequacies.</p> <p>While the various sections are basically intact, they contain a number of misconceptions, inconsistencies, omissions, or unrecognized deficiencies.</p> <p>Writing, structure, presentation, and APA style will be at minimum standards throughout, or highly variable, making the thesis generally difficult for the marker to read and understand.</p> | <p>The work cannot be considered as a serious attempt to complete the basic requirements of an Honours standard thesis.</p> <p>Deficiencies are general and many, and neither the thesis nor the research upon which it reports have credibility.</p> <p>Structure, presentation and use of APA style may be unacceptable.</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Thesis or Research Report For | 100488 Empirical Research Project (Fourth year group project, year-long, written independently) | | | |
| | 100980 Psychology Honours Thesis (Individual project, year-long) | | | |
| | 101239 Applied Research Project (Individual project, year-long) | | | |
| Thesis or Project Title | | | | |
| Student Name | | | Student ID: | |
| Examiner | | | Date examined: | |
| <i>Using the categories below, and based on evaluations on the following pages, which are made available to the student, I award this Thesis/Project a Grade of</i> | | <i>With a numeric mark of</i> | | % |

| HONOURS GRADE | FOURTH YEAR/MASTERS GRADE | MARK RANGE |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| First Class Honours | High Distinction | |
| 1+ | HD+ | 95-100 |
| 1 | HD | 85-94 |
| Second Class Honours (Level 1) | Distinction | |
| 2-1+ | D+ | 80-84 |
| 2-1 | D | 75-79 |
| Second Class Honours (Level 2) | Credit | |
| 2-2+ | C+ | 70-74 |
| 2-2 | C | 65-69 |
| Third Class Honours 3 | Pass P | 50-64 |
| Honours Not Awarded F | Fail F | 0-49 |

Criteria for Evaluating a Research Report or Thesis (According to the Standards on Page 2)

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| Student Name | | Student ID: | |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|--|

| | Passing Criteria | | Failing Criteria |
|--|---|--|---|
| Abstract | Clear and concise, yet comprehensive summary of entire study; correct word length. | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> | Generally lacking key elements |
| Introduction | | | |
| Introduce the problem area under investigation and indicate why it deserves further research | Clear and focused statement of the problem area under investigation; compelling, highly original, or creative indication of why the general area deserves further research attention. | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> | Vague, generalised indication of research area, if any at all; token, if any, indication of why it deserves further research attention. |
| Provide the theoretical and empirical background and context for the study | <p>Thorough and <i>critical</i> review of <i>relevant</i> empirical literature – Identifying strengths, weaknesses, pertinent findings, relevant methodological issues, and major conclusions.</p> <p>Logical continuity throughout, and between previous and present work.</p> <p>Clear and relevant discussion of theoretical framework adopted, and the appropriate paradigm of enquiry (i.e., post-positivism, constructionist, critical theory).</p> <p>Sophisticated, professional expression of ideas.</p> | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Body of introduction not coherent, and may also include some or all of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omission of key theoretical perspectives • Major omission of relevant empirical work • Inclusion of irrelevant or peripheral literature • Lack of logical continuity or direction, or diffuse sequencing of ideas • Descriptive list of studies with little or no critical review • Poor understanding of the literature, or many misconceptions • Very poor written expression |
| Statement of research question(s) and their correspondence to research design | <p>Clear and integrated statement of the research question(s), and their rationale (i.e., how they are derived from or logically connected to previous argumentation.)</p> <p>Primary or secondary questions are clearly worded and identified as such.</p> <p><u>Indication</u> (not detailed description) of the research design and <u>how it permits the inferences</u> needed to examine and provide answers to the research question.</p> | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Research question(s) is/are not coherent, and/or have no defensible rationale derived from previous argumentation.</p> <p>Very poor, or absent integration of research question(s) into proposed research design</p> <p>Unrealistic or unanswerable research question(s) within the scope of the proposed design</p> |

| | Passing Criteria | | | | Failing Criteria | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Method | | | | | | |
| Research Design | Clear and precise description of the research design (e.g., case study, phenomenological study, discourse analysis, grounded theory) and its essential features, including associated methodology (e.g., interviews, focus groups, observation). | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> | F <input type="checkbox"/> | The research design is not described, is not appropriate for the research, has significant missing elements, is clearly not understood, and/or is not coherent. |
| Participants | <p>Comprehensive description of all relevant sample parameters (eligibility and any exclusion criteria, recruitment procedures and sites, relevant demographic characteristics, group descriptions).</p> <p>Comprehensive description of sampling procedure, rationale for sampling method (i.e., random, purposive, theoretical), numbers who declined participation, any inducements or payments, ethical standards met, ethical safeguards in place (e.g., use of pseudonyms).</p> <p>Sample (and group) sizes and sample size justification (e.g., theoretical saturation reached).</p> <p>Clarity and precision in reporting all aspects.</p> | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> | F <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, incomplete, uninterpretable, erroneous, or not understood.</p> <p>The reporting may be rambling, disjointed, and/or incoherent, or insensitive.</p> |
| Materials /Instruments /Apparatus | Clear and precise description of any physical materials, software, or equipment that was used, including the development and piloting of interview schedules, and transcription conventions (and the psychometric properties and appropriateness of any psychological tests or scales that are used). | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> | F <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, incomplete, uninterpretable, erroneous, or not understood.</p> <p>The reporting may be rambling, disjointed, and/or incoherent.</p> |
| Procedure | <p>Full, yet clear and concise, description of the procedure, including any procedures undertaken to deal with ethical issues present in the research.</p> <p>Clear and full details of how the data was collected, and the context of the research. Clear description of any field notes and/or memoing.</p> | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> | F <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Important aspects of the Procedure are absent, incomplete, uninterpretable, or not appropriate.</p> <p>The reporting may be rambling, disjointed, and/or incoherent.</p> |
| | Passing Criteria | | | | Failing Criteria | |
| Results | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Analysis | <p>Clear description of the analytic technique adopted (e.g., thematic analysis of meaning units for a phenomenological study; formal process of open and axial coding etc. necessary to support a grounded theory study).</p> <p>Clear and precise description of how data was coded (i.e., manually, computer programme), relevant examples of codes used, concise description of how data were selected for presentation, and data typicality.</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Note: Qualitative researchers need to take care to analyse and code for actual meaning units, categories, or themes in their data, as opposed to simply summarising the data.</i></p> | <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, incomplete, uninterpretable, erroneous, or not understood.</p> <p>The reporting may be rambling, disjointed, and/or incoherent.</p> |
| Complete, and insightful reporting of the analytic treatment of the data | <p>Accurate and complete reporting (but not discussion) of the results of the qualitative data analysis to address the research questions.</p> <p>Clear mastery of qualitative analysis techniques used.</p> <p>So as to allow the reader to properly interpret the results, there is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear and considered re-presentation of the data in appropriate illustrative extracts; • logical organisation and parsimony in the re-presentation of data/themes; • reporting of all relevant results with indication of marginal, minority, or “negative” (i.e., atypical) accounts if appropriate. <p>Clarity and precision throughout, with absolute adherence to APA style (including use of Table and Figures).</p> | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Any evidence of cheating, falsifying of data, or deliberate misrepresentation of the results will result in a fail grade for the entire thesis.</p> <p>A capacity to analyse research data is fundamentally lacking, through evidence such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of inappropriate analyses; • Conducting the analyses incorrectly; • Inaccurate interpretation of the results of analyses; • Inaccurate reporting of analysis results, ignorance or misunderstanding of the relevant assumptions, failure to provide appropriate supporting data or to use them correctly. • Significant departures from APA reporting style. • Rambling, disorganised, and/or incoherent write up of the results. • Data presented is idiosyncratic, deductively produced, and/or laden with value judgments. |

| | Passing Criteria | Failing Criteria |
|-------------------|--|---|
| Discussion | | |
| Opening | Opens with a clear statement of the outcome of research question(s), distinguished by primary and secondary questions. | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Body | <p>The implications of the results are evaluated and discussed in the light of existing theory, and of previous work by others, including similarities and differences in findings.</p> <p>There is critical consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the <i>soundness</i> or <i>trustworthiness</i> of the research (i.e., its <i>credibility</i>, <i>transferability</i>, <i>dependability</i>, and <i>confirmability</i>) and the implications of any weaknesses for interpretation of the results; • any unanticipated methodological issues that arose during the research process and how these shaped the data arising; • the role of the researcher in shaping the research process, results, and interpretations; • the limitations of the research, alternative explanations, the generalisability of the findings, and the limits imposed by the sampling strategy. | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, uninterpretable, erroneous, or unjustified from the findings.</p> <p>Wild and unjustified speculation may be present, with interpretations that go beyond what the data and findings allow.</p> |
| Conclusion | <p>A reasoned and justifiable commentary on the importance of the findings and their contribution to knowledge – tightly reasoned, self-contained, and not overstated – with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the theoretical, methodological, practical, and/or clinical contribution/importance of the findings. • Identification of problems that remain or have arisen from the findings, and any (precise) suggestions for how they might be addressed by future research. | <p>HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Most or nearly all of the necessary criteria are either absent, uninterpretable, erroneous, or unjustified from the findings.</p> <p>Wild and unjustified speculation may be present, with interpretations that go beyond what the data and findings allow.</p> <p>Suggestions for future research may be irrelevant, unjustified, or unrealistic.</p> |

| Passing Criteria | | Failing Criteria | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Reference list and referencing | Reference list is complete and accords with in-text referencing. All referencing adheres strictly to APA referencing conventions. | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> | F <input type="checkbox"/> | Any evidence of plagiarism will result in a fail grade for the thesis. Reference list and/or in-text referencing departs seriously from APA referencing conventions; there may be a significant lack of correspondence between in-text referencing citations and entries in reference list; reference list may contain entries that could not have been read by the student. | |
| Appendices | Appendices are relevant and carefully presented, and must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ethical clearance letter; • copies of recruitment flyers/advertising used; • copies of information statements, consent forms, and instructions given to participants; • copy on interview schedule(s); • copies of any psychological tests or scales used. | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> | F <input type="checkbox"/> | Required Appendices are missing; inappropriate or unnecessary Appendices (e.g., raw data/transcripts) are included. | |
| Presentation and APA Style | Presentation is near perfect and accords closely with APA style in all respects. Any departures are minor and isolated. | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> | F <input type="checkbox"/> | Presentation is careless throughout, with very little adherence to the conventions of APA style. | |
| Coherence and academic quality of the work as a whole, and in view of the relative importance of its strengths and weaknesses: | | | | | | | |
| The overall impact of the thesis as a whole, through integration of the level of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual depth, critical capacity, intellectual sophistication • Original and independent thinking and interpretation • Sophistication of writing and logical construction • Technical competence and mastery | | HD <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | | C <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | | P <input type="checkbox"/> | Fail <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments on any other considerations to be taken into account in awarding the final grade. These may include the overall level of complexity of the project, the resources available to the student (e.g., capacity to access a highly relevant sample of sufficient size); amount of time and effort required to conduct the project; level of supervisor assistance/support; or limitations affecting the quality of the data as might arise in the context of group projects. (Note: Students must always demonstrate appropriate awareness of the implications of any limitations, particularly for the interpretation of the results.) | | | | | | | |

Appendix H: Requirements for Ethics Approval

Human and Animal Ethics and Biosafety for Honours students at UWS

...all research is an ethical undertaking, and all researchers are confronted with ethical choices, whether in the laboratory, the library or the field.¹

Research involving human participants or animals must undergo a formal ethical review to ensure it is carried out in accordance with Australian research practice.

All honours research involving human participants **must** meet the National Statement criteria for Low 1 or Negligible risk research.

In Australia, the honours student's Supervisor is the applicant for both human and animal ethics approval.

Given the short time frame available for Honours study, it is recommended that where ethics approval does not already exist, that ethics approval is sought as a matter of **priority** at the earliest possible time during the Honours program.

All research carried out at UWS involving human participants or animals must be conducted in accordance with national and University frameworks:

- Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007)
- National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (2007)
- Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes (2004)
- Health Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research (2003)
- Office of the Gene Technology Regulator
- Australian Standard AS 2243.3 Safety in the Laboratory, Part 3: Microbiology.
- International Compilation of Human Research Standards
- UWS Research Code of Practice

Before conducting any data collection, experimentation or field work, Supervisors of Honours projects must determine whether ethical review is required and obtain approvals from the relevant ethics committee. All projects are considered the responsibility of the supervisor who will be the applicant for ethics protocol approval.

The following guidance will assist supervisors in managing the ethics review process within the narrow timeframe of undergraduate Honours.

Honours projects involving Human Research

Honours projects meeting the conditions for expedited review by the Human Research Ethics Committee and will be eligible for review at its weekly Executive meetings (Negligible and Low 1 risk levels).

The Risk level will be confirmed by the disciplinary Peer Review Committee which will also confirm that the proposed research plan meets the *National Statement*'s requirements of Research Merit and Integrity.

Once your application has met the *National Statement*'s Research Merit and Integrity standards – as determined by the Peer Review Committee, the Secretariat of the Committee will forward the application for ethical review to the Human Research Ethics Committee's Executive.

Applications should be presentation standard and all documentation provided. To assist the HREC Executive, applications are screened by the Human Ethics Officer prior to being reviewed. Your early response to feedback arising from that screening will enable your Honours student's project to undergo ethical review at the next scheduled meeting date.

¹ <http://gradresearch.unimelb.edu.au/programs/GReP/GREIM.html>

Feedback from the ethical review by the HREC Executive is provided within 7 days of the Executive's meeting date. Final approval, however, will be subject to how quickly applicants are able to respond to any feedback that the Executive provides.

Guidelines for Ethics Application

1. Submit your ethics application as early in the academic year as possible. Approval periods depend on the quality of the application and any feedback from the review processes, however, this may be one (1) month.
2. Refer to the UWS Ethics webpages for Hints and Tips for completing the ethics application, and the [Frequently Asked Questions](#) page for human ethics. These are invaluable sources of information and will assist in completing a high quality ethics application.
3. If you feel you have not had a response to your application within a reasonable time - at either the Peer Review stage or the Ethics review stage of the process - follow up with the professional staff – PRC Secretary for Peer Review or the Human or Animal Ethics Officer for Ethics review. UWS is a research led university has large numbers of research projects under review at any one time. so it is in your best interest to monitor an application's progress.
4. Ensure that all attachments are included at the time of submission using those available on the UWS Ethics webpages, as these are the most current templates.