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Welcome to the Joanna Briggs Institute – Higher Degrees by Research Program (JBI-HDRP), we are delighted you have chosen to study for a research degree with us and look forward to working with you as a higher degree by research (HDR) student. This short manual will introduce you to the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Research and Education Program and to the Structured Program for HDR students. Enclosed in your induction package is the University of Adelaide Research Student Handbook – which contains university rules and processes for postgraduate research students – and materials for the classroom activities associated with your JBI higher degree structured program.

JBI is an independent Research Institute within the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Adelaide. The Faculty of Health Sciences currently comprises 5 Schools: the School of Dentistry, School of Medicine, School of Nursing, School of Psychology and School of Public Health (previously the School of Population Health). As a student of the University, we recommend you become familiar with the faculty and avail yourself of the fantastic facilities available on the North Terrace Campus, and the JBI premises.

The JBI-HDRP mission is to facilitate evidence based health care practice globally and focuses on teaching and research related to the translational health cycle. The JBI-HDRP is globally recognised for being home to the world-class research organisation, the Joanna Briggs Institute, and the teaching and research programs offered are underpinned by the JBI methodologies that are recognised internationally. The institute is an international, independent, research and development collaboration with a headquarters in Adelaide that focuses on the synthesis, transfer and implementation of evidence to improve global health outcomes. Translational research is a process derived from the need to ensure that our best knowledge (that is, the best available evidence) is used in policy and practice and involves the ongoing, iterative and interactive process of translating knowledge from research into practice through the ethically sound application of complex interactions between research developers and the end users of research.
JBI offers specialised higher degree programs that provide students with the skills of evidence synthesis and a comprehensive research program that seeks to address the 'gaps' in the translation of knowledge into action. JBI research degree programs have been designed to suite busy clinicians and healthcare professionals who are seeking to grow or establish their careers.

This postgraduate research program aims to train students in research methodologies and techniques specific to the needs of evidence-based healthcare, as well as the critical evaluation of evidence and research. The Master of Clinical Science program is usually completed in 1-2 years while the Ph.D (Doctor of Philosophy) is usually completed within 3 years.

1.1 The University of Adelaide

Since its establishment in 1874 the University of Adelaide has been amongst Australia’s leading universities. Its contribution to the wealth and wellbeing of South Australia, Australia as a whole and internationally - across all fields of endeavour - has been enormous.

Studying at the University of Adelaide means becoming part of a rich tradition of excellence in scholarship, education and research, with world-class academic staff and a vibrant student life. Adelaide has a fine tradition of exemplary scholarship and ground-breaking research, and its unique relationship with industry and other organisations ensures that our research expertise is translated into tangible benefits for the global community. Adelaide’s research is at the leading edge of knowledge, with research earnings consistently the highest per capita of any university in Australia. Analysis of the impact of publications and citations shows that the University of Adelaide is ranked in the top 1% in the world in 11 research fields.

An innovative and forward-looking University, Adelaide has major strengths in wine and food, health sciences, biological sciences, physical sciences, information technology and telecommunications, environmental sciences and social sciences; and through JBI; Translational Health Science.
1.2 The Joanna Briggs Institute

The Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) collaborates internationally with over 70 entities (including centres and other groups) located across the world, including Australia, Botswana, Cameroon, Canada, China, Ethiopia, England, Ghana, Hong Kong, Kenya, Korea, Malawi, Myanmar, New Zealand, Nigeria, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Scotland, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, USA, Wales and Zimbabwe. The Institute and its collaborating entities and groups promote and support the synthesis, transfer and utilisation of evidence through identifying feasible, appropriate, meaningful and effective health care practices to assist in the improvement of health care outcomes globally.

The knowledge needs of health professionals and consumers across the world drive and influence the work undertaken by JBI and the resources we develop.

The JBI approach to evidence-based healthcare is unique. Global healthcare evidence needs, as identified by health professionals or patients/consumers, are addressed through the generation of research evidence that is effective, but also appropriate, feasible and meaningful to specific populations, cultures and settings. This evidence is collated and the results are appraised, synthesised and transferred to service delivery settings and health professionals who utilise it and evaluate its impact on health outcomes, health systems and professional practice.
In order to provide those who work in and use health systems globally with world class information and resources, JBI:

- Considers international evidence related to feasibility, appropriateness, meaningfulness as well as effectiveness (evidence generation);

- includes these different forms of evidence in a formal assessment called a systematic review (evidence synthesis);

- globally disseminates information in appropriate, relevant formats to inform health systems, health professionals and consumers (evidence transfer);

- has designed programs to enable the effective implementation of evidence and the evaluation of its impact on healthcare practice (evidence utilisation).
Sir Peter Cosgrove attending the offices of JBI - featured here with the institute's Executive Director, Associate Professor Zoe Jordan and Post Graduate Coordinator/Director Implementation Science, Associate Professor Craig Lockwood
In February 2017, there will be over 60 students studying research degrees (the Master of Clinical Science [M ClinSc] and the Doctor of Philosophy [PhD]) with the JBI-HDRP. Higher degree by research students are an important part of JBI, and are expected to participate in and contribute to the institute’s research programs. The JBI-HDRP offers a wide scope for scholarly inquiry and research and sufficient experience to guide and supervise students in the broad field of evidence based healthcare.

The JBI-HDRP offers world class research facilities and assistance, including the following:

- Custom designed software to guide and frame the conduct of high quality, rigorous systematic reviews of evidence;
- two compulsory, 2-day (with optional 3\textsuperscript{rd} day) intensive Research Schools for PhD and M ClinSc students per year;
- supervision by highly experienced academics;
- opportunity to attend research seminars offered within the faculty;
- opportunities to collaborate with other departments within the School of Medicine, School of Nursing, School of Psychology and School of Public Health; and
- a strong research culture that values all rigorous research methods and offers supervision and guidance in quantitative, interpretive and critical approaches to evidence based healthcare.
2.1 Candidature in overview

Candidature in the Master of Clinical Science or the PhD includes a series of University requirements that may be unfamiliar due to the differences in how research degrees are managed compared with coursework degrees or undergraduate programs. This section of the Handbook maps out who is responsible for what aspects of your program of study.

This handbook also includes JBI based requirements and guidance for successful degree completion, and is complemented by world leading methodology guidance and teaching in systematic reviews, access to cutting edge software for systematic reviews and a network of supervisors with specialist skills in the development, conduct and publication of high quality systematic reviews.

JBI has methodology to support the conduct of 10 types of reviews, including scoping reviews. Of these, there are two types that are not suitable for use within the Master of Clinical Science, these being overviews of reviews, and scoping reviews. Overviews of reviews do not suit the HDR Master’s program as they lack detailed methods of synthesis. Similarly, the central characteristics of scoping reviews include a very broad search for evidence (qualitative and quantitative research plus text and opinion and extensive grey literature search requirements). These reviews do not include critical appraisal, and lack formal synthesis in terms of statistical, or thematic processes, instead, narrative summary tends to be in the form of a conceptual map that aims to illustrate the ‘coverage’ of a topic, demonstrating where the gaps are, and what research is known to exist. Scoping reviews are therefore not considered acceptable within the Master of Clinical Science as they do not allow students to demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of critical appraisal or methods of synthesis.

A scoping review may be included in a Ph.D program of study provided it is followed by an extensive program of research that explicitly extends from the scoping review; the scoping review may not be considered a major project within a Ph.D, if used at all, a scoping review may form an introductory chapter, but does not replace the requirement for a systematic review within each Ph.D program of study.

2.2 Research Supervision

Postgraduate research students in the JBI-HDRP are allocated to a principal supervisor. Each student must also nominate at least one co-supervisor/associate supervisor from outside JBI prior to enrolment.

In higher degree work, it is the student's role, in collaboration with the supervisor, to define in broad terms the research problem or thesis topic and to identify possible lines of investigation. It is part of the supervisor's role to criticise constructively the student's detailed plans, and to ensure that the student is adequately prepared to address the topic. It is also the supervisor’s job to criticise constructively drafts of the thesis but not to undertake proof reading or to ensure that referencing is correct. These matters of editing, proper citation and quotation, spelling, grammar and so on, are the responsibility of the student. The relationship a student develops with their supervisor is an important one.
The range of thesis topics staff members may supervise is dependent on the relationship of a student’s topic to their own research interests. A further consideration is the size of the supervision load carried by individual staff members. Students should note that staff members in the Institute are engaged in their own projects and responsibilities. The purpose of thesis supervision is to assist students toward independent research and scholarship. A student may already have a number of ideas for their research. Normally these require considerable thought and refinement resulting in the development of a proposal. This takes place as the student collaborates with their allocated supervisors and as they become familiar with the relevant literature.

Supervisor - Student Contact

Students are encouraged to seek frequent contact with their supervisors, preferably by booking fortnightly meetings for the year ahead in January of each year. **The student is expected to take the initiative** in consulting with their supervisors on the development of a proposal, the conduct of the research and subsequently, the preparation and writing of the thesis and related publications. As the thesis writing proceeds, typewritten chapter outlines and draft chapters should be submitted chapter by chapter directly to supervisor(s) for comments.

Milestones – Program Expectations

Milestones are predetermined times during the degree program when students are required to complete a review. Through the process of completing the various milestones, the JBI-HDRP and Adelaide Graduate Centre (AGC) will be able to monitor students’ progress to ensure their research is progressing at a rate that will enable them to complete program within the time allocated. Information regarding the AGC’s milestones can be accessed at
http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/milestones/. Further clarification regarding university expectation can be sought from the HDR Program Coordinator. Students should prepare suitably for each milestone as the JBI-HDRP committee will be unable to prevent termination of candidature if any of the required criteria are not satisfactorily met. Students are encouraged to discuss impending milestones with their supervisors, but should not rely on them to provide advice on the specific nature of the AGC’s candidature expectations. Students must liaise with either the Post-Graduate Coordinator, Program Coordinator, or directly with the AGC, in regards to all course component material and completion requirements.

If a student has any concerns or inquiries regarding their allocated supervision, they should discuss the matter with said allocated supervisor in the first instance. It is much better to address any concerns early rather than leave it. If a student gains no satisfaction, they should then voice their concerns directly to the Postgraduate Coordinator or Program Coordinator.

During candidature, the Postgraduate Coordinator must ensure that a structured program of activities is provided for all higher degree by research students within the institute; that opportunities are provided for students and staff to interact and develop profitable intellectual relationships with one another; that an appropriate procedure is established for dealing with unresolved conflicts between supervisor(s) and student(s), in line with University policy; and that the University’s policy on close personal relations between a student and a staff member is followed, the policy is available at: www.adelaide.edu.au/policies/138/

When a candidate seeks to submit their dissertation for examination, the Postgraduate Coordinator must ensure that the dissertation is prima facie worthy of examination both in terms of its content and its presentation relative to the standards specified in the Academic Program Rules for the degree.

2.3 The Role of the Postgraduate Coordinator

The Postgraduate Coordinator is appointed by the Executive Director to oversee higher degree by research matters within the JBI-HDRP. The role (in conjunction with the Program Coordinator – Higher Degrees) includes:

- disseminating information regarding higher degree by research matters to all postgraduate research students;

- assisting students to resolve any questions or problems they may be experiencing, either directly or by referral to the relevant areas;

- assisting new higher degree by research students with the administration of their candidatures and ensuring that they are aware of the responsibilities of the Postgraduate Coordinator, and their supervisors;

- ensuring that commencing higher degree by research students attend the compulsory postgraduate research induction program;

- co-ordinating the delivery of the structured program;
• helping to resolve problems that may arise between the students and their supervisors, or other members of the School;

• receiving complaints regarding higher degree by research matters in JBI and recommending action as appropriate;

• providing opportunities for students to develop their presentation skills;

• at the time of the submission of a dissertation for examination, certifying that the thesis is prima facie worthy of examination both in terms of its content and its presentation relative to the standards specified in the Academic Program Rules for the degree.

2.4 The Role of the Program Coordinator – Higher Degrees

The primary function of the HDR Program Coordinator is to ensure students, supervisors and the Adelaide Graduate Centre are collaborating effectively and working towards the common goal of achieving higher degree completions. The Program Coordinator is responsible for supporting students with all aspects of their program experience and providing direction and advice on the expectations of the school and Graduate Centre in satisfying the requirements of candidature.

Whilst academic supervisors will assist in matters relating to a student’s research work, it is the role of the Program Coordinator to support students with the administrative requirements associated with meeting all degree milestones, commencing with the process of enrolment, induction, panel assessment, annual academic evaluations, and finally submission/completion requirements. The Program Coordinator is also available to students to discuss any and all matters that relate to their academic experience within JBI, including access to institute and university resources, student funding, OHS&W matters, and any special requests that relate to student candidature.

If a student would like to raise a matter in relation to their supervision or have any issues or concerns relating to their candidature, the Program Coordinator can provide guidance and facilitate a suitable resolution process. All such inquiries should be directed to the Program Coordinator or Postgraduate Coordinator in the first instance.

2.5 The Role of the Supervisor

Supervisors are appointed by the Postgraduate Coordinator. The principal supervisor has primary responsibility for coordinating the supervisory process. It is the role of principal and co-supervisor to be familiar with and abide by the University’s Academic Program Rules and the policies and procedures governing research degrees; providing academic guidance to students at all stages of candidature. This includes:

• assisting students to resolve any questions or problems they may be experiencing, either directly or by referral to the relevant areas;
• meeting with the student at the commencement of candidature to clarify their respective roles, responsibilities and expectations throughout the candidature;

• determining a program of research in consultation with the student that is capable of being completed by a competent and well-supervised Doctoral or Masters research student within time (full time equivalent candidature);

• suggesting ways that the student can make the most effective use of his/her time;

• completing the minimum resources proforma in consultation with the student at the commencement of his or her candidature;

• meeting with, or otherwise contacting the student at least once per fortnight and ensuring that the student takes notes at these scheduled meetings which are later circulated to all members of the supervisory panel;

• providing appropriate academic support throughout the candidature to enable the student to achieve his/her highest standard;

• carefully monitoring the performance of the student relative to the standard required for the degree, and ensuring that inadequate progress or work below the standard generally expected is brought to the student’s attention;

• using the regular reporting procedures established by the University as the minimum means by which any difficulties and problems discussed with the student during the year are noted, indicating the action taken or advice given (if the problem is not resolved, the Postgraduate Coordinator, in the first instance, should be involved. Where the Postgraduate Coordinator is also the student’s supervisor, the Executive Director should be contacted directly. Similarly, if the Executive Director is also the student's supervisor and/or the Postgraduate Coordinator, another senior academic staff member of the institute should be involved. The Postgraduate Coordinator should be notified, in writing, of continuing problems between reporting periods);

• reporting at the annual reviews of progress whether the resources provided in the previous term were adequate AND re-negotiating the resource requirements for the year ahead, ensuring that any modifications are detailed on the annual review of progress form;

• requiring written work from the student on a pre-arranged and agreed schedule so that progress can be assessed at regular intervals;

• providing a constructive and critical assessment of the student's written work;

• supporting the student in relation to outside organisations and funding agencies;

• advising the Graduate Centre in the event that the student fails to maintain adequate attendance or to return from leave on the expected date so that candidature and any scholarship payments may be suspended and, in the case of an international student, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship notified;
• commenting on the content and on drafts of the thesis in a timely manner;

• recommending that the thesis is prima facie worthy of examination both in terms of its content and its presentation relative to the standards specified in the Academic Program for the degree or recommending that the thesis is unacceptable for examination in its current form for the specified reasons and participating fully in any dispute resolution process subsequently initiated by the student.
2.6 Academic Panel Review of protocols/research proposals to complete the structured program

Within the first four months of the structured program, all postgraduate research students within JBI are required to present a ten-minute overview and defence of their finalised protocol/proposal to a Review Panel.

The student’s 10-minute presentation should include the review/research title, question, background and methods. Documents tabled for panel meetings and review will always be accompanied by a cover sheet that sets out:

- the student’s full name;
- the full name and title of both supervisors;
- the name of the program they are enrolled in; and
- the title of the project.

Documents attached to the cover sheet will use 1.5 line spacing for paragraph set up, use a size 12 font and justify all paragraphs. Page numbering will be on the right hand lower side of each page. All necessary references will be completed and appendices attached and labelled sequentially.
Students are advised to suitably prepare for the panel process, as it will involve a critical evaluation of their work by external professionals, chosen for their experience in the topic description. A student’s inability to satisfactorily complete a panel interview will place their enrolment in review, with a formal review meeting between the Supervisory Panel and Postgraduate Coordinator to determine suitability for continuing candidature, or either suspension or termination of candidature. Students are strongly encouraged to discuss preparation for the session with their supervisors. Further advice regarding academic panel can be sought from the Program Coordinator.

2.6.1 Role of the JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports (JBIDSRIR) during Protocol Development Prior to the Panel

Student protocols for systematic reviews should be submitted to the JBIDSRIR prior to Academic Panel. The JBIDSRIR provides a pre-panel peer review process in the early stage of protocol development for HDR students and supervisors to ensure consistency and compatibility with JBI guidelines and methodology before panel assessment. Once a student’s supervisors has approved the draft protocol, it is uploaded to the JBIDSRIR, and is subject to blinded external peer review.

The role of the JBIDSRIR shall be to provide support in the development of the protocol (not the final approval, which should be the role of supervisors and panel).

HDR

2.6.2 Role of the HDR Program Coordinator during your Protocol Development Prior to the Panel

The Program Coordinator will require a copy of the student’s draft protocol four weeks prior to their panel defence date. The review by the JBI Library will take two weeks and the protocol must be circulated to all panel members (via Program Coordinator – HDR) at least one week prior to the panel defence date.

Students should aim to submit their protocol to the Program Coordinator before the end of month three of full time candidature, or the part time equivalent.
2.7 Academic Panel composition and structure

The panel will consist of:

- The Postgraduate Coordinator (as Chairperson);
- The supervisory panel (teleconference facilities are available as needed for external supervisors); and
- a minimum of one, but possibly two external experts from other schools within the University of Adelaide Faculty of Health Sciences (or staff from other Faculties within the University of Adelaide where appropriate expertise is not available within the Faculty of Health Sciences).

The Panel Review Meeting should consist of:

- A short opening introduction to the Panel Review process by the Postgraduate Coordinator before inviting the student to join the meeting;
- an introduction of the student to Panel Members, and of Panel Members to the student;
- a 10-15 minute presentation by the student, including a tabled copy of their updated Gantt chart; (refer Appendix 3)
- a 15 minute question/discussion period; and
- a discussion between the Panel (without the student) culminating in the completion of the Review Panel proforma (Appendix 1), including one of the following recommendations of the Panel:

  Satisfactory progress during the structured program and a recommendation of confirmation of candidature. The Panel may recommend certain courses of action to ensure the timely completion of the higher degree, to the satisfaction of the supervisors;

  OR

  Unsatisfactory progress during the structured program with an extension of provisional status for a specified period or termination, subject to attendance at another meeting of the Panel.

The Role of the Postgraduate Coordinator

The Postgraduate Coordinator acts as impartial Chairperson of the Panel Meeting by presiding over the proceedings and ensuring that:

- the student is given an opportunity to present their protocol/proposal;
- student has an opportunity to respond to questions from the external Panel members and defend their protocol/proposal;
• all external Panel members have an opportunity to address any questions or concerns with the student;

• that the conclusions made by the panel are recorded on the Panel’s recommendation proforma; and

• that supervisors of the Panels are informed of the decision and subsequent action taken.

The Role of Supervisors

Panel Review meetings should only be arranged when:

• the supervisors have determined that the student’s protocol/proposal is complete;

• that it is of a satisfactory standard; and

• that the student has made satisfactory progress.

In making a judgment on student progress, the supervisors are expected to consider:

• the degree to which the student produces accurate and thorough work;

• the student’s level of productivity/output and timeliness of work; and

• the degree to which the student demonstrates independent action and resourcefulness by developing new methods, offering constructive suggestions, etc.

Given that supervisors have therefore supported the student’s intention to defend her/his protocol/proposal before a Review Panel, they have, ipso facto, indicated that they have already addressed any questions they have with the student and that they regard the protocol/proposal as satisfactory.

Accordingly, the role of supervisors at Panel meetings is to offer support to students where needed and they would not normally contribute to the questioning of the student.

The Role of External Panel Review Members

External Panel Review members are expected to:

• familiarise themselves with the expectations of JBI regarding Panel Reviews;

• constructively critique the protocol/proposal;

• address questions and concerns they may have with the protocol/proposal to the student;
• offer, where appropriate, further advice to the student; and

• determine the degree to which:
  
  • the proposal, and the student’s defence of it, represents accurate and thorough work;

  • the proposal, and the students defence of it, demonstrates independent thought and resourcefulness;

  • the student demonstrates the ability to complete the proposed work in a timely fashion;

  • the proposed work is of high quality and has the potential to be sufficiently substantive to generate a dissertation that would merit the award of the degree; and

  • (in the case of end-of-structured program reviews) the student’s protocol/proposal and their defence of it demonstrates that their candidature should be confirmed - or (in the case of application to upgrade to the PhD program reviews) the student’s completed work to-date and their defence of it supports a recommendation to submit an application to the University to upgrade to the PhD program.

2.8 The Core Component of the Structured Program

The Core Component of the Structured Program is a series of mandatory requirements that the University evaluate in a formal review of student progress. All HDR students are expected to complete the structured program within the first 6 months of full time candidature (or equivalent part time candidature). Students are required to prioritise completion of the documents/paper work listed below as part of the “Core Component” of the Structured Program. The Program Coordinator - Higher Degrees will take responsibility for processing of these completed and signed documents with the Adelaide Graduate Centre.

• Core Component Completion form ~ a copy of this form may be obtained from the web at: 
  
  

• JBI Gantt Chart ~ Refer Appendix 3

• All research students (Master of Clinical Science and PhD) will be required to have an Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) from 2016. Visit https://orcid.org/signin to set up your account.

• Completed Systematic Review Protocol in the JBI format approved by the panel and published in the JBI Library

• *Systematic Review Protocol in Faculty of Health Sciences Research Proposal Proforma; _HYPERLINK_ "http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/
http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/

• (*This proforma aligns with Calendar rules and with guidelines in the Research Student Handbook. It is to be completed as part of the Core component of the student’s Structured Program and is in addition to the JBI research protocol presented prior to panel. Having consulted with supervisors, students should structure their Research Proposal based on the headings provided. (Appendix 2)

• Reading the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research: _HYPERLINK_ http://www.adelaide.edu.au/rb/code_

• Completion of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research: _HYPERLINK_ "https://sms.gradcentre.adelaide.edu.au/" _blank" _https://sms.gradcentre.adelaide.edu.au/_ worksheets, providing certificates at time of panel


• Reading the University’s guide to Research Data Management: _HYPERLINK_ "http://libguides.adelaide.edu.au/researchdata" _blank" _http://libguides.adelaide.edu.au/researchdata_
3 The Master of Clinical Science

The Master of Clinical Science is a 1-2 year full time postgraduate research degree offered by the JBI-HDRP, Faculty of Health Science, University of Adelaide. The aim of this degree (within the field of evidence-based healthcare supervised by staff of JBI) is to train students in research methodologies and techniques associated with evidence-based healthcare and in the critical evaluation of evidence review and its implementation and evaluation. Candidates who have exceeded all milestones and have completed their first 18 months of the Master of Clinical Science degree may be considered for an upgrade or transfer to the PhD, subject to approval by the Head of School, Postgraduate Coordinator and "Academic Progress Committee."

Specifically, to have an application for transfer to PhD considered, candidates will need to, within the first 18 months of enrolment have:

- Completed the core component within the required timeframe;
- have completed all subsequent program reviews required by the Adelaide Graduate Centre;
- had their protocol accepted in the JBI Library;
- had their systematic review accepted in the JBI Library;
- have a publication from their review accepted by an International Journal;
- have developed a proposal for the PhD that encompasses a further 2 years of programmatic research, and
- successfully present the findings of the systematic review, and PhD proposal before an academic panel consisting of i) The Post Graduate Coordinator, ii) the supervisory panel from

JBI-HDR students and staff taking part in the September 2015 University of Adelaide Graduate Ceremony
year one of the Master’s program and, iii) two external experts from the University of Adelaide or associated agencies.

Transfer to PhD is based upon successful completion of the above criteria and by formal review and approval by Committee. If these milestones are not achieved, transfer to PhD will not be considered. Completing the Master of Clinical Science is usually recommended before enrolling for PhD to allow maximal time for completion of the PhD requirements.

3.1 Program Sequence for Higher Degree by Research Candidates

3.1.1 Master of Clinical Science Timeline for good progress

In the first four months of Candidature a MCLINSC candidate is expected to have attended:

- The two one week blocks of core training (completing University Induction in week 1)
- Drafted a systematic review protocol that has been reviewed and accepted by their supervisory panel, completed peer review through the JBI Library, and is ready for Academic Panel.
- Completed the paperwork for the ‘Core Component’ (see relevant section of this handbook)
- Started development of a search strategy for their systematic review.

By the end of 12 months a MCLINSC student is expected to have:

- Completed the searching, retrieval, and selection of studies for inclusion
- Completed Critical appraisal and data extraction of the included studies
- Completed a Best Practice Information Sheet (BPI)

By the end of month 18 a MCLINSC student is expected to (in order of priority) have:

- Completed write up of the thesis to the supervisory panels satisfaction
- Submitted 3 soft bound copies of the thesis (plus a CD with pdf copy) to JBI in preparation for thesis examination
- Completed their systematic review report
- Published the review report in the JBI Library
• Presented a poster at the Faculty of Health Science, University of Adelaide – Florey Postgraduate Research Conference

• A published systematic review in the JBI Library; **Note**: The systematic review **MUST** be published in the international online JBI Library **BEFORE** your thesis can be submitted to the Adelaide Graduate Centre;

### 3.2 The Structured Program

The University of Adelaide structured program comprises "core" and "development" components. **The core component must be completed within four months** from the commencement of a student’s candidature.

Satisfactory completion requires that the candidate has:


• formulated a research proposal/evidence review protocol that is satisfactory to JBI after explicit consideration of the ethical, intellectual property, and resource implications of the proposed research/review. The research proposal/evidence review protocol must be the student’s own work, except where there is clear acknowledgement and reference to the work of others;

• presented the research proposal at a postgraduate seminar (2 presentations for M ClinSc students and 3 for PhD students);

• participated in the Florey International Postgraduate Research Conference;

• successfully defended the research proposal/systematic review protocol to an Academic Panel; and

• lodged the "Completion of the Core Component of the structured program" form and all other required documentation with the Adelaide Graduate Centre by the due date. Further information can be found at: [http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/milestones/core-component-structured-program/docs/ccsp.pdf](http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/milestones/core-component-structured-program/docs/ccsp.pdf)

Candidates are also required to complete the following short courses as part of their core component:

• Postgraduate Student Induction (online)

• Postgraduate Student Orientation (1 day);

• Comprehensive systematic review training (4 days);

• Qualitative research methods for health professionals and health scientists (1 day); and

• Statistical concepts and methods for evidence-based health care (1 day);
The structured program commencing 2017 will require attending two, one week school based intensives in semester 1. In subsequent semesters, students are required to meet regularly with their supervisors and attend the scheduled two-day compulsory Research School/Symposium (with optional 3rd day). These two day symposiums focus on working in a group as a community of scholars and serve to increase student’s multidisciplinary understanding of research in evidence based healthcare and to develop skills and confidence in debate, argument and scholarly discussion.

3.3 Period of Candidature

A candidate may proceed to the degree by full-time study (or part time as agreed with the Postgraduate Coordinator. Except by special permission of the Board, the work for the degree shall be completed and the thesis (or thesis by publication) submitted:

• In the case of a full-time candidate, not less than one year no more than two years from the date of commencement of candidature;

• in the case of a half-time candidate, not less than two years nor more than four years from the date of commencement of candidature.

Note that students who upgrade to doctoral candidature having already completed the core component during their prior Master’s enrolment are exempted from undertaking the core component of the structured program in the doctoral program.

Formal acceptance as a higher degree by research candidate is a multi-stage process. The first twelve months of candidature (or half time equivalent) are provisional and during this time, a student will undertake a number of milestones. These are:

• Attendance at the JBI induction program;

• attendance at the Adelaide Graduate Centre induction program;

• completion of the core component of the structured program;

• completion of an annual review of progress (note that you are exempted if you commence in candidature after the first of August in the year of the review); and

• completion of the major review of progress.

The number of milestones is greater during the period of provisional candidature than following confirmation to ensure that, irrespective of the student’s discipline:

• they receive a comprehensive induction to the facilities, services and professional development opportunities available to them;

• to introduce as much structure as possible into the first twelve months of the research program whilst the student is adjusting to what is often a very different study environment and style, and
• to ensure that the student formulates an academically sound and feasible research proposal in the early stages of their candidature.

All research students, including those currently on leave of absence, are required to complete the Annual Review of Progress.

It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that the Annual Review is submitted to the Graduate Centre by the due date of 31 October annually.

In 2016, the University switched from a paper based to an online Annual Review of Progress. It is important students read the document "Instructions for Completion of the online annual review - http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/milestones/annual-review/process/

Well in advance of the required completion date for your Annual Review, students must organise a mutually convenient time to meet with your supervisory panel to:

1. Review your progress during the previous twelve months or since you started in candidature;
2. Discuss and establish a plan of work and set academic milestones or goals for the next twelve months;
3. Review your ethics, IP, resource and supervision needs; and
4. Identify any concerns/problems/grievances that may have interrupted/delayed your progress and their impact on your progress in terms of the number of research days lost.
5. Make a second later appointment to discuss progress with Principal Supervisor to authorise the completed Annual Review.
6. Following (or during) meeting with supervisors, complete all sections of the online form when prompted, ensuring that all information provided is accurate and correct.

7. Certify the form and submit to Principal Supervisor for comment.

On receipt of notification that your completed Annual Review containing supervisory comments and your supervisor’s assessment of your progress is ready for viewing, access and review the Annual Review in its entirety

8. Following review, you will be prompted to agree with the institute’s assessment of your progress (including, if applicable, any milestones/tasks that have been set for you to complete during a period of conditional re-enrolment).
9. If you disagree with the institute’s assessment, or wish to report any complaints or grievances that you have been unable to resolve, you will be able to upload a confidential report for the attention of the Dean of Graduate Studies. If you attach such a report, it will not be visible to your supervisors, Postgraduate Coordinator or Head of Institute.
10. Authorise the electronic submission of your Annual Review to the Graduate Centre prior to the due date.
3.4 “Transfer” from the MClinSc to the PhD Program

Moving from Masters to PhD should be carefully considered as the impact on available study time is a significant limitation that will make completion during candidature very challenging for students who are unable to allocate the equivalent of full time study on a weekly basis to their research. Effectively, moving from Masters to PhD decreases the duration for completion of a PhD by 12 months, therefore serious consideration should be given to the impact on capacity to undertake, complete and write up PhD work within two years (the first year of masters counts as year one of PhD for students who successfully transfer, thus reducing their PhD timeframe to two years).

Students should discuss plans to transfer to the PhD program with their supervisor/s and the Postgraduate Coordinator. For students who enrol in the M Clin Sc who are seeking to apply to “roll over” to the PhD program, the following criteria must have been met:

- The masters enrolment was accepted as Honours I or Honours II equivalence, and/or
- The output achieved academically during the first year of masters was significantly above expectations (measured in multiple publications)

If the above criteria are met, in the second or third year of their M Clin Sc enrolment, presentation at a second Academic Panel meeting is required at which the potential PhD candidate will present:

- their completed review/research report, and
- a proposal of how this work will be extended as a PhD project.

Wherever possible, the composition of the Panel will be the same as the completion of the structured program Panel.

Students intending to apply to transfer to the PhD program should plan to complete their M Clin Sc review report in September/October of the year in which they intend to apply, to ensure they have time for the PhD enrolment process and to ensure this second panel meeting occurs prior to completion of enrolment forms.

Upon the Head of School or Postgraduate Coordinator approving completion of the Academic Review Panel to upgrade to the PhD, students are also required to complete the documents/paper work listed below.

- Application to upgrade candidature from a Masters to a PhD form ~ a copy of this form may be obtained from the web at: [http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/upgrade.pdf](http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/upgrade.pdf)
- evidence of an accepted publication in a referred journal (i.e. evidence/letter of manuscript acceptance to the journal) and evidence of acceptance/publication in the JBI Library of Systematic Reviews;
- completed Systematic Review Report (in the JBI standard systematic review format approved by supervisors and the panel);
- PhD research proposal (approved by supervisors and the panel);
- ethics approval (if required) subject to the context of the study;
- Academic Review Panel report, and
4 The Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

PhD students enrolled with the University of Adelaide and receiving supervision within JBI are provided with access to all JBI-HDRP resources including a fully networked workstation and are integrated into the institute’s extensive international work program. A number of scholarships are available to holders of an Australian Postgraduate Award Scholarship or equivalent. (For information on scholarships, refer to the University Graduate Centre). Supervision is offered in the following areas:

Evidence Review and Synthesis
Including methodological work on the synthesis of qualitative research findings; the synthesis of text and opinion; the meta-analysis of quantitative research findings; and the systematic review of international evidence.

Evidence Transfer
Including the study of the use of electronic and print media in knowledge transfer; guideline development; embedding evidence in organisational systems; and consumer involvement.

Evidence Utilisation
Including the evaluation of methods of implementing evidence based guidelines; clinical audit and feedback; and action-oriented approaches to barrier identification and change management in clinical practice improvement.

JBI-HDR students taking part in the April 2015 University of Adelaide Graduate Ceremony with JBI supervisory staff
The University of Adelaide is moving to a new model of expectations for PhD study. Students from 2016 onward will be expected to devote 1.5% of their time to the acquisition of transferable skills, which equates to 15 FTE days over the 1042 days of a four year PhD candidature. This new initiative is part of a suite of changes that intend to enhance the PhD experience, and provide students with a toolkit of skills, knowledge and experiences that may enhance their employment prospects post PhD.

Each PhD student enrolled with JBI will need to develop a plan for at least 5 days of programmed ‘transferable skill acquisition’ education or training. Note that in Semester 1 of the year of enrolment, the JBI intensive residencies in Systematic Review methods will constitute 10 FTE days, therefore no further activity is required in Semester 1 of the first year of enrolment.

4.1 Program Sequence for PhD Students

4.1.1 Doctor of Philosophy Timeline for good progress

In the first four months of Candidature a PhD candidate is expected to have attended:

- The two one week blocks of core training (completing University Induction in week 1)

- Drafted a PhD proposal that is sufficient in scope to merit the awarding of a Doctor of Philosophy within three years of enrolment.

- Drafted a systematic review protocol that has been reviewed and accepted by their supervisory panel, completed peer review through the JBI Library, and is ready for Academic Panel.

- Completed the paperwork for the ‘Core Component’ (see relevant section of this handbook)

- Prepared for Academic Panel to defend the proposed program of research

- Started development of a search strategy for their systematic review

- Started preparing a CaRST Development Plan.

By the end of 12 months a PhD candidate is expected to have:

- Completed the searching, retrieval, and selection of studies for inclusion

- Completed Critical appraisal and data extraction of the included studies

- Completed and confirmed ethics approval (if required) for their larger PhD project

- Completed a Best Practice Information Sheet (BPI)
By the end of 24 months a PhD candidate is expected to have:

- Completed and published their systematic review
- Have completed and submitted at least one additional paper for publication
- Have presented a poster at the Faculty of Health Science, University of Adelaide – Florey Postgraduate Research Conference
- Have substantively progressed their major program of research, and
- Have drafted the outline of their thesis, and developed a detailed writing plan for the thesis that has been reviewed and approved by the supervisory panel
- Satisfied 120 hours of CaRST accredited training hours

The University of Adelaide structured program comprises "core" and "development" components. The core component must be completed within four months (or half-time equivalent) from the commencement of candidature. Satisfactory completion requires that the candidate has:

- formulated a research proposal/evidence review protocol that is satisfactory to JBI after explicit consideration of the ethical, intellectual property, and resource implications of their proposed research/review. The research proposal/evidence review protocol must be the student’s own work, except where there is clear acknowledgement and reference to the work of others;
- participated in the Florey International Postgraduate Research Conference;
- successfully defended the research proposal/systematic review protocol to an academic panel; and
- lodged the "Completion of the Core Component of the structured program" form and all other required documentation with the Graduate Centre by the due date. [http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/milestones/core-component-structured-program/docs/ccsp.pdf](http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/milestones/core-component-structured-program/docs/ccsp.pdf)

Candidates are also required to complete the following short courses as part of their core component:

- Postgraduate Student Orientation (1 day);
- Comprehensive systematic review training (4 days);
- Qualitative research methods for health professionals and health scientists (2 days); and
• Statistical concepts and methods for evidence-based health care (2 days);

*Students who have completed the Master of Clinical Science prior to enrolling in the PhD are not required to complete the short courses, but must attend the compulsory Research Schools, and complete all other requirements in order to meet their obligations and continue in the program.*

Students are required to meet regularly with their supervisors and to attend a two-day compulsory Research School/Symposium (with optional 3rd day). These two day schools focus on working in a group as a community of scholars and serve to increase student’s multidisciplinary understanding of research in evidence based healthcare and to develop skills and confidence in debate, argument and scholarly discussion.

**Thesis Component**

Students are required to submit a thesis comprising of a substantial research report that represents an original contribution to knowledge. The word length of the thesis, including footnotes, but excluding appendices, tables, diagrams, bibliography and references, shall not exceed 80,000 words.


**4.2 PhD: Period of Candidature**

A candidate may proceed to the degree by full-time (or half time study as agreed with the Postgraduate Coordinator). Except by special permission of the Board, the work for the degree shall be completed and the thesis submitted:

• In the case of a full-time candidate, not less than two years nor more than four years from the date of commencement of candidature;

• in the case of a half-time candidate, not less than four years nor more than six years from the date of commencement of candidature.

**4.2.1 Provisional Candidature and Annual Reviews**

Formal acceptance as a higher degree by research candidate is a multi-stage process. The first nine to twelve months of candidature (or half time equivalent) are provisional and during this time, you will undertake a number of milestones. These are:

• Attendance at the JBI-HDRP induction program;

• attendance at the Adelaide Graduate Centre induction program;

• completion of the core component of the structured program;

• completion of an annual review of progress (note that students are exempted if they commence candidature in the year of the review); and

• completion of the major review of progress.
The number of milestones is greater during the period of provisional candidature than following confirmation to ensure that:

- Irrespective of a student’s discipline, they will receive a comprehensive induction to the facilities, services and professional development opportunities available;
- we introduce as much structure as possible into the first twelve months of the research program whilst the student is adjusting to what is often a very different study environment and style; and
- the student formulates an academically sound and feasible research proposal in the early stages of their candidature.

All research students, including those currently on leave of absence, are required to complete the Annual Review of Progress.

It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that the Annual Review form is submitted to the Graduate Centre by the due date of 31 October annually.

In 2016, the University switched from a paper based to an online Annual Review of Progress. It is important students read the document "Instructions for Completion of the online annual review - http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/milestones/annual-review/process/

Well in advance of the required completion date for your Annual Review, students must organise a mutually convenient time to meet with your supervisory panel to:

1. Review your progress during the previous twelve months or since you started in candidature;
2. Discuss and establish a plan of work and set academic milestones or goals for the next twelve months;
3. Review your ethics, IP, resource and supervision needs; and
4. Identify any concerns/problems/grievances that may have interrupted/delayed your progress and their impact on your progress in terms of the number of research days lost.
5. Make a second later appointment to discuss progress with Principal Supervisor to authorise the completed Annual Review.
6. Following (or during) meeting with supervisors, complete all sections of the online form when prompted, ensuring that all information provided is accurate and correct.
7. Certify the form and submit to Principal Supervisor for comment.

On receipt of notification that your completed Annual Review form containing supervisory comments and your supervisor’s assessment of your progress is ready for viewing, access and review the Annual Review form in its entirety

8. Following review, you will be prompted to agree with the institute’s assessment of your progress (including, if applicable, any milestones/tasks that have been set for you to complete during a period of conditional re-enrolment).
9. If you disagree with the institute’s assessment, or wish to report any complaints or grievances that you have been unable to resolve, you will be able to upload a confidential report for the attention of the Dean of Graduate Studies. If you attach such a report, it will not be visible to your supervisors, PGC or Head of Institute.

10. Authorise the electronic submission of your Annual Review to the Graduate Centre prior to the due date.

5 Career and Research Skills Training (CaRST) for Doctor of Philosophy students

5.1 Why CaRST?

All students enrolled in a PhD within the University of Adelaide must satisfy a required 120 hours of accredited Career and Research Skills Training (CaRST) in order to satisfy the academic requirements of the degree. Master of Philosophy students must complete 60 hours of CaRST activity, but note that JBI does not accept Master of Philosophy enrolments.

Delivered collaboratively by the University, Faculties, Schools, Centres, and Institutes, CaRST offers a suite of workshops, courses, events, online training, and resources to meet the personal, professional, and career development needs of HDR students.

Embedding transferrable skills development within HDR training is becoming increasingly critical to prepare graduates for success in the variety of career options available today. Conventional research training programs emphasise building academic and research skills as well as deep disciplinary knowledge; however students today, by and large, will not follow an academic career path or spend a majority of their time as academic researchers. In fact, HDR graduates can expect to pursue a wide array of professional opportunities in both research and non-research capacities across academia, business, industry, government, and not-for-profits.

In order to ensure our students are ready for graduate employment, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) commissioned an external review of HDR skills development at the University. This review delivered a set of recommendations informed by interviews with key stakeholders, AGC student survey data, best practices in research training globally, and government policy and recommendations. A major outcome of this review has been the creation of a refreshed central and whole-of-cohort career and skills training program.

5.2 JBI-HDRP Accredited CaRST Hours

Since the establishment of the CaRST program, the 2, 1 week JBI-HDRP core training intensives have been endorsed by the University of Adelaide and will satisfy 60 hours of the required CaRST accredited training. The JBI-HDRP core CaRST accrediting training hours breakdown as follows –

- Qualitative Research for Evidence-based Healthcare 30 hours
- Quantitative Research for Evidence-based Healthcare 30 hours
How Activities are categorised in the CaRST program

To provide a framework for the development of professional and transferable skills in HDR students, the University has adopted the Researcher Development Framework (RDF).

Completion of Graduate Centre Milestones – CaRST Accredited Hours

In addition to those CaRST accredited hours comprised in the JBI-HDRP core training, the following academic milestones required by the Adelaide Graduate Centre as part of the Doctor of Philosophy research degree, in addition to the activities supported by the JBI-HDRP, will further amount to accredited CaRST hours –

- Adelaide Graduate Centre Induction Program
  2hrs of CaRST accredited training – DOMAIN B

- Institute Induction Program
  3hrs of CaRST accredited training – DOMAIN B

- Attendance at Florey Postgraduate Research Conference
  5hrs of CaRST accredited training – DOMAIN B

- Completion of a Research Proposal (CCSP)
  5hrs of CaRST accredited training – DOMAIN C

- Introductory training on the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (CCSP)
  3hrs of CaRST accredited training – DOMAIN C

- Obtain an Open Research and Contributor ID (ORCID) (CCSP)
  1hr of CaRST accredited training – DOMAIN C

Total: 60 accredited hours
• Creation of a Data Management Plan (CCSP)  
 3hrs of CaRST accredited training – **DOMAIN C**

• Creation of a Gantt Chart (CCSP)  
 3hrs of CaRST accredited training – **DOMAIN C**

• Commencing students – 2nd week of Core Program, protocol presentation to JBI staff and continuing students  
 6hrs of CaRST accredited training – **DOMAIN D**

• Publication of systematic review in The Joanna Briggs Institute Library  
 3hrs of CaRST accredited training – **DOMAIN D**

• Participation in 3MT Competition  
 6hrs of CaRST accredited training – **DOMAIN D**

• Attendance at Faculty workshop - Human Research Ethics Workshop for Students  
 8hrs of CaRST accredited training – **DOMAIN C**

The core requirements of the JBI-HDRP training and the milestone assessments of the Adelaide Graduate Centre combined will provide PhD students with **108 hours** of approved CaRST accredited training.

It is the responsibility of the student to ensure they fulfil the balance of accredited CaRST hours to satisfy the training requirements of their degree. The JBI-HDRP will provide all students with regular advice about additional CaRST accredited training offered by the Adelaide Graduate Centre.

Mapping activities to the four domains of the RDF will support HDR students to identify the knowledge, skills, and behaviours required to be an effective researcher, and to enhance their skills for employment in a range of professions. Further information about the RDF can be downloaded here - [https://www.vitae.ac.uk/vitae-publications/rdf-related/researcher-development-framework-rdf-vitae.pdf/view](https://www.vitae.ac.uk/vitae-publications/rdf-related/researcher-development-framework-rdf-vitae.pdf/view)

**Students must apply for their own CaRST Accreditation**

The Adelaide Graduate Centre does not automatically credit students with CaRST hours. Students are responsible for recording and claiming their own training activities and hours. Progress is reviewed by the Graduate Centre during the standard candidature milestones reviews, in which students must submit a development plan, training summary, and portfolio of evidence at each candidature milestone review: CCSP, Major Review, Annual Review, and Thesis Submission.

A student’s Principal Supervisor will be required to review and endorse the development plan, training summary and ePortfolio and certify that the student is on track to complete the CaRST requirement by thesis submission.
Templates for CaRST Development Plan, training summary and ePortfolio are available on the Adelaide Graduate Centre website - [http://www.adelaide.edu.au/carst/](http://www.adelaide.edu.au/carst/)

6 Best Practice Information (BPI) Sheets

Within the first 12 months of candidature, all higher degree students enrolled with the JBI-HDRP are required to produce and submit for publication a Best Practice Information (BPI) sheet.

A BPI sheet is a document that concisely presents the best available evidence on a topic, which has been derived from the findings of systematic reviews, with a view to providing condensed best practice information for clinicians in direct patient care.

The requirement to develop a BPI sheet is to educate students in the process of reviewing a complex scientific review and summarising the main points into a short 4 page document that is accessible and can be easily interpreted and implemented by clinicians.

Students will be provided a template for preparing a BPI sheet and will settle the document in conjunction with their allocated supervisors.

7 Plagiarism Information for Students

The University of Adelaide and the Joanna Briggs Institute expects students to understand their responsibility for academic honesty and to develop the knowledge and skills to avoid plagiarism.

The University of Adelaide's Academic Honesty Policy includes the issues associated with plagiarism, the responsibilities of the Faculty/School/Department, the responsibilities of staff and students, as well as the procedures and penalties for plagiarism.

The University of Adelaide’s Academic Honesty Policy can be located here - [http://www.adelaide.edu.au/policies/230/](http://www.adelaide.edu.au/policies/230/) All commencing students with the JBI-HDRP are expected to familiarise themselves with this policy as the institute will assume a student’s understanding and acceptance of the terms contained therein.

8 Funding support for HDR students

8.1 Joanna Briggs Student Funds

The JBI-HDRP offers AUD $500 per student ($1,000 to remote students) to support their candidature. Students are entitled to claim their research related expenses such as attending a conference, printing a poster, buying books or software, interlibrary loans or the costs associated with the preparation of
a single hardbound copy of their final thesis for submission to the Graduate Centre. (Please note that computer hardware is excluded). Students are advised to make the claim through the Program Coordinator. Expenses will be reimbursed through usual university processes, original receipts must be provided.

8.2 How to apply for student funding

Students will need to incur the cost of their study related expense in the first instance. The student will then need to complete and submit to the Program Coordinator the two required Expense Claim Forms (one for JBI and one for faculty) attaching proof of expense incurred. The claim forms can be located here - http://health.adelaide.edu.au/jbi/downloads/current-students/student-expense-claim-form.pdf and http://www.adelaide.edu.au/finance/docs/category.html#forms

9 The JBI-HDRP Structured Program

The JBI-HDRP offers a common structured program for all Higher Degree by Research students (MClinSc/PhD). This program introduces students to the science, methodologies and methods of evidence synthesis, translation and utilisation. The culmination of the structured program is the student’s ability to defend their proposal/protocol before an academic panel.

Students are required to develop a research proposal/systematic review proposal with their supervisors within four months of full time enrolment (or part time equivalent) and to then “speak to/defend” their proposal at a panel meeting. The panel consists of the student’s supervisors, two external academics and the postgraduate coordinator (who acts as chairperson).

The panel process is collaborative in nature and is designed to give the student feedback and to assist them to submit a high quality proposal/protocol to the Graduate Centre to enable them to verify they have successfully completed the structured program and to confirm their ongoing candidature.
9.1 Selecting the Question, Problem or Topic

A task of major importance in research at any level is that of identifying the exact nature of the question, issue or problem to be studied (the research/review topic). Great care is needed selecting a question that can be researched in the time available.

To find a good topic, a student must adopt a critical attitude to the field in which they are interested. They should read the literature in the field, question assertions and statements. Students should not read with blind acceptance of authority and the printed word, but rather look for gaps in the field that textbook writers tend to gloss over.

The formulation of the topic should be done with great care and with the assistance of the student’s supervisor/s. When the student has selected a topic, they should ask themselves "What do I mean by these questions?" “What are the assumptions underlying the asking of such questions?” Students should use these questions (and their qualifiers) to direct reading, thinking and note-taking.
Since the problems in healthcare are many and complex, no single researcher can expect to make a great contribution to their solution. “The researcher has some of the characteristics of the ant, who brings his single grain of sand to the ant hill” (Best, 1978. p.18). This statement implies that the person contemplating a review or a research study should not think of him or herself as a lone pioneer making an organised attack on some problem area, but rather one of many people engaged in similar endeavours. Also, the problem should be manageable by the researcher, not too broad in scope, yet worthwhile.

For a current list of JBI-HDRP students and their topics, please refer: https://health.adelaide.edu.au/jbi/current-students/

To gain some insight, students are advised to browse through a selection of completed theses that may be found in the JBI Library (or alternatively the Barr Smith Library).

All proposals/protocols are subject to peer review by the JBI Library prior to panel defence. Proposals/protocols must be submitted to the JBI Library a minimum of 4-6 weeks prior to the panel date.

The proposal/protocol a student presents to the panel should be of high quality as completion of the structured program (which is required to enable candidature to be confirmed so that the student can progress to the research part of the degree). Continuation is dependent upon the panel approving both the academic quality of the proposal/protocol and the “do-ability” of the study/systematic review.

On completion of the panel defence, students may be required to make further changes to their proposal/protocol. Thereafter, a final copy is sent to the Translation Science Unit for publication in the JBI Library and a copy is provided to the Graduate Centre (in the Faculty template) as part of the Core Component Completion paperwork.


The panel defence is also where the title of the student’s proposed work is confirmed and/or refined. Any subsequent title changes must be approved by the Post Graduate Coordinator in conjunction with the student’s principal supervisor.

9.2 Systematic Review Protocols

It is essential to use the JBI-SUMARI in preparing a protocol.

The structure below must be followed and the background section must refer to the literature and be fully referenced:

- Title
- Investigators:
  - Your full name
  - The full names of your supervisors
- The Degree you're enrolled in (i.e. Master of Clinical Science/ Master of Philosophy/ Doctor of Philosophy)
- Review Purpose
- Review Question(S)/Objective(S)
- Background
- Criteria For Considering Studies For This Review
  - Types Of Studies
  - Types Of Participants
  - Types Of Interventions/Phenomena Of Interest
  - Comparators/Context
  - Types Of Outcome Measures (When Appropriate)
- Review Methods
  - Search Strategy
  - Assessment Of Methodological Quality/ Critical Appraisal
  - Data Extraction
  - Data Synthesis
- References
  - Appendices
  - Appendix 1: Critical Appraisal Instrument(S)
  - Appendix 2: Data Extraction Instrument(S)
  - Appendix 3: Detailed Search Strategy

Systematic review protocols that have not been created in JBI-SUMARI will not be accepted for review by the Library. There are no exceptions to this requirement.

9.3 Role of Primary and Secondary Reviewers

Conducting a systematic review requires both a primary and a secondary reviewer. Students are advised to assign an appropriate secondary reviewer for their reviews.

The secondary reviewer may be a fellow student from the HDR program or any research fellow who has experience in conducting systematic reviews. A student’s nominated secondary reviewer must have an understanding about their systematic review process and methodology, including potential papers in the review.

As the primary reviewer would take the leading roles, the secondary reviewer should be to conduct critical appraisal of the papers. That is the sole role of a secondary reviewer; they are not in determining study inclusion and data extraction.
Secondary reviewers are named in the acknowledgements section of the protocol and completed systematic review. They are not named as “co-authors”.

9.4 Research Proposals (Including Implementation Studies)

The structure below must be followed and the background section must refer to the literature and be fully referenced:

- Title
- Investigators:
  - Your full name
  - The full names of your supervisors
- The Degree you are enrolled in (i.e. Master of Clinical Science/ Master of Philosophy/ Doctor of Philosophy)
- Problem Statement
- Overview
- Research Question/Hypothesis
- Objectives and Aims
  - Overall Objective
  - Specific Aims
- Background and Significance
- Research Design and Methods
  - Overview
  - Methodological Considerations
  - Sampling (where appropriate)
  - Population and Study Sample
  - Sample Size and Selection of Sample
  - Sources of Data
  - Collection of Data
  - Data Management
  - Data Analysis Strategies
- Ethics and Human Subjects Issues
- Timeframes
- Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study
- References
- Appendices

9.5 Ethical Issues and Ethics Approval Processes

Almost all primary research has ethical implications (by-and-large, this is not the case for systematic reviews). Areas involving ethical issues include:

- provision for anonymity/confidentiality where appropriate,
- informing participants of the broad goals of a student’s research and identity,
• ensuring appropriate and reasonable demands on participants/subjects/respondents, and

• providing useful feedback to participants in research.

In all research, it is essential to be sensitive to cultural backgrounds especially in research overseas. It would also be courteous on the "acknowledgments" page to express appreciation to participants, unless anonymity/confidentiality is required.

Other issues involving ethics will likely emerge and students should discuss these with their supervisor/s. It is essential that students undertaking research obtain permission to do so from the appropriate authorities. In hospitals, for example, this means submitting a formal application to be processed by the institute and normally also involves obtaining approval from the participating hospitals. Lead-time can be substantial.
10 The Thesis

Although Masters students focus on the conduct of secondary research (a systematic review) or an evidence implementation study in the thesis component of the degree and PhD students are expected to include both a systematic review and a program of primary research, all research students are required to submit a thesis for examination to be eligible for the award of the degree.

Whilst the thesis varies in size and scope (for the MClinSc a maximum of 40,000 words representing original work; for the PhD, a maximum of 80,000 words representing an original contribution to knowledge) the approach to writing and formatting a thesis is common in all degrees.

A thesis is:

- a report of an original investigation of an approved topic; and
- based on a program of original work that demonstrates significant originality and insight into the research area.

A thesis offers a sustained line of argument supported by evidence, which may be based upon analysis of data and contains argument relevant to the examination of (and/or defence of and/or confutation of) a particular question or hypothesis (or set of particular hypotheses).

A thesis for evaluation is usually divided into sections or chapters for the convenience of discussion. Each chapter, however, should contribute to an advancement of the argument and when taken together should form an integrated unit. A writer endeavours to maintain and present the argument in a clear, precise, and consistent manner. Judgment, logical presentation, and sound interpretation are vital in research.

The thesis should embody the result of an original investigation – be it an analysis of secondary data or of primary data (or of both). Originality may lie in the discovery or collection of material never before used; or it may lie in a new approach to material that has been previously used (such as a systematic review).
Whatever the approach, the thesis is expected to add something new to our understanding of the particular question or problem studied. It is an investigation, not a mere compilation of the work of others, but a study that asks and attempts to answer questions not previously addressed.

Most theses begin with the statement of a question, issue or problem whose relationship and significance is linked to a review of the pertinent literature. In the body of the thesis the problem is examined, and certain conclusions are drawn. It is essential that the conclusions stated are consistent with the question that the thesis purports to examine and that they be arrived at through the examination of relevant evidence and argument. There should be a clear and logical argument running through the thesis from beginning to end. If, as is often the case, the direction of the argument changes as a result of the research undertaken, the overall pattern of the thesis, as originally projected, will need to be revised. The writer often concludes the thesis by offering suggestions for further research. These should clearly follow from the findings presented.

Students are encouraged to look at previous examples of theses. Supervisors may be able to recommend some that he or she has supervised. While the student’s topic is different, it is useful to see what some finished products look like.

For further assistant with thesis writing, please refer the Research, Education & Development (RED) website who conduct free workshops: http://www.adelaide.edu.au/red/student/timetable.html

10.1 Thesis Structure: Systematic Review Thesis

NOTE 1: while indicative word counts have been indicated, these are provided as a general guide. The University rules dictate that a Research Master’s Thesis must not exceed 40,000 words, and JBI is keen to ensure any thesis submitted for examination does not fall to a point that might raise concerns by potential examiners about the level of depth and rigour a thesis demonstrates. Please do not feel obligated to aim for either the minimum, or maximum; do discuss this with your supervisor.

NOTE 2: A PhD thesis structure will vary depending on the research methods and proposal that has been investigated. The PhD thesis structure should be discussed and agreed with by the supervisory panel in year 2 of PhD candidature.

Chapter 1: Introduction (approximately 5-6,500 words)

The introduction chapter of a Master’s thesis sets the scene by presenting the reader with an overview of what the study was about and why it was important to undertake the work. This chapter should aim to provide a novice reader with a good understanding of the review topic, the background to the methodology, and how the topic relates to the broader body of literature (qualitative and/or quantitative). There should be reference to JBI methodology and guidance, and reference to the published protocol.

The subheadings of this chapter may include the following:
• context of the review;
• statement of the review question;
• overview of the science of evidence synthesis;
• discussion of the methodological basis of the chosen approach to synthesis (e.g. Meta-analysis; aggregative synthesis etc);
• the scope and state of current literature on the topic, including the presence or otherwise of existing systematic reviews and their findings,
• the relationship between the existing literature and the proposed systematic review;
• assumptions, limitations and delimitations; and
• definitions of terms.

Chapter 2: Methodology and Method (approximately 2-3,500 words)

This chapter is based upon the methods in the protocol. These are now phrased in the past tense as the work is being reported as complete. However, there is inadequate detail in the protocol to constitute a transparent and auditable chapter, therefore this chapter should also include discussion and support for how and why the steps and stages of the systematic review were conducted. Again, referencing the appropriate JBI methodological resources is important. The subheadings of this chapter may include the following:
• Review Question(s)/Objective(s)
• Background
• Criteria For Considering Studies For This Review
  • Types Of Studies
  • Types Of Participants
  • Types Of Interventions/Phenomena Of Interest
  • Comparators/Context
  • Types Of Outcome Measures (When Appropriate)
• Review Methods
  • Search Strategy
  • Assessment Of Methodological Quality/ Critical Appraisal
  • Data Extraction
  • Data Synthesis

Chapter 3: Results (approximately 2-3,500 words)

This chapter should align with the reporting requirements of the JBI Library. While there is a tendency to focus on data, the results chapter in a thesis needs to be of sufficient depth and detail of reporting that an external examiner could confidently follow the decision making process from searching, through to selection, appraisal, inclusion, extraction and synthesis.
• Description of Studies

Numbers of studies identified, numbers screened, selected for retrieval, appraised, included/excluded, numbers in meta-analysis or qualitative synthesis. Reasons for exclusions, methodology of included studies, total population size for combined included studies, geographic context of included studies and participant characteristics, characteristics of the interventions, or phenomena of interest. Reference to the included PRISMA flow chart.

• Methodological Quality of Included studies

This section to include a write up of overall study quality per methodology, leading to the table of critical appraisal scores. The table of appraisal scores is followed by an explanation of any scores graded as ‘unclear’ or ‘not applicable’; and an overview of the general scoring trends across all included studies

• Review Findings/Results

Review findings or results are preferentially structured according to the outcomes of interest for reviews with quantitative data, and according to the phenomena of interest for qualitative data. Mixed methods reviews will include both, potentially in sections; this is determined in agreement with supervisory input. Note that the results are based on the pre-stated outcomes published in the protocol, outcomes not reported in the a-priori protocol are not included.

The presentation of the results will include the following where applicable to the review type:

• Qualitative Review Overview Flowchart for systematic reviews that include qualitative data (template follows)

• ConQual and Summary of findings for systematic reviews that include qualitative data (template follows)

• GRADE and Summary of Findings Tables for systematic reviews that include quantitative data of the effects or effectiveness of interventions (template from the GRADE website: For GRADE Summary of Findings Tables see http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/index.htm)

The results chapter will conclude with a brief summary of one to two paragraphs that provides a narrative overview of the key findings, including key statistical or textual data.

Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusions (approximately 5-6,500 words)

The discussion chapter will include the following sub headings. It will also include a narrative discussion of the review results in comparison with other external literature, and against the broad directions established in the introduction chapter.

• General Discussion

It is also useful to highlight and discuss the impact that the limitations on the systematic review project may have had on the results of the review. The general discussion section will also provide the reader with a brief overview of the whole thesis, including a concise narrative summary of the results.
• Impact of any limitations or operational definitions

Limitations in the discussion should distinguish between the limitations associated with the systematic review methods, and those arising from the included studies. It is not necessary to write extensive limitations sections, but do address issues related to the conduct of the review that are likely to impact on the results (e.g. language or date limits, or type of literature, timeframe or resources due to Masters requirements).

• Implications for Practice

The implications for practice should be context specific and enable a reader to consider the applicability to practice. E.g. suggesting in a general sense that ‘...more education should be provided...’ is not as useful a contribution to knowledge than providing a specific type of education on a specified topic for the participants of interest. Implications for practice are expressed as recommendations with a JBI Grade of recommendation.

• Implications for Research

The implications for research should not be generic statements regarding repeat study with larger samples (quantitative reviews) or further research on a phenomena of interest (qualitative reviews) without providing specific detail on what should be investigated in specific populations to measure a specific outcome or phenomena. Remember that by this point, you have comprehensively reviewed the international literature on your topic, and are therefore well placed to provide meaningful, researchable recommendations. While drafting implications for research, consider what information you would find helpful if you were planning to do further research on the topic.

• Conclusions

This section should include a brief restatement of the problem, then bring together the key elements of the discussion chapter. In a Master of Clinical Science, the conclusions are usually embedded at the end of the discussion rather than set up as a separate chapter.

References

Appendices

Ensure all forms for appraisal, extraction, a complete search strategy for one full database, summary of findings, tables of excluded studies etc. are listed as Appendices.
10.2 Thesis Structure: Primary Research Thesis

Most PhD thesis supervised through JBI will include a systematic review report presented as described in the Master’s Thesis section of this manual.

A "typical" thesis structure for the primary research component of a thesis is outlined below. Each thesis does, however, have its own structural peculiarity. Since theses do vary in structure - in chapter organisation and chapter contents - the most appropriate structure for any particular thesis will be developed in consultation with supervisors. In the case of a philosophical thesis, for example, the structure will be determined primarily by the nature of the argument being developed and the major consideration will be that it is presented in a clear, systematic and sequential manner.

Note that an “abstract” is important. It provides an overview of the purpose, the conduct and outcomes of the research. It is usually written last, to best convey the achievements of the thesis in its final form.

Chapter 1: Introduction

The introduction is concerned with identifying the problem or purpose of the study. The introductory chapter should state the nature of the issue that the student is investigating, how it fits into the current research on the topic, and how the student intends to go about answering it.

The subheadings of this chapter may include the following:

- context of the study;
- statement of the research question/issue/problem;
- statement of the hypothesis or research questions;
- significance of the study and hypotheses or research questions;
- assumptions, limitations and delimitations; and
- definitions of terms

Chapter 2: Review of the Related Literature

(This may be split into two chapters; with a literature review in one and a systematic review in the other). The literature review must be tightly organised. It should not be a loosely related supplement or an uncritical listing of others' results.

The purpose of the review is to fit the particular study into a broad scheme or framework, enabling the reader to see its importance and relationship to other studies and perhaps to provide an empirical basis for the hypotheses or questions of the study. In other words, the student should so organise the previous findings that the reader can see, if it is a question arising from the literature, why the study
is important and if/how it is worthwhile and justifiable or, if it is a question arising from practice, where the literature does not provide adequate answers but does provide indicators towards fruitful investigation. Include only references relevant to the topic statement and/or the hypotheses that surround it. Use sub-headings to facilitate organisation and meaning. Summarise the conclusions or trends evident from the literature reviewed under each sub-heading and relate them to the thesis topic and hypotheses or research questions/objectives.

In some theses the literature review may not be confined to only one chapter. Depending on the subject and structure of the thesis, it may be appropriate to refer to relevant literature in several chapters.

Chapter 3: Methodology

In this chapter the student describes the methodology on which the study is based; the methods used; the processes followed; and how data were analysed. In some theses, these may be separated out into different chapters.

Headings in this chapter for an empirical thesis may include the following:
- description of research design;
- sampling procedures;
- data gathering instruments and/or procedures;
- analytical procedures; and
- securing informed consent/ethical issues

In some theses the methodology, methods and data analysis are best presented and illustrated in the course of discussing the data. In others, a whole chapter may be devoted to methodology itself. However, it is usually useful to set out clearly the approach taken and to show understanding of the intellectual positions and research traditions that inform the student’s research.

Chapter 4: Analysis of Data

This chapter includes the presentation and analysis of the data. Through presentation of text and/or tables, and/or graphs and figures, the data are reported and analysed.

Tables and figures are used to clarify significant relationships. Good tables and figures are constructed and titled so that they are self-explanatory. Textual discussion may be used to point out generalisations and significant interpretations, but not to restate the information that they have presented. Good tables and figures are relatively simple, pointing out one or two significant relationships. If complex tables are developed, they should be placed in [an] appendix (Best 1977, p. 313).

Chapters 5: (onwards) Results
In this chapter (or chapters) the results of the data analysis are reported. The structure here depends largely on the nature of your work and this should be developed in consultation with supervisors.

**Final Chapter: Summary/Discussion/Conclusions**

The conclusion is about what the student now knows as a result of carrying out the research and what still needs to be done.

This chapter may include the following headings:

- restatement of the problem;
- summary description of procedures (briefly stated);
- major findings;
- conclusions, and
- recommendations for further investigation

See Tuckman (1978, pp. 330-338) for suggestions about the type of discussion that could be included in this chapter.

**10.3 Thesis Presentation**

Format, design and typographical lay-out constitute an integral part of a thesis. Consistency is vital. Faulty, inconsistent or inaccurate bibliographical references are often regarded as an indication of mediocre, if not inferior work in the manuscript as a whole. Inconsistencies of spelling, capitalisation, and the use of quotation marks, margins, headings and page numbering detract from the worth of the work done. Inconsistency, even in minor details, will harm an otherwise authoritative text. The responsibility for attention to such detail rests squarely on the student. It is a good idea to peruse other recent theses to get a good picture of the kinds of presentation decisions that previous students have made.

Examiners expect that the candidate has done them the courtesy of proof-reading the thesis. Therefore a student should allow adequate time to go through the manuscript word by word, line by line and page by page, ensuring that all typographical and other errors are removed. (Many candidates do this poorly because they do not plan properly and are rushed for time at the end.) A student should do this themselves; then do it with another person; then, if possible, get a third person to proof-read it once more. There may still be errors remaining, but at least most will have been eliminated.

Many examiners check references and quotations to see whether they are accurate. Some examiners can be extremely searching, so be warned. Student should check these things before the original copy is duplicated.

Full guidelines on Thesis preparation and presentation can be found on the Adelaide Graduate Centre website at: [HYPERLINK]
10.4 Research Schools

The Research Schools offered to higher degree students are compulsory (except in extenuating circumstances) and if a student fails to attend a Research School during their candidature while actively enrolled, that the first such occurrence will result in candidature being held at (or returned to) “provisional” status with the next formal review milestone reflecting “unsatisfactory” progress.

For a student who does not attend a second Research School while actively enrolled in the same degree, candidature will be “suspended” and the student will be expected to meet with the Head of School, Postgraduate Coordinator and their JBI Supervisor to show due cause as to why they should be able to continue in the program.

Whilst the Research Schools in the structured program consist of timetabled tutorials and group work, they are designed to create a “community of scholars” and focus on discussions and debate on individual student studies, research methodologies and methods, and the field of evidence based healthcare.
10.4.1 Research School dates For Commencing Students

Semester 1 - 2017

- **University Induction** – Required to be completed within 4 weeks of commencing study, available online (http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/milestones/induction/)
- **Week 1 of core program - Monday 6\textsuperscript{th} to Friday 10\textsuperscript{th} February 2017**
- **Week 2 of core program - Monday 3\textsuperscript{rd} to Friday 7\textsuperscript{th} April 2017**
- **Academic Panel Meetings - TBA**
- **2 Day compulsory Research School/Symposium (all students) – 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} April 2017 (with optional attendance on 7\textsuperscript{th} April 2017)**

Semester 2 - 2017

- **2 Day compulsory Research School Symposium (all students) – 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} August 2017 (with optional attendance on 4\textsuperscript{th} August 2017)**

Then in each subsequent semester for all HDR students.

*Student should note that the above dates are “tentative only” and subject to change.*

NOTE: For remote students, it may be possible to attend both the Symposium day and panel meetings via video or teleconferencing.
10.4.2 Research School dates For Continuing Students (all Students who enrolled prior to February 2017)

- 2 Day compulsory Research School/Symposium (all students) – 5th and 6th April 2017 (with optional attendance on 7th April 2017)

- 2 Day compulsory Research School Symposium (all students) - 2nd and 3rd August 2017 (with optional attendance on 4th August 2017)

*Please note that the above dates are “tentative only” and subject to change.
10.5 Useful Student Resources:

Academic Poster Resources

- Poster template – dimensions - [http://www.papersizes.org/a-paper-sizes.htm](http://www.papersizes.org/a-paper-sizes.htm)

JBI-HDRP – Online Resources

- Joanna Briggs Institute – Higher Degrees by Research Facebook - [https://www.facebook.com/groups/translational.hdr/](https://www.facebook.com/groups/translational.hdr/)

Text References


University of Adelaide – Useful Resources

• Student Services weblink - http://www.adelaide.edu.au/student/

Library Resources


• Library Search Engine - http://adelaide.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo_library/libweb/action/search.do?dscnt=0&dstmp=1383112633657&vid=SUA&fromLogin=true

• Login to Barr Smith Library Services - http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com.proxy.library.adelaide.edu.au/sp-3.17.0a/ovidweb.cgi?QS2=434f4e1a73d37e8cb17da02d43bbd96c69d5a1709cc3b4e5bbc03c5d9124901483323b91ab222869e8fe09170278a1409f4f3c43e52400583db02b16f1f599e3780dc8af0ae896309e1707c74428c534572b30dd2ade0ff848842537ea7de16d689e04ec518e175dca3ae98f0007033f1b83724da6a8146829943373f598f22facbc52902700d225a60d56e67a3105320c0ea49a7b7efbece2e81e3bd77c6320f98ff3eaf4d1b09443e84bf59728f3a0fd10bc5c6f47e6e1b669b3cf96ecb34

Adelaide Graduate Centre Website

• Adelaide Graduate Centre – Contact - http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/contact/

• Adelaide Graduate Centre – Homepage - http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/

• Adelaide Graduate Centre Scholarship Information - http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/scholarships/

ORCID login - https://orcid.org/signin

ORCID is an open, non-profit, community-based effort to provide a registry of unique researcher identifiers and a transparent method of linking research activities and outputs to these identifiers. ORCID is unique in its ability to reach across disciplines, research sectors, and national boundaries and its cooperation with other identifier systems.
11 Appendix I: Commencing JBI-HDRP Students - Structured Program

The full program is available from the JBI HDR website: https://health.adelaide.edu.au/jbi/current-students/

Oral Presentation - Research School

Effective verbal communication is of fundamental importance to the transfer of research. The JBI-HDRP expects students to prepare several oral presentations during the course of their candidature.

Master’s Students are required to:
  • Present on 2 separate occasions
    • Present a conventional oral report of their PICO (excluding methods), where the presentation includes a title slide, one slide of background, 1 slide for the PICO elements. These will be a maximum of 5 minutes, followed by questions/discussion.

PhD students are required to prepare 3 oral presentations during candidature. The first two will be traditional 10 minute presentations, while a final presentation on results will also be expected.
12 Appendix II: Student Representatives

Our higher degree by research students are unique in the breadth of disciplines they represent and in the vast experience they bring to our research and inquiry program. Most students are mid-career professionals with experience across diverse roles. As such, most students have busy professional lives as well as demanding social roles. As self-directed research students who will become independent researchers in their own professional fields, we seek to involve our HDR students in the intellectual life of the institute; to make them part of our ongoing pursuit of inquiry and scholarship; and to foster strong collegial relationships across the student body.

Recognising that many HDR students have times constraints due to career and study workloads, building the student body into a strong, active collegial group and encouraging their participation in appropriate decision making processes of the school is challenging. Representing the student voice to the institute

Student Representatives are elected JBI-HDRP students to represent the views and interests of Masters and PhD students of the institute on issues that directly affect their academic study.

Student Representatives are required to find out about issues impacting on students’ studies and experience.

The institute supports the Adelaide University’s position on the importance of the student supervisor relationship and matters pertaining to this relationship are outside the domain of the student representatives. It is noted that any student may raise matters concerning supervision through the Post Graduate Coordinator, the Head of Institute, or the Adelaide Graduate Centre.

HDR Student Collegiality

It is an expectation of the institute that HDR students contribute to the school’s scholarly research program and interact as a cohort of engaged scholars through various collegial processes. How this occurs is dependent upon the ideas and preferences of the student body, but it may include – but not be limited to – organising social events; organising scholarly occasions such as seminars and debates; and creating opportunities to discuss issues related to the translational research trajectory.

The institute is committed to supporting such activities and will provide modest financial resources in response to proposals that demonstrably aim to promote collegiality. It is also noted that the effectiveness of student representation will largely depend on the vitality of the HDR student community developed within the institute and how it is driven by its elected Representatives.

In the absence of a formal student body, the institute has an expectation that the appointed Student Representatives will take the initial responsibility for providing leadership that encourages the development of a culture of collegiality and to coordinate the establishment of ongoing unity in student representation.
The Role of Student Representatives

Represent the experiences and views of the HDR students to the school on:

- Issues that directly affect their academic study other than immediate concerns regarding the conduct of supervisor-student relationship.
- Matters relating to decision making concerning changes to requirements or undertaking of the course of study.
- Represent the student body at the Institute Board and Higher Degree Committee meetings.
- Facilitate the development of a culture of student collegiality and the establishment of a formal student body.

Guidance as to Carrying Out the Student Representative Role

Student Representatives represent the views of the student body in relation to issues that affect one student or the whole student body of the institute; more specifically they may:

- Raise issues that are presenting difficulties or problems for students;
- Represent the student voice when change is being considered by the institute, Faculty of University;
- Let the institute know when it is doing something well.
- At the program of study/school level, they may raise detailed issues about:
  - How the core component program of study and the bi-annual Research Schools are delivered;
  - Program deadlines and milestones;
  - Technical processes related to the HDR program;
  - Software related experiences relevant to recommended software for the HDR program; and Academic Panel sessions.
- At the wider University level they may raise issues related to services provided centrally by the University in particular anything to do with the wider student experience including the campus environment, student services and University-wide change.
- Working with other members of the student cohort in initiating a series of student led events throughout the calendar year where the events generate a social or scholarly contribution to the HDR experience including but not limited to:
  - The initiation of student led debates;
  - The initiation of evening events with guest speakers;
  - The promotion of relevant scholarly and social events that assist HDR students to engage with the wider community; or
  - The establishment of an annual ‘flagship’ event;
  - Organising and conducting a session at each Research School to conduct business with the student cohort including such things as soliciting feedback on matters relating to representation, the establishment of a formal student body, nature and frequency of events, conducting of elections.
- Providing ad hoc reports to the institute via the Institute Board or HDR Committee. (Note reports are forwarded to the Program Coordinator 1 week in advance of the meeting.)
- Providing a conduit for student communications to the PGC;
- Contributing to the development of the Student Representative Handbook in relation to enhancing the institute’s goals and mission (Note: Proposed changes to the handbook will be tabled at the institute’s HDR Committee meetings for discussion and ratification).
Expectations of Student Representatives

Student Representatives are expected to:

- Demonstrate commitment to undertake the role - including time commitment;
- Attend institute board meetings, HDR meetings and faculty HESPA meetings and other relevant institute meetings to which they are invited;
- Communicate with their cohort to enable student views to be represented effectively; and
- Make efforts to find out the views of their peers (and to set aside their own views where necessary).

Student Representatives must undertake to not act in a manner that causes risk to the institute or University, and endeavour to balance the need to be a conduit for the student cohort with the goals and mission of the institute.

Formal representation to the student cohort should be conducted in a manner that is congruent with the aims, mission and values of the institute.

Appointment

There will be 2 student representatives, one from the Master of Clinical Science cohort, and one from the Doctor of Philosophy cohort. The student body may appoint a student as a proxy. To be eligible for nomination, a student must be available to attend all relevant institute meetings (Board once every six weeks, and the HDR committee meeting once every four weeks).

Students are appointed by confidential ballot of the student body at the second Research School of each year during a session coordinated by the outgoing Student Representatives.

- Nominations may be made by any student and a student may self-nominate.
- The outgoing Student Representatives will jointly collate the ballot papers.
- In the event of a resignation of a Student Representative the proxy will fill the casual vacancy until the next formal ballot. In the absence of a proxy and if there are more than three months to a formal ballot, the remaining Student Representative, with the administrative assistance of the institute, will call for nominations from eligible students and conduct an election, through any appropriate online polling or survey site. Student Representatives are appointed for one year and may be appointed for a maximum of two consecutive terms.

Support for the role

Student Representatives will be continuously supported by the institute to effectively communicate without and within the institute. Support may include: Sessions at each Research School for interaction with Students and allocated space in the JBI Matters, the School Blog and the School Social Media.

The institute will undertake to ensure all students and staff are made aware of who the Student Representatives are what their role is and how to contact the relative Student Representative within the institute.

Within the constraints of University Policy and Privacy Legislation the School will assist in providing administrative support to facilitate communication between the Student Representatives and the broader student body. Student Representatives may access support from staff within the JBI-HDRP including the Head of Institute, the Postgraduate Coordinator and the Postgraduate Studies Coordinator.
Student Representatives may seek support from fellow Student Representatives. The institute, fellow HDR Student Representatives from other Schools within the University, the University of Adelaide Students Union and the Adelaide University Student Representative Council.
13 Appendix III: The Joanna Briggs Institute - Scholars Award for Academic Excellence

Background

The Institute Scholars Award is a newly formed annual award for a JBI Higher Degree Student who has demonstrated high-level standards for academic rigour, engagement and participation with all aspects of the program, and collegiality with the wider student cohort throughout their candidature.

- The Institute Scholars Award runs for a period of five years commencing in 2016.
- One candidate from either the Master of Clinical Science or Doctorate of Philosophy programme will be chosen by the consensus of a panel.
- The award will consist of an annual prize of $2000 that will be used to assist a student (who has completed within the calendar year) to either attend an international conference, or publish their work in an open access journal either in that or the immediate following calendar year.
- The Award is offered contingent upon the student providing records of either travel/conference costs, or publication fee requirements specific to a paper that has been submitted (submission cost) and/or accepted (publication cost).
- Copies of papers published under the award are forwarded to the Postgraduate Coordinator.

Eligibility Criteria

The eligibility criteria will be assessed by a panel of senior academic staff, and includes consideration of the following:

- The results of a completed thesis examination,
- Evidence of Academic Rigour throughout candidature,
- Engagement and participation in all required aspects of the HDR programme,
- Participation in institute Life, including the Academic Panel, timely achievement of University milestones, and collaboration and engagement with the student and staff of JBI.

Nomination

Nomination is open to any member of staff or the student body (including self-nomination).

Staff (students who are staff of the Institute) are not eligible for nomination.
Nominations close on the last weekday of October each year. A nominated student must confirm acceptance of the nomination.

The award is conferred during an institute event where the nominee who was recommended by the review panel delivers a presentation and receives the award.

Application process

1. Nominations are forwarded to the Program Coordinator for Higher Degrees by Research via email,
2. The Program Coordinator emails the nominated individual to confirm their willingness to accept the nomination (except where self-nomination has occurred),
3. A nominated individual must reply within 2 weeks from the send date of the email to indicate either acceptance or otherwise of the nomination,
4. In the first week of November each year the Program Coordinator for Higher Degrees will collate the list of nominated students and convene a meeting of the review panel,
5. The review panel will meet in the second week of November each year, and confer the award to the student who best meets the combined criteria.

Minimum Submission Requirements

The following are forwarded to the Program Coordinator for Higher Degrees by research. The content may be in the form of an email, or an attachment to an email:

1. A minimum of two recommendations for the award. One of the recommendations may be from a supervisor or self, or both may be from fellow students enrolled in a research degree with the Joanna Briggs Institute
2. Recommendations should be accompanied by correspondence that demonstrates/showcases their personal and/or group actions which have positively contributed to student life within the institute.
3. Supported with correspondence and/or reporting, students must be able to demonstrate 100% compliance with all Adelaide Graduate Centre and institute based academic expectations, including attendance at compulsory Research School/Symposiums and milestone completion.

Ranking nominated students

Students will be evaluated against the following criteria:

- The results of a completed thesis examination, based on score achieved and examiner feedback
- Evidence of Academic Rigour throughout candidature, based on the supervisors and Postgraduate Coordinators’ input
- Engagement and participation in all required aspects of the HDR programme based upon records of attendance at institute events, research days and training programs,
• Participation in institute life, based upon performance during Academic Panel, timely achievement of all University milestones, and collaboration and engagement with the student and staff of JBI.

Receiving the Award

The award includes a cash prize and a certificate to demonstrate the award is for Academic Excellence.

The certificate is awarded on conclusion of an oral presentation at the next Research School.

The cash prize may be awarded in advance of the Research School presentation.

NOTES:

An inability to provide supporting evidence for the minimum submission requirements for a research degree awarded by the University of Adelaide (or adequately substantiate the reasons for the non-compliance) will automatically void a nomination.

Students who do not attend an international conference, or submit a paper to an open access journal within 12 months (retrospectively or prospectively) of receipt of the award will not be eligible to claim the funds, but may retain the title of the award.

Funds that are not disbursed will be retained within the Award programme for future rounds.

Students who undertake activities that exceed the financial award must cover those additional costs individually.
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The University of Adelaide offers four modes for higher degree completion -

- Conventional written narrative;
- Publication, including publications that have been published and/or accepted and/or submitted for publication and/or which have been prepared in publication format;
- Combination of conventional and publication formats; and
- Major Work (creative, musical or visual) with exegesis.

The publications/manuscripts must be closely related to the research topic in terms of subject matter, form a cohesive research narrative and not have been accepted for any other University award. It must also include a contextual statement which contains the aims underpinning the publications/manuscripts. The discussion should not include a detailed re-working of the discussions from individual papers within the thesis.

All papers included in the thesis must be prefaced by a statement of authorship which details each author’s contribution. The length and number of publications to be included in the thesis will be determined by the student’s supervisory team. The primary consideration is that the body of work included in the thesis satisfies the requirements for the degree for which it is presented.

**Thesis by Publication – JBI-HDRP Structure**

**Overview**

- Contextual Section (3000 - 5000 words)
- Publications (X2 MCLINSC, X3 PhD)
- Discussion Chapter (5000 - 8000 words)

The Thesis table of contents can include the sub headings of included papers, and a separate list of tables and figures. If discussions are embedded in each paper, the final chapter may simply be titled ‘Conclusions’.

This is a narrative section; use of sub-headings within this section is at the discretion of students and their supervisory panel. It is strongly recommended that a clear structure be discussed and agreed in the development of this section.

The publication must include –

- An introduction of the topic,
- An overview of the aim and objectives,
- A description of the phenomena or intervention or disease etc, and explores the relevance to the profession/s, and certainties or uncertainties in the extant literature and how this research proposes to address the uncertainties or contribute to the field of knowledge in light of what is already known,
• Consideration of evidence from other paradigms,
• Description of choice of systematic review methodology over primary research (i.e. what’s the empirico-logical explanation of why a review would be valid compared with a primary research study),
• A detailed description of the specific methodology and rationale for choice of methodology,
• A narrative perspective on the current Policy/Clinical context
• A narrative perspective on potential Policy/Clinical impact

Example contextual statement content (3000 - 5000 words)

• Background to the topic selection
• The EBHC movement
• The systematic review of evidence
• The pooling of evidence
• The use of animals in health care
• Rationale of this thesis
• Composition of this thesis

Publications • Master of Clinical Science Students:

• 2 publications is the minimum, not the maximum,
• Students may develop more than one paper from a systematic review,
• The two minimum can be the protocol and systematic review if both are published in the JBI database of SRIR, however; students can consider a second paper from their SR if NOT publishing in the JBI database of SRIR

Statements of authorship

• Per contributor, per paper,
• As described in the University HDR Handbook, these precede each paper,
• Some schools place these in an appendix, rather than prior to the paper so as to not disrupt the flow of the thesis

By signing the Statement of Authorship, each author certifies that their stated contribution to the publication is accurate and that permission is granted for the publication to be included in the candidate’s thesis.

Statement of Authorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Paper</th>
<th>Cross-national comparisons of background and confidence in visual arts and music education of pre-service primary teachers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication Status</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted for Publication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lead Author Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Principal Author (Candidate)</th>
<th>Lesley Russell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Paper</td>
<td>Performed analysis on all samples, interpreted data, wrote manuscript and acted as corresponding author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Lesley Russell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-Author Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Co-Author</th>
<th>Sam Marshall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Paper</td>
<td>Supervised development of work, helped in data interpretation and manuscript evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Sam Marshall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Co-Author</th>
<th>Robert Young</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Paper</td>
<td>Helped to evaluate and edit the manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Robert Young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Chapter

This is a narrative section that is broader than the discussion presented in the published (accepted for publication) papers. It is strongly recommended that a clear structure be discussed and agreed prior to the development of this section. This section can draw on literature that was not included in the review; however, it should do so to compare and contrast, not to introduce new findings.

Policy/political implications associated with economic impact, or other aspects of FAME if those elements were not included in the review itself (allows for extended literature inclusion) What is new that we now know about the evidence in this topic area Overall completeness and applicability of the evidence. Discussion of internal and external validity (or cross case generalization) of the review findings A summary section of what works for whom in what circumstances – using a narrative approach to dissect the intervention or phenomena of interest and present. Where/how it fits within the translational cycle, and exploring relationship to other aspects of the translational cycle.

Comparison and contrast with other reviews/primary studies Differences (if any) between protocol and review Feedback from peer reviewers (if available) and how it might have influenced the direction and outcomes of the findings.
Conclusions

- Broad, not a re-presentation of the review findings or implications.
- Bring together the review/study findings within the context established in the final discussion, and
- HOW these relate to evidence-based practice/quality improvement.

Example Conclusions

- Restate the purpose of the thesis and give a brief overview of the methods that were used,
- Revisit the key implications of the context,
- Statement of the PICO questions,
- Summary of the work undertaken,
- Discussion of synergy between papers,
- What the thesis demonstrates as a whole.

Examination

Examiners receive

- a covering letter;
- the thesis;
- the program rules;
- the program cover sheet; and
- the program report form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The thesis as a whole is a substantial and original contribution to knowledge of the subject with which it deals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The candidate shows familiarity with, and understanding of, the relevant literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thesis provides a sufficiently comprehensive study of the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The techniques adopted are appropriate to the subject matter and are properly applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results are suitably set out and are accompanied by adequate exposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of English and general presentation are of a standard for publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examiner Comments

- standard of work completed;
- possibility for publication; and
- further work that may arise from the research completed.
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The Adelaide University conducts workshops, lectures and training sessions that are available to all HDR students. Some of these sessions are run on demand, others are routinely scheduled.

The full curriculum is available online from Researcher Education & Development (RED). There are no fees attached with most of the workshops listed below.

The RED Centre is open to conducting these workshops for groups on demand – i.e. our students could register a group interest on invitation or survey and arrange to have staff from RED present in the JBI Board or Conference Room.

Some of the courses below are generic to HDR planning and preparation and therefore would be suitable to the entire cohort should they be interested. Others are targeted toward students undertaking primary research and would probably be of interest to PhD students, however, all of the following courses are available to any student.

NOTE: The courses listed below are adjunctive to HDR study, they do therefore avoid the complication that would occur if coursework programmes were added. Coursework would require full institute and faculty level approval for the components that are coursework, would have a negative impact on our HDR income as coursework is rated at a lower value than research only, and we would also have to consider how to rate and recognise ‘credit’ for prior learning across the Master of Clinical Science and PhD programmes.

On being supervised

A good relationship between HDR candidates and their supervisors is one of the keys to a successful research degree. This workshop explores ways in which HDR candidates can establish and maintain clarity in the supervision relationship during the course of their degrees.
Reviewing literature

Strategies and tips for getting organised and managing the process of locating the relevant literature, reviewing it with a critical eye and presenting the resulting critique in an appropriate document.

Effective writing strategies

This interactive workshop provides practical guidelines to ensure clear written communication through logical flow and cohesion.

Time management and procrastination

The process of the PhD is often both exciting and daunting. This workshop will offer strategies and ideas to help students along this journey. Key aspects such as procrastination, study-life balance, and getting back on track will be explored to help students deal with the 'ups and downs' of the PhD process.

Thesis writing groups

Struggling with writing up your research? Need some extra energy to get you motivated? We can help you set up a writing group in your discipline and facilitate the first five sessions to get you started.

Writing a paper for publication: papers that analyse primary data

Focuses on 'packaging' results, identifying the most appropriate journal, identifying likely expectations of referees, and strategies for writing and revising. Example papers are analysed to highlight issues of structure, information flow and writing style.

Managing a HDR thesis with Word 2007 – Lecture

This course will firstly help the user understand the concepts involved in managing a long document. It will then assist the user to develop the skills to implement these techniques using Microsoft Word 2007. Experience has shown that some HDR students have used Word to prepare shorter documents, but have never understood the rationale for some of the more complex features.

It is assumed that the user already has sound basic computer skills and familiarity with MS Word 2007. If a user lacks these skills, they should attend a preliminary course in Word 2007.

Introduction to Qualitative Social Research Approaches

The course is aimed at students and researchers who are considering, or are in the initial stages of engaging in qualitative research.

This session provides an overview of some of the main issues relating to qualitative social research. In addition to considering various theoretical and methodological frameworks, a
brief overview of key methods, including qualitative interviewing, observation and content analysis, will be provided.

**Basic statistics and research methods**

This course consists of 5 x 2hr workshops. Participants MUST enrol in and attend all workshops. This course is a first introduction to basic statistical methods for research students with little or no recent exposure to mathematics and statistics. Experience with statistical computing is not assumed and the material is complementary to the introductory SPSS course.

**Statistics for research students**

This course consists of 5 x 2hr workshops and is a more advanced course than the 'Basic statistics and research methods' course. Participants MUST enrol in and attend all workshops.

**SPSS training linked to 'Basic statistics' course**

This workshop provides some hands-on training in the SPSS statistical software package. It covers the basics: entering data, simple charts and data summaries. Students receive a worksheet to go through at their own pace with demonstrators to help when needed.

Only those who are enrolled in the full 5-part 'Basic statistics and research methods' course are eligible for this workshop. Students enrol in only one session.

NVivo 10 Beginners Workshop - A: getting started  
NVivo 10 Beginners Workshop - B: beyond the basics  
NVivo 10 Beginners Workshop - C: integrating the elements

**Team supervision: challenges and strategies**

Team supervision raises new challenges for supervisors and students. This session will explore the possible models of team supervision and the various roles supervisors might play within the team. Strategies for negotiating differences of opinion will be canvassed. The session will also consider how best to organise feedback on writing from supervisors to students, and how to maintain good communication between all parties.

**Going Forward**

For courses rated highly, we will seek to work with RED and arrange as ‘in-service’ offered to students from our Conference or Boardroom;

For courses not highly rated, we will advise students of the dates and enrolment process;

RED also offer courses for staff, including a course on team supervision that could be of interest to JBI staff, the majority of whom do not have substantive experience in supervision.

All inquiries regarding these courses should be directed to the Program Administrator in the first instance.
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Overview

The University of Adelaide Responsible Conduct of Research Policy adopts the principles embodied in the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research [the Code], including the requirements for the attribution of authorship in research publications. This Policy is designed to ensure University compliance with the Code.

To be an author, it is essential to have made a substantial scholarly contribution to the published work. While specific practices may differ from discipline to discipline, there are a number of overarching ethical principles and procedures to which all researchers are expected to adhere. These formal procedures are also intended to minimise potential disputes over authorship issues.

Scope and Application

This Policy applies to all staff, students and titleholders of the University of Adelaide who are involved in the conduct of research associated with the University. In this regard, we accept the Code definition of research as 'original investigation undertaken to gain knowledge, understanding and insight'. For specific matters relating to higher degree by research student theses, refer to the Higher Degree by Research Academic Program Rules.

16.1 PRINCIPLES

1. Determining Authorship

1.1 Although attribution of authorship depends to some extent on the discipline involved, in line with the Code and the 'Vancouver Protocol' on Authorship and Contributorship, authorship must be based on a substantial contribution to at least two of the following three activities:

* conception and design of the project;
* analysis and interpretation of research data;
* drafting significant parts of the article or critically revising it so as to contribute to the interpretation.

1.2 Authorship must not be offered purely on the following grounds:

* holding a position of authority (e.g. head of a research group or a supervisory role);
* facilitating the acquisition of funding;
* providing routine assistance in some aspects of the project;

* providing a technical contribution, data that has already been published or materials obtained from third parties, but no substantial input to the project or publication.

In this context, 'honorary' authorship is not acceptable.

1.3 Each individual author must be able to take public responsibility for the part of the work they contributed.

1.4 Publication may not proceed, if any of the authors have legitimate reservations concerning the theory, data or its interpretation underpinning critical parts of the work.

1.5 All individuals and organisations that contributed to the research outcome (e.g. research assistants, technical writers, funding bodies, the University), must be properly acknowledged within the publication.

16.2 PROCEDURES

2. Authorship Protocols

2.1 In circumstances where there is more than one author, a corresponding author must be appointed to record authorship and manage communication about the work with the publisher. Where the corresponding author is not a member of the University of Adelaide, the policy of the corresponding author's institution is to be followed.

2.2 Any person who qualifies as an author must be included or excluded only with prior permission in writing.

2.3 As the accepted practice for the order of author names on a publication varies between disciplines, that order should be determined, recorded and reviewed in tandem with any other decisions about authorship. Authors should be prepared to explain the listing order, if required.

2.4 Where individuals who contributed to the research outcome are to be acknowledged within the publication (e.g. research assistants, technical writers), their written consent must be obtained, where practicable.

2.5 As an acknowledgement of the institutional contribution to the delivery of research outcomes, authors must cite their institutional affiliation or affiliations in any publication.

2.6 In compliance with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, an 'Authorship Declaration' must be completed by the author of a publication or, where there are multiple authors, by the corresponding author. This must be done before the publication is presented in a public forum.

2.7 Where required by a funding organisation (e.g. the NHMRC, the ARC, etc.) as a condition of providing support for a research project, any peer reviewed journal publication arising from
that support must be deposited into an open access institutional repository within a 12 month period from the date of publication.

2.8 All authors must declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to their research project if and when they become apparent, in line with the University's Conflict of Interest Policy.

**Responsibility: Researchers**

a) At an early stage of the research project, discuss authorship of a research output with all other researchers involved, and review whenever there are changes in participation.

b) Where there are joint authors, appoint a corresponding author.

c) Collectively determine the order of authorship.

**Responsibility: Sole or Corresponding Author (as appropriate)**

d) Offer authorship to all people, including research trainees, who meet the criteria for authorship listed in this Policy. Those offered authorship must accept or decline in writing within 30 days.

e) If a potential author fails to respond in 30 days, the corresponding author must keep a record of decisions made on behalf of the authors.

f) Acknowledge all individuals and organisations that contributed to the research outcome, (e.g. research assistants, the University, etc.). Where individuals are to be named, obtain their written consent, where practicable.

g) Complete an 'Authorship Declaration'. Ensure that all authors have approved the version to be published, unless circumstances are such that this is not possible. If an author is deceased or cannot be contacted following reasonable efforts, the publication may proceed provided that there are no grounds to believe that this person would have objected to being included as an author. The Declaration will need to be updated if a publication is re-submitted.

h) Lodge a copy of the publication with the University of Adelaide's institutional repository, in accordance with its guidelines.

3. Dispute Resolution

It is acknowledged that, on occasions, disputes over authorship may arise. Where researchers are unable to reach mutual agreement on an issue of authorship, the following procedures apply:

3.1 Any person involved in the dispute may seek advice from a Research Integrity Advisor, a Head of Institute, or a Postgraduate Coordinator (if involving HDR students).

3.2 Continuing disputes over authorship are to be referred for attempted resolution to the Executive Dean of the corresponding author. Disputes involving co-authors from other institutions are to be handled by the institution of the corresponding author.
3.3 If the dispute remains unresolved within 30 days of referral under clause 3.2, it will be referred to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Research) for determination. The DVC&VP(R) may engage an external arbitrator or mediator to assist in this process, although the final decision remains with the University.

3.4 Outcomes from the dispute process may include the following options:

* agreement is reached by all valid authors (as defined in Principle 1.1);
* individuals who do not meet the authorship criteria will not be included as authors of the publication, but may have their contributions acknowledged in the publication;
* where valid authors cannot agree on content, the publication might be divided in such a way that some sections can be published separately, or not published at all; or
* where disputes concerning publications arise over matters not directly related to the inclusion or exclusion of an author, content or interpretation of data, a reasonable decision may be made that permits the paper to be published and the dispute to be suitably acknowledged.

3.5 Any determination made as part of a dispute resolution will not be considered grounds for findings of research misconduct, as detailed in the University's Research Misconduct Procedures. However, proceeding to publication without agreement or formal determination of authorship may be considered a breach of the Code or a case for research misconduct.

Responsibility: Executive Deans

a) Attempt resolution of authorship disputes.

Responsibility: Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Research)

b) Where it has not been possible to resolve authorship disputes at the faculty level, make a determination on what action will be taken.

DEFINITIONS

The Corresponding Author is defined as a specified co-author of a publication who takes formal responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, acts as point of contact for all correspondence regarding the publication, and maintains related records. The position is determined by agreement amongst the authors. The corresponding author is sometimes referred to elsewhere as the 'executive author'.

A Publication is defined as the formal dissemination of research findings in a public forum whether in hardcopy, electronic, web-based or other tangible forms. It includes refereed and non-refereed books and journals, web-pages, conference presentations, creative works, technical papers, etc. It does not include a student thesis.
**Written consent** includes original hand-written signatures, emails, fax, scanned documents or electronic identification as appropriate.

**Breaches of the Code** involves actions or omissions that constitute breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, but lack the seriousness of consequence or wilfulness to constitute research misconduct. However, repeated or continuing breaches of the Code may constitute Research Misconduct.

**Research Misconduct** means fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of research, failure to declare or manage a serious conflict of interest, and avoidable failure to follow research proposals as approved by a research ethics committee, particularly where this failure may result in unreasonable risk or harm to humans, animals or the environment. It also includes the wilful concealment or facilitation or research misconduct by others.

### 16.3 Co-publication and acknowledgement of secondary reviewers:

The institute has a requirement that supervisors be named as authors on papers the student publishes arising from their study. The supervisor’s input in a student’s study is a substantive intellectual contribution to a central idea in the development of a thesis, so a student may choose to discuss co-publication with them.

It is expected that:

- principal supervisors and other supervisors be named as “co-authors” in CReMS for protocols and systematic review reports produced by their students except in cases where any parties wish this not to be the case;

- that supervisors named as a co-authors also make a substantive contribution to the development of the paper for submission, prior to its submission

Students are advised that when undertaking critical appraisal for other students, they are to be acknowledged in the acknowledgements section of CReMS for protocols and systematic reviews, not recognised as co-authors in published protocols or systematic review reports.

If a student wishes to acknowledge secondary reviewers or others who assisted in the review, they should do so using the acknowledgements section of their report.
Appendix VII: JBI HDR Supervisors

A/Professor Zoe Jordan BA, MA, PhD (Executive Director of the Joanna Briggs Institute)

A/Professor Craig Lockwood RN, BN, GDipClinNurs, MNSc, PhD (Director Implementation Science – JBI, Post Graduate Coordinator JBI-HDRP)

A/Professor Edoardo Aromataris B.Sc. (Hons), PhD (Associate Director, Synthesis Science JBI)

Dr Zachary Munn (Director of Transfer Science, Learning and Teaching Coordinator)

Prof Alan Pearson AM, RN, ONC, DipNEd, MSc, PhD, FRCNA, FCN, FAAG, FRCN (Director of the Centre for Research Excellence)

Ms Christy Pirone BSN, RN M.CISci (Principal Consultant, Safety and Quality Clinical Systems, SA Health)

Dr Kylie Porritt RN MNSc, PhD (Research Fellow JBI)

Alexa McArthur RN, Dip (Applied Science), MPHC (Research Fellow JBI)

Dr Matthew Stephenson PhD, BBiotech (Hons) (Research Fellow JBI)

Dr Jared Campbell (Research Fellow JBI)

Dr Cindy Stern PhD, BHlthSci, BHlthSci(Honours), (Research Fellow JBI)

Dr Micah Peters BHSc MA(Q) PhD (Research Fellow, Synthesis Science)

Dr Lucyllynn Lizarondo, PhD, MPhysio, MPsych (Research Fellow – Implementation Science)

A/Prof Peter Anderson (Senior Consultant Craniofacial Surgeon/ Director of Research Australian Craniofacial Unit)

Dr Chiung-Jung Wu RN, BN, MN(Intensive Care), DrHlthSc  (Lecturer, Queensland University of Technology - School of Nursing and Midwifery)

Deborah James (Speech Pathology)

Dr Allan Cyna PhD (Senior Consultant Anaesthetist, Women's and Children's Hospital)

Dr Andrew Tai (Paediatric Respiratory and Sleep Specialist, Womens and Childrens Hospital, Adelaide)

Dr Gary Misan (Associate Research Professor with the Centre for Rural Health and Community Development of the Centre for Regional Engagement at the UniSA Whyalla campus)
Dr Gloria Mejia MPH, PhD (Research Fellow at the Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health)

A/Prof Helen Marshall MPH (Director, Vaccinology & Immunology Research Trials Unit (VIRTU), Women's and Children's Hospital)

Prof Jon Karnon BA(Hons), MSc Health, PhD (Professor in Health Economics, University of Adelaide)

Assoc Prof Josephine Chow RN, PhD BAppSci DipN, MCN MBA (University of Sydney)

Assoc Prof Michelle Miller PhD, MNutDiet, BSc, APD (Nutrition and Dietetics, Flinders University)

Prof Allison Cowin (Head Wound Healing Laboratory, Women’s & Children’s Health Research Institute)

Prof Cath Rogers-Clark BA, MNurs, PhD (Head of Department, Nursing and Midwifery, University of Southern Queensland)

Prof Hugh Grantham ASM, MBBS, FRACGP (Professor of Paramedics, Flinders University)

Prof Simon Carney MBChB, BSc(Hons), FRCS, FRACS (Professor of Otolaryngology - Head & Neck Surgery, Flinders University)

Prof Stephen Worthley MB, BS, PhD, FRACP, FACC, F.C.S.A.N.Z (Helpman Professor of Cardiology, University of Adelaide)

Professor Violeta Lopez MNA, MPET, PhD, FRCNA (Director of the Research Centre for Nursing and Midwifery Practice, Australian National University)

Dr Hsiang Tan (Oncology)

Dr Michael Metz BS, MD, FAAP, MAACB, FRCPA (Sa Pathology/Clinpath Laboratories)
Appendix 1: Review Panel Report Proforma

SCHOOL OF TRANSLATIONAL HEALTH SCIENCE
The Joanna Briggs Institute
Faculty of Health Sciences
The University of Adelaide

HDR Panel Review Report

Student Name: ______________________________________________

Candidature start date: ________

Date of Panel Review Meeting: ________

Status (please circle): Fulltime / Part-time

Work Quality: The degree to which the proposal, and the student’s defence of it, represents accurate and thorough work:
( Satisfactory
( Unsatisfactory
Comments

The degree to which the proposal, and the students defence of it, demonstrates independent thought and resourcefulness:
( Satisfactory
( Unsatisfactory
Comments

The degree to which the student demonstrates the ability to complete the proposed work in a timely fashion:
( Satisfactory
( Unsatisfactory
Comments
The degree to which the proposed work is of high quality and has the potential to be sufficiently substantive to generate a dissertation that would merit the award of the degree:
(Satisfactory
(Unsatisfactory
Comments

END-OF-STRUCTURED PROGRAM REVIEWS:

The degree to which the student’s protocol/proposal and their defence of it demonstrates that their candidature should be confirmed:
(Satisfactory
(Unsatisfactory
Comments

CONFIRMATION OF RESEARCH TITLE:

Application for refinement of research topic description OR change of research topic required:
_(HYPERLINK "http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/research_topic.pdf"
(Yes
(No
Comments

APPLICATION TO UPGRADE TO THE PHD PROGRAM REVIEWS:

The degree to which the student’s completed work to-date and their defense of it supports a recommendation to submit an application to the University to upgrade to the PhD program:
(Satisfactory
(Unsatisfactory
Comments

Recommendation:

END-OF-STRUCTURED PROGRAM REVIEWS:
(We recommend confirmation of candidature;
OR
We recommend confirmation of candidature subject to the following courses of action to ensure the timely completion of the higher degree, to the satisfaction of the supervisors;

OR

We recommend an extension of provisional status for a specified period or termination, subject to attendance at another meeting of the Panel for the following reasons:

APPLICATION TO UPGRADE TO THE PHD PROGRAM REVIEWS:

We recommend that an application for upgrade into the PhD program be supported;

OR

We recommend that an application for upgrade into the PhD program be supported subject to the following courses of action to the satisfaction of the supervisors;

OR

We recommend that the student’s intention to apply for PhD enrolment for the following reasons:

Signatures:

*External Panel Member 1*
Name: 
Signature: Date:

*External Panel Member 2*
Name: 
Signature: Date:

*Principal Supervisor*
Name: 
Signature: Date:

*Associate Supervisor*
Name: 
Signature: Date:

*Postgraduate Coordinator*
Name: 
Signature: Date:

*Executive Director/Head of School*
Name: 
Signature: Date:
• Appendix 2: The University of Adelaide Research Proposal Proforma Faculty of Health Sciences

The University of Adelaide
Faculty of Health Sciences

Research Proposal Proforma

Total number of pages in this proposal (excluding References) Name of institute (Discipline/Group)

Please structure your Research Proposal based on the headings provided below. Use a clear and legible font (e.g. Arial Narrow, Times New Roman or Times in and size 12 font).

• Project (research topic) title

Provide a short descriptive title of no more than 250 characters.

2 Project (research topic) summary

In no more than 100 words, intelligible to a reader who is not a specialist in this field, summarize the aims, significance and expected outcomes.

3 Project (research topic) details

This statement should be brief (no more than 5,000 words) but comprehensive, following the headings provided below. Please number the pages. Express your arguments clearly and concisely and avoid the use of jargon.

3.1 Introductory background/Literature review

This section should comprise a critical review of the literature, in a logical progression from the broad perspective to the specific, defining the gaps in knowledge and justifying the proposed research.

3.2 Research questions

Summarise the gaps in the literature that will be addressed.
3.3 **Aims/Objectives of the project**

Provide a brief statement of the hypotheses or aims and objectives of the research.
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