



Higher Degree Progress Report

Candidate Details

Contact details

Name	Kelly Alexandra Roe
Student ID	9753890
Phone	(022) 308 3098
Email	email@kellyroe.org
Address	16 5 Park Road Grafton Auckland, 1023 New Zealand

Enrolment details

Qualification	MPhil - Master of Philosophy
Subject	Master of Philosophy in Philosophy
Faculty	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Current enrolment status	Unspecified
Research stage	Confirmed Enrolment
Visa expiry	
Enrolment start date	01/May/2018
Confirmed enrolment start date	01/May/2018
Official submission date	30/Jun/2019

Funding

University of Waikato Masters Scholarship	Complete
Ailsa M. Snow Prize in Philosophy	Complete

Thesis Details

Thesis title	Disbilty and Equity in Medicine and Public Health
---------------------	---

SGR Chief Supervisor	Justine Kingsbury
SGR Supervisor	Joe Ulatowski
SGR Supervisor	Nick Munn
Extensions	None
Suspensions	None

Student-Candidate Evaluation

Submitted on 01/Oct/2018

Completed? Yes

If this is your first progress report, please go to the next question. Progress Update - With reference to the previous page, have your stated goals been met? Please indicate how the plan has been fulfilled and outline any difficulties that may have affected your progress.

Are you on track to meet your official submission date?

Yes

Self Evaluation Question 1 - Progress over last six months

Meets my expectations

Self Evaluation Question 2 - Overall quality of work

Meets my expectations

Self Evaluation Question 3 - Effort put into study

Meets my expectations

Self Evaluation Question 4 - Please explain why you have selected that self evaluation:

I feel concerned about my answer to the above questions. I have been working very hard / thinking very hard on my project and have not at all been taking it easy or viewing it as an easy option. That being said, workflow does feel different from workflow in undergraduate sciences and I don't know how one would compare.

I hope that my work will be judged by others to be good enough. I worry that if I say I think it is good enough others will think I am arrogant, but if I say I worry it isn't good enough others will agree from agreeability.

I am expected to be in the position to defend the work I have done, and so I choose to believe that my work meets my expectations of being good enough. But, of course, I am nervous about how it will be received by others.

Self Evaluation Question 5 - Since your last report, have you had any major changes to your thesis research that will impact on your ethical approval?

No

Self Evaluation Question 6 - Do you have any concerns with your English language skills?

No

Self Evaluation Question 7 - Have you been domiciled in NZ in the last six months?

Yes

Projected goals - Give an outline of your plan/goals for the next six months. Indicate any difficulties that may affect your progress. If your progress over the past six months has been impaired, outline the specific steps you will take to address this.

I have submitted a softbound draft to the SGR on September 14, in accordance with my timeline.

I was given the opportunity to keep working on that draft and get a better version sent out to external examiners. I have developed that revised version which currently sits with my supervisor.

I will submit a version of this on October 4 to the SGR to be sent to externals.

In hindsight I wish I had have got this current draft to my supervisor at least 2 and ideally more like 7 days earlier than I did to allow more space for comments / critique.

Other research activities and teaching - We are interested in any other avenues you may have explored in disseminating your research. Please indicate whether you have done any of the following in the last six months: -Given a departmental seminar -Attended any conferences -Presented any papers -Had any papers accepted/submitted for publication -Teaching -Tutoring -Other

None.

Please provide details

I applied for funding to do various things. I applied for a DHB scholarship which would have required me to present a seminar to them, and I would have used a portion for transport into the region and presented that to the department prior to presenting to the DHB. I did not get that scholarship, however. I also applied for a FASS scholarship which I intended to use to get me transport into the region, again, so I could present a seminar to the philosophy department. I didn't obtain this scholarship either, however. I applied for a women's scholarship - but it turned out I wasn't eligible for that. I couldn't see any other sources of funding from the Waikato Scholarships website, but I did check in for sources of funding from there, periodically. To the best of my knowledge I received no scholarships for this project. I see, however, that currently my Higher degree progress report lists 'University of Waikato Masters Scholarship' and 'Ailsa M. Snow Prize in Philosophy' as sources of funding for this project. This is the first I have heard about any of that, however, and none of that was applied for by me. (Though I received a Master's scholarship for my previous (first) Master's project on delusions. I did not apply for teaching / tutoring work. Honestly, I did not look further afield for more sources of funding. My intention of doing this project was to complete no less than 120 points by December 7 so as to be eligible to be selected for interview to Medicine with Auckland for 2019 intake. The University of Auckland stated that this was what was required of me. This focus of getting my project handed in to allow for the possibility of a good outcome from the standard 3 month external examination process has meant that I have had to forsake some of the pleasanter aspects of philosophy / the arts. Honestly, if I had have been required to have done any of that then I wouldn't have been able to hand in work of the quality I did in the time I took to do it, however. I was upfront about my intention from the very start. I am grateful that I did not receive sources of funding that placed extra requirements on me with respect to presentations (particularly the DHB one where I would have needed to learn how to talk to economists - which is far from trivial). I am presently working through some Kahn Academy AP courses on Economics (now I have some time to do that). But I couldn't have squashed it in earlier. Previously I received funding from the ANU to work on a project in philosophy and they were generous with me (and the Australian Government was generous with me) for conference funding, and the like. I didn't feel like my project had much of anything valuable to say, then, however. I think this one is more... Useful. Not as technically polished, of course, but I was more concerned to sort out ideas. I hope to build on these ideas from the perspective / vantage point of becoming / being a Medical Doctor. There is concern that you have to commit atrocities if required to, otherwise you don't get to be a Medical Doctor. That really needs not to be the case. I've made my end clear, I hope.

Chief Supervisor

Supervisor: Justine Kingsbury

Submitted on 10/Oct/2018

Completed? Yes

**If this is the candidate's first progress report, please go to the next question.
Progress Update Question -. With reference to the candidate's plan for the previous six months, please comment on how the plan has been fulfilled.**

Kelly has submitted her thesis ahead of time. I think the quality of the thesis would have been considerably higher if she had taken more time over it: however, the submitted version is a substantial improvement on her earlier draft.

Supervisor Evaluation Question 1. Please rate the progress over the last six months

Meets my expectations

Supervisor Evaluation Question 2. Please rate the overall quality of candidate's work

Below my expectations

Supervisor Evaluation Question 3. Please rate the effort the candidate has put into study

Exceeds my expectations

Supervisor Evaluation Question 4. Overall evaluation

Meets my expectations

Supervisor Evaluation (In reference to the candidate's projected goals as shown in the previous page) - Your comments on these goals.

The thesis has been submitted - there are no further goals.

Supervisor Evaluation further information - Please provide any further information that may impact on the candidate's progress.

The quality of the thesis is well below what could have been achieved if more time had been allowed for revising in response to supervisor feedback.

Is the candidate on track to meet their official submission deadline?

Yes

Supervisor's Progress Report

Supervisor: Joe Ulatowski

Submitted on 10/Oct/2018

Completed? Yes

Supervisor progress update 1 - Please comment on the candidate's progress so far

Kelly's progressing toward the completion of an MPhil.

Supervisor's Progress Report

Supervisor: Nick Munn

Submitted on 11/Oct/2018

Completed? Yes

Supervisor progress update 1 - Please comment on the candidate's progress so far

She has submitted (without allowing her supervision team sufficient opportunity to comment, nor responding adequately to the comments we did make)

Student Acknowledgement

Submitted on 18/Oct/2018

Completed? Yes

Candidate acknowledgement comments 1. Any further comments from candidate

When I approached my supervisor in February about this project I was very clear that it was done with the intention of providing the University of Auckland with evidence of completion by December 7.

Before I signed acceptance of offer (which required me to throw away all work done during the months of March and April) I checked with the SGR about when I would realistically need to submit to the SGR to be likely to have evidence of completion by December 7. Professor Kay Weaver said (acting in her capacity as Dean) that 3 months was standard. Since the Dean is the person who makes the final decision on whether I have done enough to complete this program of study or not, I took the Dean's word to be authoritative. As such, my submission deadline was (4 weeks prior) September 14. The goal was to get the best work I could to the SGR on time. I did a timeline showing how I could distribute 120 points of study, 1200 hours over a compressed timeframe by basically shutting myself away from the world and doing very

little other than working on my thesis this year. This is what I have done this year. It is not reasonable to expect candidates to do this, perhaps... It is what I have done in order to be able to submit this to my timeline, however. I don't understand how my supervisor or my supervisory panel can claim to not understand all this.

It is simply false that I submitted 'ahead of time'. I submitted my thesis on schedule. When the Dean offered me revise and resubmit I did a new timeline (which I may have actually forgotten to attach) and I resubmitted my thesis to the SGR again, on schedule. If my supervisor or supervisory panel wanted me to get them the revised draft more than 3 days in advance (in accordance with my schedule) they should have spoken up when I sent them my timeline. I wish they had have spoken up about my timeline earlier in the process. If they had have said 'hey – I'm going to need 2 weeks with this' or whatever, then I would have done a new timeline and factored in earlier deadlines so I could get work to them. If they had have said 'hey – we need to factor in a couple rounds back and forth' then I could have tried to factor that into my timeline. They didn't say any of this about my timeline in time for me to factor any of this into my timeline, however. As such, I've simply been doing the best I could to get the work in on time the way I did as an undergraduate. Thinking back to posting in the the FASS box before the deadline. I didn't run drafts by people I just did the best I could and then they graded what arrived in their post-box. Time stamped: Not late.

In response to the claim that quality is below my supervisors expectations I think we need to ask whether or not my supervisors expectations are reasonable. This is, after all, a 120 point paper. I do not deny that it could be improved on if I took more time with it. One would be hard pressed to find any article or book that could not be improved on if the writer / editors had not taken more time with it, however. At the end of the day this is a 120 point paper that does not credit for more than a first Master's Thesis or an honours year and the quality of the work needs to be compared to MPhil candidates who completed in and / or under time and not candidates who allowed their project to run over.

With respect to my panel's opportunity to provide input (which was less than my supervisor): I sent a full first draft to all panelists on August 28 (Chapters 1-5). A tidier version of Chapter 3 on September 7. A tidier version of Chapter 4/5 on September 9. I received comments from him on Chapter 1 on September 10 (12:20). I responded to all comments on Chapter 1 (and edited for typos) and sent out updated versions of Chapters 2. and 3 (19:22). On September 11 I sent out a revised chapter 4. I believe I addressed all of Nick Munn's comments. I either accepted his suggestions and made changes, found a reference, rephrased, or explained better. If there was a time or two that I ignored what he said it was an executive decision that I am happy to defend. This is my response to all panellists (and my supervisor). I did my best to do everything they told me to do. I apologise that I did not get them work earlier. I did my best to get them

early work that was not complete rubbish. I was working to the limits of my capacity to get them the quality work I did in the time I had, however.

In response to Nick – I believe I have responded adequately to all comments he made on my thesis. In most cases I accepted the change / added a reference where requested / explained more to the best of my ability. There were a few occasions where I made an executive decision to not alter things – but I believe I can explain why I made that decision (and the answer is never ‘I didn’t have time’).

Candidate acknowledgement 2. I have read my chief supervisor's report

Yes

Chair - Head of School

Supervisor: Bruce Curtis

Submitted on 23/Oct/2018

Completed? Yes

Chairperson comments 1. Any comments from Chairperson:

I note that there has been extensive discussion about the submission of this thesis. Further, the university cannot guarantee the length of time associated with the examination process.

Chairperson comments 2. Any issues for resolution from Chairperson:

see above

Postgraduate Representative

Supervisor: Ann Hardy

Submitted on 25/Oct/2018

Completed? Yes

Dean's nominee comments 1. Are comments consistent?

Yes

Dean's nominee comments 2. Does this evaluation indicate satisfactory progress

Yes

Dean's nominee comments 3. Please comment on the progress to date and any concerns raised (ie: if progress has not been satisfactory).

All the comments from both the candidate and supervisors indicate that the process of writing and submitting this MPhil has neither been smooth nor entirely satisfactory in terms of the quality of work submitted. Nevertheless, as stated, the candidate had a strong utilitarian goal for undertaking the project and the goal has been achieved to the extent that the project has been submitted and the result of the exam process is awaited.