



Graduate Studies Committee Agenda

Committee Secretary: Megan Kemmis

Secretariat, Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3306; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: gradstudies@academicboard.usyd.edu.au

Web site: http://www.usyd.edu.au/ab/committees/grad_studies/index.shtml

Notice of Meeting

A meeting of the **Graduate Studies Committee** will be held at **2.00pm** on **Wednesday 26 March 2008** in the Western Tower Room. (Room S 495, first floor of the Western Tower area of the Quadrangle Building on the Camperdown Campus, opposite the Clock Tower.)

Members who are unable to attend are asked to notify Megan Kemmis at the above address. Enquiries concerning this meeting may also be directed to Ms Kemmis.

Megan Kemmis

for

Dr W Adams

Registrar

19 March 2008

Agenda

Pages

1. Apologies

Apologies have been received from: Associate Professor P Dunbar-Hall and Ms J Gamble (Dr M Jones will attend in her stead).

2. Minutes of previous meeting

pages 4-10

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 February 2008 as a true record.

3. Business arising from Minutes (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)

4. Report of the Chair

4.1 Oral report

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair.

5. Report of the Academic Board page 11

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting of 27 February 2008, as set out in the report presented.

6. Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses pages 12-13

6.1 Faculty of Economics and Business

- (1) **Executive Master of Business Administration and Graduate Certificate in Business Administration** page 12, separate attachment

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) *approve the proposal from the Faculty of Economics and Business to introduce the Executive Master of Business Administration and Graduate Certificate in Business Administration,*
 - (2) *recommend that Senate:*
 - (a) *endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal;*
 - (b) *approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate relating to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Economics and Business; and*
 - (c) *approve the introduction of Resolutions of Senate relating to the courses; and*
 - (3) *approve the faculty requirements relating to the courses;; with effect from 1 January 2009, as set out in the report presented.*
- (2) **Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS) and Graduate Certificate in Management** pages 12-13, separate attachment

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) *approve the proposal from the Faculty of Economics and Business to introduce the Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS) and Graduate Certificate in Management*
- (2) *recommend that Senate:*
 - (a) *endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal;*
 - (b) *approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate relating to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Economics and Business; and*
 - (c) *approve the introduction of Resolutions of Senate relating to the courses; and*
- (3) *approve the faculty requirements relating to the courses; with effect from 1 January 2009, as set out in the report presented.*

7. Report from Faculties pages 14-16

7.1 Faculty of Law: Master of Administrative Law and Policy and Master of International Law

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend the Academic Board:

- (1) *approve the minor amendment to the Faculty Resolutions for the Master of Administrative Law and Policy; and*
- (2) *note the report from the Faculty of Law regarding the introduction and amendment of units of study in the Master of International Law as set out in the report presented.*

8. Academic Board Resolutions: Student appeals against academic decisions *pages 17-29*

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amended Academic Board Resolutions relating to student appeals against academic decisions, as set out in the report presented.

9. General business

10. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, 14 May 2008.

Agenda Item 2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Minutes of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 13 February 2008

There were present: The Chair (Associate Professor P McCallum) presiding, Professors M Behnia, G Murray and J Thistlethwaite, Associate Professors B Buckley and J Shields, Drs S Cumming and L Hossain, and Mr J Clegg and Mr C Riley. Dr P Frow and Ms M Kemmis were in attendance.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from: Professors L Burns, B Sutton and J Trehwella, Associate Professors D Dragovich and P Dunbar-Hall, Dr R Walker and Ms J Gamble (Dr S Cumming attended in her place).

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

Resolution 01/08

The Graduate Studies Committee adopted the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 November 2007, as a true record.

3. Business arising from Minutes (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)

The Chair reminded members that, at the Committee's last meeting, Ms Margaret O'Byrne had provided advice on recent changes to the ESOS (Education Services to Overseas Students) Act and the Skilled Migration Program. She had suggested that the Student Centre could provide advice related to the number of international students attending the University as part of the Skilled Migration Program. The Centre has provided figures for 2007, showing that 613 students applied for written confirmation of their University attendance, of which 327 (which is roughly 10% of the total international student population at the University) applied for such confirmation on completion of their course. The Chair undertook to circulate the information from the Student Centre.

4. Report of the Chair

4.1 Postgraduate Coursework Review

The Chair reminded members that an interim report on the Postgraduate Coursework Review had come to the Committee's last meeting. He advised that some small revisions had been made to the document and that the revised report would be circulated to faculties soon. Faculties would be asked to comment on the implications of implementing the recommendations of the report.

The report's main recommendations are aimed at introducing a consistent model for postgraduate coursework masters degrees at the University. The model included a capstone experience, capacity for students to pursue a research path (to increase the flow of students from postgraduate coursework to postgraduate research) and the ability to include professional and international experiences into the course.

The Chair noted that the Postgraduate Coursework Review was occurring in tandem with reviews of generic graduate attributes and undergraduate coursework. Discussions were also occurring regarding the role of honours as a research training pathway, and the Chair advised that there was strong support for retaining honours, rather than switching exclusively to a Bologna/University of Melbourne model of "3+2+3" (three years of undergraduate study, a two-year masters then a three-year PhD). However,

discussion was focussing on a model based on flexible pathways and entry and exit points, with a view to strengthening the Master's pathway as an alternative research training track.

The higher education sector was facing a period of rapid change, and Australian universities may decide it is in their interests to align with the Bologna or US models. The Postgraduate Coursework Review proposed retaining the University's current multi-stranded approach while providing agility for the University to move as and when the need for alignment with an overseas model occurred. The University would also retain the undergraduate honours degree, but encourage the use of masters by coursework as an alternative pathway to research training.

Members expressed support for the use of the masters by coursework as a pathway to research training. Dr Hossain noted that that Faculty of Engineering and IT had assessed the quality of research students entering via the Master of Information Technology (a coursework degree) with those entering via undergraduate honours. The overall quality of the coursework masters students was good, with many of the best research students coming from this group. The Chair indicated that awarding masters by coursework with honours should also be reviewed.

Resolution 02/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the Chair's report on the Postgraduate Coursework review.

4.2 English Language Competencies Working Party

The Chair advised members that a report was being finalised and would be circulated shortly. He noted that there had been a discussion prior to the meeting on the issue of setting English language requirements for local students admitted on the basis of overseas qualifications taught in a language other than English.

Resolution 03/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the Chair's report on the English Language Competencies Working Party.

4.3 Oral report

The Chair advised members that he had nothing further to report.

Resolution 04/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Chair.

5. Report of the Academic Board

The Chair noted that the report in the agenda was self-explanatory and commended it to members for noting.

Resolution 05/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting of 12 December 2007, as set out in the report presented.

6. Degrees with Merit

The Chair advised members that the issue of awarding degrees with merit had been investigated by the Undergraduate Studies Committee, and that the report included with the agenda had been presented to the Academic Board in late 2007. He noted that the *University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000 (as amended)* outlined the classes of award that could be offered for different levels of courses (see Clause 20 of the Rule), with graduate certificates and graduate diplomas to be awarded the

grade of pass only, bachelors degrees to be awarded as either pass or honours and masters degrees to be awarded as pass, pass with merit or honours.

The paper on awarding degrees with merit had been developed following the most recent review of honours, and the re-affirmation of honours as a research pathway. The revised Academic Board policy on awarding degrees with honours effectively prevented the use of honours to recognise coursework achievement, and it was intended that the awarding of degrees with merit would fill this gap. The paper recommended that degrees be awarded with merit based on a set WAM, with no more than 10% of a cohort receiving their degrees with merit. It also recommended adopting the honours Latin nomenclature "*Magna cum Laude*". Faculties had been asked to comment on the adoption of the paper's recommendations for undergraduate degrees, and the Chair suggested that the Committee consider whether or not the recommendations should also be adopted for postgraduate coursework.

Members raised the following points in discussion:

- US universities used the Latin honours nomenclature for undergraduate degrees, but not for masters degrees, viewing masters as being of a high standard in their own right; the adoption of the Latin nomenclature for postgraduate coursework could confuse international students and make benchmarking more difficult;
- members expressed concern at the use of a cohort percentage for the awarding of degrees with merit, arguing that any student who met the marking criteria should receive the award;
- the Dean of Graduate Studies argued that there was sufficient information on student transcripts to indicate how well a student had performed; he also pointed out that elite overseas universities did not rank masters degrees; and
- the President of SUPRA advised that SUPRA was more concerned with ensuring that the research components of coursework degrees were properly recognised, and that there was a clear distinction between those masters by coursework degrees containing a significant research element, and the professional masters with little or no research content.

The Chair undertook to look at how this issue was dealt with by overseas universities and to bring further information back to the Committee.

Resolution 06/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the White Paper on the Award of Degrees with Merit, as set out in the report presented.

7. Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

7.1 Faculty of Dentistry: Doctor of Clinical Dentistry, Master of Dental Science, Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Dentistry

The Chair noted that the proposed Doctor of Clinical Dentistry would be the University's second coursework doctorate (the other being the Doctor of Clinical Psychology), and invited Professor Murray to outline the proposal. Professor Murray explained that the Faculty wished to overhaul its postgraduate coursework degrees, in particular the Master of Dental Science which provides accreditation for students wanting to become orthodontists, periodontists and other dental specialists. The proposal before the Committee would delete the Master of Dental Science and introduce the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry in its place, noting that the doctorate was essentially a restructured version of the old Masters degree. The proposed doctorate would also align the Faculty with other dental faculties across Australia, and was supported by the relevant professional body. The proposal also included amendments to the existing Graduate Certificate and

Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry, which would amend both courses to become exit points for the doctorate.

Members raised the following points in discussion:

- there was some discussion as to whether or not the articulated courses should include a masters-level exit point at the end of the second year, although some members expressed concern that introducing a masters at that point could damage the reputation of the old Master of Dental Science; Professor Murray also stated that it would be highly unlikely that a student would want to exit at the end of the second year;
- members noted that it would be possible for students to articulate from the Graduate Certificate to the Graduate Diploma and then to the doctorate, and it was suggested that this be clarified in the resolutions;
- members discussed the structure of the units of study, noting that there was no obvious grouping of foundational units followed by more advanced units; members were advised that there had been a lot of work undertaken by the Faculty to transform the existing course into a coherent suite of units, and that the existing structure was very much driven by the Faculty's specific teaching model;
- it was noted that there were no Commonwealth-supported places for students in the new degree, and it was recommended that the Faculty seek advice on whether such places could be allocated to the course;
- Mr Clegg pointed out that students in the existing Master of Dental Science qualified for Austudy as of 2008, and asked the Faculty to ensure that students in the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry would also be eligible;
- the Chair advised members that the Faculty had advised that part-time admission would be available for the doctorate, and that the Faculty had revised the faculty resolutions relating to examination of the thesis (the revised resolutions would be circulated to members following the meeting); and
- Mr Riley pointed out that the English language requirements for the course should be amended to specify a minimum mark (he suggested 6.5) for each band of the IELTS.

The Committee agreed that the proposal should be reconsidered at the Committee's next meeting. In the interim, the Faculty would be asked to comment on the following matters:

- the possibility of clarifying the unit of study structure;
- the possibility of offering Commonwealth-supported places;
- whether students in the new Doctor of Clinical Dentistry would be eligible for Austudy;
- the IELTS score of 7 should be expanded to include a minimum score in all bands (6.5 was suggested);
- further amendment of the resolutions relating to the examination of the thesis;
- clarifying the articulation up from Graduate Certificate to Graduate Diploma to the doctorate in the resolutions; and
- the possibility of including a Masters exit point at the end of the second year.

7.2 Faculty of Economics and Business: Master of Marketing

Associate Professor Shields advised members that the proposal for the Master of Marketing from the Faculty of Economics and Business was based on the Faculty's 60 credit point model for specialist Masters degrees. The proposed degree would include a substantial capstone research element, and would be aimed at people with seven to eight years industry experience. It would provide an in-depth study experience for students already committed to

working in the industry, and the Faculty was confident that there was a definite market for the course. He introduced Dr Frow, who had developed the proposal. Dr Frow advised members that the proposal included details of the Faculty's research into the viability of the proposed course, and highlighted the extensive consultation undertaken with employers, industry groups and potential students.

The following issues were raised in discussion:

- the Chair pointed out the extensive use of degree-exclusive units of study and queried whether there was any scope for more cross-over with other courses, to which Dr Frow responded that the student profile for the new degree would be very different from students in other degrees; the units of study were also designed to have significant contributions from industry practitioners;
- the Chair also noted that the course costs were likely to be high, using Dr Florian Salzgeber's financial model, but Associate Professor Shields advised that the Faculty was confident that the course would be sustainable;
- a query was raised regarding the differences between graduates of the proposed course and graduates from a standard Master of Business Administration; Dr Frow advised that graduates from the proposed course would already be committed to a career in marketing and would be looking for more in-depth training in this discipline than could be provided by an MBA; and
- members were also advised that, while students could enter the course in either Semester 1 or Semester 2, there was no set order for the units of study, meaning the Faculty did not have to present all units in both semesters.

Members endorsed the proposal for approval by the Academic Board.

Resolution 07/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Economics and Business to introduce the Master of Marketing,
 - (2) recommend that Senate:
 - (a) endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal;
 - (b) approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate relating to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Economics and Business; and
 - (c) approve the introduction of Resolutions of Senate relating to the course; and
 - (3) approve the faculty requirements relating to the degree;
- with effect from 1 January 2009, as set out in the report presented.

7.3 Faculty of Medicine

The Chair suggested considering the three proposals from the Faculty of Medicine as one item, given that all three involved the introduction of on-line units as a mode of delivery such that the courses would be available in fully online mode. He advised members that he was seeking advice from Dr Rob Ellis as to whether or not the Committee should be advising the E-Learning Governance Group of proposals such as these.

The Chair asked Professor Thistlethwaite to comment on the statement in one proposal regarding the increased workload for staff. She advised that this was in relation to Medical Education, where staff numbers had been

reduced, but she advised that the staff involved were confident they could cope with the extra work.

The Chair noted that the Learning and Teaching Committee had commented that the development time for introducing e-learning courses was not always properly resourced in all faculties, adding that the Graduate Studies Committee and the Academic Board expects faculties to properly resource the development of any on-line learning modules. Professor Thistlethwaite advised that the on-line modules would primarily involve peer review and discussion.

The Chair suggested that it would be worthwhile having the Faculty of Medicine report in the future on how the introduction of online delivery had worked for these courses. He also raised the issue of confirming the identity of students using on-line modules, noting that the Faculty of Engineering & IT used video interviews. Professor Thistlethwaite advised that this issue had been discussed by the Faculty.

The Committee approved the proposals, noting that the amendments would be introduced immediately.

7.3.1 Master of Medical Education, Graduate Diploma in Medical Education and Graduate Certificate in Medical Education

Resolution 08/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to introduce a new delivery mode to the Master of Medical Education, Graduate Diploma in Medical Education and Graduate Certificate in Medical Education; and
- (2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal, noting that there are no amendments to the Resolutions of Senate relating to these courses with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out in the report presented.

7.3.2 Master of Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Master of Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Graduate Diploma in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Graduate Diploma of Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology) and Graduate Certificate in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology)

Resolution 09/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to introduce a new delivery mode to the Master of Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Master of Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Graduate Diploma in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Graduate Diploma of Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology) and Graduate Certificate in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology); and
- (2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal, noting that there are no amendments to the Resolutions of Senate relating to these courses with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out in the report presented.

7.3.3 Master of Public Health and Graduate Diploma in Public Health

Resolution 10/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to introduce a new delivery mode to the Master of Public Health and Graduate Diploma in Public Health; and
- (2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal, noting that there are no amendments to the Resolutions of Senate relating to these courses with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out in the report presented.

8. Postgraduate course reviews

8.1 Faculty of Dentistry

The Chair noted that the major points raised by the two reviews were the need to increase staff levels and to utilise e-learning. Professor Murray advised that he had not been involved with the reviews, but agreed with the Chair's assessment.

The Committee noted the two reviews.

8.1.1 Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry (Conscious Sedation and Pain Control)

Resolution 11/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the review of the Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry (Conscious Sedation and Pain Control) by the Faculty of Dentistry, as set out in the report presented.

8.1.2 Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry (Oral Implants)

Resolution 12/08

That the Graduate Studies Committee note the review of the Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry (Oral Implants) by the Faculty of Dentistry, as set out in the report presented.

9. General business

There were no items of general business.

10. Next meeting

Members noted that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday, 13 February 2008.

Agenda Item 5 Report of the Academic Board

5.1 Report of the Academic Board meeting held on 27 February 2008

The agenda for the meeting of the Academic Board on 27 February 2008 may be accessed on the web: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/>

5.1.1 Approval of New and Amended Courses

The Academic Board approved proposals for the following new and amended courses:

- Faculty of Economics and Business: introduction of the Master of Marketing; and
- Faculty of Medicine: amendments to the Master of Medical Education, Graduate Diploma in Medical Education and Graduate Certificate in Medical Education, Master of Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Master of Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Graduate Diploma in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Graduate Diploma of Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology) and Graduate Certificate in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Master of Public Health and Graduate Diploma in Public Health.

5.1.2 Proceedings of the Committee

The Academic Board noted the proceedings of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 13 February 2008.

5.1.3 Report of the Chair of the Academic Board

The Academic Board approved:

- the appointment on nomination to the Academic Board of Professor Scott Kable;
- the appointment of the Chairs of the Academic Board's standing committees, including the appointment of Associate Professor Peter McCallum as Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee;
- the appointment of Associate Professor Peter McCallum as Deputy Chair of the Academic Board;
- the nomination of various academic staff members to fill casual vacancies on the Academic Board
- the guidelines for the Phase 3 Academic Board reviews of faculties;
- the terms of reference for the proposed Ethical Entrepreneurialism Working Party; and
- actions taken by the Chair of the Academic Board under delegated authority.

5.1.4 Other reports

The Academic Board also:

- approved TOEFL equivalencies for English language requirements;
- noted a focus topic at the Learning and Teaching Committee meeting on eLearning;
- approved changes to the Academic Board resolutions regarding the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy; and
- approved the membership of the Student Proctorial Panel for 2008.

Agenda Item 6 Proposals for New and Amended Courses

6.1 Faculty of Economics and Business

(1) **Executive Master of Business Administration and Graduate Certificate in Business Administration** *separate attachment*

The Faculty of Economics and Business is proposing to introduce a new award course, the Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA). The course is designed to meet the needs of experienced managers who are on a path to senior leadership positions in their organisations. The launch of this course is a strategic response to the dissolution of the joint venture with the Australian Graduate School of Management which has opened the way for the Faculty of Economics and Business to re-enter the management education market with a suite of courses that match the needs of business globally. Our EMBA represents a highly innovative and distinctive entry into the market, one designed specifically to address the concerns of leading business school academics, industry and past MBA students about the state of MBA offerings, as well as meet a range of new learning and development imperatives associated with elite executive education. No directly comparable course is currently offered by the University of Sydney, and as such the EMBA represents a distinctive approach to postgraduate coursework teaching and learning in Business and Economics. The existing Executive Master of Public Administration, also addresses an executive audience, but has a clear focus on public sector management.

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) *approve the proposal from the Faculty of Economics and Business to introduce the Executive Master of Business Administration and Graduate Certificate in Business Administration,*
- (2) *recommend that Senate:*
 - (a) *endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal;*
 - (b) *approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate relating to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Economics and Business; and*
 - (c) *approve the introduction of Resolutions of Senate relating to the courses; and*
- (3) *approve the faculty requirements relating to the courses; with effect from 1 January 2009, as set out in the report presented.*

(2) **Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS) and Graduate Certificate in Management** *separate attachment*

The Faculty of Economics and Business is proposing to introduce two related new award courses, the Master of Management (MMgt) and the Master of Management (CEMS) (MMgt CEMS). Designed in consultation with leading European business schools and international corporations, the Master of Management is a pre-experience postgraduate qualification which will equip high performing local and international students with the skills and knowledge necessary for them to pursue a career in management in some of the world's leading organizations. The pre-experience segment is one of the most rapidly growing areas in the management education market and, unlike the current Master of Business (MBus) degree (which is to be withdrawn by the Faculty), the MMgt is specially designed to cater for this market. Introduction of the MMgt will also allow the Faculty of Economics of Business to become a full member of CEMS (the Community of European Management Schools and International Corporations). Full membership of CEMS will ensure that the MMgt is benchmarked against pre-experience masters degrees from some of the world's leading business schools and will allow students enrolled in the proposed MMgt

(CEMS) to participate in the prestigious CEMS MIM program, which is currently the number two ranked pre-experience masters in management program globally.

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Economics and Business to introduce the Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS) and Graduate Certificate in Management,*
- (2) recommend that Senate:*
 - (a) endorse the Academic Board's approval of the proposal;*
 - (b) approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate relating to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Economics and Business; and*
 - (c) approve the introduction of Resolutions of Senate relating to the courses; and*
- (3) approve the faculty requirements relating to the courses; with effect from 1 January 2009, as set out in the report presented.*

Agenda Item 7 Report from Faculties

7.1 Faculty of Law: Master of Administrative Law and Policy and Master of International Law *pages 15-16*

The Faculty of Law has submitted the enclosed report outlining the following minor amendments to courses:

- Master of Administrative Law and Policy – references to units within the area of Government and International Relations have been amended following the transfer of this discipline from the Faculty of Economics and Business to the Faculty of Arts;
- Master of International Law – the list of units of study for this degree has been amended to reflect Faculty-approved changes to some units.

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend the Academic Board:

- (1) approve the minor amendment to the Faculty Resolutions for the Master of Administrative Law and Policy; and*
- (2) note the report from the Faculty of Law regarding the introduction and amendment of units of study in the Master of International Law as set out in the report presented.*

Proposal for Academic Development Notification of faculty variation or approval

Faculty/Board of Studies: Faculty of Law

Contact person: Professor Lee Burns, Associate Dean (PG Coursework)

1. Name of award course

Master of Administrative Law and Policy (MALP)
Master of International Law (MIL)

2. Purpose of proposal

To revise Faculty Resolutions relating to the MALP to reflect the relocation of Government and International Relations from the Faculty of Economics and Business to the Faculty of Arts effective from January 2008.

To revise the list of units of study to the MIL amend related Faculty Resolutions accordingly

3. Details of amendment

At its meeting held on 4 March 2008 the Faculty Board resolved to:

.1 amend the Faculty Resolutions relating to the Master of Administrative Law and Policy as follows:

Pages 71-72, 2008 Faculty Handbook

Master of Administrative Law and Policy (MALP)

2.4.1.3.2 Candidates may enrol in Policy Analysis ~~Public Policy Making: Structure & Processes~~ or any other unit of study of 6 credit points prescribed by the Department ~~Discipline~~ of Government and International Relations.

2.5.2 The units of study for the Master of Administrative Law and Policy (MALP) may be taken from units offered in other faculties including from the Department ~~Discipline~~ of Government and International Relations, the Department of Sociology and Social Policy, and the School of Social Work and Policy Studies as units of study leading to the master's degree.

.2 amend the Faculty Resolutions relating to the Master of International Law as follows:

Page 88, 2008 Faculty Handbook

Delete

2.4.2 Core units of study

~~2.4.2.7 Law and Society in Indonesia~~

Insert/Add in alphabetical order

2.4.3 Optional units of study

2.4.3.3 Australian International Taxation

2.4.3.7 Comparative Corporate Taxation

2.4.3.10 Comparative Value Added Tax

2.4.3.12 GST – International Issues

2.4.3.19 Law and Society in Indonesia

2.4.3.27 Transfer Pricing in International Taxation

.3 report the Faculty's decisions to the University Graduate Studies Committee; and

.4 update the 2008 Faculty Handbook accordingly.

4. **Transitional arrangements**
Nil
5. **Other relevant information**
Nil
6. **Signature of Dean**

Professor Gillian Triggs

Agenda Item 8

Academic Board Resolutions: Student appeals against academic decisions

The Academic Board Resolutions relating to Student Appeals against Academic Decisions outline the procedures to be followed by students and staff when dealing with appeals at the local and faculty level. These resolutions have undergone a major review following the introduction and implementation of the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*.

Attached is a copy of the draft revised resolutions. The current resolutions are also included for purposes of comparison.

Recommendation

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amended Academic Board Resolutions relating to student appeals against academic decisions, as set out in the report presented.

Revised resolutions



The University of Sydney

Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions – Academic Board Resolutions

Approved by: Academic Board
Latest amended approved on: 15 November 2006
Amended to take effect: 16 November 2006

Procedures Approved by the Academic Board in Respect of Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions

Glossary

Academic decision means a decision of a member of the academic staff that affects the academic assessment or progress of a student.

Academic unit means a school, department or other unit within a Faculty

Dean means the dean, college principal or director, or chairperson of the board of studies

Decision-maker means the person or academic unit responsible for the decision which is the subject of any given appeal

Faculty means the faculty, college board, department, school or board of studies

Introduction

The University operates on the basis that academic decisions (e.g. in relation to assessment, examining, etc.) are entrusted to members of the academic staff acting in accordance with proper procedures established by the faculty in question. A student dissatisfied with a decision should be able to apply to have the decision reconsidered and in appropriate cases reviewed. As set out below, a student would first approach their relevant teacher to discuss the issue and attempt to resolve it in person. If this were unsuccessful the student would have the opportunity to write formally to the Faculty. Where the issue under discussion involves an academic decision made by a dean, the student has the opportunity to write formally to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching). Any student who was not satisfied with the Faculty's decision would be able to appeal to the Student Appeals Body against the academic decision if he or she believed that due academic process had not been observed by the relevant Faculty in relation to the academic decision. A student wishing to appeal must lodge his or her written appeal with the Registrar (on behalf of the Student Appeals Body) within 21 days of the date of the written decision of the Dean of the relevant Faculty regarding the academic decision, or within such extended time as the Registrar, in his or her absolute discretion, authorises.

An appeal will not be heard by the Student Appeals Body unless

- (a) the basis for the Student's appeal has previously been considered by the relevant Faculty, as set out below;
- (b) the Student has set out in the written appeal his or her reasons, including any written evidence and written submissions, for believing that due academic process has not been observed by the Faculty in relation to the academic decision, including matters pertaining to Special Consideration; and
- (c) the Registrar has confirmed that the requirements under clauses (a) and (b) above have been satisfied.

(extract from the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*)

Principles for Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions

Preliminary

1. Any student may contest an academic decision that affects him or her. This document describes the principles and procedures to be followed by students, academic units and decision-makers when a student contests an academic decision:
 - 1.1 First, at a local level, to enable a student's concerns to be addressed via personal communication; and
 - 1.2 Secondly, by means of a formal procedure.
2. The procedures in clauses 5 to 7 apply to all academic decisions made in relation to undergraduate and postgraduate coursework awards. A separate set of procedures in clause 8 applies to postgraduate research awards.
3. Each stage below represents an opportunity to resolve the issue. Members of academic staff are expected to attempt to resolve all students' concerns at a local level, wherever possible. If at any stage further information comes to light which causes a staff member or a faculty reverse a decision taken previously, a note recording the reasons and the new recommendation should be sent by the staff member or faculty to the person or group currently dealing with the issue.

Principles that underpin these procedures

4. The following principles apply with respect to any dispute about an academic decision, whether dealt with formally or informally:
 - 4.1 **Timeliness.** *All disputes should, wherever possible, be resolved as quickly as possible.* Timelines prescribed in these procedures should always be followed, unless there are exceptional circumstances. If the timeline is to be exceeded by staff, the student must always be informed of the length of, and the reason for, the delay. A student may request an extension to these timelines where they can provide good grounds for the granting of such an extension. Such requests are to be made in writing, and before the timeline expires.
 - 4.2 **Confidentiality.** All student appeals must be treated confidentially at all stages of the process. Any information about an appeal must be strictly limited to those staff who need to know about it in order to deal with the appeal.
 - 4.3 **Procedural fairness.** All staff involved in an appeal have a duty to observe the principles of procedural fairness (sometimes called natural justice), which include the following.
 - 4.3.1 Staff and students involved in an appeal are entitled to raise all issues which are important to them, and to put their points of view in their own terms.
 - 4.3.2 Staff and students are entitled to have matters dealt with in an unbiased manner, and lack of bias or conflict of interest should always be apparent. Any person concerned about bias or conflict of interest is expected to raise it with the appropriate person promptly (Refer to the University's *Code of Conduct* for staff members).
 - 4.3.3 Parties are entitled to know the basis on which decisions about them have been made, and accordingly reasons should be given for a decision, in sufficient detail that it is reasonable to expect both the staff and student involved to be able to understand the decision.
 - 4.3.4 Any person involved in this process who is disadvantaged in any way in their ability to present their case should be allowed the support and

advice they need to participate effectively. While a conciliatory approach is preferred and encouraged under these rules it may be appropriate, in some circumstances, that the student or staff member has another person speak on his or her behalf.

- 4.4 **Record-keeping.** It is important that staff establish and maintain proper records (through the Records Management Services filing system) once an appeal becomes formal. Staff are also advised to keep notes of any discussions with students. Copies of documentation given to students in relation to a unit of study should be kept, as well as a record of the date on which that information was supplied to students and the means by which it was disseminated.
- 4.5 **Access.** Students should normally have a right of free access to all documents concerning their appeal. This right does not apply to any documents for which the University claims legal professional privilege.

Procedures for Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Coursework Awards

5. Resolution with teacher

- 5.1 If a student is concerned about any academic decision, he or she should first discuss the issue with the relevant teacher or unit of study co-ordinator. Students are encouraged to take the earliest opportunity to discuss their concerns with relevant staff. This should be done within 15 working days of the student being advised of the particular academic decision or, in the case of matters relating to a unit of study, within 15 working days of the unit of study result being posted. During this time the student should attempt to resolve the matter with the relevant teacher or unit of study co-ordinator.
- 5.2 The teacher or unit of study co-ordinator should then deal with the issue promptly, giving a full explanation to the student of the reasons for the academic decision. It should be possible to resolve many issues at this stage.
- 5.2.1 If the student's concerns are not resolved by these means, then the teacher should:
- 5.2.1.1 Explain the next step and the procedure, which is set out in paragraph 6 below; and
 - 5.2.1.2 Give to the student a copy of these principles and procedures or advise the student how to access the document online.

6. Approach the Faculty

- 6.1 If the student's concerns cannot be resolved under paragraph 5, or because of an apparent failure to follow procedures, the student may then approach the Faculty. The student should put his or her concerns in writing within 15 working days of the outcome of discussions under paragraph 5. The student will submit their written concerns to the office or staff member nominated by the Faculty to receive student appeals (this information is to be provided to students at the start of each Semester).
- 6.2 If the Dean is the decision-maker under paragraph 5, then the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) shall act as decision-maker under this paragraph 6.
- 6.3 The Faculty must acknowledge receipt of a formal complaint in writing within 3 working days of receipt.

- 6.4 The Faculty must try to resolve the complaint within 10 working days of receiving the complaint, and then advise the student in writing of the Faculty's decision:
 - 6.4.1 setting out the reasons;
 - 6.4.2 advising that if the student does not agree with the decision, then the student has a right of appeal under these procedures; and
 - 6.4.3 giving to the student a copy of these principles and procedures, if the student does not already have a copy or advising the student how to access the document online.

- 6.5 The Faculty will determine who is to undertake the initial review of the student's appeal. This person will normally be the person to whom the decision-maker (of Section 5) reports, and may be the course co-ordinator, Head of Department or School or relevant Associate Dean. The report of the reviewer will be considered by the Dean or his or her nominee (where the Dean chooses to nominate another staff member to consider review reports, it will be on the understanding that the Dean retains final responsibility for any decision made regarding a student appeal to the Faculty).

7. Student Appeals Rule

- 7.1 If the student is not satisfied that his or her concerns have been addressed satisfactorily under paragraph 6, the student may lodge a written appeal, in accordance with the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*.

Procedures for Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions for Postgraduate Research Awards

8. If a student wishes to appeal an academic decision associated with:
 - 8.1 termination of their candidature, they should lodge a written appeal in accordance with the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*;
 - 8.2 the examination of a thesis, they should lodge a written appeal in accordance with the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*; or
 - 8.3 any other matter, they should follow the steps outlined for coursework matters in clauses 5 to 7 above.

Current resolutions



The University of Sydney

Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions – Academic Board Resolutions

Approved by: Academic Board
Latest amended approved on: 15 November 2006
Amended to take Effect: 16 November 2006

Procedures Approved by the Academic Board in Respect of Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions

Introduction

The University operates on the basis that academic decisions (e.g. in relation to assessment, examining, etc.) are entrusted to members of the academic staff acting in accordance with proper procedures established by the faculty, college board or department in question. A student dissatisfied with an adverse decision should be able to apply to have the decision reconsidered and in appropriate cases reviewed. Since Senate has the ultimate authority over the University and since it is by authority of the Senate that all degrees, diplomas etc. are awarded, there is always an ultimate appeal to Senate against decisions, including academic decisions made within faculties. However, Senate has determined that appeals on questions of academic judgement will not be heard by the Senate unless, in the view of the Chair of the Academic Board, there are grounds for believing due academic process has not been observed.

In any appeal based solely on questions of academic judgement it will be sufficient for the Chair of the Academic Board to be satisfied that the academic process established by the faculty college board or department have been duly followed, and that the procedures set out below have been complied with.

Principles for Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions

Preliminary

1. Any student may complain about an academic decision that affects him or her. This document describes the principles and procedures to be followed by students, academic units and decision-makers when a student complains about an academic decision:
 - 1.1 First, at a local level, to enable a student's concerns to be addressed in an informal way; and
 - 1.2 Secondly, by means of a formal, central procedure.
2. These procedures apply to all academic decisions made in relation to undergraduate and postgraduate course awards. A separate set of procedures applies with respect to postgraduate research awards.
3. In these procedures, an '**academic decision**' means a decision of a member of the academic staff that affects the academic assessment or progress of a student.

4. Each stage below represents an opportunity to resolve the complaint. Members of academic staff are expected to attempt to resolve all students' complaints at a local, informal level, wherever possible.

Principles that underpin these procedures

5. The following principles apply with respect to any dispute about an academic decision, whether dealt with formally or informally:

- 5.1 **Timeliness.** All disputes should, wherever possible, be resolved as quickly as possible. A procedure that creates a number of opportunities to resolve a problem should not be treated as a series of hurdles which prolong the dispute. Unresolved disputes have a detrimental effect on the performance of both students and staff involved.

Deadlines prescribed in these procedures should always be followed, unless there are exceptional circumstances. If the deadline is to be exceeded by staff, the student must always be informed of the length of, and the reason for, the delay.

Time limits allowed to students are generally longer than those allowed to staff. As a general rule, it may be more appropriate to relax time limits for students within reason. Students may find pursuing a complaint or an appeal a difficult and stressful undertaking.

They may need further time to marshal the confidence, support and evidence they need to pursue a complaint. Students should also be able to express their complaint in their own terms.

- 5.2 **Confidentiality.** All student appeals must be treated confidentially at all stages of the process. Any information about a complaint must be strictly limited to those staff who need to know about it in order to deal with the complaint. For example, where a complaint is dealt with at departmental or faculty level, any sensitive personal information about the student should only be available to the head of the department, dean (or college principal) or the staff member assigned to the appeal. If information needs to be distributed at a broader level, then the student's written consent must first be obtained.

- 5.3 **Without disadvantage.** The fact that a student has made a complaint under these procedures should not disadvantage the student in any way, especially by way of victimisation. That said, the fact that a student has had to complain often does, of itself, cause disadvantage, for example, delay in finalising the mark for a unit of study. However, students should be able to complain under these procedures and feel confident that they will not be disadvantaged in any other way.

- 5.4 **Procedural fairness.** All staff involved in a complaint or an appeal have a duty to observe the principles of procedural fairness (sometimes called natural justice), which include the following.

- 5.4.1 Staff and students involved in a complaint are entitled to raise all issues which are important to them, and to put their points of view in their own terms. In most cases, any formal complaint will be dealt with by means of written submissions. In some cases, however, it may be appropriate to deal with the matter by interviewing the relevant parties. This will be determined by the relevant decision-maker.

- 5.4.2 Staff and students are entitled to have matters dealt with in an unbiased manner, and lack of bias should always be apparent. It is impossible to list all types of potential bias. One example is where a

staff member involved in conciliating a complaint has a close personal relationship with the student. The question for any decision-maker is whether he or she has a pre-conceived view that is so strong, and so related to the matter being decided by the staff member, that it is reasonable to suspect that he or she is unable to listen to the complaint in a fair manner, and to deal with that complaint on its merits alone. Any person concerned about bias is expected to raise it with the appropriate person promptly.

- 5.4.3 Parties are entitled to know the basis on which decisions about them have been made, and accordingly reasons should be given for a decision, in sufficient detail that it is reasonable to expect a student to be able to understand the decision.
- 5.5 **Support.** Any person involved in this process who is disadvantaged in any way in their ability to present their case should be allowed the support and advice they need to participate effectively. While a conciliatory approach is preferred and encouraged under these rules, it may be appropriate, in some circumstances that the student or staff member has another person speak on his or her behalf.
- 5.6 **Record-keeping.** In order to facilitate resolution of student complaints, it is important that staff establish and maintain proper records (through the Records Management Services filing system) once a complaint becomes formal. Staff are also advised to keep brief notes of any informal discussions with students. Copies of documentation given to students in relation to a unit of study should be kept, as well as a record of the date on which that information was supplied to students and the means by which it was disseminated. This may be important to the speedy resolution of a complaint.
- 5.7 **Access.** Students should normally have a right of free access to all documents concerning their appeal. This right does not apply to any documents for which the University claims legal professional privilege.

Procedures for Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Coursework Awards

6. Informal resolution with teacher

- 6.1 If a student is concerned about any academic decision, he or she should first discuss the issue informally with the relevant teacher or unit of study co-ordinator. This should be done within three months of the particular academic decision being made.
- 6.2 The teacher or unit of study co-ordinator should then deal with the issue promptly, giving a full explanation to the student of the reasons for the academic decision. Many complaints should be resolved at this stage.
- 6.2.1 If the student's concerns are not resolved by this means, then the teacher should:
- 6.2.1.1 Explain the next step and the procedure, which is set out in paragraph 7 below; and
- 6.2.1.2 Give to the student a copy of these principles and procedures.
- 6.3 If the teacher or unit of study co-ordinator is the head of the department or school, then the student should approach the dean or college principal or director (see 8 below).

7. Approach head of department or school

Informal complaints

- 7.1 If the student's concerns cannot be resolved under paragraph 6, or because of a failure to follow procedures, the student may then approach the head of department or school. The student may, at this point, choose to approach the head of department on an informal basis, or else put his or her complaint in writing. The student should do either of these things within 15 working days of the outcome of discussions under paragraph 6.
- 7.2 If a student chooses to approach the head of department informally under paragraph 7.1, this does not later preclude the student from proceeding formally under this paragraph 7 by putting his or her complaint in writing to the head of department.
- 7.3 The head of department should deal with informal complaints promptly, giving a full explanation to the student of the reasons for the academic decision. Many complaints should be resolved at this stage.

Formal complaints

- 7.4 The head of department must acknowledge receipt of a formal complaint in writing within 3 working days of receipt.
- 7.5 The head of department must try to resolve the complaint within 10 working days of receiving the complaint, and then advise the student in writing of his or her decision:
- 7.5.1 setting out the reasons;
- 7.5.2 advising that if the student does not agree with the decision, then the student has a right of appeal under these procedures; and
- 7.5.3 giving to the student a copy of these principles and procedures, if the student does not already have a copy.

8. Approach the dean or college principal or director or their nominee

Informal complaints

- 8.1 If the student's concerns cannot be resolved under paragraph 7, or because of a failure to follow procedures, the student may then approach the dean or college principal or director. The student may, at this point, choose to approach the dean or college principal or director on an informal basis, or else put his or her complaint in writing. The student should do either of these things within 15 working days of the outcome of discussions under paragraph 7. In some cases the dean, college principal or director may nominate another faculty officer, for example a pro-dean or associate dean to deal with the matter.
- 8.2 If the dean or college principal or director is the decision-maker under paragraphs 6 or 7, then the pro-vice-chancellor of the relevant academic college shall act as decision-maker under this paragraph 8.
- 8.3 If a student chooses to approach the dean or college principal informally under paragraph 8.1, this does not later preclude the student from proceeding formally under this paragraph 8 by putting his or her complaint in writing to the dean or college principal or director.
- 8.4 The dean or college principal or director should then deal with informal complaints promptly, giving a full explanation to the student of the reasons for the academic decision. Many complaints should be resolved at this stage.

Formal complaints

- 8.5 The dean or college principal or director must acknowledge receipt of a formal complaint in writing within 3 working days of receipt.
- 8.6 The dean or college principal or director must try to resolve the complaint within 10 working days of receiving the complaint, and then advise the student in writing of his or her decision:
- 8.6.1 setting out the reasons;
- 8.6.2 advising that if the student does not agree with the decision, then the student has a right of appeal under these procedures; and
- 8.6.3 giving to the student a copy of these principles and procedures, if the student does not already have a copy.

9. Written appeal

- 9.1 If the student is not satisfied that his or her concerns have been addressed satisfactorily under paragraph 8, the student may lodge a written appeal in accordance with the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*.

Procedures for Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions for Postgraduate Research Awards

Informal resolution

10. Students are expected to seek to resolve any problems or difficulties through, in order, the supervisor, departmental postgraduate coordinator, the head of department or school, chair of the faculty board of postgraduate studies or equivalent.

Approach the dean or college director or principal or chair of the board of studies

- 11.1 A student who has not resolved a problem in respect of an academic decision made by the faculty, college or board of studies (hereafter referred to as "the faculty") in respect of the award of a degree or other matter which affects the student's candidature may approach the relevant dean or college principal or director or chairperson of the board of studies.
- 11.2 The student may, at this point, choose to approach the dean or college principal or director or chairperson of the board of studies (hereafter referred to as "the dean") on an informal basis, or else put his or her complaint in writing. A student intending to approach the dean informally or formally must:
- 11.2.1 give notice of this intent to the dean within one calendar month of the date of notification of the decision; and
- 11.2.2 lodge the formal appeal with the dean within two calendar months from the date of the notification of the decision.

Informal complaints

- 11.3 In some cases the dean may nominate another faculty officer, for example a pro-dean or associate dean, to deal with the matter, except that the dean may not nominate any faculty officer to deal with the matter under this paragraph 11. who was the decision-maker in respect of the matter concerned.
- 11.4 If the dean was the decision-maker in respect of the matter concerned, then the pro-vice-chancellor of the relevant academic college shall act as decision-maker under this paragraph 11.

- 11.5 If a student chooses to approach the dean informally under paragraph 11.2, this does not later preclude the student from proceeding formally under paragraph 11.2 by putting his or her complaint in writing to the dean.
- 11.6 The dean should then deal with informal complaints promptly, giving a full explanation to the student of the reasons for the academic decision. Many complaints should be resolved at this stage.

Formal complaints

- 11.7 The dean must acknowledge receipt of a formal complaint in writing within three working days of receipt.
- 11.8 The dean must try to resolve the complaint within ten working days of receiving the complaint, and then advise the student in writing of his or her decision:
 - 11.8.1 setting out the reasons;
 - 11.8.2 advising that, if the student does not agree with the decision, then the student has a right of appeal under these procedures; and
 - 11.8.3 giving to the student a copy of these principles and procedures, if the student does not already have a copy.

Approach the Chair of the Research and Research Training Committee

- 12.1 A student who has not resolved a problem relating to an academic decision made by the faculty in respect of the award of a degree or which affects the student's candidature under paragraph 11 may approach the Chair of the Research and Research Training Committee.
- 12.2 The student may, at this point, choose to approach the Chair of the Research and Research Training Committee on an informal basis, or else put his or her complaint in writing. A student intending to approach the Chair of the Research and Research Training Committee informally or formally must:
 - 12.2.1 give notice of this intent to the Chair within one calendar month of the date of notification of the decision by the dean under paragraph 11; and
 - 12.2.2 lodge the formal appeal with the Chair within two calendar months from the date of the notification of the decision under paragraph 11.

Consideration of appeal by the Chair of the Research and Research Training Committee

- 13.1 The Chair must acknowledge receipt of a formal complaint in writing within three working days of receipt.
- 13.2 The Chair must seek a report from the dean of the faculty and may consult with other persons as appropriate.
- 13.3 If, after considering that report, the Chair concludes:
 - 13.3.1 that the appeal is based solely on a question of academic judgement;
 - 13.3.2 that the proper academic procedures (including any procedures specifically established by the faculty or department) have been followed; and
 - 13.3.3 that the appeal raises no issue of general principle requiring consideration by the Research and Research Training Committee; the Chair should disallow the appeal.

- 13.4 If the Chair does not disallow the appeal he or she must:
- 13.4.1 refer the matter back to the dean for action and report; or
 - 13.4.2 refer the matter to the Research and Research Training Committee.

Having received a report after referring the matter to the dean the Chair may refer the matter to the Research and Research Training Committee.

- 13.5 The Chair shall inform the student in writing of his or her decision. If the decision is to disallow the appeal, the student will be informed of any further avenues of appeal. If the decision is to allow the appeal to proceed, the student will be informed that the appeal has been referred to the Appeal committee of the Research and Research Training Committee.

Appeal Committee of the Research and Research Training Committee

14. There is to be an Appeal Committee of the Research and Research Training Committee consisting of:
- 14.1 three academic staff members of the Committee (not involved in the candidature),
 - 14.2 one postgraduate student member of the Committee selected by the Chair,
 - 14.3 the Dean of Graduate Studies, and
 - 14.4 the Chair or the Chair's nominee (who is to preside).
- Any four members constitute a quorum.
15. If the appeal raises an issue of general principle, the Appeal Committee may consider that issue and may direct the Chair of the Research and Research Training Committee or the dean of the faculty concerned to deal with the appeal in accordance with its decision on that issue.
16. The Appeal Committee may:
- 16.1 refer the matter back to a faculty with a recommendation for action,
 - 16.2 dismiss the appeal, or
 - 16.3 if the faculty declines to accept the recommendation for action, amend or alter the decision (including amending the result on behalf of the Board of Postgraduate Studies or Board of Examiners).

Procedure

17. An Appeal Committee under these resolutions must allow the student to make written observations on the appeal and may, if it thinks the issue raised is sufficiently serious, allow the student to appear in person. The student may be accompanied by a friend.
18. An Appeal Committee must reach a determination under these resolutions within a reasonable period of time. The dean or Chair must keep a record of the process of the appeal.
19. The decision of an Appeal Committee under these resolutions shall be communicated in writing to the parties with a brief statement of the reasons for the decision. If the appeal is dismissed the appellant shall be advised of any further avenues of appeal and of sources of advice.

Appeal to Senate

20. If the student is not satisfied that his or her concerns have been addressed satisfactorily under this procedure, the student may lodge a written appeal in accordance with the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*.