

GUIDELINES FOR EXAMINERS – MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY (INNOVATION) PHD.I



Section 1: General Information

This information should be read in full by the examiner prior to beginning the examination process.

The Graduate Research School will provide each examiner the following items examination:

- Thesis (Adobe PDF or link to multiple files)
- Examiner Report
- Information for HDR Examiners (as applicable)
- Honorarium Claim

The email will also include a link to the relevant course rules or handbook. Theses may contain multiple digital files, which will be sent as a OneDrive link.

Printed Copy

Should an examiner require a printed copy of the thesis, the request must be sent to the Graduate Research School on hdrexam@une.edu.au

More Information

More information about the examination process and requirements is available in the [HDR Thesis Submission and Examination Policy](#).

Section 2: Time for Examination

Each examiner is given six (6) weeks to examine the HDR thesis unless an extension has already been agreed to. If during the examination this deadline is not possible, examiners are to contact the Graduate Research School as soon as possible to request an extension. Extension requests will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

Section 3: Conflicts of interest

During the selection of examiners all efforts would have been taken to avoid or manage any perceived or actual conflicts of interest. If an examiner identifies a conflict of interest in relation to the examination, the Graduate Research School must be notified.

Section 4: Questions During Examination

All questions and/or concerns should be directed to the Graduate Research School by emailing hdrexam@une.edu.au.

We request that examiners do not contact either the supervisor(s) or candidates in relation to any material that is under examination. If an examiner requires clarification or has questions, these must be directed to the Graduate Research School.

Section 5: Examiner's Report

Each examiner is asked to submit a completed Examiner Report form to the Graduate Research School (hdrexam@une.edu.au) addressing the criteria and a recommended outcome.

Each examiner is able to provide additional comments that merit comment but that aren't captured by the criteria (for example, relevance to policy or social contexts, potential implications of the work to other disciplinary or professional fields that the researcher may benefit from having highlighted, strength of argument, nuanced insights, elegance of writing, etc.).

Section 6: Examiner Anonymity

Examiners may indicate to request anonymity on the Examiner Report form. By selecting this, the Graduate Research School will not release the examiner name or institution to the candidate once the examiner reports and outcome are released to the candidate, supervisor(s), and the Associate Dean, Research or delegate (for example HDR Coordinator).

Section 7: Release of Examiner Reports

Once an examination outcome has been determined, copies of examiners' reports will be made available to candidate, supervisor(s), and the Associate Dean, Research or delegate (for example HDR Coordinator).

Section 8: Annotated Thesis

To better assist the candidates, if examiner(s) wish to annotate the thesis, printed and/or digital format, this must be returned to the Graduate Research School for dissemination to the candidate.

Section 9: Confidential Disposal

The thesis and all related items sent to the examiners are confidential documents and must not be disclosed.

All thesis and associated documents must be either destroyed or deleted from any computer storage system used by the examiner. If a printed thesis has been provided, this must either be returned to the Graduate Research School or confidentially destroyed.

Section 10: Standard of Examination

Success or failure in the UNE MPhil.I Higher Degree by Research program is determined by portfolio examination alone. It is crucial that examiners consider the candidate's portfolio solely on

its merits as an independent piece of supervised research, irrespective of whether the candidate's approach to the research is the same as that which the examiner might have used in such a study.

Section 11: Master of Philosophy (Innovation) Information

The Master of Philosophy (Innovation); or MPhil.I, is a unique, project-based, higher research degree at UNE. The MPhil.I is provided across all our schools and disciplines, linking professional and industry expertise with academic theory in creating innovation.

It involves contextual research on a project that identifies one or more tangible or process-based innovations that have identifiable impacts when implemented

Section 12: Project Portfolio Structure

The innovation portfolio is the assessable research output from MPhil.I. It shows how the innovation project:

- is relevant to a specific context that constitutes an original, scholarly contribution to a field of work or learning,
- bridges the boundaries between the academic research community and practice-based communities relevant to their Innovation,
- conducts highly contextual developmental and evaluation, based on research principles and methods applicable to that Innovation project,
- produces evidence-based research surrounding the Innovation development and its realised or potential consequences,
- communicates, critically analyses and reflects on the entire innovation process including its role in innovation development and implementation,
- produces an Innovation project Portfolio for examination based on empirical evidence and critical analysis.

This innovation portfolio should comprise of three distinct, but interwoven knowledge pillars:

- a) innovation conception,
- b) evidence for impact or potential impact of the innovation,
- c) critical and systemic reflection upon the process of development and what this innovation means to the person, profession/industry and more broadly.

Section 13: Examiner's Report

Each examiner is asked to submit a detailed report (in the template provided) together with a completed summary recommendation form. The examination report should be at least 2 A4 pages in length.

The report should specifically address the following elements:

1. the degree to which the portfolio shows sufficient familiarity with, and understanding of, the relevant literature and scholarly theorizing, balanced with an industry/profession and practice/policy emphasis, such that the Portfolio speaks effectively and convincingly to the relevant industry/profession and academic audiences;
2. the degree to which the portfolio and the process surrounding its emergence around an innovation, demonstrate clear originality, accessibility, potential for scalability and/or commercial application or viability including due consideration and responsiveness to implementation/application for an identified user or user context;
3. the degree to which the portfolio provides clear and convincing research to support credible claims about demonstration of impact or potential for innovation impact as well as the quality of the innovation and development process; feeding into creative, systemic and strategic forward thinking and learning about the innovation;
4. the extent to which the research methods and approaches are appropriate to achieving a systemic and contextualised understanding of the entire innovation process, including development, implementation, and adoption/change pathways and outcomes;
5. the extent to which the research outcomes, including data management and analysis, conclusions and implications, are set out clearly and logically, accompanied by adequate exposition and interpretation; in light of the academic and professional/industry target audiences;
6. the degree to which the literary quality and general presentation of the portfolio are of a suitably high standard, particularly in light of the academic and professional/industry target audiences;

The Graduate Research Examinations Board would welcome any other comments of general nature which may be of assistance to the Board, the candidate and the supervisors. Examiners may wish to comment with respect to potential publishable content within the portfolio. A list of errata should also be provided if possible.

Copies of examiners' reports are made available to the candidate and supervisors after they have been considered and a decision has been made.

Section 14: Examiner's Report

Each examiner is asked to submit a detailed independent report (usually no less than two standard pages) together with a completed summary recommendation form. In their report, examiners are requested to include comments on both the strengths and weaknesses of the Innovation project Portfolio. Please consider the following elements in your report:

- (i) The degree to which the Portfolio shows sufficient familiarity with, and understanding of, the relevant literature and scholarly theorizing, balanced with an industry/ profession and practice/policy emphasis, such that the Portfolio speaks effectively and convincingly to the relevant industry/profession and academic audiences;
- (ii) The degree to which the Portfolio and the process surrounding its emergence around an innovation, demonstrate clear originality, accessibility, potential for scalability and/or

commercial application or viability including due consideration and responsiveness to implementation/application for an identified user or user context;

- (iii) The degree to which the Portfolio provides clear and convincing research to support credible claims about demonstration of impact or potential for innovation impact as well as the quality of the innovation and development process; feeding into creative, systemic and strategic forward thinking and learning about the innovation;
- (iv) The extent to which the research methods and approaches are appropriate to achieving a systemic and contextualised understanding of the entire innovation process, including development, implementation, and adoption/change pathways and outcomes;
- (v) The extent to which the research outcomes, including data management and analysis, conclusions and implications, are set out clearly and logically, accompanied by adequate exposition and interpretation; in light of the academic and professional/industry target audiences; and
- (vi) The degree to which the literary quality and general presentation of the Portfolio are of a suitably high standard, particularly in light of the academic and professional/industry target audiences.