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1. Introduction

These guidelines, policies and procedures apply to the Information Technology Honours Programs, which are offered through all of the following approved undergraduate courses managed by the Faculty of Information Technology:

- Bachelor of Information Technology and Systems (Honours) (BITS (Hons) – 3336)
- Bachelor of Business Information Systems (Honours) (BBIS (Hons) – 3335)
- Bachelor of Computer Science (Honours) (BCS (Hons) – 1608)
- Bachelor of Informatics and Computation Advanced (Honours) (BICA (Hons) – 4310)
- Honours stream in the Bachelor of Software Engineering (BSE (Hons) – 2770)
- Honours degree of Bachelor of Computer and Information Sciences (BCIS (Hons) – 4308) South Africa only

The guidelines and policies are also broadly applicable to the following postgraduate courses:

- Master of Business Information Systems (Honours), (MBIS (Hons) - 3343)
- Master of Information Technology (Honours), (MIT (Hons) - 3349)
- Master of Business Information Systems (MBIS - 3342)
- Master of Business Information Technology (Professional) (MBIS (Prof) - 3341)
- Master of Information Technology (MIT - 3348)
- Master of Information Technology (Professional) (MIT (Prof) - 2402)
- Master of Networks and Security (MNS - 4312)
- Master of Information Technology Professional/Master of Business Information Systems Professional (MIT Prof/MBIS Prof - 4313)

When students in any Faculty of Information Technology Honours course with an Honours component undertake similar activities and assessment they should be as comparable as possible with those for equivalent students in the Bachelor of Information Technology and Systems (Honours). However, where there is any ambiguity, the guidelines in this handbook do not override the separate approved policies for the BITS (Hons), BBIS (Hons), BCS (Hons), BICA (Hons), BSE (Hons), BCIS (Hons), MBIS (Hons), MIT (Hons), MBIS, MBIS (Prof), MIT, MIT (Prof), MNS and MIT Prof/MBIS Prof.

1.1. Scope of these guidelines

In accordance with the university Honours Year Programs Policy and the associated Honours Year Programs Procedures, the faculty has a number of responsibilities including but not limited to:

- Provide a formal organisational and administrative structure for the Honours program involving either a co-ordinator or an Honours Course Committee charged with such matters as:
  - Scrutinising thesis proposals;
  - Making recommendations on course proposals;
  - Monitoring the structure and coherence of the Honours course offerings;
  - Monitoring the effectiveness of the supervision provided;
  - Monitoring assessment procedures;
  - Counselling students and mediating disputes on an informal basis.
• Formulate and explicitly state the objectives of their Honours programs. The content of the program and the assessment should clearly reflect the objectives.

• Requirements for entry into Honours Programs should be determined by the faculty boards of each faculty and published in handbooks. The circumstances in which such requirements may be waived or varied should also be clearly defined.

• Ensure that the expectations and responsibilities of project supervisors and students are clearly set out in a code of practice similar to that developed by the university for doctoral programs, suitably modified for the Honours level. They should ensure that staff and students are familiar with these guidelines.

• Prepare a handbook setting out the aims, nature and benefits of the Honours Program, together with details of staff interests, the role of supervisors, facilities available, course requirements and assessment procedures, thesis requirements (including word limits) and assessment criteria, weightings of the various components, submission dates, and guidelines for such activities as laboratory or field work. In particular, faculties/departments should develop explicit criteria for the assessment of theses, including definitions of performance at the various grades of Honours.

• Faculties/Departments should provide regular and systematic feedback to students on all elements of their performance in the Honours year as it proceeds.

The Monash University Honours Year Policy can be found at:

http://www.policy.monash.edu/policy-bank/academic/education/awards/honours-year-programs-policy.html

The Monash University Honours Year Program Procedures can be found at:

http://www.policy.monash.edu/policy-bank/academic/education/awards/honours-year-programs-procedures.html

The purpose of this document is to set out the guidelines for the Faculty of Information Technology Honours Programs in compliance with the above Monash University policies.

2. Academic requirements of the courses

2.1. Program details and objectives

The Information Technology undergraduate Honours programs and Masters Minor Thesis programs require the completion of both coursework and research units. A key component of these courses is the completion of a thesis, or alternatively, for Masters students the completion of an Industrial Experience component. Hereafter in this document both versions of the thesis will be referred to as the ‘Honours Thesis’. All programs will be generically referred to as the ‘Information Technology Honours Programs’.

The programs aim to provide students with a high level of experience in independent analysis and research in their chosen field of expertise. The programs also provide a preparation for postgraduate study by coursework and/or research for the higher degrees of Master of Philosophy (3337) or Doctor of Philosophy (0190).

On completion of the course, students will have demonstrated a high-level of understanding
of the key theoretical and practical aspects of their area of study.

For further information related to program details and objectives please refer to the course handbook entries listed below:

**Bachelor of Information Technology and Systems (Honours)**
http://www.monash.edu/pubs/handbooks/courses/3336.html

**Bachelor of Business Information Systems (Honours)**
http://www.monash.edu/pubs/handbooks/courses/3335.html

**Bachelor of Computer Science (Honours)**
http://www.monash.edu/pubs/handbooks/courses/1608.html

**Bachelor of Informatics and Computation Advanced (Honours)**
http://www.monash.edu/pubs/handbooks/courses/4310.html

**Honours Stream in the Bachelor of Software Engineering**
http://www.monash.edu/pubs/handbooks/courses/2770.html

**Honours degree of Bachelor of Computer and Information Sciences**
http://www.monash.edu/pubs/handbooks/courses/4308.html

**Master of Business Information Systems (Honours)**
http://monash.edu/pubs/2013handbooks/courses/3343.html

**Master of Information Technology (Honours)**
http://monash.edu/pubs/2013handbooks/courses/3349.html

**Master of Business Information Systems**
http://monash.edu/pubs/handbooks/courses/3342.html

**Master of Business Information Systems (Professional)**
http://monash.edu/pubs/2014handbooks/courses/3341.html

**Master of Information Technology**
http://monash.edu/pubs/handbooks/courses/3348.html

**Master of Information Technology (Professional)**
http://monash.edu/pubs/2014handbooks/courses/2402.html

**Master of Networks and Security**
http://monash.edu/pubs/2015handbooks/courses/4312.html

**Master of Information Technology Professional/Master of Information Systems Professional**
http://monash.edu/pubs/2014handbooks/courses/4313.html

### 2.2. Program structure and admission requirements

The Information Technology Honours Programs involve advanced study (theory), research training and a research project leading to a thesis that will demonstrate a contribution to the knowledge of the subject, and include a critical review of the literature and
seminar/presentations.

Students undertaking the Information Technology Honours Program enrol in two or more units per semester.

Specific information on entry requirements and course structure can be found in either the CourseFinder entries (for Honours programs) or the course Handbook entries (for Masters programs):

http://www.monash.edu/study/coursefinder/

In addition, the normal Monash University minimum English language requirements for undergraduate students also apply to the Information Technology Honours Programs.

Normally, the level-three studies upon which admission to the Honours Program is based must have been completed no more than five years prior to commencement of the course.

The relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Masters Course Coordinator of the Faculty will certify for each approved application for admission to the Information Technology Honours Program that adequate supervision and facilities are available (resources permitting).

In order to admit a student without any of the normal qualifications outlined above, a case should be made to the Associate Dean (Education) for permission.

2.3. Period of candidature and enrolment

The Information Technology Honours Program is normally completed as a one-year (two-semesters) full-time program requiring the completion of a total of 48 credit-points. Enrolment can commence in Semester 1 or in Semester 2. Full-time enrolment in the Honours Program is normally undertaken over either both first and second semester ('full-year') or both second and first semester ('Semester 2-Semester 1').

Specific details regarding period of candidature and enrolment can be found in the course handbook entries listed under Section 2.1.

A part-time enrolment is permitted, with a normal enrolment of 12 credit points per semester over four consecutive semesters. After four weeks from the commencement of the thesis units, students will not normally be permitted to convert from full-time to part-time candidature, and then only with the permission of Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator and upon the recommendation of both the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator and the student’s supervisor/s.

Students are not normally permitted to undertake part-time, or full-time, Honours studies concurrently with any other studies, including any other requirements towards a double-degree program.

Students wishing to overload while undertaking an Honours program must gain the approval of the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator. Decisions to allow students to overload will be made on a case-by-case basis and will comply with the Monash University Course Enrolment Procedure item 1.3.4 Student study load (http://policy.monash.edu.au/policy-bank/academic/education/admissions/coursework-enrolment-procedures.html), which is limited to students who have completed at least 48 credit points of study at Monash in one calendar year and who have achieved a credit average or higher in the most recent year. Exceptions may be made in relation to high-
achieving students in courses approved for accelerated delivery by Academic Board. Students may not take more than 72 credit points per calendar year, 30 credit points in either semester 1 or 2, or 24 credit points in any other teaching period (i.e. 5 x 6 credit point units). Overloading during the Honours program is not recommended.

It is strongly recommended that students should avoid attempting to complete the required thesis units for an 18cpt or 24cpt thesis in a single semester. A single semester generally does not allow the student sufficient time to receive feedback on the proposal, interim presentation and literature review. Also it generally does not allow sufficient time consider the research topic in depth and to integrate content from the research methods unit into the project.

In exceptional circumstances students may be granted intermission, or 'leave of absence', during their Honours Program. The maximum period of intermission for candidates is 12 months, providing it is within the maximum period of candidature and intermission available for the course. An application from a domestic student to intermit Honours studies must be endorsed by the supervisor and Campus Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator and submitted to the Faculty office. An application from an international student to intermit Honours studies must be endorsed by the supervisor, Campus Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator and Manager, Academic Programs Support and submitted through to the Faculty office. The application must outline the reasons for the request. It must include full details of the assessment components completed by the student and outline the anticipated timelines for the completion of the remaining components of the program following the period of intermission. Intermission is not normally granted to allow students to pursue other studies during their course. The results for any enrolled assessable units that are completed prior to the intermission must be submitted to the faculty in the normal manner.

The maximum period of candidature for the BITS (Hons), BBIS (Hons), BCS (Hons), BCIS (Hons), MBIS (Hons) and MIT (Hons) is four years, including any approved intermission. The maximum period of candidature for MBIS, MBIS (Prof), MIT, MIT (Prof), MNS and MIT Prof/MBIS Prof is between five and six years (depending on the duration of the course), including any approved intermission. Students may only exceed the maximum period of candidature in exceptional and unforeseen circumstances, with the permission of the Associate Dean (Education) on the recommendation of the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator. Upon termination of the enrolment in the Honours Program prior to completion of all requirements, the faculty must return marks and grades for all assessable units in which the student was enrolled at that time.

Students may be excluded from the Honours Program if they have not demonstrated adequate progress in their studies. Adequate progress will be determined by a student’s performance in their interim thesis assessment tasks and feedback provided by their supervisor.

2.4. Reading Units

Reading units are intended to enable students to read widely in a relevant topic within the field of information technology under supervision. They may cover an area not offered in any other fifth-year level unit, or they may involve building greater in-depth knowledge of an area with which they already have some familiarity. Details for reading units will be defined and approved individually by the academic supervisor for each student in a learning contract, which will include objectives, assessment details, due dates and an initial reading list. The details of the agreed assessment will be submitted to the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator by the end of week 2 of the semester. The academic supervisor is responsible for submitting a mark and grade to the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator at the end of the semester.
Assessment may be comprised of a research paper or review (6000-10,000 words), project report, or equivalent, but will be equivalent to the workload associated with one 6 credit point unit. Assessment items submitted for reading units may not be directly included in the Honours Thesis, however the thesis may reference such material.

Undergraduate reading unit: FIT4008 Reading unit
Postgraduate reading unit: FIT5108 Reading unit

2.5. Honours Thesis Extension Units

Enrolment into Thesis Extension units is subject to approval by the Associate Dean Education where exceptional circumstances have been determined, and allows the student a further semester to complete the thesis. Full-time or part-time students requiring more than 4 weeks extension to the thesis deadline, must apply via the Special Consideration process and submit an Extension of FIT Honours and Minor Thesis Due Date Application Form explaining the new exceptional circumstances that have caused the delay in completing the thesis. – link to handbook

If the Associate Dean Education approves the application, the student will be permitted to enrol in FIT4000 Honours thesis extension unit (6 credit points), or FIT5000 Minor thesis extension unit (6 credit points), as applicable. Fees are applied for enrolment in either of these extension units.

Eligibility criteria and application process details are available at Honours/Minor Thesis Extensions of Examination Due Dates:

2.6. Repeating units for admission purposes

Students may apply to repeat a unit that they have already passed for Honours purposes because their first attempt at the unit had been adversely affected by personal, financial or health reasons. The application should be made to the Associate Dean (Education), who will consult with the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator before making a decision.

A unit repeated for the purposes of improving their result in support of their application for Honours purposes is above degree requirements and must be done on a non-award basis.

The above process will not affect the mark and grade recorded on the student’s academic transcript for the second attempt at the unit – the averaging of the marks only applies to the averaging process used to determine eligibility for admission to Honours.

2.7. Credit for previous studies, exchange, and cross-institutional studies

No more than 24 points of credit may be awarded towards the BITS (Hons), BBIS (Hons), BCS (Hons), BICA (Hons), MBIS (Hons) and MIT (Hons) and this can only apply for coursework units. No more than 48 points of credit may be awarded towards the MBIS, MIT and MIT Prof/MBIS Prof and 36 points for MBIS (Prof), MIT (Prof) and MNS. This credit can only apply for coursework units. The research component (i.e. the thesis components) of the Information Technology Honours Program must be completed at Monash University.
Credit for relevant previous studies at an equivalent level at Monash, or at another institution, will be assessed on an individual basis by the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator (or nominee) or the relevant Course Coordinator, in consultation with the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator.

Students may also undertake part of their Honours studies at another institution under *complementary study, study abroad and/or exchange study*, with the approval of the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator, in consultation with the relevant supervisor/s, the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator (or nominee) or the relevant Course Coordinator.

Any Honours level units counted towards their undergraduate course may not be credited towards their Honours course.

### 2.8. Scholarship programs

There are a number of scholarships available to students commencing an Honours program. Details of all available scholarships are provided on the University Scholarship website including application details and key dates:

http://www.adm.monash.edu/scholarships/applicants/honours-scholarships.html

Students applying for Honours Programs in the Faculty of Information Technology should note:

**Monash University Jubilee Honours Scholarship**
http://www.adm.monash.edu/scholarships/opportunities/jubilee-honours.html

**University Medal for Undergraduate Academic Excellence**

Each faculty is allocated a number of University Medals annually to be awarded to the undergraduate student or students eligible to graduate/course complete with honours degrees or degrees with honours and judged by the faculty to have the highest record or records of academic achievement.

In the Faculty of Information Technology, where the selection and ranking of Honours Program candidates is required for scholarships, then the process will be carried out by a panel consisting of:

- The Associate Dean (Education) or Associate Dean (Research Training) (Chair)
- The Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator,
- The relevant Campus Honours Coordinator(s) or the relevant Course Coordinator(s) of the candidates involved.

The criteria used for selecting and ranking candidates will comply with the guidelines of the relevant scholarship scheme.

### 3. Assessment

#### 3.1. Assessment requirements for the thesis

The assessment of the Honours Programs must clearly reflect the objectives of the Information Technology Honours Program, and must follow the principles of assessment at Monash outlined in the Assessment in Coursework Programs policy and the rules for good practice stated in the Unit Assessment Procedures.
The individual assessment components required for the Honours Thesis and Minor Thesis are listed below:

- Research Proposal: (approximately 3000 words) 5%;
- Literature Review: (approximately 6000 words) 10%;
- Interim Presentation: hurdle;
- Final Presentation: 5%;
- Thesis: (approximately 9000 – 24000 words, depends on the course for specific requirements see the appropriate unit guide) 80%
  - 18cpt theses: 9000 – 18000 words (subject to faculty approval)
  - 24cpt theses: 12000 – 24000 words (subject to faculty approval).

Each unit is 6 credit points and students will be expected to spend a minimum of **12 hours per week** during semester on this unit, including:
- Supervision meetings,
- Seminar and workshop attendance, and
- Self directed study.

The guidelines for typical Honours assessment tasks are outlined below.

**Research Proposal**

**Description:**
Create a research proposal (approximately 3000 words) that clearly identifies the agreed research topic, identifies the problem being studied, and justifies the aims and significance of the project. The proposal should include a discussion of the research context and background, the proposed methodology, the research design and deliverables. The proposal should also be presented professionally with a standard of written expression appropriate to research publications in the field.

**Weighting:**
5% of the 24pt or 18pt thesis

**Criteria for assessment:**

1. Content of the proposal
2. Organisation of the proposal
3. Quality of writing
4. Quality of presentation
5. Accuracy of the bibliographical details

**Due date:**
Week 6, 3pm Friday in the first semester of candidature (or the first available week day previous to this date if the Friday falls on a University holiday)

**Literature Review**

**Description:**
Create a literature review (approximately 6000 words) based on the agreed topic, which provides a critical review of the key literature in the content area. The argument constructed should be coherent and supported by an adequate number of relevant and correctly formatted references. The review should be structured in an appropriate scientific format, and it should be clearly and concisely expressed. The presentation should be of a professional standard and include a title page, table of contents, page numbering and references.
**Weighting:**
10% of the 24pt or 18pt thesis

**Criteria for assessment:**

1. Depth of analysis of the chosen articles and their sources
2. Organisation of report
3. Quality of writing (including spelling and grammar)
4. Quality of presentation
5. Appropriate citation of sources

**Due date:**
Week 14 ***, 3pm Friday in the first semester of candidature (or the first available week day previous to this date if the Friday falls on a University holiday).

(*** Bachelor of Software Engineering students who are enrolled in a full time load but in only one 6pt thesis unit in the first semester of their Honours program may apply for an extension of up to 3 weeks to the submission date of this assessment task.)

**Interim Presentation**

**Description:**
Provide a 20 minute (usually 15 mins present + 5 mins questions) summary of the current progress of your research project to your peers. The seminar will be scheduled in week 14 of semester.

**Weighting:**
This is a non-assessable hurdle requirement

**Criteria for assessment:**

1. Selection and organisation of content
2. Voice and language
3. Timing
4. Non-verbal communication (e.g., body language, eye contact)
5. Quality of visual aids

Delivering a 20 minute seminar on the current progress of the research project is a hurdle requirement.

Attending and providing feedback to at least five other interim presentations is a hurdle requirement.

**Due date:** Week 14 in the first semester of candidature at a time to be scheduled.

**Final Presentation**

**Description:**
Present a 20 minute presentation on your research project to your peers with an additional 5 minute question period. The presentation should clearly identify the research problem, significance and aims. The background research context should be outlined and the research approach and method clearly defined. The research outcomes and possible avenues for further research should be presented. The presentation should be well structured and concisely delivered. The presenter will be required to answer questions raised by their peers and the academic staff.

**Weighting:**
5% of the 24cpt or 18cpt thesis

Criteria for assessment:

1. Selection and organisation of content
2. Voice and language
3. Timing
4. Non-verbal communication (e.g., body language, eye contact)
5. Quality of visual aids

Attending and providing feedback to at least five other final presentations is a hurdle requirement.

Due date: Week 14 in the second semester of candidature at a time to be scheduled.

Thesis Description:
Submit a thesis (approximately 9000 – 24000 words, this depends on the course for specific requirements see the appropriate unit guide) that describes your research. The thesis should be well structured and contain an abstract, table of contents and correct referencing. It should provide a clear description of the objectives of the project, a comprehensive literature review, and description of the methodology used. The thesis should provide a thorough analysis of the results. It should utilise correct grammar and clear expression. The thesis should be presented in a manner that is consistent with the standard expected of academic writing in the field.

Weighting:
80% of the 24cpt or 18cpt thesis

Criteria for assessment:

1. Content of the thesis
2. Organisation of the thesis
3. Quality of writing
4. Quality of presentation
5. Accuracy of the bibliographical details

Due date:
Week 15, Friday 3pm in the second semester of candidature (or the first available week day previous to this date if the Friday falls on a University holiday)

The due dates listed above represent the expected progress of a full-time student enrolled over two semesters. The due dates for students enrolled part-time will be confirmed and recorded by the Campus Honours/Minor Thesis Coordinator in consultation with the supervisor of the student. In general the due dates set for part-time students will be equivalent to the study time available to a full-time student.

Students are required to attach an assignment cover sheet, including the Faculty Plagiarism Declaration, when submitting any assessment items in the Honours/Minor Thesis units.

3.2. Publication of assessment requirements
At the start of the program students must be provided with thesis assessment requirements for including all assessment details as outlined below:

- The assessment regime of the Honours Thesis via unit guides, that is, the set of essays, talks, assignments, examinations, thesis and other assessment tasks, and their contribution to each enrolled unit and to the final Honours mark and grade;
- All thesis requirements (word or page limits, structure, conformity to conventions, both scientific and grammatical, formatting, binding, etc);
- Criteria by which the thesis will be evaluated;
- Submission dates; and
- Penalties for late submission.

3.3. Feedback

Campuses must have processes in place to ensure that Honours students receive regular and effective feedback on their progress through:

- Progress meetings with a supervisor and/or Campus Honours Coordinator will normally take place every week. These meetings do not always need to take place face to face
- Feedback on at least two drafts of the thesis, provided the student has submitted the draft in time to allow the supervisor sufficient time to provide appropriate feedback;
- Formative written and/or oral assessment tasks; and
- All other individual summative assessment tasks, including their individual marks.

Feedback from the supervisor/s will generally be returned to the student within two weeks of submission of assessment tasks.

Feedback from the Thesis Examiners will generally be returned to the student within two to four weeks of submission of the thesis.

3.4. Special consideration and extensions

Students who have been adversely affected by acute illness or other exceptional cause beyond their control, may apply for special consideration for their course work units. The outcome of their application will depend on their case and the type of assessment affected, but mark adjustments will not be made under any circumstances. Eligibility criteria and application process details are available at: http://www.policy.monash.edu/policy-bank/academic/education/assessment/special-consideration-policy.html

Special consideration applications for in-semester Honours assessment items are lodged with and approved by the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator.

- Extension of thesis submission or deferment of final assessment for Honours component units of under four weeks will be considered by an Extension Consideration Panel, consisting of the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator (as Chair), the Campus Honours Coordinator and the local Manager, Academic Programs Support.
- Extensions of over four weeks must be approved by the Associate Dean (Education), upon the recommendation of the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator and the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator.

Eligibility criteria and application process details are available at Honours/Minor Thesis Extensions of Examination Due Dates: http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/resources/staff/edgov/policies/assessment-
3.5. Late submission of assessment

A penalty of 1% per day (late days including weekend days) must be applied to all in-semester Honours assessment items of the Information Technology Honours Programs, unless an extension or alternative assessment is granted through the special consideration process described above.

The due date of an honours/minor thesis for examination is the end of Week 15 of the semester of the final honours/minor thesis unit.

After examination, the due date of the final version of the honours/minor thesis is four weeks after the receipt of the examiner’s reports.

If the thesis is not received by the due date for examination, and no extension has been granted via the Special Consideration process, then a penalty of 1% per day of the maximum allowable thesis mark will apply.

4. Marking and grading

In accordance with University procedures (EC 6/11, Item 13.7, revised Unit Assessment Procedures Item G 2 – Marking, Grading, and Results) the Faculty of Information Technology will ensure the equivalency and consistency of assessment and grading across all campuses. Assessors will have access via the Internet to a common repository of marked assessment items containing a representative number of marked samples for each assessment task. Assessors will ensure that the marking for their students is consistent with the marked samples in this repository.

4.1. Marking of seminars and oral presentations

Assessment of oral presentations contributing 5% or more towards the final Honours mark should be determined by the average mark assigned by a campus panel of at least two academics. The participating academics should be asked to consider the presentation according to specific criteria that should be advised to students in advance.

4.2. Marking of literature reviews and major written assessment tasks other than the thesis

All written assessment tasks contributing 10% or less to the final Honours mark should be marked by the supervisor/s, or an academic/s with appropriate expertise nominated by the supervisor in consultation with the Campus Coordinator.

4.3. Marking of the research thesis

The research thesis must be marked in accordance with the Honours grade descriptors in Appendix 1 by at least two examiners, one of whom would normally be external to the immediate research group.

Supervisors are ineligible to examine their students’ research project theses.
The Honours thesis is a training ground for learning, and demonstrating mastery of research skills, and it should be possible for a student to get a high mark for an outstanding command of methodology and its application to the content area of the thesis, even if the topic has been already researched in the literature. Thus the kind of originality expected might involve new insights into a well-established area, rather than a genuinely original research study. It is perfectly acceptable for a student to obtain null results, or to address what an assessor may believe to be a mundane question. The good student will find imaginative and theoretically sound ways of interpreting their results.

4.4. Reconciling mark discrepancies

As noted above, all Honours research theses should be examined by at least two examiners, both of whom should return a recommended mark. The process of resolution of mark discrepancies is:

- In the event that there is a greater than 10 point discrepancy between the marks given by the two examiners of an honours/minor thesis, the Campus Honours Coordinator will facilitate a meeting between the two examiners to discuss the discrepancy to resolve the issue.
- Where the discrepancy cannot be resolved, a third person may be appointed as an adjudicator. The role of an adjudicator of an honours/minor thesis is not as a third examiner, but to review the examiner’s reports and the thesis itself. The adjudication’s role is as a judge requested to pronounce on the relative soundness, correctness and appropriateness of the initial two examiners’ recommendations.
- The adjudicator is to come up with a decision on the final mark of the thesis and the revisions that need to be done.
- Under normal circumstances, the final mark will be neither less than the lowest mark nor more than the highest mark.

The Faculty Policy on Honours/Minor Thesis Adjudication can be found at:


4.5. Submission of Honours results and grades

The recommendations for the results and grades for all individual assessable units for the Honours Program must be submitted to the Board of Examiners of the teaching faculty, in accordance with the university requirements for the release of results in each semester. The recommendation for the final Honours mark and grade for each student must be submitted to the Board of Examiners, according to the timelines for the submission of results for the final semester of enrolment, unless the student has an approved extension due to special consideration.

Marks that are not returned will be recorded as withheld (WH) until the end of the fourth week of the following semester, after which they will be amended to a fail result (0 N) if no further communication has been received from the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or the relevant Course Coordinator.

4.6. Overall Honours/Minor Thesis mark and grade
In addition to the results for the individual component units, students receive an overall Honours/Minor Thesis mark and grade upon completion of the program. This overall mark and grade is recorded on each student’s academic transcript.

For all honours/ minor thesis courses, other than the Bachelor of Software Engineering (BSE), the final grade will the Weighted Average Mark (WAM) for the course. The WAM is the average mark achieved across all completed units in a course. For more information regarding WAM please see: http://www.monash.edu.au/exams/wam.html

Notes:
- Failed marks with all attempts are included in the final grade calculation, other than in cases approved by the course coordinator.
- Student must pass the minimum required points before the degree can be awarded.
- A minimum mark of 50 is required for the thesis in order to be awarded the degree.

In addition to a numerical mark, the following honours grades will be awarded*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>H2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>H2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final grade awarded may not be more than one grade-band higher than the grade achieved in the honours thesis. In such cases, students will have their mark capped at the top of the awarded grade.

Calculating BSE Honours grades (approved by Faculty Education Committee 1/2014)

Students undertaking the BSE (Honours) must refer to the Bachelor of Software Engineering Honours Weighted Average Calculation as approved at Faculty Education Committee 1/14.

Failed Units

When students are permitted to repeat failed units the following policy applies:

In exceptional circumstances, the campus-based honours coordinator can approve the exclusion of the marks in the failed unit from the honours grade calculation. This must be done via the submission of an Honours Grade Variation Form.

Undergraduate students who do not pass all required component units of the Honours Program do not satisfy course completion requirements and cannot graduate with an Honours Degree or a degree with Honours. In such cases, students are strongly advised to withdraw from candidature from the Honours Degree by the census date to avoid any further academic or financial penalty. The university will issue the student with an academic statement of their results.
Students in the Bachelor of Software Engineering (BSE) Honours who do not meet the above Honours requirements may continue in the coursework stream, and subject to the successful completion of all other requirements, graduate in the Bachelor of Software Engineering.

5. Roles and responsibilities

The Faculty of Information Technology has overall responsibility for a range of specific aspects of the administration, admission, supervision and assessment for its Honours Programs. Through its Faculty Education Committee (EC), and by appropriate delegation to the Faculty Undergraduate Programs and Graduate Programs Committees, the Faculty Board of Examiners and relevant faculty staff, the faculty will ensure appropriate coordination and management of the Honours Programs in accordance with these university policies and procedures.

The Faculty Education Committee is the primary academic decision-making body of the faculty. It is responsible for all matters relating to studies within the faculty. It has specific responsibility for oversight of all matters relating to the curriculum and teaching of courses as well as research and research training.

Subject to section 9 of the Statutes, the Faculty Education Committee in respect of the Honours Programs has responsibility to:

- Manage and control, and advise the Council or Academic Board on, all matters relating to studies within the faculty’s academic fields of interest and responsibility, and in particular matters relating to - the teaching of courses in such fields, and, with the assistance of such examiners as the Council may by resolution appoint on the recommendation of the board or the Dean, the conduct of examinations in such courses;
- The curriculum for any degree or diploma the courses for which fall within the faculty’s field of responsibility;
- Supervise the course of study and subjects within the faculty’s academic fields of interest and responsibility and may, as it from time to time thinks necessary, prescribe outlines of and the books for such courses and subjects;
- Have such powers and duties as are conferred or imposed on it by any other statute or by any regulation or resolution of the Council;
- Consider and take action upon any resolution transmitted to it from a meeting of the faculty.

5.1. Faculty Education Committee

The approved terms of reference of the Faculty Education Committee requires the committee:

1. To oversee the educational programs of the Faculty, in particular:
   - to maintain a broad overview of the Faculty’s education programs and carry out long term planning;
   - to contribute to the development and implementation of the Faculty Operational Plan;
   - to develop and implement education policy and strategy at the faculty level in line with the University Education Policy for all coursework programs;
   - to ensure that all coursework programs meeting Faculty and University regulations, policies, procedures and guidelines;
• to receive recommendations and advice from the Faculty Education Committee sub-committees and working groups on matters relevant to the educational programs of the Faculty;
• to ensure that courses meet external accreditation requirements where appropriate.

2. To be responsible for the development and management of coursework courses and units, in particular:
• oversee the quality assurance and approval for the establishment of new courses and units and the amendment of existing courses and units, which will be received through the relevant sub-committee (Undergraduate or Graduate Programs Committee);
• oversee the development and implementation of quality assurance processes in the management and delivery of coursework courses and units.

3. To formulate policy, procedures and guidelines to support excellence in undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate coursework teaching and learning and address other faculty-wide issues relevant to student learning experiences.

4. To oversee any scholarship, prize and award schemes intended for undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate coursework students.

5. To be responsible for the Faculty’s admissions and credit transfer arrangements.

6. To consider matters referred by the Dean, Deputy Dean, Faculty Executive, Board of Examiners, Academic Progress Committee and relevant University committees and boards.

5.2. Faculty Board of Examiners (BoE)

The Faculty of Information Technology Board of Examiners is responsible for the approval of final marks and grades in respect of individual students for all undergraduate and postgraduate units taught by the Faculty of Information Technology, including those at Honours level.

The Board of Examiners has responsibility to monitor the Honours grade distributions over a period of time, and where appropriate in relation to students’ previous level of performance, and make recommendations to FIT campuses and the Faculty Education Committee that assist in the maintenance of uniform standards both within the course and in relation to other similar courses at comparable institutions.

The Board of Examiners shall receive from the relevant unit chief examiners, through the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator and the relevant Campus Honours Coordinators or the relevant Course Coordinator, recommendations for the overall Honours marks and grades achieved by all students at the completion of their program. The Board will consider those recommendations on final marks and grades to ensure their comparability and consistency from year to year and shall monitor the moderation processes adopted at each FIT campus to ensure best practice.

5.3. Associate Dean (Education)

The Associate Dean (Education) is responsible for providing leadership in the development, implementation and monitoring of Education policy and curriculum within the faculty and assists in the development of education policy in the wider University.

In respect of the Information Technology Honours Program, the Associate Dean (Education)
has responsibility to:

- Ensure that appropriate academic and administrative support structures are in place to support the Information Technology Honours Program;
- Ensure that the curriculum and methods of assessment of the Honours Program provide an appropriate level of consistency of standards and assessment;
- Ensure the faculty establishes and makes available to staff and students guidelines for good practice in supervision, similar to that developed by the university for higher-degree by research programs;
- Ensure that the objectives, assessment criteria, expectations and responsibilities of Honours Programs are clearly set out and published in a code of practice;
- Liaise with staff in the collaborating faculties to ensure that there is a consistent approach to all Information Technology Honours Programs;
- Evaluate the Honours Program in terms of success in achieving its objectives, the comparability of its standards, and its equity across students;
- Approve offers of admission for the Information Technology Honours Program in accordance with faculty policies;
- To extend their candidature beyond the normal maximum period of enrolment;
- Liaise with the Associate Dean (Research) to ensure that there is a clear nexus between teaching and research and, if appropriate, that the Information Technology Honours Programs is linked with the research activities of the broader faculty;
- Undertake regular comparisons of grade distributions for all students enrolled in Information Technology Honours Programs;
- Liaise with the Associate Dean (Research Training) on research training matters and to assist in scholarship ranking for those students applying for higher-degree by research programs.

In practice, some of these responsibilities are delegated to other members of staff, including the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator, the Campus Honours Coordinators and relevant Course Coordinators.

5.4. Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator

The Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator in conjunction with the relevant FIT Heads of Campus offering Honours studies are responsible for providing a formal organisational and administrative structure for the Honours Program, including such matters as:

- Informing students about opportunities for Honours Programs within their disciplines;
- Monitoring the structure, coherence and assessment standards of the Honours Program offerings;
- Consideration of applications, and allocation of projects and supervisors to students (see below);
- Provision of adequate induction (see below);
- Provision of adequate supervision (subject to availability) (see below);
- Provision of adequate study space and resources (where appropriate), and IT resources;
- Establishing, publishing and monitoring assessment requirements and procedures;
- Monitoring the assessment of students’ work, including benchmarking with other institutions;
- Ensuring that the expectations and responsibilities of project supervisors and students are clearly set out in a code of practice.

The Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator in conjunction with the relevant FIT Heads of Campus will ensure that these responsibilities are met, including by specific delegation to either the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or relevant Course Coordinators or other appropriate staff at their campus.
5.5. Campus Honours Coordinator

The FIT Heads of Campus of campuses offering the Information Technology Honours Programs must nominate a local Honours Coordinator for each campus (henceforth the ‘Campus Honours Coordinator’) to assist in meeting the FIT campus responsibilities related to the offering of an Honours Program. The specific responsibilities of the Campus Honours Coordinator, including their relationship to any approved Chief Examiner for the Honours units, will vary between campuses and must be determined and approved by the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator, in consultation with the FIT Heads of Campus. For example, the Campus Honours Coordinator might typically be responsible for overseeing all matters related to the Honours Program at the FIT campus, including:

- Coordination of applications and allocating projects/supervisors to students;
- Welcoming new students, ensuring appropriate supervision and facilities are available, and that a suitable program of study and research has been established;
- Ensuring all students receive appropriate induction and a copy of The Information Technology Honours Programs Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for Good Practice booklet;
- Monitoring and reviewing students’ progress in conjunction with the supervisor. If the student is not making satisfactory progress, the Campus Honours Coordinator and the supervisor will consult with the student at the earliest possible stage to determine the most appropriate course of action for the student;
- Acting as mediator and facilitator for the resolution of conflicts between students and supervisors which have not been resolved at the local level;
- Ensuring that any grievances that arise are dealt with according to the university policy and procedures for the resolution of student grievances;
- Monitoring the curriculum and methods of assessment of the FIT campus Honours Program to ensure that it provides an appropriate level of consistency of standard of curriculum and assessment in comparison both to related areas of Information Technology, and to similar courses at comparable institutions;
- In conjunction with the supervisor, ensuring that every Honours student prepares an Honours Thesis in accordance with the objectives of the research component, taking account of the timeframe and the proportion of the research component;
- Seeking nominations from the supervisor for examiners and ensure that the necessary administrative arrangements for examination occur in a timely and efficient manner;
- To convert between part-time and full-time Honours studies, to intermit their Honours studies,
- Seeking comments from the supervisor in determining the final grade to be awarded;
- Maintaining a permanent record of results of individual assessment tasks of all students; and
- On behalf of the FIT campus, recommend to the Information Technology Board of Examiners, via the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator, the mark and grade of Honours for each student, in a timely manner.

The Campus Honours Coordinator is also responsible for communicating the requirements of the Honours Program to all potential students, and the Faculty office. The Campus Honours Coordinator may also be required to provide advice to the Faculty office from time to time on other aspects of the Honours Program.

Where the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator does not assign all of the above roles to the Campus Honours Coordinator, they should advise all students and Associate Dean (Education) the members of staff who have responsibility for those matters.
In a number of situations outlined in this document, exceptions to normal policies and practices for the Honours Program may be considered by the Associate Dean (Education) and Board of Examiners upon the recommendation of the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator. Normally, the final formal approval of those recommendations with the FIT campus cannot be delegated to the Campus Honours Coordinator.

5.6. Course Coordinator

The Associate Dean (Education) of the Faculty of Information Technology will appoint a Course Coordinator to assist in meeting the Faculty responsibilities related to courses containing an Honours Program. The specific responsibilities of the Course Coordinator will vary between campuses and relate primarily to overall course advice and entry requirements. For example, the Course Coordinator might typically be responsible for overseeing all matters related to the course in general, including:

- Approval of the enrolment of new students;
- Making existing students aware of entry requirements and options regarding the Honours program in a specific course;
- Ensuring all students receive appropriate induction and a copy of The Information Technology Honours Programs Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for Good Practice booklet;
- Monitoring and reviewing that the Honours program is aligned with the objectives of the course;
- Ensuring that any grievances that arise are dealt with according to the university policy and procedures for the resolution of student grievances;
- Monitoring the curriculum and methods of assessment of the Honours Program to ensure that it provides an appropriate level of consistency of standard of curriculum and assessment in comparison both to related areas of Information Technology, and to similar courses at comparable institutions.

The Course Coordinator is also responsible for communicating the requirements of the Honours Program to all potential students, and the Faculty office. The Course Coordinator may also be required to provide advice to the Faculty office from time to time on other aspects of the Honours Program.

5.7. Campus Academic Programs Support Staff

The Campus Academic Programs Support Staff are responsible for providing leadership and support in academic administration across the faculty and assisting the Associate Dean (Education) and the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator in the development and implementation of policy and procedures in support of educational programs. In respect of the Information Technology Honours Programs, the Campus Academic Programs Support Staff have responsibility to:

- Ensure information and advice is provided to potential Honours students about all Information Technology Honours programs;
- Ensure that the units of study approved by the Faculty Education Committee at Honours level are available for enrolment and the relevant details included in university publications;
- Ensure that all commencing students are provided with a copy of The Information Technology Honours Programs Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for Good Practice booklet;
- In consultation with the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator, the Campus Honours Coordinators and relevant Course Coordinators, establish timelines and manage processes to ensure the timely handling of Honours applications, enrolments,
and results finalisation in accordance with university requirements;

- Ensure that administrative processes and advice provided by Faculty of Information Technology Student Services staff is informed by faculty directions and consistent with university and faculty policies, procedures and guidelines.

5.8. Academic supervisors

Each Honours student will be assigned a primary supervisor for their Honours research project. The aim of Honours supervision is to guide and inspire the student through the design and conduct of an appropriate research project and to train the student in the ability to analyse, synthesise and evaluate critically the literature relevant to the topic, so that the student can carry out original research.

The role of the supervisor is to

- Provide academic guidance concerning the nature and practice of research;
- Provide an introduction to the relevant literature and opportunities for its critical appraisal;
- Assist the student to understand the rationale behind the development of the research project;
- Instruct the student in the appropriate experimental techniques, where appropriate;
- Assist the student in the planning of experimental protocols and provide guidance on statistical analyses, where appropriate;
- Assist the student in the critical analysis and interpretation of data;
- Make the student aware of any compulsory ethic clearance requirements;
- Make the student aware of relevant university and faculty policies and procedures;
- Make the student aware of facilities and resources available to students, in particular the services offered to Honours students by the library; and
- Assist the student to develop oral and written communication skills.

In particular,

- Prior to the commencement of any Honours research project, the supervisor must establish that the proposed research component is appropriate in scope and character for the Honours Program, and is feasible in terms of time, facilities, equipment, technical and resource requirements.
- The supervisor will advise their Campus Honours Coordinator or Course Coordinator, and the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator as soon as possible of emerging issues concerning an Honours project and/or candidate which are likely to affect the students ability to successfully complete the Honours Program;
- At the commencement of candidature the supervisor must meet and discuss with the candidate their mutual expectations and establish an approved program of study including clearly identified objectives for the research component; as well as discussing relevant ethical and safety requirements, intellectual property issues, and at this point should establish frequency of communication and plan an appropriate program of coursework in accordance with approved requirements for Honours in that area of study
- The supervisor must provide regular and systematic feedback to students on all elements of their performance in the Honours year as it proceeds. The supervisor should normally meet with students under his/her supervision every week to discuss their research project and work through any problems associated with it.
- The supervisor should also provide feedback on at least two drafts of the thesis, provided the student has submitted the draft in time to allow the supervisor sufficient time to provide appropriate feedback.
5.9. Students

Prior to applying for candidature, students are required to discuss potential Honours research topics with appropriate Faculty staff. In consultation with the Campus Honours Coordinator or Course Coordinator, the applicant should identify areas of interest and, after discussion with an appropriate potential supervisor, nominate a suitable topic for research in their application.

Students should be made aware, and accept, from the start that their level of success in the Honours Program is their own responsibility. The supervisor is responsible for suggesting, guiding, advising, assisting, providing constructive criticism, but is not required to apply any pressure on a student to complete their studies in a timely manner.

Honours students have a right to receive

- An appropriate work environment, including study space, storage facilities, and access to IT and library resources and services
- Adequate supervision. They should normally meet with their supervisor every week to discuss the topic and work through any problems associated with it.
- Constructive and critical assessment of work submitted. In particular students have a right to know when a supervisor considers progress as inadequate or standards of work as being below that generally expected.
- Constructive feedback on at least two drafts of the thesis, provided the student has submitted the draft in time to allow the supervisor sufficient time to provide appropriate feedback.
- Individual marks for all assigned assessment tasks, and all relevant information on the overall assessment requirements and standards required.

On the other hand, it is the responsibility of the student to:

- Dedicate to Honours studies an average of 48 hours (full time students) or 24 hours (part-time students) per week;
- Attend the campus orientation session;
- Play an informed part in planning the research project within the time limits identified by the Faculty;
- Establish agreed methods of working and a schedule of meetings with the supervisor;
- Keep the supervisor informed of any difficulties and problems being experienced and take an active role in seeking solutions;
- Maintain the progress of work in accordance with the stages and timelines determined by the particular pattern of enrolment;
- Participate in the opportunities offered by the campus, which may include attendance at and presentations in non-assessable research seminars;
- Be familiar with and comply with all requirements relating to ethical conduct, intellectual property, and privacy;
- Conform to the faculty’s administrative requirements for enrolment, leave of absence, re-enrolment and extensions;
- Understand and comply with relevant university and faculty policies and procedures, including those on
  - Special consideration
  - Plagiarism
  - Conflict of interest
  - Acceptable use of information technology facilities by students; and
- Accept responsibility for preparing an Honours research thesis for examination.

5.10. Provision of orientation information and The Information Technology Honours and Minor Thesis Programs - Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for Good Practice booklet
All campuses contributing to the Information Technology Honours Programs should conduct formal orientation for all commencing Honours students. An effective orientation program will ensure that students are well informed about overall Honours requirements and area of study specific expectations, whether or not they have previously been enrolled as a student at Monash. Orientation is considered to be a continuous process, which generally starts with contact prior to taking up the offer of a place in the Honours Program and proceeds through arrival, first days/weeks, and generally up to the third month of enrolment.

Prior to the start of their first semester, schools/departments should provide all enrolled Honours students with a copy of The Information Technology Honours and Minor Thesis - Programs Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for Good Practice booklet; (in written or electronic form) including all of the following:

- The aims, nature and benefits of the Honours Program;
- Assessment details (see 3.1);
- Feedback processes (see 3.3);
- The roles and responsibilities of the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator, the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or relevant Course Coordinator, students, supervisors and co-supervisors;
- Faculty of Information Technology policies and expectations about supervisor–student contact;
- Any relevant Faculty of Information Technology and university safety-related information and policies;
- Policies on computer usage, plagiarism, ethics, privacy and intellectual property;
- Facilities available to Honours students in the Faculty of Information Technology, information to assist the students in using them effectively and any relevant Faculty of Information Technology policies on reasonable usage; and
- Any other discipline-specific information.

5.11. Provision of adequate supervision

The academic supervisor must:

- Be a member of academic staff from within the Faculty of Information Technology. In the case of a supervisor being from another faculty or from outside the university, for example Monash Medical Centre or another hospital, an academic supervisor from the relevant faculty and with knowledge, expertise and interest in the student’s research topic will be nominated as co-supervisor.
- Be an active researcher.
- Normally be an accredited Monash University Institute of Graduate Research (MIGR) Level 1 supervisor, or have completed the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education.
- Have access to adequate resources.
- Be available during the relevant academic year. Honours supervisors cannot be away for long periods of time; and
- Normally meet with the students every week during the semesters of enrolment.

In the event that supervisors are absent from the university for longer than two weeks within a given semester, it is important that they inform the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or relevant Course Coordinator and organise an alternative source of assistance for the student in good time.

Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator in conjunction with the relevant FIT Heads of Campus must ensure that the total workload of the staff member is manageable and that the supervision workload including HDR and Honours students is not higher than 8 equivalent full-time students or 12 part-time students at any point in time.

FIT campuses should consider whether each Honours student should also be assigned a
suitable co-supervisor, to provide additional advice and support during the program. Where they are appointed, their specific roles and responsibilities should be identified to both students and staff. For example, co-supervisors might be requested to meet with the supervisor and student to discuss the project at an early stage, and might meet with both at regular intervals during the year.

5.12. Allocation of projects and supervisors to students

The process by which students are allocated to projects and supervisors should be made clear to all applicants through a faculty and/or campus website or in printed form. The approaches may vary across campuses depending on their resources. Students would be normally required to indicate preferences for a particular project/supervisor. The projects are then allocated on the basis of the students’ preferences, students’ marks, resources and academic staffing required to carry out the projects successfully by the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator.

6. Enrolment administration

6.1. Admission and enrolment

The Faculty of Information Technology office provides support to staff and students in the administration of the Honours course. The faculty has responsibility for:

- Coordinating applications for the Information Technology Honours Programs and providing supporting information on the eligibility of individual applicants for consideration by the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator and Campus Honours Coordinator or Course Coordinator and other staff;
- Processing offers of admission and coordinating the enrolment and re-enrolment processes;
- Recording the award of overall Honours marks and grades for individual candidates.

6.2. Load management and quotas

The Faculty of Information Technology does not impose minimum or maximum intake targets for the Information Technology Honours Program. At any given time Honours enrolments will reflect the eligibility of applicants and will be limited only by the availability of appropriate resources and appropriate academic supervision.

In areas of the Faculty for which the number of applications for entry to the Honours course exceeds the available supervision, the relevant Campus Honours Coordinator or relevant Course Coordinator, in consultation with the Faculty Honours and Minor Thesis Coordinator, may recommend to the Faculty that only a limited number of places be offered to eligible applicants for the Honours course in that area of study. Where this occurs, the quota must be advised to the Campus Academic Programs Support Staff in advance of selection for the Honours course, and admission to the course in that area will be determined on the basis of academic merit (only).
Appendix 1 – Honours/Minor Thesis Grading System

The following is the interpretation of the overall mark of the thesis.

High Distinction (80-100)
There should be no significant weaknesses in the content of the thesis. It must show that the student has an excellent understanding of the topic area and the research method employed. In particular, the critical evaluation of the project and the discussion of the content of the research carried out should demonstrate significant depth of analysis. This grade indicates that the student has the aptitude and research ability to make an excellent candidate for a research degree.

Distinction (70-79)
The thesis should have no significant weaknesses in content. It must show that the student has a good overall understanding of the topic area and the research method, but some minor gaps are acceptable. The critical evaluation of the project and discussion of the content of the research carried out must be satisfactory, but need not show particular depth of insight. This grade indicates that the student has sufficient aptitude and research ability to undertake a research degree.

Credit (60-69)
The thesis should at least cover the areas of content mentioned above, but may be weak in one or more areas. Critical evaluation of the project and discussion of the content of the research carried out may be of poor quality, but a reasonable explanation of the project details themselves should be present (the what, if not the why). This grade indicates that the student probably does not have the aptitude and research ability to undertake a research degree.

Pass (50-59)
The thesis is likely to cover only some of the areas of content mentioned above, and is probably weak in one or more areas. Critical evaluation of the project is unlikely to exist, and the basic explanation of the objectives and conduct of the research is poor. This grade indicates that the student has no aptitude or research ability for undertaking a research degree.

Fail (0-49)
This grade is awarded in the case of non-completing students and in the case of a student who has failed to describe in even the most basic and straightforward manner the nature, objective and form of the research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft Marking Rubric for Literature Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Descriptors - how the assessor will observe as indicators of the level of competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion in the Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction in the justification for the sources and clear description of the expected purpose of the literature review</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sources used are appropriate for the task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage of Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sources used are adequate and relevant to the task.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a clear statement of the aim/s of the literature review, and the aim/s is/are well contextualised according to the scope of the review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The literature review is not self-contained, and the aim/s is/are not fulfilled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td><strong>Descriptors - how the assessor will observe as indicators of the level of competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion in the Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction in the justification for the sources and clear description of the expected purpose of the literature review</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sources used are appropriate for the task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage of Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sources used are adequate and relevant to the task.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a clear statement of the aim/s of the literature review, and the aim/s is/are well contextualised according to the scope of the review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The literature review is not self-contained, and the aim/s is/are not fulfilled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of literature</td>
<td>Student's discussion of the literature acts primarily as a description/summary, rather than a critical evaluation of the sources used.</td>
<td>Students discussion of the literature includes elements of critical evaluation of the sources used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of argument</td>
<td>No distinct student voice detectable. Argument not present or lacking logic.</td>
<td>The student's voice is at times indistinct from those in the sources. The argument lacks a clear line of logic throughout the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of conclusion</td>
<td>No statement regarding the aim/s of the literature review. Aim/s are not contextualised according to the scope of the task.</td>
<td>While a statement is included, it does not respond to the aim/s of the literature review clearly. The aim/s do not correspond entirely with the scope of the task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The style and vocabulary used in the writing are not accurate or articulate, and the writing may consist of poorly structured sentences with frequent grammatical errors. Poor paragraph structure and development (too short or long) and lack of logic detract from the writing; headings, if used, do not clarify the writing. The writing does not have a clear narrative; the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion) may be wholly or partially absent. The document produced has an unclear format, inappropriate for the scope of the task, and technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline are not met.

The style and vocabulary used in the writing is not accurate or articulate most of the time, and the writing, while still able to be followed, may contain some grammatical errors. Paragraphs are not developed, structured and/or linked logically throughout; if applicable, section headings are not used effectively to clarify the writing. The writing has a tenuously logical narrative as a whole, and may include an attempt at the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion). The document produced has some attempt at format, though not entirely appropriate for the scope of the task; the student neglects most of the technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.

The style and vocabulary used in the writing is often not accurate or articulate, while the writing consists in the main of clearly structured sentences with few to no grammatical errors. The writing consists of a set of mostly well composed paragraphs that are in most cases linked logically, and if applicable, section headings are used mostly effectively to clarify the writing. The writing has a logical narrative as a whole, including a reasonably attempt at the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion). The document produced has a readable format appropriate for the scope of the task, and the student respects most of the technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.

The style and vocabulary used in the writing are generally accurate and articulate, and the writing consists of clearly structured sentences without noteworthy grammatical errors. The writing consists of a set of well composed paragraphs that are linked logically, and if applicable, section headings are used accurately to clarify the writing. The writing has a clear and logically formed narrative as a whole, including the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion). The document produced has a clearly readable format appropriate for the scope of the task, and the student respects all the technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.
The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some minor errors.

The student observes most technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.

The student has attempted to undertake citing and referencing, with frequent errors.

The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some errors.

The student observes some technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.

The student has not been addressed.

The student does not attempt to undertake citing and referencing.

The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some errors.

The student observes most technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.
## Draft Marking Rubric for Research Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptors - how the assessor will observe as indicator of the level of competency</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formulation of Research Questions/Aims</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes clearly articulated research questions/aims, and they are presented with some structure.</td>
<td>80%–100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a set of research questions/aims, and they are presented with some structure, but they may be vague.</td>
<td>70%–79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a set of unarticulated questions/aims, but they are not presented with any structure.</td>
<td>60%–69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a set of unarticulated questions/aims, and they are not presented with any structure.</td>
<td>50%–59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a set of unarticulated questions/aims.</td>
<td>0%–49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Used</td>
<td>Review's Structure</td>
<td>Justification of Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate or inappropriate</td>
<td>Implications of the project/the field of study are not well understood.</td>
<td>The project/effectiveness of the project is not well supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear structure and strong narrative</td>
<td>Implications of the project/the field of study are well understood.</td>
<td>The project/effectiveness of the project is well supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicious selection of literature</td>
<td>Perceptive interpretation of sources and clear justification for inclusion in the review</td>
<td>The project/effectiveness of the project is very well supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no description of the research design/methodology/method(s).

There is no alignment presented in the writing between the research questions/aims and the research design/methodology/method(s) used.

There is no descriptions of timeline and administrative requirements.

Research design, methodology and method(s) are described however either too little or too much detail that obscure the focus of the description as a whole. There is also no structure in the description, and the writing resembles a list of tasks.

Research design, methodology and method(s) are inconsistently aligned against the relevant research questions/aims. No justification was made for this alignment.

There are descriptions of timeline and administrative requirements where applicable; they however suffer from lack of clarity.

Research design, methodology and method(s) are described however either too little or too much detail that obscure the focus of the description as a whole. They are also not presented coherently, sequentially, and/or hierarchically to illustrate the structure within the design.

Research design, methodology and method(s) are logically and consistently aligned against the relevant research questions/aims. They however are not justified fully.

There are clear and structured descriptions, discussion and justification of timeline and administrative requirements where applicable.
### Discussion of (expected) outcomes and (potential) contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions/aims</th>
<th>Research design/methodology/method(s)</th>
<th>(Expected) outcomes</th>
<th>Methodology(s))</th>
<th>Description of the (expected) outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no description of the research design/methodology/method(s). There is no alignment presented in the writing between the research questions/aims and the (expected) outcomes. An attempt is made to articulate alignment between (expected) outcomes and research questions/aims, but it is incomplete or seriously flawed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Expected) outcomes are discussed with appropriate level of detail, and are presented coherently to illustrate varying levels of implications and contributions the project offers. (Expected) outcomes are logically and consistently aligned against the relevant research questions/aims.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no alignment between the research questions/aims and the (expected) outcomes. They are also not necessarily presented in the same order as discussed in the project outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The style and vocabulary used in the writing are not accurate or articulate, and the writing may consist of poorly structured sentences with frequent grammatical errors.</td>
<td>The style and vocabulary used in the writing are not accurate or articulate, and the writing may consist of poorly structured sentences with frequent grammatical errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor paragraph structure and development (too short or long) and lack of logic detract from the writing; if applicable, section headings are not used effectively to clarify the writing.</td>
<td>Poor paragraph structure and development (too short or long) and lack of logic detract from the writing; if applicable, section headings are not used effectively to clarify the writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing does not have a clear narrative; the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion) may be wholly or partially absent.</td>
<td>The writing does not have a clear narrative; the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion) may be wholly or partially absent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The document produced has an unclear format, inappropriate for the scope of the task, and technical requirements are not met.</td>
<td>The document produced has an unclear format, inappropriate for the scope of the task, and technical requirements are not met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>Citing and referencing</td>
<td>Revised: July 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student follows the requirements for faculty and/or discipline.</td>
<td>The student has attempted to undertake citing and referencing. Some minor errors.</td>
<td>The student successfully undertook citing and referencing, with some minor errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student follows the requirements for faculty and/or discipline.</td>
<td>The student has attempted to undertake citing and referencing. With frequent errors.</td>
<td>The student successfully undertook citing and referencing, with frequent errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student observes most technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.</td>
<td>The student successfully undertook citing and referencing, with some minor errors.</td>
<td>The student successfully undertook citing and referencing, with some minor errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student follows the requirements for faculty and/or discipline.</td>
<td>The student has attempted to undertake citing and referencing. Some minor errors.</td>
<td>The student successfully undertook citing and referencing, with some minor errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student observes most technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.</td>
<td>The student has attempted to undertake citing and referencing. Some minor errors.</td>
<td>The student successfully undertook citing and referencing, with some minor errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student follows the requirements for faculty and/or discipline.</td>
<td>The student has attempted to undertake citing and referencing. Some minor errors.</td>
<td>The student successfully undertook citing and referencing, with some minor errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student observes most technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline.</td>
<td>The student has attempted to undertake citing and referencing. Some minor errors.</td>
<td>The student successfully undertook citing and referencing, with some minor errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Structure ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Introduction, overview, background, summary, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Aims, expected outcomes, potential contributions, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of slides ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Format, style, figures, readability, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research design ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Appropriate methodology, alignment with aims, timeline, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Language used, visual aids, speech, eye contact, clarity, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Assessment** (circle one):  Poor  Ok  Good  Very Good  Excellent

**Comments/Suggestions:**
### Draft Feedback Sheet

**Student Name:**

**Feedback by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Poor 0-9</th>
<th>Ok 10-12</th>
<th>Good 13-14</th>
<th>Very Good 15-16</th>
<th>Excellent 17-20</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logical Structure ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Introduction, overview, background, summary, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Aims, expected outcomes, potential contributions, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of slides ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Format, style, figures, readability, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research design ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Appropriate methodology, alignment with aims, timeline, etc)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Language used, visual aids, speech, eye contact, clarity, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments/Suggestions:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Descriptors - how the assessor will observe as indicator of the level of competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of research questions/aims</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>HD, PD, C, D, N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulation of research questions/aims</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no statement of research questions/aims</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a set of clearly articulated research questions/aims, and they are presented coherently and hierarchically to illustrate the structure within the statement</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a set of research questions/aims, but not coherently and hierarchically presented to illustrate the structure within the statement</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing includes a set of research questions/aims, however the statement may also be either vague, or include too much details that obscure the focus of the statement</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no statement of research questions/aims. The statement is either vague, or include too much details that obscure the focus of the statement</td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Word limit for 18pt theses is 9,000-18,000 words. Word limit for 24pt theses is 12,000-24,000 words.

Thesis Type: 18pts / 24 pts

Draft Marking Rubric for Theses
There is no review of the literature as background of the proposed project.

The sources used are inadequate or inappropriate;
review does not show clear understanding or justification of sources for inclusion in the review.

The review does not have a clear structure, and it does not necessarily lead logically to the problem/gap in research that necessitates the proposed project.

The sources used may be somewhat inadequate or inappropriate; review does not always show clear understanding or justification of sources for inclusion in the review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Time and Administrative description of</th>
<th>Research design, methodology and methods used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no description.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no description of the research design, methodology and methods used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no alignment presented in the writing between the research questions/aims and the research design/methodology/methods used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no description of timeline and administrative requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research design, methodology and methods are described however either too little or too much detail that obscure the focus of the description as a whole. There is also no structure in the description, and the writing resembles a list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research design, methodology and methods are inconsistently aligned against the relevant research questions/aims. They are also not justified fully. There are structured descriptions of timeline and administrative requirements where applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research design, methodology and methods are described with appropriate level of detail, and are presented coherently, sequentially, and hierarchically to illustrate the structure within the design. Research design, methodology and methods are logically and consistently aligned against the relevant research questions/aims, and they are justified in light of this alignment. There are clear and structured descriptions, discussion and justification of timeline and administrative requirements where applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of hypotheses and the hypotheses are well-researched.</td>
<td>Evidence of hypotheses and the hypotheses are well-researched.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly and develop</td>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly and develop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient methods for research.</td>
<td>efficient methods for research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main hypotheses are weak.</td>
<td>The main hypotheses are weak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation is weak.</td>
<td>Argumentation is weak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relied on close control of the project by supervisors.</td>
<td>Relied on close control of the project by supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td>Limited evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td>Played a major role in project development, demonstrating a strong understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Candidate showed a good degree of autonomy, while seeking advice when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td>Good use of advice and resources from supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td>Evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td>Result might be flawed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td>Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td>Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not fully justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td>Interpretation is sensible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an ability to think clearly about relevant hypotheses and the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Seriously Flawed and Incomplete.**

The candidate failed to understand or properly apply research methods. Failure to accept or follow guidance from supervisors. Software aspects of the project were handled poorly or ignored. Experimentation seriously flawed. Interpretation shows clear errors. Important hypotheses are omitted or their treatment badly flawed. Argumentation is poor.

More than usual help from supervisors required to complete the project. Some knowledge of research methods, but mistakes or misinterpretations may flaw the final outcome. Software aspects of the project were handled poorly or glossed over. Experimental design and execution incomplete or otherwise flawed. Interpretation shows clear errors. Some important hypotheses are omitted or their treatment badly flawed. Argumentation is weak.

Relied on close control of the project by supervisors. Limited evidence of creative input with a basic understanding of research methods. Result might be marred by some errors and oversights. Completed enough software design and development to formally conclude the project; review and testing may be deficient. Acceptable selection of experiments and statistical tests, although other approaches may have been preferable. Interpretation is questionable. The main hypotheses are identified, and relevant arguments brought to bear, although they may be flawed.

Good use of advice and resources from supervisors, resulting in a well-designed and conducted program and evidence of understanding of algorithms, software design principles and code development practices. Demonstrates some understanding of research methods, including research design and execution. Mistakes in research plan or execution were dealt with under supervision. Demonstrates some understanding of algorithms, software design principles and code development practices. Good choice of experiments and statistical tests, although perhaps not completely supported by evidence from experimentation. Some important hypotheses are omitted or their treatment badly flawed. Argumentation is weak.
original thought and critical reasoning in dealing with hypotheses, including opposing points of view. Main arguments are relevant and coherent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no description of the research design/methodology/method(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no alignment presented in the writing between the research questions/aims and the (expected) outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Expected) outcomes of the project are discussed however with too little or too much detail that obscure the focus of the argument. They are also presented inconsistently aligned against the relevant research questions/aims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Expected) outcomes are presented coherently, to illustrate varying levels of implications and contributions the project offers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is not articulated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is implicit correlation between the descriptions of the (expected) outcomes and the relevant research questions/aims, but this is not articulated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Expected) outcomes of the project are discussed with appropriate level of detail, and are presented coherently to illustrate varying levels of implications and contributions the project offers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Expected) outcomes are logically and consistently aligned against the relevant research questions/aims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no description of the project or the research design/methodology/method(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The style and vocabulary used in the writing are not accurate or articulate, and the writing may consist of poorly structured sentences with frequent grammatical errors.

Poor paragraph structure and development (too short or long) and lack of logic detract from the writing; headings, if used, do not clarify the writing.

The writing does not have a clear narrative; the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion) may be wholly or partially absent.

The document produced has an unclear format, inappropriate for the scope of the task, and technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline have not been addressed.

The student does not attempt to undertake citing and referencing.

The style and vocabulary used in the writing is not accurate or articulate most of the time, and the writing, while still able to be followed, may contain some grammatical errors.

Paragraphs are not developed, structured and/or linked logically throughout; if applicable, section headings are not used effectively to clarify the writing.

The writing has a tenuously logical narrative as a whole, and may include an attempt at the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion).

The document produced has some attempt at format, though not entirely appropriate for the scope of the task; the student neglects most technical requirements.

The style and vocabulary used in the writing is often not accurate or articulate, while the writing consists in the main of clearly structured sentences with few to no grammatical errors.

The writing consists of a set of mostly well composed paragraphs that are linked logically throughout; if applicable, section headings are used mostly effectively to clarify the writing.

The writing has a logical narrative as a whole, including a reasonable attempt at the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion).

The document produced has a readable format appropriate for the scope of the task, and the student observes most technical requirements.

The style and vocabulary used in the writing are generally accurate and articulate, and the writing consists of clearly structured sentences without noteworthy grammatical errors.

The writing consists of a set of well composed paragraphs that are linked logically, and if applicable, section headings are used effectively and accurately to clarify the writing.

The writing has a clear and logically formed narrative as a whole, expertly including the expected structural elements (e.g. intro, conclusion).

The document produced has a clearly readable format appropriate for the scope of the task, and the student observes most technical requirements.
| The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing. | The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some minor errors. | Some errors. The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing. | The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some minor errors. | The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some minor errors. | The student does not follow the requirements for citing and referencing. | The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some minor errors. | The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some minor errors. |
Appendix 3 – Honours/Minor Thesis Sample Templates

Monash University
Faculty of Information Technology
Honours/Minor Thesis
Sample Research Proposal Structure

The research proposal should answer the following questions:

- What research will be conducted?
- How the research will be conducted?
- Why the proposed strategy has been chosen?

The research proposal should include the following sections:

1. Title Page (refer Title Page Template)
2. Table of Contents
3. An Introduction
   This section presents an overview of your proposed area of study, states the problem being studied, the aims and significance of your project. Note that this should include why, and to whom, this project is of interest, in a form that can be understood by non-experts in the area of study.
4. Research Context/Background
   This section sets the project in the context of previous studies including the most recent work.
5. Research Design (Plan and Methods)
   - Methodologies
   - Proposed thesis chapter headings
   - Timetable
   - Potential difficulties
   - Special facilities required
6. Deliverables/Outcomes
7. Bibliography/References

Honours/Minor Thesis Proposal - Title Page Template

Research Proposal
[working title]

Student ID:
Name:
Course:
Date:
Supervisor:
The literature review should answer the following:

- What is the range of research conducted in the research area?
- What does the existing research tell us?
- What is the gap in the existing research that motivates the research project?

The literature review should include the following sections:

1. Title Page (refer Title Page Template)
2. Table of Contents
3. Abstract of 100-200 words length
4. A number of sections and subsections of main text
5. Bibliography/References

Honours/Minor Thesis Literature Review - Title Page Template

**Literature Review**

[Working Title]

Student ID:

Name:

Course:

Date:

Supervisor:
1. Introduction

The honours/minor thesis is intended to provide research training to students and the opportunity for them to qualify for higher research degree entry (e.g. PhD). Students undertake this thesis as a supervised research project that involves:

- Conducting a thorough review of current research specific to a domain in IT;
- Analysing and critiquing existing solutions and identifying questions that need to be addressed to further the state-of-the-art;
- Proposing novel and creative solutions to address specific questions and issues; and
- Conducting an objective evaluation of their research using well established strategies and techniques within their discipline.

The thesis should contain the following:

- Title
- Abstract
- Declaration of originality
- Acknowledgements (optional)
- Table of contents
- List of tables and figures if relevant
- Bibliography
- Appendices as necessary

The thesis should include the following:

- Introduction
- Literature review chapter(s)
- Contribution chapter(s)
- Discussion/Evaluation chapter
- Conclusion
Appendix 4 – Relevant university policies and procedures

University legislation, policies and procedures

• Honours Year Program Policy and Procedures
• Statute 6.1.5 Assessment
• Assessment Regulations
• Assessment in Coursework Program Policy
• Unit Assessment Procedure
• Grading Scale Policy and Procedures
• Special Consideration Policy and Procedures
• Plagiarism Policy and Procedures
• Monash Graduate Attributes Policy
• Credit Policy and Procedures
• Course structure policy

Faculty legislation, policies and procedures

• Faculty of Information Technology Regulations