

**Complaint of the Arrangement of Supervision and Training  
and  
Appeal for Resubmission and Transfer to Other Department**

**Submitted by Mr. Tongi Lee**

**1. Grounds for appealing**

- (a) The report of upgrading panel failed to point out their concern on the sociological contribution in first round, and did not upgrade the candidate with same concern in second round.
- (b) The upgrading panel did not ask the candidate to revise and resubmit a chapter of literature review and methodology, hence the judgement on the sociological contribution was based on partial written material. Particularly, the research methods in the first round (the willingness-to-pay method and cost-benefit analysis framework) have been revised, which was not presented in the second round.
- (c) There was no input from an architectural historian in the supervision, which is essential to the research, given the candidate's background is an architect, the emphasis of the Programme, and the value he intends to contribute in heritage.

**2. Objectives of Complaint and Appeal**

The ultimate objectives are to gain an appropriate supervision, a further chance to restructure the thesis, transfer to a department that accepts architectural/ planning contribution and re-present to the upgrading panel.

- (a) The candidate requires a formal arrangement of external supervisory adviser with expertise of historic architecture and restoration.
- (b) The candidate recognises that assessment of his project with sociological contribution is unfair to him. With the external support, his thesis will have greater chance to be accepted as a doctoral project in other examiners/ departments who recognise his contribution in the discipline of heritage restoration and regeneration. Hence he seeks support to relocate him to another department.

**3. Evidence of improper panel assessment**

Item 1: (the first attempt) upgrading note on 6 December 2005

Item 2: (the second attempt) upgrading report on 26 October 2006

Item 3: Message from Dr. Fran Thomas on 11 October 2006

Item 4: Letter from Prof. Rice on 30 November 2004

(a) The panel did not ask a revision of sociological contribution, and it is recommended that the project is to contribute to the “issues of measurements and evaluation of benefits in relation to key stakeholders”. Surprisingly, the panel considered such contribution is not sociological significant.

Part 4 in item 1: Sociology contribution

Tongi asserted that the sociological contribution made by the study concerned the links between the restored building and its neighbourhood, understood in terms of larger debates concerning the social impact of heritage restoration.”

Recommendation in item 1:

“They asked him to re-submit the material within 6 months, revised along with following lines:...2. Chapter which...(ii) outlines issues of measurements and evaluation of benefits in relation to key stakeholders...”

Line 14 in item 2:

“...Tongi had not satisfied them in relation to Parts 4 and 5 of the report on the initial submission- in relation to the sociological contribution of the proposed thesis (Part 4),...”

(b) The panel did not provide a concrete reason that the project will not “make an original contribution to the scholarly literature”. The assessment is based on partial submission as the panel did not ask re-submission of literature review and methodology chapter.

Line 23 in item 2:

“In such a way that it might pass a doctoral examination- i.e. that it could be adjudged to make an original contribution to the scholarly literature; and be written to a publishable standard.

Item 3:

“The issue of making an original contribution to the scholarly literature, which is one of the criteria according to which doctoral theses are assessed, does not refer only to theoretical literature, but to research literature (i.e. the body of scholarly research work) more generally. Your approach to theoretical, policy and other relevant literature was considered in the first assessment, and the panel did not ask for revision of, or additions to, this part of the work.”

(c) The panel took time-frame into consideration which is partly attributed to the disruption of the supervisory arrangement.

Line 21 in item 2:

“The panel could not confidently assess, based on the original and revised submission, that the work could be developed within a realistic time-frame...”

Item 4: Apology for disruption of supervision from MPhil/PhD Director

#### **4. Evidence of improper structure of supervision**

(a) The methodology of impact model (using willingness-to-pay etc) was accepted in Aims and Methods examination (Dec 2004), which framed the fieldwork. The

panel disagreed with the willingness-to-pay method in the first round. The fundamental problem was not unforeseeable if the supervision could clarify it at earlier stage.

- (b) Given the candidate's background is architecture and architectural discussion is the core connection socio-economic impacts of heritage. He did not have supervisor with architectural background since Ms. Christine First left 2 years ago. He asked Prof. Tilehurst if he could send a paper for comment, Prof. Tilehurst decided not to intervene.

#### **5. Sociological trainings/ courses for non-sociology background student**

- (a) I joined the Programme in October 2002 and completed four courses (half unit each) and got merit (65 each). They were EC436, EC437, GY405, and SA 434. None of them were taught in the Sociology Department. I was told I need not change my topic and methodology in my second year when the programme became a part of Sociology family. I worried about my capacity for sociological analysis. Although I familiar with qualitative analysis with resources in Methodology Institute and become course teachers for using Nudist software, data analysis is only part of the formation of arguments. I applied for the Qualitative Analysis courses taught by Prof. Richard Smithies, but I was not selected.
- (b) I have passed the requirement in my first two years (4 courses in merit in the first year, and Aims and Methods paper in the second year). These courses and assessments do not help me to gain sufficient knowledge and skills to ground my sociological argument. The PhD seminar is good resource for people from non-sociology background student, but it was unable to help my thesis after the "impact model" was set, and I was advised to concentrate the findings on social and economic impact instead of high-level or abstract social theory.

[End of Complaint/ Appeal]