

## CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

### LIST OF CENSURED UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIONS

According to information supplied by the Canadian Association of University Teachers the following university administrations are under CAUT censure:

President and Board of Regents, Memorial University of Newfoundland (1979).

Board of Governors, University of Calgary (1979).

Requests for information about the events which led to censure should be sent to:

The Executive Secretary  
Canadian Association of University Teachers  
75 Albert Street, Suite 1001  
Ottawa, Canada, K1P 5E7

## ACADEMIC STAFFING: THE SEARCH FOR EXCELLENCE

*Our [staff] appointment procedures are based on selecting the best qualified candidate for the position. Only in this way is it possible to develop and maintain the standards of excellence that Australians demand from their educational institutions.<sup>1</sup>*

Yet, why does such a search for excellence result in a high proportion of overseas appointments and relatively few female staff? Why does the pattern vary so much between universities?

In an attempt to analyse these questions the academic staff at nineteen of Australia's twenty universities in 1977 were examined. The newest university of Deakin was excluded since published data were not available at the time. Using calendars or handbooks, the academic staff of each university was recorded by sex, faculty, academic status and location of institutions awarding first and second degrees. The assumption was made that persons normally acquire their first degree in their home country. Therefore recording these should give some idea as to the Australian composition of each university's staff. Sex is not stated in calendars, but can be inferred from the forenames. However, three universities, Queensland, Western Australia and Wollongong, did not give full names and these had to be omitted from the cross-tabulations related to sex. It was necessary to use 1976 data for the University of New South Wales. The status of fellows at the Australian National University has been incorporated at the comparable levels in all tables. There is some doubt whether all tutors were recorded in the calendars. Thus some anomalies will appear in the following tables.

**Status of Women** The very small proportion of women at senior academic levels is a well publicised fact and the following table will surprise no one. Some excellent reports<sup>2</sup> on this situation have already been published.

Clearly males predominate overwhelmingly in the top three status levels. Why if one third of the tutors is female is there not a corresponding proportion of females to be found at other status levels? Whilst many valid feminist arguments have been put forward to account for this disparity, there is one factor which may also be significant. The

### Fay Gale

Professor of Geography  
University of Adelaide

preference of Australian universities for overseas degrees may militate against married women who are usually by the nature of their domestic roles, not as mobile as males.

Table 1

Sex in relation to academic status (16 universities)

Status	Female		Male	
	No.	%	No.	%
Professor	12	1.2	1056	98.8
Assoc. Prof/Reader	34	3.9	832	96.1
Senior Lecturer	180	7.3	2272	92.7
Lecturer	349	15.1	1961	84.9
Senior Tutor	195	35.0	363	65.0
Tutor/Demonstrator	297	34.5	563	65.5

Table 1 suggests that women have less opportunity for promotion than do men. Promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer is a relatively normal procedure. Yet whilst there are more males at the senior lecturer level than at the lecturer level the reverse is the case for females.

The FAUSA report of 1977<sup>3</sup> provides several explanations of this situation in which women appear to be disadvantaged. The FAUSA questionnaire obtained a number of responses accounting for lower promotional opportunities. One particularly significant factor was that of interrupted careers due to the mobility of husbands and the responsibilities of young families. Both of these aspects made it more difficult for married women to obtain higher degrees and to publish at the speed of their male counterparts. Since both appointments and promotions depend almost entirely upon these two achievements women were indeed disadvantaged. However, the real causes lie much deeper in our social fabric than these symptomatic reasons would suggest.

**Overseas Degrees** Australian universities appear to select persons with overseas degrees. Encel made the point in 1962 "that we are continuing to rely heavily on recruitment from overseas, that over 50 per cent of the appointees are already filling academic posts, and that recruitment from amongst graduate students is relatively small".<sup>4</sup> By 1977 the situation appeared to have changed little. Still almost 50 per cent of those occupying academic positions of lecturer and above had overseas qualifications.

**Table 2**  
**Location of Institutions Awarding Second Degree: Lecturer and above**

Place	No.	%
Australia/Papua-New Guinea	3532	42.9
United Kingdom	2150	26.1
North America	1205	14.6
Europe	226	2.8
New Zealand	126	1.5
Other places	119	1.5
None stated	871	10.6

Tutors, demonstrators and senior tutors have been omitted from Table 2. There is some doubt as to the accuracy of the tutorship figures. Also these are temporary or non-promotional positions which, until recently, have not attracted overseas applicants and often were not even advertised overseas. The situation is now changing with the tightening job-market and it seems that increasingly tutorships may also be filled by overseas applicants. Furthermore, tutorships in the past have been given to persons enrolled for, but not possessing, a higher degree. At the time these figures were compiled 54.7 per cent of tutors and demonstrators, including senior tutors, did not have a higher degree.

If the assumption is correct, that persons normally take their first degree in their country of origin, then a comparison of Tables 2 and 3 will show that a significant proportion of Australians go overseas to obtain a second degree.

**Table 3**  
**Location of Institutions Awarding First Degree: Lecturer and above**

Place	No.	%
Australia/Papua-New Guinea	5013	61.9
United Kingdom	1592	19.7
North America	587	7.2
Europe	223	2.8
New Zealand	341	4.2
Other places	324	4.0
None stated	23	.3

Our universities thus employ Australians in approximately 61.9 per cent of the academic posts of lecturer and above, but only some 42.9 per cent obtained their second degrees in Australia. But note that 10.6 per cent had no higher degree and a large proportion of these would be Australians. It was not possible to obtain a doctorate in any Australian university until after the Second World War although Master's degrees were available.

Table 3 shows that nineteen per cent of Australian lecturers went overseas to obtain higher degrees. In actual fact the proportion must be higher because the figures are concealed by the increasing numbers of overseas people taking second

degrees in Australia. This figure suggests that a preference for overseas degrees exists and that there is even pressure upon Australians to go abroad to further their education and experience.

This apparently preferential system has been maintained over long periods of time. The census of 1971 shows that whereas immigrants accounted for 26.8 per cent of the total Australian work force they made up 40.6 per cent of academics in universities here.<sup>5</sup>

In such a climate it is possible to postulate that females are doubly disadvantaged, that is they are female and lack overseas qualifications. This is particularly true when it comes to higher status levels where overseas qualifications appear to be even more important. In Table 4 those without higher degrees are omitted, but it is interesting to note that all of the females who were readers or professors possessed a second degree. However, 70 males appointed to these levels did not have a higher degree. Of all staff at lecturer level who possessed second degrees 53.8 per cent of women and 48.0 per cent of men had obtained their qualifications in Australia.

**Table 4**  
**Status by Sex: Location of Institutions Awarding Second Degree**

	Female		Male	
	No.	%	No.	%
Readers and Professors				
Australia	28	60.9	789	42.6
Elsewhere	18	39.1	1065	57.4
Senior Lecturers & Lecturers				
Australia	236	53.0	1913	50.6
Elsewhere	209	47.0	1866	49.4

Females are swimming against the tide as it were since, of those promoted to the status of reader or above, 60.9 per cent have Australian degrees, but of the males at this level, only 42.6 per cent hold higher degrees from Australian universities. Thus one of the reasons for low numbers of females at high status levels in Australian universities may be accidental in the sense that committees apparently prefer overseas qualifications and thus unwittingly select against women at these levels. Or do the women obtain promotion in spite of their local qualifications? At the lecturer or senior lecturer level there appears to be less discrepancy.

An inevitable follow-on resulting from the lower mobility of women is the fact that not only are appointment committees attracted by overseas qualifications but that promotion committees judge quality largely on the basis of publications in overseas, refereed journals. Yet this is not as objective a measure as it is usually assumed to be. The editors and referees of journals are strongly, if

not always consciously, influenced by known names and institutions. The network system operates at all levels; thus if Australians, and women in particular, have not been able to study overseas, and thus get on to the known circuit in their field, they may be disadvantaged in the accessibility of publication opportunities in overseas journals. Such factors, of course, make study leave opportunities for Australians quite critical.

So what are these just and equitable grounds on which all Australian universities make appointments in their search for excellence?

**Variations between Universities.** If as Professor Russell states in his previously quoted letter to the Advertiser, "selection for appointments to Flinders University follows the same procedure adopted by other universities in Australia" why is there such a disparity between Australian universities?

**Employment of Women** Under the same procedures the Australian National University (Advanced Studies) and the University of Tasmania have managed to appoint women to only 6.6 per cent of their total academic positions, but at Macquarie 23.5 per cent of the academic staff is female. In the following table the universities of Queensland, Western Australia and Wollongong are again excluded because data on sex were not specified. All academic staff including tutors are counted.

If tutors and senior tutors are excluded, that is only those of lecturer status and above listed, the rank ordering is altered but not dramatically. All universities employ much lower percentages of women at the tenured and promotional levels but there is still a considerable difference between universities. Griffith, La Trobe, Macquarie, Melbourne and Sydney remain within the top six ranks at both levels of staffing.

These figures suggest that women had considerably more opportunity for appointment to both temporary and permanent positions at some universities than at others. One reason for this may be the structure of the university concerned. Universities vary enormously in their mixture of faculties. Some, like Adelaide, are much more heavily weighted towards the sciences than are others. Since there are fewer women in science than in arts faculties, opportunities for women may vary according to the university structure. Newer universities tend to develop with the 'cheaper' faculties which require less expensive establishment. Since arts-type departments are the cheapest to initiate one would expect a higher proportion of women in the newer universities. Although these factors are evident in some sections of Tables 5 and 6 there is no clear

correlation. The reasons for women being given more opportunity at some universities than others must therefore depend upon a number of other factors also.

**Appointment of Australians** Selection on the basis of nationality also varies from one university to the next. Table 7 shows that at Wollongong, Melbourne, New South Wales, Sydney, Newcastle and Macquarie over two thirds of the academic staff of lecturer and above may be classed as Australian nationals having acquired their first degree at an Australian university. By contrast only about half of the staff at both the Advanced and General Studies campuses of the Australian National University and at Griffith and James Cook are Australian. In Table 7 the numbers with first degrees from universities in the United Kingdom and North America are also listed, these being the largest overseas components. Universities are ranked according to their percentage of Australian staff.

**Table 5**  
**Sex by Individual University: All Academic Staff**

University	Female		Male	
	No.	%	No.	%
1 Macquarie	132	23.5	431	76.5
2 Griffith	22	20.4	86	79.6
3 Melbourne	163	16.6	821	83.4
4 Sydney	166	15.8	887	84.2
5 Murdoch	17	15.6	92	84.4
6 La Trobe	55	14.6	322	85.4
7 A.N.U. (Gen. Stud.)	49	14.0	300	86.0
8 New England	50	12.6	346	87.4
9 Adelaide	87	12.0	636	88.0
10 Flinders	34	11.2	270	88.8
11 Monash	91	10.9	741	89.1
12 New South Wales	126	10.1	1127	89.9
13 Newcastle	25	9.4	241	90.6
14 James Cook	18	9.0	181	91.0
15 Tasmania	19	6.6	267	93.4
16 A.N.U. (Adv. Stud.)	18	6.6	257	93.4

**Table 6**  
**Sex by Individual University: Lecturer and above**

University	Female		Male	
	No.	%	No.	%
1 Griffith	12	15.8	64	84.2
2 La Trobe	49	13.4	318	86.6
3 Macquarie	50	13.3	327	86.7
4 Melbourne	104	12.7	718	87.3
5 Sydney	91	10.5	778	89.5
6 A.N.U. (Gen. Stud.)	30	10.2	264	89.8
7 Murdoch	7	9.5	67	90.5
8 Flinders	20	7.4	251	92.6
9 Monash	49	7.4	615	92.6
10 New England	22	7.5	272	92.5
11 Newcastle	16	6.7	222	93.3
12 A.N.U. (Adv. Stud.)	18	6.6	257	93.4
13 James Cook	9	6.3	134	93.7
14 Adelaide	37	6.2	561	93.8
15 New South Wales	59	5.6	999	94.4
16 Tasmania	12	5.0	230	95.0

**Table 7**  
Location of First Degree: Lecturer and Above

University	Australia		United Kingdom		North America		Other Places plus No 1st Degree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 Wollongong	88	71.5	11	8.9	4	3.3	20	16.3
2 Melbourne	570	69.3	120	14.7	53	6.4	79	9.6
3 New South Wales	732	69.3	164	15.5	53	5.0	109	10.3
4 Sydney	593	68.2	163	18.8	54	6.2	59	6.8
5 Newcastle	162	68.1	36	15.1	17	7.1	23	9.7
6 Macquarie	254	67.4	66	17.5	29	7.7	28	7.4
7 Monash	406	61.2	129	19.4	41	6.2	88	13.2
8 La Trobe	224	61.0	70	19.1	35	9.5	38	10.4
9 Queensland	502	60.6	162	19.6	74	9.0	90	10.9
10 New England	168	57.1	65	22.1	24	8.2	37	12.6
11 Adelaide	337	56.4	164	27.4	39	6.5	58	9.7
12 Tasmania	136	56.2	67	27.7	12	5.0	27	11.2
13 Murdoch	41	55.4	22	29.7	11	14.9	0	0.0
14 Western Australia	253	54.8	105	22.7	44	9.5	60	13.0
15 Flinders	146	53.9	57	21.0	33	12.2	35	12.9
16 A.N.U. (Gen. Stud.)	156	53.1	59	20.1	21	7.1	58	19.7
17 James Cook	72	50.3	38	26.6	13	9.1	20	14.0
18 A.N.U. (Adv. Stud.)	138	50.2	69	25.1	15	5.4	53	19.3
19 Griffith	35	46.1	11	14.5	15	19.7	15	19.7

By and large, those universities with the lowest numbers of Australians on staff have the highest numbers of academics from the United Kingdom. This is not so in all cases. At Griffith, North Americans actually outnumber those from the United Kingdom.

Several combinations of universities were made in an attempt at determining the pattern of these variations in staff nationality. It might be thought that the older, established universities would be similar in staff and different from the post-war institutions. This is not the case. Whilst there are considerable differences between universities, age of the institution is not a critical variable.

The most significant variable appears to be that of geographic location. A core-periphery model was applied to the data given in Table 7 and this was found to be valid. Using this model the assumption was made that the two metropolitan cities of Sydney and Melbourne form the urban cores of Australia and that all other places consider themselves to be somewhat on the periphery. If these cities perceive themselves as the cores of Australia then they should also hold a stronger Australian identity, adopt more Australian images and be less influenced by 'colonial psychology' than the less independent centres. On this model it could be hypothesised that universities in the core-cities would feel less pressured into appointing overseas staff to maintain 'colonial' standards.

The three universities in Melbourne and the three in Sydney plus the northern and southern extensions of metropolitan Sydney at Newcastle and Wollongong are shown to be the eight universities in the top eight ranks of Table 7. Thus these eight

universities located within the two urban cores of Australia do in fact contain the highest proportions of Australian staff, defined by location of first degree.

**Significance of Overseas Qualifications** Similarly there appears to be a considerable difference in the emphasis which the various universities place on the importance of overseas second degrees. Table 8 shows that the Australian representation ranges from a low 28.9 per cent at Griffith to 53.8 at Newcastle. If those without second degrees are omitted from the calculations then Melbourne heads the list with 60.1 per cent of its second degree holders possessing Australian qualifications while Griffith remains low at 31.9 per cent. Thus, whilst in all Australian universities a considerable proportion of the academic staff has a higher degree from an overseas institution the emphasis upon this requirement is not consistent between universities.

In Table 8, universities are ranked according to the proportion of staff holding degrees from an Australian university. Only the two main overseas sources of staff are detailed. All staff of lecturer and above are included. If the calculations are done on only those who hold second degrees then a slight change in the Australian rank order occurs. These figures are given underneath Table 8.

In the newer universities there appears to be a move from the United Kingdom to North America as a source of recruitment. The more recent universities of Griffith, Murdoch, Flinders, La Trobe, Macquarie and the Australian National University (General Studies) all have high levels of staff with North American qualifications. This may only reflect

an overproduction of academics in North America somewhat later than that in the United Kingdom.

But where will the products of Australia's even later academic growth find employment?

**Table 8**  
Location of First Degree: Lecturer and Above

University	Australia		United Kingdom		North America		Other Places plus No 1st Degree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 Newcastle	128	53.8	41	17.2	36	15.1	33	13.9
2 Melbourne	432	52.6	152	18.5	102	12.4	136	16.5
3 Wollongong	63	51.2	19	15.5	18	14.6	23	18.7
4 New South Wales	534	50.5	235	22.2	122	11.5	167	15.8
5 Sydney	429	49.4	243	27.9	110	12.7	87	10.0
6 New England	130	44.2	77	26.2	48	16.3	39	13.3
7 Queensland	350	42.3	218	26.3	126	15.2	134	16.2
8 Macquarie	157	41.6	93	24.7	66	17.5	61	16.8
9 Murdoch	30	40.5	23	31.1	17	23.0	4	5.4
10 Monash	268	40.4	202	30.4	109	16.4	85	12.8
11 Adelaide	236	39.5	191	31.9	79	13.2	92	39.5
12 James Cook	56	39.2	34	23.8	22	15.4	31	21.7
13 Tasmania	94	38.8	74	30.6	35	14.5	39	16.1
14 A.N.U. (Adv. Stud.)	105	38.2	109	39.7	29	10.5	32	11.6
15 A.N.U. (Gen. Stud.)	111	37.8	90	30.6	52	17.7	41	13.9
16 La Trobe	136	37.1	108	29.4	74	20.2	49	13.3
17 Western Australia	159	34.4	146	31.6	84	18.2	73	15.8
18 Flinders	92	34.0	78	28.8	60	22.1	41	15.1
19 Griffith	22	28.9	17	22.4	20	26.3	17	22.4

Australian ranking in percentages when those without second degrees are omitted from the calculations. Melbourne 60.1, Newcastle 57.4, New South Wales 56.8, Wollongong 56.3, Sydney 52.3, Queensland 48.0, New England 47.5, Macquarie 46.7, Adelaide 44.4, James Cook 43.1, Monash 43.1, Tasmania 43.1, Murdoch 41.7, A.N.U. (Advanced Studies) 40.1, A.N.U. (General Studies) 39.9, La Trobe 39.5, Western Australia 37.5, Flinders 34.9, Griffith 31.9.

**Table 9**  
Faculties: Location of second degree, all academic staff

University (Alphabetical Order)	ARTS				SCIENCES											
	Australia No.	%	U.K. No.	%	Other or No Second Degree No.	%	Total No.	%								
Adelaide	66	9.2	78	10.8	128	17.8	272	37.8	193	26.8	116	16.1	139	19.3	448	62.2
A.N.U. (Adv. Stud.)	41	15.0	49	17.9	35	12.8	125	45.8	64	23.4	60	22.0	24	8.8	148	54.2
A.N.U. (Gen. Stud.)	78	22.3	65	18.6	88	25.2	231	66.2	58	16.6	27	7.7	33	9.5	118	33.8
Flinders	41	13.6	47	15.6	96	31.9	184	61.1	59	19.6	29	9.6	29	9.6	117	38.9
Griffith	11	10.4	6	5.7	38	35.8	55	51.9	21	19.8	10	9.4	20	18.9	51	48.1
James Cook	23	11.6	13	6.6	56	28.3	92	46.5	46	23.2	29	14.6	31	15.7	106	53.5
La Trobe	75	20.5	67	18.4	111	30.4	243	66.6	64	17.5	41	11.2	17	4.7	122	33.4
Macquarie	126	22.5	72	12.9	195	34.8	393	70.2	82	14.6	27	4.8	58	10.4	167	29.8
Melbourne	175	17.8	61	6.2	192	19.6	428	43.6	296	30.1	97	9.9	161	16.4	554	56.4
Monash	134	16.1	113	13.6	206	24.8	453	54.6	173	20.9	116	14.0	87	10.5	376	45.4
Murdoch	9	8.0	12	10.7	37	33.0	58	51.8	25	22.3	13	11.6	16	14.3	54	48.2
Newcastle	71	27.1	34	13.0	45	17.2	150	57.3	67	25.6	6	2.3	39	14.9	112	42.7
New England	84	21.2	54	13.6	106	26.8	244	61.8	75	19.9	29	7.3	48	12.1	152	38.4
New South Wales	163	12.9	79	6.3	193	15.3	435	34.5	421	33.4	160	12.7	244	19.4	825	65.5
Queensland	149	16.1	84	9.1	169	18.3	402	43.5	244	26.4	143	15.5	135	14.6	522	56.5
Sydney	122	11.2	109	10.0	173	15.9	404	37.2	362	33.3	138	12.7	182	16.8	682	62.8
Tasmania	37	13.2	36	12.8	52	18.5	125	44.5	66	23.5	41	14.6	49	17.4	156	55.5
Western Australia	60	11.0	74	13.6	105	19.3	239	43.9	133	24.5	79	14.5	93	17.1	305	56.1
Wollongong	36	24.8	5	3.5	44	30.3	85	58.6	29	20.0	13	9.0	18	12.4	60	41.4

**Faculty Variations.** Frost<sup>6</sup> has shown that departments of English in Australian universities display a strong concentration of Oxbridge staff in senior posts. Whilst this preference may be very strong in English departments, it is also evident in other arts departments. If we divide faculties on a straight arts/science split placing economics, law, etc., with arts, and medicine, engineering etc., with science, we see definite discrepancies in appointment pat-

terns between these two broad fields. Arts-type faculties have a greater preference for overseas staff than do the science-type faculties.

Combining all academic staff in the nineteen universities we find those with Australian second degrees account for an average of 48.8 per cent in science faculties but only 32.5 per cent in arts faculties. Again there is a definite variation between univer-

sities. Vice-Chancellors and Deputy Vice-Chancellors, who, of course, cannot be assigned to faculties, are omitted from this table.

In arts faculties females account for 19.2 per cent of the academic staff. In science faculties, however, only 7.5 per cent of the academic staff is female. But the fact that in arts faculties only 32.5 per cent of the academic staff obtained their second degrees in Australia in contrast with 48.8 per cent in science further illustrates the problems facing females. Table 4 has shown that proportionately more females than males obtain their second degrees in Australia. It seems possible therefore that females are further disadvantaged in that they are trying to obtain positions with Australian degrees in the faculties which show a lower preference for local qualifications.

### Summary

Women are clearly disadvantaged but some of the reasons may be those not usually seen as discriminatory. They appear to be restricted by the operation of three factors in addition to those usually said to operate against women. A high proportion have Australian degrees, they may also have limited access to publication opportunities in overseas journals and are more frequently found in arts-type disciplines which appear to place greater emphasis on the first two factors than do science disciplines. Males trained in Australia may also be disadvantaged in comparison with those in the United Kingdom, and in more recent years, in North America. The survey has also shown that the so-called search for excellence does not result in the same appointment patterns in each university. There are distinct locational influences operating in different cities upon the selection of staff. Faculty procedures also differ and the age of the university may affect appointment. It is possible that differences in university structure and the faculty mix may also cause variations. Thus there are a number of variables operating to produce different staffing patterns within and between universities.

Several questions are prompted by these statistics. Why in all these years of appointing persons with overseas qualifications to maintain "standards of excellence" has that excellence not yet been able

to reproduce itself? Why with the declining academic market overseas is Australia still taking up the overproduction of other countries when most of those countries now place a quota on academics coming in from outside? In the present market situation, excellence could well be a nebulous, mystifying concept which results in Australia taking overseas people who cannot obtain positions in their own country. If our institutions cannot produce quality excellent enough for a higher percentage of appointments then graduates will lack the stimulus to further their education and our very foundations may be endangered.

### Acknowledgements

A very special thanks goes to Bruce Kapferer, Professor of Anthropology, Adelaide, for his stimulus in producing this paper and for the many ideas he contributed. I am also grateful to Ken Provins, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Adelaide, for reading the final draft and helping me to qualify some of my statements. Kris Pedler, at the time a junior laboratory assistant in geography, helped with recording and coding the university calendars. Wence Sulda, programmer in geography, computerised the data. Kay Anderson, a temporary research assistant, assisted with the extraction of tables.

### References

1. Russell, Roger W., Vice-Chancellor of Flinders University, in Letters to the Editor, *The Advertiser*, Adelaide, 27 December, 1978.
2. Bramley, Gwenda M. and Ward, Marian W., *The Role of Women in the Australian National University, A report to the Council of the A.N.U.*, Canberra, 1976.
3. University Assembly, University of Melbourne, *Women's Working Group Report*, July 1975.
4. Federation of Australian University Staff Associations: Committee on the Status of Women Academics, 1977.
5. Encel, S., "Sources of Academic Staff", *Vestes* Vol. V., No. 3, 1962, p. 39.
6. Simon, Leslie L., "Academic Brain Gain", *The Australian Quarterly*, Vol. 48, No. 3, September 1976, p. 37.
7. Frost, Lucy, "English in Australia: The Perils of an Historical Stance", *Meanjin Quarterly*, Volume 35, No. 4, 1976, p. 347-351.

## HIGHER DEGREE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES IN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES

Stephen Lovas

### Preamble

Some time after the award of my Ph.D. in April 1977 I made a submission to a number of Australian universities concerning *Proposed Alterations to University By-laws Governing Higher Degrees*. This submission dealt with various aspects of supervising and examining procedures. Its content was partly inspired by my own experiences as a Ph.D. candidate, although the issues raised in it were of a much more general nature and the suggested changes went well beyond the scope of my personal preoccupations. The document concentrated on the following main issues:

- (i) the role and responsibility of the supervisor,
- (ii) the secrecy surrounding the examiners, and their anonymity,
- (iii) the lack of provision for public debate, in case of a disagreement between the examiners, or the examinee and the examiners,
- (iv) more generally, the absence of any open appeal mechanism,
- (v) the lack of open consultation between the parties concerned (candidate, supervisor, examiners).

In detail the submission was:

### Supervisor

A candidate will be accepted if the head of a department, a professor, a reader, or a staff member holding a doctorate is willing to accept full responsibility as supervisor. The principal supervisor may be assisted by other members of the university staff and may refer the candidate for advice to any other appropriate specialist in the university or elsewhere. It is considered that a supervisor cannot without assistance adequately direct the work of more than four or five full-time Ph.D. candidates.

The supervisor should be thoroughly familiar with the relevant degree rules, with the advice to candidates on the presentation of a thesis, and with the suggestions to examiners. He or she should regularly draw the attention of candidates to pertinent aspects of the rules and encourage them to abide by them.

The supervisor should ensure that the candidate is engaged on a promising topic which might fairly be expected to produce sufficient results within a time

which does not greatly exceed the minimum period specified.

The supervisor should assist the candidate to develop standards of achievement that will result in a thesis of merit. With this end in view the supervisor should —

- (a) plan with the candidate an appropriate course of study;
- (b) meet the candidate at regular intervals to discuss and guide the progress of the work;
- (c) advise the candidate on the aims, scope and presentation of the thesis and on any publication likely to arise from the work;
- (d) insist on seeing drafts of the major sections of the thesis as they are prepared;
- (e) comment critically on the draft of the completed thesis before it is submitted by the candidate;
- (f) ensure that, having regard to the nature of the topic, any thesis presented is not unnecessarily long.

### Change of Supervisor

A candidate may apply through the head of his or her Department to the Post-graduate Studies Committee at any time for a change in supervisor. However, it should be appreciated that unless another qualified person is willing to act as supervisor the candidature may lapse.

The supervisor(s) shall be required to provide a report on the thesis at the time of the submission to the examiners. The report will contain a history of the candidature, the problems and difficulties the candidate has encountered and in particular it will state which parts or aspects of the work represent the supervisor(s)' own contribution in the form of advice or instructions to the candidate.

In general, the report shall clearly state the extent to which the supervisor(s) accepted responsibility for, or approved of, the submitted work.

Copies of the supervisor(s)' report shall be made available to the Professorial Board, the examiner(s) and the candidate, who may object to the supervisor(s)' and the examiner(s)' disagreement with the report, if any.

### Examiner

The Professorial Board shall appoint three ex-