

## AGENDA ITEM 11 Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

### 11.2 Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting held on 22 February 2005

The Committee met on 22 February 2005 when there were present: The Chair (Professor J Carter) presiding, Professor J Sachs, Associate Professors M Freeman, M Jackson and B Sutton, Drs M Boughton, C Groenlund, D O'Connor, A Poulos, P Russell, G Ryan and C Taylor, Ms S Hanfling, Ms R Jackson, Mr S Lojewski and Mr I Trevena. Ms M Isherwood and Ms M Kemmis were in attendance.

#### 11.2.1 Receipt of Report

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 22 February 2005.

#### 11.2.2 Academic Board Faculty Review Visits

(1) **Faculty of Law**

63-64

The Board is asked to note that the Committee received and noted the Final Report and Recommendations from the Academic Board Phase Two visit to the Faculty of Law.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the report of the Phase Two Academic Board Visit to the Faculty of Law.*

(2) **Faculty of Medicine**

65-67

The Board is asked to note that the Committee received and noted the Final Report and Recommendations from the Academic Board Phase Two visit to the Faculty of Medicine.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the report of the Phase Two Academic Board Visit to the Faculty of Medicine.*

(3) **Faculty of Pharmacy**

68-70

The Board is asked to note that the Committee received and noted the Final Report and Recommendations from the Academic Board Phase Two visit to the Faculty of Pharmacy.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the report of the Phase Two Academic Board Visit to the Faculty of Pharmacy.*

(4) **Sydney College of the Arts**

71-72

The Board is asked to note that the Committee received and noted the Final Report and Recommendations from the Academic Board Phase Two visit to the Sydney College of the Arts.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the report of the Phase Two Academic Board Visit to the Sydney College of the Arts.*

### 11.2.3 Faculty Reports on Cases of Academic Dishonesty

73-107

The Committee noted that, with the exception of two faculties, all faculties had reported on this issue. A full set of faculty reports is enclosed for the information of the Academic Board.

The following points were raised in discussion:

- the Faculty of Economics and Business has trialled new plagiarism detection software in conjunction with Blackboard; it was noted that the new software was being used as an educative tool with students encouraged to check their work prior to submission using the software;
- members noted that many faculties did not provide information on the number of cases handled during the year, but it was pointed out that, while data on formal cases would be easy to collate, it could be difficult to report on the number of informal cases dealt with by unit of study co-ordinators;
- members noted that the Vice-Chancellor had approved a new plagiarism policy which should be made available to the Academic Board in the near future;
- members discussed the issue of “degrees of intent to deceive”, agreeing that there was a difference between a deliberate intent to deceive and the case of a student who uses plagiarism as a means of coping with a heavy workload; and
- members noted comments made about ambiguities in the Academic Board Resolutions on Academic Honesty in Coursework with regard to educating and/or disciplining students with regard to plagiarism and the guidelines for allowing students to resubmit work.

With regard to the last point it was noted that the Vice-Chancellor’s new policy on plagiarism may address this issue. Members also noted that further work would be undertaken to refine the template for future faculty reports.

#### **Recommendations**

*That the Academic Board note the faculty reports on cases of academic dishonesty*

### 11.2.4 Unit of Study Manual

The Committee was advised that this project had started with a request from the Faculty of Pharmacy to develop guidelines for unit of study co-ordinators. The version provided to the Committee was a more generic guide which could be adapted by faculties for their own needs.

Full documentation can be accessed from the Teaching and Learning Committee website at: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/committees/TLCommittee/2005.html>.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- it was agreed that the Library would provide a section on applying for unit of study support, for items to be reserved, contacting specialist librarians, etc;
- members endorsed the idea of the manual being made available as an on-line resource rather than in hard copy, with an on-line version being easier to access and to keep updated;
- members suggested developing a similar manual for course co-ordinators; and
- members noted that references to scaling should be removed or amended to promote the use of standards-based assessment as outlined in the Academic Board Resolutions on Assessment and Examination of Coursework

The Academic Board is advised that a draft version of this document was distributed to faculties earlier in 2005 and that an updated version will be similarly distributed. It was agreed that the revised version would be submitted to the Teaching and Learning Committee for endorsement.

#### **Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the draft Unit of Study Manual for unit of study coordinators.*

### 11.2.5 Committee Terms of Reference

108-109

The Committee was advised that the new University Strategic Plan refers to “Learning and Teaching” rather than “Teaching and Learning” which signalled a student-centred focus and a more collegial approach. Members strongly supported the amendment of the Committee’s Terms of Reference to reflect this change by amending the Committee’s name to the “Learning and Teaching Committee”.

#### **Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board:*

- (a) *approve the amendment of the Terms of Reference for the Teaching and Learning Committee to change its name to the Learning and Teaching Committee; and*
  - (b) *encourage faculties to rename existing faculty Teaching and Learning Committees to Learning and Teaching Committees*
- in line with the new University of Sydney Strategic Plan, as set out in the report presented.*

### 11.2.6 Proceedings of the Committee

#### **(1) Report of the Chair**

The Chair reported to members on the following issues:

- special consideration and jury duty; and
- the Australian Universities’ Quality Agency Audit Report.

#### **(2) Report of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)**

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) report to members on the following issues:

- the working group on Principles of Teaching and Learning;
- the new University Strategic Plan; and
- review of the University Teaching and Learning Plan.

#### **(3) Australasian Council on Open, Distance and E –Learning**

The Committee noted a report of the 36th meeting of the Australasian Council on Open, Distance and E-Learning.

### **11.2.2 (1) Academic Board Visit to the Faculty of Law – Executive Summary**

The Faculty of Law is facing multiple challenges on a variety of fronts. In addition to the construction of a new Law School Building, the Faculty teaching profile is changing, with a significant increase in postgraduate coursework student numbers. At present 50% of the Faculty budget derives from student fees and the student population is approaching equivalent numbers of undergraduate and postgraduate students.

The Faculty has traditionally seen its undergraduate programs as its core business – and Faculty processes appear to be focussed in this area. For example, the Pro Dean (Teaching Programs) meets weekly with the SULS Vice President (Education). Since the Phase One Review the Faculty has appointed a WebCT Officer and all undergraduate units have some form of online learning. The Academic Board Phase Two Review Team have recommended that the Faculty respond to burgeoning postgraduate student numbers by developing new communication processes and new ways of teaching as numbers impinge on the success of Small Group Teaching and Intensives.

In the past isolationist location in the CBD has encouraged the Faculty to maintain some isolation from the University, its committees, planning processes and policies. The Faculty is being integrated back into the University both by the construction of a new Law School Building on the Camperdown Campus and by the changing nature of initial and continuing education in Law. Most of the growth in the postgraduate coursework area has been of an interdisciplinary nature; the Faculty anticipates that propinquity will further increase the success of their coursework programs and research in the future.

Since their Phase One Review, the Faculty has focussed on growing its research culture amongst staff. A Research Support Officer has been appointed, new research centres established and fourteen new research clusters have been developed. The Faculty has a very successful weekly seminar program and all new staff are given the names of staff they may approach for informal mentoring. All this activity has resulted in increased research applications and some successful research grants. The Phase Two Review recommends that the Faculty now turn its attention to including research students into this improved research climate.

#### **Commendations**

1. *The Faculty is commended for its active participation in the Australasian Law Teaching Workshop. (Section 3.2.2)*
2. *The Review Team commend the Faculty's progress on developing opportunities for informal mentoring of staff. (Section 3.5.4)*
3. *The Faculty is commended for its active embracing of online learning and its appointment of a WebCT Officer. (Section 3.7.3)*
4. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its quality assurance processes with regards to its offshore programs. (Section 3.8.2)*
5. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for re-using existing Units of Study to help build a comprehensive and targeted postgraduate suite of programs. (Section 4.8.2)*
6. *The Review Team commends the Faculty on the number of initiatives established to encourage and support faculty research performance. (Section 6.1.6)*
7. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for the three research methods courses provided to research students. These courses were resoundingly praised by the RHD students interviewed. (Section 6.1.10)*

8. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for the development of research clusters. These are seen as a strategic way to improve research productivity and enhance the research culture within the Faculty. (Section 6.2.2)*
9. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for the establishment of the new research Centres which will integrate teaching and research. (Section 6.4.2)*

### **Recommendations**

1. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with the Faculty of Architecture regarding that Faculty's processes around the review and reporting of trends from SCEQ, SREQ and CEQ results. (Section 3.6.2)*
2. *The Review Team recommends that the Associate Dean (Postgraduate Coursework) develop an accessible communication channel for communication with postgraduate students. (Section 3.6.4)*
3. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with Sue Silveira and Helen Wozniak from the School of Applied Vision Sciences regarding their work on student online interactivity using WebCT. (Section 3.7.5)*
4. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty proceed with the review of Units of Study and standardisation at 6 credit points as a priority activity; as this Faculty teaches double degrees it is important to provide students with coherence. The Review Team draws the Faculty's attention to the 2006 deadline. (Section 4.1.3)*
5. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty move into compliance with Academic Board Policy on Awards with Honours. (Section 4.2.4)*
6. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty ensure that the links between Generic Graduate Attributes and Contextualised Graduate Attributes and the content and assessment of Units of Study are made clear to students. (Section 4.4.4)*
7. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty undertake an audit of assessment practices. The Faculty should aim for consistency and compliance with Academic Board policies. (Section 4.6.4)*
8. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty make greater use of its Graduate Diploma programs as a required pathway to postgraduate study for non-lawyers. This may assist the Faculty to address the different audiences in its postgraduate program and facilitate the Faculty in meeting the different expectations and experiences of students. (Section 4.8.5)*
9. *The Review Team recommends that the PG Research Room be available to RHD students during the same hours as the Library. (Section 6.1.8)*
10. *The Review Team recommends that RHD students be automatically included in the research cluster of their supervisor and they be given opportunities to join other clusters of interest to their research. (Section 6.2.5)*
11. *The Review Team recommends that RHD students be invited to the weekly lunchtime seminars to increase their sense of inclusion in a community of scholars. (Section 6.3.5)*

### **11.2.2 (2) Academic Board Visit to the Faculty of Medicine – Executive Summary**

The Review Team found the Faculty to be alert and open to the identification of problems and quick to devise a solution (often multiple solutions) and to dedicate resources to achieving that solution.

Feedback on inconsistencies in the quality of teaching due to the heavy involvement of clinical and honorary staff in the University of Sydney Medical Program (USydMP) found in the Phase 1 Review have been taken seriously by the Faculty. The Faculty's Office of Teaching and Learning in Medicine (OTLM) has been given responsibility for both PBL tutor allocation and tutor professional development as a means of addressing this issue. Outcomes are starting to be seen in SCEQ feedback, where the Good Teaching Scale is showing an upward trend.

This approach to quality – based on seeking and responding to stakeholder feedback – is being broadened by the Faculty in two ways. Firstly, the Faculty is applying its quality approach beyond Teaching and Learning and Research Training to all University Goals. And secondly, the Faculty is internally identifying and analysing potential problem areas and responding proactively. An example of this broadening application of a quality approach can be seen with relation to Goal 7 – Service to the Community. The Faculty has recognised that while its engagement with the Community is clearly impressive, there are no clear indicators of the extent or nature of any outcomes which can be linked to the Faculty's community service activities. This is planned to be rectified as part of the Faculty Strategic Plan 2005-08.

Two areas that have emerged as issues for the Faculty from the Phase 2 Review are benchmarking and the recruitment of indigenous students. The Review Team felt that the Faculty could be further extended in its pursuit of excellence by benchmarking and consulting outside its own faculty and also pursuing the potential for international accreditation for its programs.

As with other University faculties with either graduate entry or high UAI's the Review Team found that the Faculty is struggling to enrol Indigenous Australians within its programs. The Faculty itself has identified this as an issue and has multiple steps in place, including exploiting the existence of its School of Rural Health. The Review Team were impressed with the articulate feedback given by students from the Graduate Diploma in Indigenous Health Promotion and felt the inclusion of these students in any strategic response by the Faculty would assist problem solving in this area.

The next stage of Faculty development is about to commence with the new Sydney Professional Master of Medicine (SPMMP), which is based on and extends Faculty learning gained through the innovative University of Sydney Medical Program (USydMP).

### **Commendations**

1. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its interventions to achieve uniform quality in teaching across all PBLs. (Section 4.1.3)*
2. *The Review Team commends the Faculty on the well developed systems for integrating Graduate Attributes into the USydMP. (Section 4.4.2)*
3. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its efforts surrounding the recruitment and retention of indigenous students. (Section 5.1.6)*
4. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its embracing of Information and Communications Technologies and incorporation into its programs. Technology has served to unite the many sites on which the Faculty is represented and provides access for rural and regional NSW. (Section 5.2.3)*
5. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for the initiatives undertaken and in-train to improve the quality of RHD Supervision. (Section 6.3.3)*

6. *The Review Team commends the Research and Postgraduate Officer from the Central Clinical School for her efforts to alert RHD students to seminars and other opportunities to decrease the isolation of the RHD experience. (Section 6.3.7)*
7. *The Review Team commends the application of resources directed at improving the Research Climate of its RHD students. (Section 6.3.9)*
8. *The Review Team commends the Faculty on its engagement and active leadership in the provision of policy advice to government. (Section 8.1.4)*
9. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for the steps it has taken to strengthen the links with clinical staff of the University. (Section 8.2.4)*
10. *The Review Team commends the ongoing review of the profession's view of the quality of USydMP graduates. (Section 8.2.6)*
11. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its proactive and entrepreneurial approach to continuing professional development. (Section 8.2.9)*
12. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for establishing mutually beneficial links with its alumni and benefactors. (Section 8.4.3)*
13. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its openness to change. The Faculty's ability to diagnose a problem and to seek appropriate solutions through the application of new technology and change in work processes is to be commended. (Section 9.1.4)*
14. *The Faculty is commended for the steps currently taken and those planned to encompass its community service activities within a strategic framework. (Section 10.1.5)*

### **Recommendations**

1. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty bring its digests of Academic Board policies in plain English to the Academic Board both to ensure they are a complete capture of the policy and to share them with other faculties. (Section 3.1.4)*
2. *The Review Team acknowledges the excellent strategies in place surrounding resource support for its postgraduate coursework programs but recommends that the Faculty continue to monitor this especially with regard to the sustainability of the new Sydney Professional Master of Medicine Program (SPMMP). (Section 3.3.2)*
3. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty monitor the ease of access to computer support both from within and outside the Faculty for postgraduate coursework students. (Section 3.3.4)*
4. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate opportunities (such as bringing students across all years of the program together) for achieving a greater understanding of Problem-Based Learning and the culture of the USydMP. (Section 4.2.4)*
5. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty seek to engage with its existing indigenous students in the School of Public Health over planning and marketing the Faculty's programs to indigenous Australians. It is further recommended that the Faculty liaise with the Faculty of Nursing to explore common issues and the potential for common approaches, including the development of pathways, regarding the recruitment of indigenous students. (Section 5.1.5)*
6. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate means of improving off-campus access to I.T. services and infrastructure. (Section 6.3.5)*

7. *The Review Team commends the application of resources and recommends that the Faculty continue to pursue its efforts to improve the Research Climate of its RHD students. (Section 6.3.9)*
8. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty look to develop the linkages in its hospital sites through the Bio-Link network as a model for encouragement of the commercialisation of Faculty research. It is further recommended, that in cases where there are joint or otherwise shared appointments, the Faculty attempt to put in place a heads of agreement on IP rights, where possible. (Section 6.4.5)*
9. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty establish (and test the value of) mechanisms for raising the awareness of students on IP issues and policies. (Section 6.4.7)*
10. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate opportunities for international accreditation of USydMP and relevant postgraduate coursework programs as another means of attaining its goals with regard to international student numbers and increasing the international visibility of the program. (Section 7.1.5)*
11. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with the Faculty of Economics and Business over that Faculty's Peer Mentoring Program (PMP) and associated Admissions programs for International students. (Section 7.2.5)*
12. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty identify appropriate national and international benchmarking partners in areas such as teaching and learning, research and indigenous recruiting. (Section 7.4.4)*
13. *The Review Team commends the ongoing review of the profession's view of the quality of USydMP graduates. The Review Team recommends that this review continue, even with lower frequency. (Section 8.2.6)*
14. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty pursue the establishment of a committee to develop, monitor and sustain Faculty relationships with industry and professional bodies. It is further recommended that the Faculty consults with the BLO during the establishment of the Committee to ensure the most effective utilisation of combined resources and that this Committee establish a strategic framework around Faculty linkage with industry and the professions; this framework to include evaluation of the effectiveness of engagement initiatives. (Section 8.3.3)*
15. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty establish means of ensuring the engagement of junior academic staff in Faculty management roles and committees. (Section 9.3.3)*

### **11.2.2 (3) Academic Board Visit to the Faculty of Pharmacy – Executive Summary**

The Faculty of Pharmacy is eager to grow and also to improve the quality of its teaching, learning and research. The Faculty is planning on a 25% growth in student numbers over the next four years. In addition to growing the number of full-fee paying students, the Faculty is introducing a new course BPharm (International) and anticipates growth in international student numbers. In concert with international growth, the Faculty is pursuing international accreditation.

Accreditation is one part of the Faculty's thrust to improve. The Faculty openly seeks evaluation and feedback, and through benchmarking is eager to learn from the experience of others. Since its Phase 1 Review, the Faculty has instigated a number of strategic reviews – of its programs, its committee structure, and of its technical and administrative services. On the day after the Phase 2 Review the Faculty was undertaking a review to renew its Australian and New Zealand accreditation.

The Faculty monitors its student feedback through the SCEQ and SREQ and has initiated a Staff-Student Liaison Committee to gain qualitative feedback and improve the student experience. The postgraduate coursework program in Herbal Medicine was one area with opportunities for improvement. Students reported that the course was not what they anticipated and that facilities in the laboratories were inadequate. The Faculty is eagerly anticipating the establishment of a Pharmacy Education Unit to assist it to improve Faculty teaching quality, including greater sophistication in its usage of WebCT. It is also benchmarking with the Faculty of Veterinary Science to learn from their quality processes.

The uncertainty surrounding the innovative BPharm (Rural) offered from the University's Orange Campus has had some influence on future plans. Several options are being investigated; in any event the BPharm (Rural) will be offered at Camperdown from 2006.

The Faculty is fully engaged with its College and is anticipating that participation in College activities will assist it to improve in areas such as the recruitment of indigenous students and the broadening of its research focus.

### **Commendations**

1. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its systematic approach to Quality Assurance. (Section 3.2.3)*
2. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its benchmarking with the Faculty of Veterinary Science which goes deeper than the mere comparison of data, by investigating the processes that lead to best practice. (Section 3.2.5)*
3. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for actively responding to student feedback through reviewing existing undergraduate programs and the audit of current units of study regarding workloads, delivery and assessment. (Section 4.2.5)*
4. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its mentoring program for staff. (Section 4.4.4)*
5. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its Excellence in Teaching Awards; both for the recognition of the breadth of staff contributing to a positive student experience and including nominations from both staff and students. (Section 4.4.7)*
6. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its uptake of WebCT which has been clearly beneficial for students. (Section 4.5.3)*
7. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its efforts to recruit indigenous students. (Section 5.1.2)*
8. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for the support provided to research students. (Section 6.1.3)*

9. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its acknowledgement of a funding dependence and its planned response to ameliorate this position. (Section 6.3.4)*
10. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for its strategic approach to increasing Faculty research performance and the consequential prioritisation of research areas and strengths. (Section 6.4.2)*
11. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for building and nurturing a mutually rewarding relationship between the Faculty and the Pharmacy Practice Foundation and the Pharmacy Alumni Association. (Section 8.2.3)*
12. *The Review Team commends the Faculty for the establishment and work of the Staff-Student Liaison Committee. (Section 9.3.2)*

### **Recommendations**

1. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty pursue the establishment of a Pharmacy Education Unit to assist the Faculty to raise the quality and consistency of Faculty teaching and learning. (Section 3.4.3)*
2. *The Review Team recommends the Faculty monitor research performance in the light of new research directions in an environment of extensive growth in student numbers. (Section 3.4.7)*
3. *The Review Team recommends that Faculty Committees develop annual Operational Plans of fully costed and managed projects designed to contribute to the achievement of Faculty Goals and Actions. (Section 3.5.5)*
4. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty establish clear goals and responsibility for its Herbal Medicine postgraduate coursework program. Within the context of clear goals, it is recommended that the program be reviewed. The review should consider the amount of industry contact provided to students. It is also recommended that the Faculty ensure that recruitment and marketing of the course accurately reflect these goals. (Section 3.6.4)*
5. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty use the planned curriculum review to address assessment issues such as: variety of assessment methods; timing of assessment; student feedback on performance; and assessing graduate attributes. (Section 4.3.3)*
6. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty use the planned curriculum review to review the heavy use of pre requisites and co requisites by the Faculty; these were felt by the Review Team to affect detrimentally student progression and choice. (Section 4.3.5)*
7. *The Review Team recommends that in addition to existing training, mentoring schemes and feedback mechanisms aimed to raise teaching quality, the Faculty encourage staff to undertake graduate studies in higher education through the ITL. (Section 4.4.5)*
8. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty undertake a pilot study to implement WebCT for active knowledge construction and flexible learning. It is further recommended that this pilot be fully evaluated, including the collection of student feedback. (Section 4.5.5)*
9. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with the Faculty of Nursing to explore common issues and the potential for common approaches, including the development of pathways, in order to encourage the recruitment of indigenous students. (Section 5.1.7)*

10. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty include an investigation of offering the BPharm (Rural) in block mode in its options for continuing to meet the needs for rural and indigenous students wishing to study Pharmacy. (Section 5.2.3)*
11. *The Review Team recommends that given the youthful nature of staff in the Faculty that existing mentoring processes be broadened to include greater opportunities for career mentoring. (Section 5.3.4)*
12. *The Review Team recommends that the Faculty develop mechanisms to increase communication between staff and RHD students. (Section 6.1.7)*
13. *The Review Team recommends that the Dean and senior Faculty staff maintain clear communication with all Faculty staff about the impending extensive growth period. (Section 9.2.3)*

#### **11.2.2 (4) Academic Board Visit to the Sydney College of the Arts – Executive Summary**

Sydney College of the Arts (SCA) is well-integrated into both its College (CHASS) and the University, both strategically and practically. In spite of its remote location, SCA participates and exploits opportunities for growth (in both quality and funding) provided by the University committees and CHASS. To signal this integration, SCA committee structure is based on those of the University and College.

Integration with the University and its faculties has also been achieved by SCA through collaboration in the provision of postgraduate coursework programs:

- *Master of Contemporary Art for Educators* first offered in 2004 in collaboration with the Faculty of Education and Social Work
- *Master of Film and Digital Image* will be offered for the first time in 2005 in collaboration with the Faculty of Arts and using electives from the Faculty of Architecture

SCA differentiates itself from other art schools in Australian Universities by its method of teaching, learning and research based on discipline-specific studios. Studio-based teaching provides SCA with the highest student endorsement across the University in the SCEQ Good Teaching Scale. SCA is seeking to protect this competitive advantage by liaising with various levels of the University and government to gain access to further studio teaching space on its campus at Rozelle.

However, in spite of this lobbying activity SCA is not focussed on protecting the status quo. The Faculty is focussed on growth, having developed new marketing brochures and set itself targets. Growth is planned in the areas of postgraduate coursework (the two courses mentioned above) and research student numbers. A growth in student numbers will also grow the SCA budget, which was felt to be detrimentally affected by an inappropriate funding categorisation. SCA claims teaching methodology equivalence with laboratory-based scientific disciplines and the funding associated with this categorisation. All levels of SCA staff interviewed were aware of the funding implications of this “inappropriate” banding.

Staff were also aware of the funding implications of the narrow definition of “research” by both the University and DEST. The University has commenced addressing this issue by including “creative works” in its definition of research for academic promotion.

#### **Commendations**

- 1 *The Review Team commends SCA for developing collaborative strategies with other faculties and programs. (Section 2.4)*
- 2 *The Review Team commends SCA for the multiple actions taken to help ease the problems of lack of space. (Section 2.7)*
- 3 *The Review Team commends SCA for its Self-Evaluation Report and for its responsiveness to recommendations from the Phase 1 Review. Results can be seen in SCEQ responses to the Generic Skills Scale (Recommendation 1), the branding developed in marketing brochures and the SER itself (Recommendation 6) and the widespread understanding by students of the concept of research-led teaching (Recommendation 12). (Section 3.1.3)*
- 4 *The Review Team commends SCA for its responsiveness to student feedback. (Section 3.4.3)*
- 5 *The Review Team commends SCA for its responsiveness to Recommendations of the Phase 1 Review, especially for the development of relevant Graduate Attributes and their planned integration with Grade Descriptors and assessment in 2005 to achieve moderation and consistency across studios. (Section 3.5.4)*

6. *The Review Team commends SCA for its support of international students, but felt the sustainability of this individual and highly personalised approach should be monitored as international student numbers increase. (Section 7.1.3)*
7. *The Review Team commends SCA for its leadership, engagement and developmental role with ARIs (Artists-Run-Initiatives). (Section 10.1.3)*

### **Recommendations**

1. *The Review Team recommends that, given the University's acknowledgement of the equivalence of creative works with research in the criteria for Academic promotion, that the Faculty seek to lobby the College for an equivalent change in the budget formula. (Section 3.2.3)*
2. *The Review Team recommends that SCA liaise with the Koori Centre and other relevant indigenous bodies, to devise mechanisms to encourage the participation of indigenous Australian students. (Section 5.1.4)*
3. *The Review Team recommends that SCA proceed with its planned evaluation of its flexible entry admissions process and that measures for equity categories be established and monitored. (Section 5.2.5)*
4. *The Review Team recommends that SCA increase the number of places for SSP Leave as a means of increasing the research climate of the faculty. (Section 6.2.2)*
5. *The Review Team recommends that SCA provide a more systematic and equitable access to teaching for PhD students. (Section 6.5.2)*
6. *The Review Team recommends that SCA consider greater use of internships and opportunities for practical engagement for students with their industry and professions. (Section 8.2.3)*
7. *The Review Team recommends that the Dean provide a regular "state of the union" address to both staff and students to communicate his vision for SCA. (Section 9.1.3)*
8. *The Review Team recommends that SCA continue to review its Workload Formula. The current average of eighteen teaching contact hours per FTE is high relative to the rest of the University. (Section 9.2.4)*
9. *The Review Team recommends that SCA monitor the effect of the new staff positions on service provision and culture in the admissions and enrolments processes. (Section 9.5.4)*

### 11.2.3 Faculty Reports on Cases of Academic Dishonesty

#### **Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources**

##### Protocols – Procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty

The procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty in AFNR include counselling by the Unit Coordinator, writing a warning letter, and an interview with the Dean, depending on the severity of the offence. Typically, during a meeting, the Academic staff present outline the University's policy on academic dishonesty, the classifications of academic dishonesty, and the University's expectations of the student in terms of their academic and overall conduct. In addition, students are interviewed to determine intent in terms of plagiarism. Once it has been established the student intentionally/unintentionally plagiarised or submitted work that reflected poor referencing, the student is counselled on the correct procedure they should have adopted, and made aware that this conduct is unacceptable. The Academic staff member will also go through the student's work at the time of the meeting and highlight the areas of concern within the assessable work. It should be noted that our Course Handbooks also contain reference to plagiarism and the penalties that apply in cases of academic misconduct. In many instances, students are asked to resubmit their work following this meeting to demonstrate their understanding of what is expected of them in their work, and to show they can correctly reference source material.

##### Detection methods - How is academic dishonesty detected?

- Web-based search tools for down-loaded material
- Gross inconsistencies within written reports, and between different types of student assessments
- Recognition of similarity between student reports by experienced markers
- Random checks on integrity of professional experience reports
- Advice from exam invigilators

##### Treatment of cases – outline of how cases were dealt with

The vast majority of a relatively small number of cases of academic dishonesty brought to light in AFNR in 2004 were plagiarism. Almost all were first offences and related to (i) inadequate attribution and citing of reference sources through ignorance or sloppiness of work, or (ii) copying laboratory reports from previous students.

Offenders were counselled, and depending on the nature of the incident either (i) warned and given an opportunity to resubmit satisfactory work, with a capping of marks awarded or (ii) awarded a mark of zero for the assignment concerned. Details of the cases dealt with in 2004 are provided at the end of this report.

##### Assessment and Examinations

No changes have been implemented in view of the nature of the majority of the offences. All students are advised of the Academic Board's policy on Academic Dishonesty and specifically of the seriousness of plagiarism.

<b>Semester 1 Units</b>	<b>No. of Cases</b>	<b>Penalty Imposed</b>
Commodity Price Analysis (AGEC 2001)	11	Students asked to resubmit work after meeting and awarded a mark of zero for assignment.
Agribusiness Management (AGEC 3001)	2	Student submitted tutorial paper of another student. Both students were given a mark of zero for tutorial paper.
Benefit Cost Analysis (AGEC 4037)	1	Student awarded a mark of zero for assignment.
Research Exercises (AGEC 4012)	1	Student requested to provide source material and given a mark of zero for assignment.

Agricultural Science 1A (CROP1001)	1	Student suspected of having outside assistance in a practical exam made an adequate defence, but mobile phones have been banned from such exams.
<b>Semester 2 Units</b>	<b>No. of Cases</b>	<b>Penalty Imposed</b>
Economic Environment of Australian Agriculture (AGEC 1004)	1	Case pending – student still to meet with Unit Co-ordinator to discuss assignment, however as assignment was given a mark of zero for irrelevance, no further penalty will be applied. It should also be noted that case is considered not to reflect intent on the part of the student to plagiarise, but counselling will occur.
Agricultural & Resource Policy (AGEC 3002)	1	Exam – Case currently being reviewed and result/penalty, if applicable, pending.
Natural Resource Economics (AGEC 4005)	2	Both students awarded a mark of zero for copying each other's assignment.
Agricultural Economics 1B (AGEC 1002)	16	Penalties ranged from students receiving a mark of zero for assignment to failing the unit of study.
Environmetrics 1 (BIOM1002)	1	Student copied another's work for submission. Severe warning and mark of zero.
Research Project B (Agronomy) (AGRO5008)	1	Lack of citation of web-based material detected. Student explained that this was accepted practice in homeland. Our standards were explained and the work was redone and resubmitted.

### Architecture

#### Protocol – What are your procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty.

Plagiarism is the main problem. Prevention is the first measure. All new undergraduates and graduates are made aware of the need for academic honesty, and the existence of the Academic Board policy regarding academic honesty. Awareness raising exercises include information in the Faculty Handbook, Graduate and Undergraduate Student Handbook given to all new students, talks at orientation, notes in unit of study handouts and discussion at the beginning of semester.

In the graduate computing area it has become necessary for the Head of School to visit the main entry classes to warn students, as well as for the lecturer to spend a lesson on the topic. This includes identifying the location of the Academic Board and Faculty policies and running through hypothetical scenarios that may or may not constitute plagiarism. This has proved very successful after a year of very high plagiarism rates. 30 cases have been reduced to 3 in one class.

#### Detection Methods – How is academic dishonesty detected?

Most academic staff detect plagiarism by the suspicion that the work is familiar to them or is of too high a standard for the student to have done. Google searches are the most common tool in assisting locating the original material.

#### Treatment of Cases – Outline how each case was dealt with.

Most cases were dealt with by the lecturer concerned presenting evidence directly to the student and the award of a fail grade for the assessment task.

Students who challenged the result and the accusation were elevated to the Head of School. Approximately 6 such cases occurred during the year to date. Students were interviewed by the Head of School, evidence presented and a resolution agreed. In at least one case the SRC attended. The

Head of School notes the increase in time required to deal with the prevention detection and cases of academic dishonesty for all academic staff.

Assessment and Examination – Has the Faculty's current assignment and/or examination system been amended as a result of item 3? If so, outline how.

Information about plagiarism is attached to the unit handouts for each unit of study.

## **Arts**

### School of English, Art History, Film & Media

I write to report from the School of English, Art History, Film and Media on the following cases of Academic Dishonesty – understanding by that peculiar title dishonesty by students, not academic staff. I am assuming that that is what the Academic Board is interested in, in which case perhaps it would like to consider a small but significant change in order to clarify the point.

The Department of Art History and Theory reports 5 cases of plagiarism in a Junior level unit of study. Students were informed of the discovery of the plagiarised material; they were offered the option of re-submitting with the highest mark available to them being 50%. Two of the students did not take up this option, and did not proceed with the unit of study.

No cases of academic dishonesty were reported from Arts Informatics.

Two cases of outright plagiarism were reported from Australian Studies, one in each semester: Case 1 involved a final year student who appeared to be on the verge of failing anyhow, having not handed in all of his assessment tasks. He cut and pasted an entire essay from the internet. He was sent a letter (which is on file), advising him that this had been identified. His explanation was it was an act of desperation due to pressure of work and other commitments. In light of his failure to submit some other tasks and because of poor tutorial attendance, he received a fail for the unit. He returned in Semester Two, but again did not complete much of the assessment and ended up not coming to class, so has again failed.

Case 2 involved a final year international student who also cut and pasted her final essay from the internet. When she received her letter (also on file), which advised her she would not receive any marks for the task, she contacted the co-ordinator in a panic, pleading for a chance to resubmit – frightened to go home to her parents etc. Given that this was a final unit of study, given her language difficulties, her situation (she'd had to write 3 long essays within the last couple of weeks of semester @ 12,000 words altogether) and having consulted with her tutor about her general performance, the uos co-ordinator decided to give her a chance to resubmit. Her second essay was borderline, however she managed a bare pass for the unit overall (though she only received 40 marks for her essay).

The Department of English reports 5 cases, two at Junior level and 3 at Senior level:

ENGL1025 – Fiction, Film and Power (two cases)

ENGL2046 – Romantic Fictions (one case)

ENGL2027 – Reading Sexuality (one case)

ENGL2011 – Jane Austen (one case)

In each case the plagiarism was documented and presented to the department's Director of Undergraduate Studies. A letter was sent to each student inviting them to discuss the matter with the course co-ordinator. In the cases of 1025 and 2027 the students received a mark of 0% for the plagiarised work on the basis that the work had been taken verbatim from a documented source. In the case of 2046 the student received a mark of 20% on the basis that some of the work could be deemed to be hers although substantial portions of the work were not. In the case of 2011 the student plagiarised while completing a take-home exam by e-mail – an arrangement offered the student because she suffered from a problematic medical condition. When confronted with the evidence the student admitted the plagiarism but pleaded special circumstances as her medical condition had become exacerbated at the time of the take-home exam. The student was asked to submit medical documentation attesting to this, which she did, and was offered the opportunity of re-sitting the exam under formal supervision but with special conditions to accommodate any problems with her illness.

No instances of academic dishonesty were reported from **Medieval Studies**.

In **Media and Communications**, in one case a student wrote on a topic which was a remarkably liberal adaptation of the proposed topic, and then incorporated plagiarised material in that. As this was the final subject for her degree, she was offered a supplementary examination (which she passed). In the other case reported from that programme, a student had incorporated material from sources without attribution, in spite of being alerted by the lecturer on a number of occasions to the necessity of referencing and acknowledging sources. The student has written requesting her project report be reconsidered, and the Director currently has that before her.

Three cases of plagiarism were identified in the Department of **Studies in Religion**. All were Senior students, of non-English speaking background. One case was in RLST 2028 Religion and Film (Semester 1). The two others are enrolled this semester (2005) in RLST 2013 Philosophy of Religion: The Existence of God and RLST 2023 Meditation and Spiritual Practice.

Studies in Religion deals with all such cases in the same way. A permanent staff member contacts the student (usually by 'phone) and arranges a meeting. At the meeting the plagiarism is discussed. In all cases the students admitted it. They were then given the chance to hand in an assignment that they have written themselves in order to pass the course. The result is held INC until then.

Although the other departments have been discreet about the matter, I understand that the majority of these cases also come from students from a non-English speaking background; which is probably not at all surprising, given the pressure these students very often are under.

#### School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry

There were two cases of plagiarism in SOPHI in 2004, one in Philosophy and one in History. Both cases were handled by the Chairs of the respective departments in accordance with the Academic Board and SOPHI procedures.

#### School of Languages and Cultures

Reports have been received from the chairs of all departments in the School, as well as the convenor of the program in Asian Studies. What follows is distilled from those reports.

#### *Protocol*

There is a strong emphasis on prevention throughout the School. Methods include careful advice to students about the importance of academic honesty and how to avoid breaches of University standards on this issue; requiring students to sign a statement certifying their work's conformance with those standards; the inclusion of an examination in the assessment regime; and designing assessment tasks in such a way as to discourage reliance on published sources (including the internet). For example, one chair writes as follows:

In assignments, which principally involve translation, opportunities for plagiarism are radically curtailed by the fact that analytic understanding is emphasised over "correct" translation. Students are made aware at the outset by staff members...of the wide range of translations and resources available and these are a *means* to proper understanding of the language. Assignments are specifically set to test this understanding. Thus students stand to gain little by mere reproduction of existing translations.

When breaches of University standards are detected, the usual approach is an educative one in the first instance. There is general understanding of the principle that assessment (marking work on its merits) and explanation are unit of study coordinator responsibilities, but that the chair of the department must be involved when there is reason to suspect intent to deceive. Reports from most departments reflect a concern to ensure that students understand the nature of their transgression and how to avoid repetitions. At least three departments favour the "revise and resubmit" approach where this is justifiable (with safeguards to ensure fairness to other students). At least two departments have *pro forma* letters that are used to warn and counsel students.

Other forms of academic dishonesty noted include deliberate enrolment in units of study for which the student has excessive prior knowledge; and recourse, for certificates, to medical practitioners of questionable probity. Considerable efforts are made by all language departments to prevent students from enrolling in elementary classes in their own native language; breaches are dealt with in accordance with the relevant Faculty resolution. The issue of corrupt medical practitioners is addressed below, under “Other Comments”.

#### *Detection Methods*

Methods used by one or more departments include:

- Monitoring work carefully for stylistic inconsistencies that possibly betray unacknowledged changes of authorship;
- Internet search (with “Google”, for example);
- Looking for suspect passages in the works from which they seem most likely to have been copied (a process facilitated when the assessment task is based on assigned readings);
- Noting inconsistencies between the student’s usual performance (including proficiency in English) and the standard of particular assignments;
- Noting inconsistencies between performance in in-class tests and performance in take-home assignments;
- Discussion with students to clarify cases of problematic collaboration;
- Asking students to explain passages that they are unlikely to have authored.

It is acknowledged that not all of the above lead directly to solid evidence of plagiarism. There is an understanding that detection methods that result only in reasonable suspicion must be followed by discussion with the suspect before any conclusion can be reached. There are comments from one department about the issues that arise when strong and reasonable suspicion (e.g. of ghost-writing) cannot be confirmed, and how the Academic Board policy might be supplemented with consistent guidelines for addressing this problem. These remarks are pasted below under “Other Comments”.

#### *Treatment of Cases*

Instances of plagiarism regarded as arising from actual dishonesty have not been reported by all departments. There seems to be a higher incidence of cases that are appropriately handled as educational issues. However, in some cases it has been necessary to invoke the *dishonesty* procedures prescribed by the Academic Board. One or more cases in which the chair of department (or equivalent) interviewed a student under the “Fair hearing” provisions of Board policy were reported by the departments of Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies; Germanic Studies; Japanese and Korean Studies; and Chinese and Southeast Asian Studies; and by the program in Asian Studies. In each case, the report from the department/program reflects familiarity with the Academic Board policy.

The following may be quoted from one department’s report as an example of thoughtful application of Board policy:

Treatment varies according to the following factors:

1. the degree of plagiarism: plagiarism of a whole essay is treated more severely than one that is partially plagiarised or a case of insufficient referencing;
2. the degree to which the plagiarism has been substantiated;
3. the intent of the student to deceive: usually determined by the lecturer meeting with the student;
4. the year level of the student: first-year students, especially with first assignments, are generally given a warning along with an explanation of what constitutes plagiarism and why it contradicts the aims of scholarship and learning the Australian university context;
5. the cultural background of the student: first-year students from non-Australian cultures, particularly Asia, are generally given a warning along with an explanation of what constitutes plagiarism and why it contradicts the aims of scholarship and learning the Australian university context.

In 2004, in cases where the degree of plagiarism was partial or the plagiarism was committed without an intention to deceive, the students were given an opportunity to resubmit their work...Letters of warning and conditions for resubmission for different degrees of academic dishonesty...were given to the students.

In cases of extensive and intentional plagiarism, the assessment was given a "0", and the student was required to attend a meeting with the course coordinator and the Chair of department. These cases were also reported to the departmental examiners' meeting. Repetition of such an offence would be referred to the Head of School, but this was not necessary in any of the cases handled in 2004.

#### *Assessment and Examination*

N/A. The question is addressed to faculties.

#### *Other Comments*

One chair of department writes as follows:

'There is one ambiguity – or rather irony – in the present Academic Board policy document that it would be good to see resolved. If one takes the guidelines literally, they would seem to offer the option of being harsher to Student A whose essay is being marked on its merits than to Student B who must be dealt with according to the "processes relating to academic dishonesty" because there is reason to believe that the unacknowledged copying was done "with intent to deceive the examiner". This works as follows.

'Par. 2.4 offers the option of awarding a fail mark for an essay that "contains" plagiarism and deeming this mark to be *not* a "penalty for plagiarism but an evaluation of the merit of the written work in the light of the University's expectations and standards". All well and good, but if the author of that essay is deemed to have breached those expectations *with intent to deceive*, a process will be launched that may result in the student being "required" (read: "offered the opportunity") "to resubmit the work for assessment" or "undertake other remedial work" (par. 3.3.c).

'We repeatedly encounter this irony. It could be resolved by *explicitly* empowering "examiners" (read: unit of study coordinators) who consider that particular cases should be handled in an educative way to offer the offenders the opportunity of revising and resubmitting the offending work. In order to maximise fairness to other students, there should be an explicit understanding as to the maximum mark that can be earned by so doing. It would not be helpful to have a blanket rule about what this mark should be (e.g. all essays that are resubmitted because of plagiarism to be marked on a pass-fail basis), but rather to leave this question to the discretion of the coordinator (perhaps with the assistance of broad guidelines).

'At present, coordinators are left in the position of offering such opportunities *in the spirit of* the policy, while knowing that there is nothing *in the letter* to justify their action. Thus actions taken in good faith to help weak students gain a hands-on understanding of proper referencing *could* provoke accusations of ignoring the explicit prescriptions of the Academic Board. As some coordinators may not wish to run that risk, the result of the ambiguity would be inequitable treatment.

'It should also be remembered that while the distinction between plagiarism through fear/ignorance/poor English and plagiarism through dishonesty is only convenient, not absolute. A student may submit a blatantly plagiarised essay knowing full well what s/he is doing, but the basic reason for the action may nonetheless be poor English and/or lack of confidence in using his/her own words. If the student has already been extensively counselled by the same coordinator, s/he probably realises that the coordinator is most unlikely to be deceived. Does a desperate *hope* that the coordinator will not notice or not bother amount to a deliberate *intent* to deceive?

'This second ambiguity is probably functional to some extent, although this depends very much on how individual coordinators use the discretion that it gives them. However, the unreliability of the

dichotomy does compromise the validity of any policy that rests upon it. This *strengthens* the case for explicitly adding “revise and resubmit” to the options open to the individual coordinator under 3.1.b – that is, actions that the coordinator may take on his/her own authority, provided that a copy of the written agreement made with the student is forwarded to the School administration for filing.’

*On the issue of unproven ghost-writing*

The same chair writes, under “Detection Methods”:

‘Step One these days is probably a “Google” search. Step Two is to consult the books from which material may have been dishonestly copied. If both of these fail, but there is solid reason to suspect dishonesty (e.g. a mismatch between the style of the essay and that of samples of the student’s writing that are known to be authentic), an interview may be the next resort. Unfortunately, if things reach this stage, dishonesty may be unprovable unless the student confesses (as some do). There are some highly literate ghostwriters in Sydney, and they have a tell-tale style. It is, however, doubtful whether style would stand up in court as “evidence that the student engaged another person to write the assignment” (par. 2.3.2.c).

If a student gives a grossly inaccurate account of the meaning of a sophisticated passage, it is a reasonable inference that s/he is not the author. As, however, this falls short of proof, our present response would be to invoke the provision on the syllabus that as a fair mark cannot be given, the student must undertake a substitute assignment. Such action would be taken in good faith to maximise fairness, yet it too is without explicit basis in Academic Board policy. It could thus cause trouble for the initiator. Some coordinators, afraid of such trouble, might simply mark the essay on its merits and give it the lowest mark possible – which would probably not be a fail. As the best ghostwriters write very well, it may be only their ignorance of the specific subject matter that prevents the award of a High Distinction.

It would be beneficial if, in the next revision of the policy, the Academic Board would provide explicit guidelines as to the *standards of evidence* required for concluding that a ghostwriter (or ghost researcher) has been used. An alternative would be to make explicit provision for cases of reasonable suspicion that fall short of evidence that would stand up in court. One possibility would be an explicit requirement that coordinators whose suspicions leave them unable to give a fair mark refer the matter to the head of department/school, who would then impose a substitute assignment, *such as* an unseen examination (par. 3.3.3.d).

*On the issue of fake medical certificates:*

The same chair writes:

‘Concerns have been raised about the medical certificates issued by one particular Chinese medical practitioner. These have been used by students whose behaviour patterns give grounds for concern for other reasons. They risk complicating cases that are already extremely hard to handle.

A signed statement by one lecturer is on file in my office naming one particular practice and setting out the evidence for believing it to be corrupt. Rather than naming the practitioner at this stage, I would prefer to ask that the issue be drawn to the attention of the Academic Board, and that clear procedures be issued for reporting practices that are suspected of such corruption. I am, of course, willing to forward the name of the practice if there is already a framework for identifying corrupt practitioners and (for example) authorising academic staff to disregard the certificates they issue.’

It would seem advisable to publicise any policies and procedures that already exist for dealing with such cases, and to establish a procedure for reporting suspect practitioners to the University if this is thought appropriate.

The framework for the Department's protocol for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty is, of course, the Academic Board's Policy on Academic Honesty in Coursework, to which students' attention is drawn in every unit outline:

1. Where an examiner detects or is made aware of plagiarism, recycling or irregularities in an assessment and/or examination, the examiner will either arrange a consultation with the student or refer the matter to the Chair of Department.

2. If the examiner believes that there is insufficient evidence that the student was acting with the intention to deceive, or otherwise acting dishonestly, the examiner may:

- (a) counsel the student by explaining referencing guidelines, providing information concerning plagiarism or referring the student to services for assistance; and/or
- (b) issue a written warning about the consequences of breaching the University's policies on academic honesty.

A copy of the warning will be:

- (i) signed and dated by both the student and examiner;
- (ii) retained by both the student and the examiner; and
- (iii) forwarded by the examiner to the Chair of Department for filing.

3. In cases where the examiner believes that there is evidence of an intention to deceive, or some other form of dishonesty, the matter is referred to the Chair of Department.

- (a) the Chair will deal with the matter no later than three (3) weeks from the time that he or she is notified of the alleged breach of academic standards of honesty.
- (b) A student shall be given a reasonable opportunity to know specifically the nature of the allegations concerning the breach of academic standards of honesty, and given a reasonable time in which to prepare a response.
- (c) The student may invite a support person or the relevant student representative to any meeting with the Chair of Department.
- (d) The student shall be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard on the allegations of failure to comply with academic standards of honesty.
- (e) The Chair of Department will make a decision about the matter within two (2) weeks of the date of meeting or other form of consultation.

4. Taking into account the student's level of experience, reasons for or circumstances relating to the breaching academic standards of honesty and/or previous incidents of such breaches, the Chair of Department shall make a determination by either:

- (a) dismissing the case with no further action other than counselling the student;
- (b) issuing a written warning;
- (c) requiring the student to resubmit the work for assessment; or to undertake other remedial work;
- (d) requiring the student to undertake another form of assessment in lieu of the assignment in question, such as an unseen examination;
- (e) applying a fail grade to the work, or part thereof, submitted for assessment;
- (f) applying a fail grade overall in the unit of study; or
- (g) referring the matter to the Registrar if the Chair of Department considers there has been a breach of the University's standards of academic honesty and the student continues in a denial or, following the interview, the Chair of Department considers that failing the unit of study is insufficient to deal with the matter.

5. Recordkeeping

- (a) A brief record of the interview shall be made on each matter regardless of outcome. This report shall be in a form designed to record the nature of the incident, attributing factors, evidence, outcome and follow up.
- (b) A letter outlining the decision and the reasons for the decision shall be sent to the student involved.

#### *Detection Methods*

The Department has no systematic technique for detecting academic dishonesty, detection takes place on an ad hoc basis, when examiners happen to recognise text as coming from a particular source, when the language and level of analytical skill appear inconsistent with the particular student, when they use Google to search phrases used in an essay, etc.

#### *Treatment of Cases*

All of our cases have been dealt with as instances of inadequate referencing, the student's result has reflected this concern with the academic standard of the piece of work, and they have been counselled by the examiner with regard to academic honesty.

#### *Any Other Comments*

None.

### **Sydney College of the Arts**

The College's report will be submitted for the April meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee.

### **Sydney Conservatorium of Music**

#### Protocol

Procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty follow broadly the directions of the Academic Board. Cases judged of a relatively minor nature are dealt with by each Course Director. Students are individually counselled re the perceived shortcomings in their work and the concept of academic honesty is clarified with students. Serious cases of Academic Honesty are referred to the Head of School. Students are advised in writing of concerns re Academic Honesty and advised of their rights including the presence of a support person at an interview. The Head of School makes the final decision in consultation with the Course Director. In some cases, students are required to repeat the course. On-going support re academic expectations is offered to such students.

#### Detection Methods

Coursework is scrutinized by all staff with a view to academic honesty. The variable nature of courses means that, in some cases, staff familiarity with assessment materials is the major means of detection. A strong reliance on formal unseen examinations in other courses also acts to check academic dishonesty. In more general courses which have a heavy utilisation of essays in assessment, excerpts from a broad sample of written assignments are fed into a search engine such as Google.

#### Treatment of Cases

No major cases in relation to Academic Honesty were drawn to the attention of the Teaching Committee or the Associate Dean, (Teaching and Learning ) in 2004. This may well result from the recent Faculty-wide attention to issues of Academic Honesty in generic skills teaching within the Faculty. For further details in this regard, see below.

#### Assessment and Examination

Cases of Academic Dishonesty during the preceding year, 2003, led to a clarification of the description of plagiarism in the official assignment guide, What's Expected?: The Conservatorium Guide to Academic Writing and Thinking. The Teaching and Learning Committee also oversaw a revision to cover sheet attached to all written assessments. to include the following clause:

I certify

a) that I am aware of the expectations and obligations regarding Academic Honesty.

Students with any queries should consult <http://policy.rms.usyd.edu.au/000007xpdf>

#### Other Comments

The absence of serious, detected cases of plagiarism during 2004 may be the result of the increased attention given to Academic Honesty during 2004. The issue was a major item for discussion at the Conservatorium's annual Teaching Day held in February 2004. Approaches, detection methods and

student instruction in issues relating Academic Honesty received very useful airing. Within the compulsory first year Historical and Cultural Studies Courses, where students received much of their basic grounding in academic skills and expectations, a new strategy was also trialled during 2004. Instead of a prescriptive, top-down instruction in issues relating to Academic Honesty, each student in each tutorial group was asked to produce a definition of plagiarism and Academic Honesty. Each individual definition was then discussed and each group then formulated a collective definition of Academic Honesty. This approach seemed to work well and was especially valuable in encouraging students to assume personal responsibility for issues relating to their academic production. This is also a useful antidote to the past practice of students choosing to blame teachers for inadequate instruction in issues relating to Academic Honesty rather than accepting any responsibility themselves. The strategy of increasing a sense of personal responsibility was also reflected in the specific revision to the assignment cover sheet referred to in Point 4. The 2005 edition of the Conservatorium Assignment Guide is also under current revision to include a section on Cross Cultural Expectations in relation to academic learning.

None of this, however, negates the enormous challenge posed for all University teachers by the internet. The casualisation of staff also raises real problems in terms of teacher detection since, in most cases, casualisation means a decline in institutional memory and experience. The current initiative to develop a College-wide electronic instruction program in generic skills, including issues of academic honesty, should be therefore be commended.

### **Dentistry**

The Faculty had one case of *suspected* academic misconduct during 2004. Two students enrolled in the BDS program accused another student of cheating in the examination held for the unit DENT4032 Paediatric Dentistry. The students making the accusations wrote to the BDS Course Coordinator and then the Dean outlining their allegations. The following procedure was followed:

I as Dean ordered an investigation of the allegations. I contacted the student accused and asked her to comment on the allegations made against her, and met with her in person to discuss the matter in detail. In doing so I checked with the Examinations Office whether any misconduct – proven or suspected – had been reported by the examination supervisor of this exam – nothing was reported (the examination was organised via the Examinations Office and supervised by an external (non-Faculty) examination supervisor).

Having met with the student accused, balancing her testimony against the accusations made against her, I could find no evidence or at best solid interpretations to pursue the allegations further – hence the matter was closed at Faculty level and no further investigative measures taken.

I did write to the two students who made the accusations, indicating that I had met with the student accused and did not have sufficient evidence to pursue the matter further. Correspondence ceased after this point. The BDS Course Coordinator and Faculty Manager were privy to this case and written correspondence. The student accused graduated in the December 2004 graduation ceremony.

No other cases occurred in 2004.

### **Economics and Business**

#### Executive summary

The Faculty is strongly committed to academic honesty and this report summarises our efforts, experiences, and forthcoming innovations in regard to it.

In section 1 we report current protocol in regard to academic honesty. In 2004, the Faculty's Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) continued to maintain and update a set of guidelines and protocols, ensuring equity and fairness in dealing with cases of academic dishonesty. The current protocol for students and staff is reproduced. In the past, issues of academic dishonesty cases have been handled by the lecturer of the unit of study, the Chair of Discipline and the Faculty's Teaching Quality Fellow. From semester 2 2004, cases were handled by Unit of Study Coordinators and Heads of School in line with Academic Board policy. Where there was evidence of a possible intention to deceive, students

were informed in writing of these meetings and told that they could bring an observer or advocate with them to the meetings. The Faculty strongly pursued improved setting of student expectations in various face-to-face and online forums (through the Orientation Working Party) as well as in the Unit of Study Outline template. The Teaching and Learning Committee's Academic Honesty Working Party, established in 2003 following feedback from Academic Board Phase 1 Review, pursued the development of a self-managed online module that deals with academic honesty. The intended Dean's Register (of students with demonstrated cases of academic dishonesty) was not established as planned in 2004 following feedback from the University's TLC in late 2003.

In section 2 we report current and future approaches to detection. The Faculty had high hopes for the use of electronic detection software and trialled TurnItIn in 2003. Following feedback from the University's TLC that students must be given the opt-out option, staff interest in using it declined. The Faculty is trialling new detection software in Summer School 2005 that overcomes this need. The Faculty is also reviewing a paper by Park (2004), which reports an institution-wide approach for dealing with academic dishonesty.<sup>1</sup>

In section 3 we report the treatment of 29 cases by each school received each year by the Faculty's TLC. The treatment of several cases extended Faculty guidelines. The majority of cases involved postgraduate students (22), international students (22), full-fee paying students (21) with all but one discipline having one or more cases of academic misconduct. The majority of cases (19) resulted in a mark of zero for the assessment.

In section 4 we discuss improvements to academic honesty aspects of assessment and examination arising from experiences in 2004. Amongst other actions, two aspects currently being pursued are worthy of mention. First, the setting of expectations is being further strengthened with the development of a short video clip showing student voices about the topic. This will be used in orientation forums and placed on the Faculty website. Second, the Faculty is trialling SafeAssignment™ detection software in Summer School 2005. This software shows promise since it is a building block that works with the Faculty's learning management system (Blackboard). This avoids student files and corresponding intellectual property to be used by an external commercial organisation, as files are stored on the Faculty server. Being used only with draft assessments allows a greater focus on prevention and education.

#### Protocol

There are two aspects relating to academic honesty protocol, namely educating students (and staff) and the procedures to follow when cases are identified.

The Faculty seeks to educate students and set appropriate expectations in regard to academic honesty in a number of ways.

- The Faculty's 2004 student orientation programs included information and advice on academic honesty and how to avoid dishonesty etc
  - Orientation program during O-week
  - Transition sessions held during the first few weeks of semester
  - Study skills workshops in week 3 of semester
  - Pre-arrival orientation CD for all students.
  - Pre-arrival orientation video conference in China and Sydney
- The Faculty's Unit of Study Outline Template includes a section on plagiarism and academic honesty
- The Faculty's recommended assessment coversheet requires student sign-off in relation to academic honesty (<http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/content.php?pageid=2498>). Assessment cover sheets were developed in semester 1 for individual and group assessments and improved

---

<sup>1</sup> Park, C. (2004) Rebels without a clause: towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 23 (8) pp.291-306

in semester 2 in response to feedback from one Discipline that received positive feedback with semester 1 academic dishonesty cases from their more refined version.

- Development of an academic honesty online module. The 7-part academic honesty online module was developed by the Faculty's Academic Honesty Working Party, including the following topics:
  1. Plagiarism – what is it really?
  2. Plagiarism – avoiding it by proper referencing
  3. Plagiarism – avoiding it by knowing what to reference
  4. Plagiarism – avoiding it with acceptable paraphrasing
  5. Acceptable collaboration and group work versus collusion and free riding
  6. Cheating in tests, exams, essays and spreadsheets
  7. Penalties for academic dishonesty
- It was piloted in both semesters and feedback sought from students. In September 2004 feedback was sought (but not received) from the SRC and SUPRA. In 2005 it will be compulsory for commencing students to complete and students will be required to tick a box on the assessment cover sheet to indicate they have completed it. If students have not ticked the box, the assessment can be marked but not released to students until they have made that declaration.
- Use of plagiarism detection software. SafeAssignment, a plug-in/'building block' detection software for Blackboard, is on trial in Summer School 2005. Students will have the option to check their plagiarism rating if they choose to submit a draft. The software avoids the problem of submission to a third party commercial organisation since all files will be kept on University servers.
- Greater use of student voices about academic honesty are currently being developed via digitized video and will be included in the face-to-face orientation forums and in the upgraded orientation CD and website.

The Faculty seeks to educate staff and set appropriate expectations in regard to academic honesty in a number of ways.

- The Staff Manual (<http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/content.php?pageid=13732>) has been updated to include information on plagiarism, and the Academic Board and Faculty policies advising staff to:
  - Incorporate the principles of academic honesty into unit of study outlines and assessment criteria
  - Apply referencing requirements consistently for all assessment tasks
  - Provide feedback to students, and referring students to sources of assistance to improve their academic writing skills
  - Notify students early if they believe any individual or group may be at risk of breaching rules of academic honesty
  - Give clear written instructions in Unit of Study outlines on the level of cooperation permitted within each assessment component
- It is included in tutor professional development workshops and manual
- The template for the Faculty's Unit of Study Outline has been updated to include it (<http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/content.php?pageid=2498>).
- The template coversheet recommended best practice for both group and individual assessments includes reference to academic honesty (<http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/content.php?pageid=2498>)
- Various staff teaching and learning forums on academic honesty have been held (November 2004) or are planned to be held (February 2005).
- Centre to Advance Learning in Economics and Business provides advice to staff and students on academic honesty and has an ongoing brief to disseminate policy (eg. Ask CALEB ezine April 2004 to all staff provided resources on managing and avoiding plagiarism)

The Faculty seeks to provide clear procedures for dealing with suspected cases of academic dishonesty. The following is an extract from the staff manual.

1. If a member of academic staff detects possible academic dishonesty in written work or examinations, the Unit of Study Coordinator should first make an assessment of whether the student's intention was to deceive. Plagiarism is deemed intentional if the student has reproduced material from published work without acknowledgement, in a manner that cannot be attributed to poor referencing, language difficulties or lack of academic skills.
2. If the case seems to be one where a student is unaware of the problem and has not acted with any intention to deceive, then it can normally be handled informally in an interview between the unit coordinator and the student. The unit coordinator may counsel the student by explaining referencing guidelines, providing information concerning plagiarism, and referring the student to services for assistance with academic writing skills. Note that in terms of marking, where written work contains plagiarism without the intention to deceive, the work should be assessed in accordance with its academic merit, and in appropriate cases may fail the assessment task.
3. If however the case seems to be one where a student is aware of the problem and has acted with an intention to deceive the examiner, the Unit of Study Coordinator should refer the matter directly to the Head of School (bypassing Step 2). Recent examples of cases where the matter was referred directly to the Head of School include a) a student being caught with study notes in a pencil case during an examination; b) a group of students giving a seminar presentation found to be taken word for word from an academic paper without acknowledgment; and c) a student found to have copied to a large extent the essay of another student in the same unit of study.
4. The Head of School considers the matter and, depending on the severity of the offence, either:
  - Refers the case immediately to the Registrar for disciplinary action, in accordance with clause 62(1) of the University of Sydney By-laws 1999, Chapter 8 Student Discipline; or
  - Arranges to discuss the matter with the student at a meeting (or other form of direct consultation)
5. When the Head of School elects to discuss the matter with the student, the following guidelines must be adhered to in order to give the student a fair hearing:
  - The Head of School should deal with the matter no more than three (3) weeks from the time he or she is notified of the case
  - The student should be fully informed about the nature of the allegations of academic dishonesty, and given a reasonable time to prepare a response
  - The student should be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard in relation to the allegations
  - The student may invite a support person or the relevant student representative to any meeting with the Head of School. This information must be included as written information when the student is notified of the allegation.
  - The Head of School will make a decision about the matter within two weeks of the meeting.
6. After discussion with the student, the Head of School may decide to take one of the following actions:
  - Dismiss the case with no further action other than counselling the student
  - Issue a written warning
  - Require the student to resubmit the work, or undertake remedial work
  - Undertake another form of assessment in lieu of the assignment in question, such as an unseen examination
  - Apply a fail grade to the assignment in question
  - Apply a fail grade to the whole unit of study

If the Head of School believes that none of the above options is suitable, the matter may still be referred to the Registrar for disciplinary action under the University by-laws. This could be appropriate in a situation where, following the interview with the student, the head of School believes that a deliberate breach of academic honesty has

occurred but the student continues in a denial, or if the Head believes the matter is so serious that failing the unit of study is not a sufficient penalty.

7. The Head of School should make a brief record of all discussions with the student. The record should note the nature of the incident, attributing factors, evidence, outcome, and follow up.

8. A student has the right to appeal a decision made under these procedures. The student should be advised of the right to appeal in the letter communicating the Head of School's decision. Appeals relating to decisions on matters of academic honesty follow the same procedure as appeals against academic decisions.

9. Heads of School should collect information annually on the way in which breaches of academic honesty have been dealt with. This information should be forwarded by the Heads of School to the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee. The purpose of this annual reporting is to ensure consistency of approach across the Faculty. The Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee should then make a consolidated report to the Academic Board, to facilitate the monitoring and review process.

#### Detection methods

The Faculty seeks to assist students and staff to detect and prevent plagiarism in a number of ways. In 2003 the Faculty trialled the use of plagiarism detection software (TurnItIn), and submitted a report of the outcomes to the University's Academic Board. The Faculty responded to recommendations from the Academic Board relating to the 'opt-out' procedures for using this software, and adjusted practices accordingly for 2004. In 2004, a number of staff previously using it discontinued their use following the University ruling requiring students be given the opt-out option. Staff are relying on more manual processes for plagiarism (e.g. recognising known statements; phrase-searching after observing changes in fluency, font, style etc.) and detecting cheating (e.g. examination invigilators).

In Summer School 2005, SafeAssignment, a 'building block' detection software for the Faculty's learning management system Blackboard, will be trialled. It does not require submission to a third party commercial organisation but allows all files to be kept on University servers thus overcoming the requirement to provide students with the opt-out option. This technology is being trialled for use with draft assessments, which means that students can detect and correct plagiarism before submitting their final assessment. In the Summer School pilot the final assessment is not scanned.

#### Treatment of cases

The following tables summarise the 29 cases of academic dishonesty for the 2004 academic year, distributed between the School of Business (17) and the School of Economics and Political Sciences (12).

#### ***School of Business***

<b>Unit Of Study</b>	<b>Type of Academic Dishonesty</b>	<b>Decision of Head of School</b>
FINC 6003	Plagiarism	Zero mark for the assessment and additional 3% penalty applied
FINC 6003	Plagiarism	10% penalty applied
FINC 6003	Cheating	Zero mark for the assessment
FINC 6003	Cheating	Zero mark for the assessment
ACCT 1001	Plagiarism	Awaiting Interview
ACCT 1001	Plagiarism	Awaiting Interview
ACCT 1001	Plagiarism	Awaiting Interview
ACCT 1001	Plagiarism	Awaiting Interview
TPTM 6495	Plagiarism	Zero mark for the assessment
TPTM 6495	Plagiarism	Further assessment to be completed in which a penalty will be applied to the final mark
TPTM 6495	Plagiarism	Zero mark for the assessment
TPTM 6495	Plagiarism	Zero mark for the assessment
WORK 5001	Plagiarism	Zero mark for the assessment

WORK 5001	Plagiarism	Zero mark for the assessment
CLAW2005	Plagiarism	Awaiting Interview
INFS 6000	Cheating	Awaiting response from student
MKTG 1002	Plagiarism	Zero mark for both pieces of assessment

***School of Economics and Political Science***

Unit of Study	Type of Academic Dishonesty	Decision of the Head of School
ECOF 5803	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
ECOF 5803	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
ECOF 5803	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
ECOF 5803	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
ECOF 5803	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
GOVT 6116	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
GOVT 6166	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
GOVT 6166	Plagiarism	Marked zero for (2) assessments
GOVT 6316	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
GOVT 6116	Plagiarism	Marked zero for the assessment
ECON 5001	Cheating	Marked zero for the exam
ECOP 1002	Plagiarism	Marked 'Fail' for the unit

The final decision reflected above follows an interview with the student, Head of School and the academic who lodged the original incident report.

Students are reminded of relevant University policies and directed to workshops that would assist the student in their academic career.

**Analysis:**

Distribution of cases across schools and disciplines of the Faculty

School of Business Units of Study (17)

- Finance (4)
- Accounting (4)
- Transport, Logistics and Supply Chain Management (4)
- Work and Organisational Studies (2)
- Business Information Systems (1)
- Commercial Law (1)
- Marketing (1)

School of Economics and Political Science Units of Study

- Government and International Relations (5)
- Economics (1)
- Political Economy (1)
- Econometrics and Business Statistics (0)
- Faculty Units of Study (5)

**Distribution of cases across level**

- Undergraduate (7)
- Postgraduate (22)

**Distribution of cases by treatment**

- Require the student to resubmit the work, or undertake remedial work (1)
- Apply a fail grade to the assignment in question (19)
- Apply a fail grade to the whole unit of study (1)
- Awaiting interview or response from the student (6)
- Other (e.g. zero mark for assessment plus an additional 3% penalty) (2)

### **Distribution of cases by entry status**

- Local (7)
- International (22)

### **Distribution of cases by payment**

- HECS (4)
- Full fee paying (21)
- Other (e.g. PELS, Sponsored Award, fee help {pre-PELS}, no offer made yet) (4)

### Assessment and Examination

The Faculty has changed the assessment and/or examination system as a result of item 3 in several ways indicated below.

- Trial of plagiarism detection software SafeAssignment. Staff that want to ensure academic honesty inevitably bear a cost if they wish to investigate suspected plagiarism, especially since TurnItIn became difficult to use effectively (because of the opt-out option for students). In addition, if student can self-evaluate their assessment for plagiarism in draft form prior to submission they can be assisted in their understanding of academic honesty and thus unintentional breaches. This software shows promise since it is a building block that works with the Faculty's learning management system (Blackboard). This is not only useful because it avoids the need for student files and corresponding intellectual property to be used by an external commercial organisation, as files are stored on the Faculty server. It can also be used with draft assessments. The latter allows a greater focus on prevention and education.
- Further actions to educate and set appropriate student expectations. Staff would like to know that all students have undertaken some foundational learning about academic honesty. Dealing with suspected cases of academic honesty would be easier if students had followed standardised processes since ignorance would be harder to claim. Students would appreciate greater clarity in expectations. Those that completed the pilot of the self-managed learning online module noted its usefulness and would like access to it throughout their studies so they can have a chance to reuse it. Therefore a range of actions are underway as indicated below.
- A decision to roll out the self-managed learning online academic honesty module beyond individual Units of Study in 2005. This module covers the particularly difficult issues of plagiarism and collusion. From 2005 it is to be available to all students in the Faculty and mandatory for commencing students.
- A short video is being developed that shows and reflects students' voices that support honest academic practice. This will be used in orientation forums and placed on the orientation CD given to commencing students and placed on the website for access at any time.
- Improving the navigation to teaching learning aspects of faculty website to make material, including aspects relating to academic honesty, more readily accessible.
- Improved assessment cover sheet. 2004 experiences showed benefits from inclusions by one discipline which have been adopted into the recommended best practise template for Faculty staff when setting assessments. To reflect the roll out of the online module, the 2005 assessment cover sheet requires students to tick a box to indicate they have completed the online module.

### References

Park, C. (2004) Rebels without a clause: towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 23 (8) pp.291-306

### **Education and Social Work**

#### Protocol – Procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty.

The University policy on academic honesty is followed where cases of academic dishonesty are detected. Students are, in the first instance, asked to meet with the examiner of their work to discuss the issue. Students are given a warning letter which outlines the academic honesty issue which they counter sign. This letter is retained by the student and the examiner as well as placed on the student file. Where the examiner of the work has the view that a student had a clear intention to deceive, the

case is referred directly to the relevant Associate Dean.

Detection Methods – How academic dishonesty is detected

Cases of academic dishonesty are detected in the assessment of students' work. Sometimes it is through a Google search which finds work on the Internet that a student has claimed to be their own. In other cases it is detected by a member of staff who is familiar with a published text that a student has copied and claimed to be their own.

Treatment of Cases – How each case was dealt with.

In all but one case, cases of academic dishonesty were treated as in 1 above. In the case of a dissertation student who, in the view of an examiner, had copied work directly from a thesis from another University for the dissertation she submitted in the Faculty, this was referred directly to the Acting Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The student has contested the examiner's claim of a breach of academic honesty. The Acting Associate Dean for Graduate Studies is currently dealing with this case and has asked for a further examiner's view of the student's work before responding to the student's appeal.

In the Undergraduate Division one case was appealed to the Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies. The student appealed on the grounds that while 50% of her lesson planning assignment was taken from the Internet she had not meant to deceive intentionally. She admitted to poor referencing. Accordingly the appeal against Academic Dishonesty was upheld in accordance with Academic Board Resolutions: Academic Honesty in Coursework Approved by: Academic Board on 14 November 2001  
Date of effect: 1 January 2002

*(3) Plagiarism is always unacceptable in academic work but may not necessarily involve dishonest intent. Some plagiarism occurs when students fail to follow the practices of referencing which are expected in the relevant field of study...  
Plagiarism which represents poor referencing practice, or which reflects an unwillingness to use one's own words, should be addressed as an educational issue. Students should be counselled about proper referencing practices and the importance of writing in their own words and the University's expectations relating to assessment should be clarified.*

Accordingly the student's work was marked on educational criteria and the student was counselled.

Assessment and Examination – How the Faculty's current assignment and/or examination system has been amended.

In 2005 all unit outlines will contain the following statement:

**Academic Honesty**

Students should be aware about the serious manner in which academic honesty is viewed in the University. There is a website link from the Faculty of Education and Social Work home page directing students to University policies.

Click on [http://www.edsw.usyd.edu.au/current\\_students/policies/](http://www.edsw.usyd.edu.au/current_students/policies/), then "Students", then "Student policies", then "Academic Honesty". You are required to sign each assignment cover sheet saying you have read the academic honesty policy of the University and that your work complies with this policy.

All theses and dissertations submitted in the Faculty from 2005 will be required to contain a declaration using the following wording. This declaration shall be signed by the student:

**Declaration of authorship**

I declare that this [thesis/dissertation] comprises only my original work, except where due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other materials used.

Signed .....

Date .....

The UG Division revised its Information for Students Booklet and to included prescriptive information on the presentation of assignments including referencing procedures. (Style Guide for Writing Assignments Faculty of Education and Social Work Information for Students pp15-25). This information was placed in the Handbook and on all Faulty Courses Web sites for 2005.

Any Other Comments

A teaching and learning seminar will be held in the Faculty in 2005 to sure all staff are certain of how to deal with cases of academic dishonesty.

**Engineering**

No report received.

**Graduate School of Government**

The School has no cases to report.

**Health Sciences**

**ACADEMIC HONESTY – 2004 CONSOLIDATED REPORT**

Item	Brief Description	Numbers	Comments
1	Cases Detected	<b>80</b>	
2	Decisions Made		
(a)	Case Dismissed, but Student Counselling	17	
(b)	Written Warning Issued	31	
(c)	Resubmission Required	7	
(d)	Another Assessment Required	3	
(e)	Failed Assessment	29	
(f)	Failed UOS	9	
(g)	Referred to Registrar	0	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>96</b>	The <b>Outcomes</b> and <b>Cases Detected Totals</b> do not match because more than one action was taken with some students.
3	Appeals lodged	<b>1</b>	
4	Appeal outcomes	<b>1</b>	Unsuccessful – failed UOS.
5.1	Protocol		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protocol varies according to severity of charge.</li> <li>• Dealt with by relevant academic, if minor.</li> <li>• HOS involved when academic dishonesty, rather than ignorance, is suspected.</li> <li>• Typically students are sent letters either to invite them for interview or to explain their 'story'.</li> <li>• Response/penalties discussed with HOS.</li> </ul>
5.2	Detection Methods		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff marking – alerted to repetition of phrases, changes in writing style, similarities between students and few references and quotations in the text.</li> <li>• Checked with plagiarism software.</li> <li>• Google or Eve2 search.</li> </ul>

5.3	Treatment of Cases		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview with UOS /year coordinators and HOS.</li> <li>• Letter for distance students.</li> <li>• Discussed at School Board Meeting.</li> <li>• Students referred to Language and Learning Unit for guidance with referencing.</li> </ul>
5.4	Assessment and Examination		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cover sheets provided for signature indicating assignment is all own work.</li> <li>• Assignments changed each year, if possible.</li> <li>• Staff reminded about making assignment tasks as plagiarism proof as possible.</li> </ul>
6	Other Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff include examples of academic dishonesty in course outlines/manuals.</li> <li>• Culturally based lack of understanding of academic honesty.</li> <li>• Penalties for inadequate/inappropriate referencing should be applied more rigorously.</li> <li>• Automatic software to detect plagiarism would be useful and save staff time in checking references</li> </ul>

### **Koori Centre**

Following implementation of strategies in 2003-4 to deal more effectively with plagiarism in both block-release and on-campus mainstream classes, occurrence of obviously deliberate cases of plagiarism in the Koori Centre diminished to almost zero. There were no other substantive cases of academic dishonesty that were brought to my attention by academic or admin staff at the end of Semester 2, 2004. It could be assumed, therefore, that more explicit reference to academic dishonesty issues in policy, unit of study outlines, handbooks, academic procedures documents and other material, helped raise levels of awareness of both the problem and how the University proposed to address it.

### **Law**

#### Protocol

The Faculty of Law deals with cases of academic dishonesty as follows:

- Lecturers bring their concerns to the Pro Dean (Teaching) for discussion
- Following discussion, the following options may be taken:
  - Informal discussion with the student by the relevant Lecturer and the Pro Dean (Teaching)
  - Formal hearing with the student before the Lecturer, Pro Dean (Teaching), relevant Associate Dean (Postgraduate or Undergraduate), or other senior academic member of Faculty
- In cases where a Formal hearing has been conducted, the student has an opportunity to explain their actions following which a determination is made in accordance with Academic Board policy as to what further course of action should be taken (opportunity to resubmit assessment, award of a fail grade, formal reprimand and warning, referral of the matter to the Registrar)

#### Detection Methods

Academic Dishonesty is detected primarily by the individual lecturers responsible for units of study. Occasionally, fellow students may raise concerns over academic dishonesty and bring those concerns to the attention of either the Lecturer or the Pro Dean.

#### Treatment of Cases

Case #1: Student attended hearing with Dr Brett Williams, Associate Professor Barbara McDonald (Pro-Dean (Staffing)), and Associate Professor Pat Loughlan (Pro-Dean (Teaching)) regarding

allegations of academic dishonesty in *International Business Law*. Award of 30 FAIL grade; no referral to the Registrar (2 February 2004)

Case #2: Student attended hearing with Professor Harland and Associate Professor Pat Loughlan (Pro-Dean (Teaching)) regarding allegations of academic dishonesty in *Consumer Protection Law*. Resubmission of essay permitted, unit of study result to be no higher than 50 PASS; no referral of the case to the Registrar (11 March 2004)

Case #3: Student attended hearing with Professor Harland and Associate Professor Pat Loughlan (Pro-Dean (Teaching)) regarding allegations of academic dishonesty in *Consumer Protection Law*. Resubmission of essay permitted, unit of study result to be no higher than 50 PASS; no referral of the case to the Registrar (31 March 2004)

Case #4: Student attended hearing with Dr Brett Williams, Associate Professor Roger Magnusson (Associate Dean (Postgraduate)), and Professor Don Rothwell (Pro-Dean (Teaching)) regarding allegations of academic dishonesty in *International Business Law*. Resubmission of essay permitted, unit of study result to be no higher than 50 PASS; no referral of the case to the Registrar (9 September 2004)

Case #5: Student attended hearing with Dr Brett Williams, Associate Professor Roger Magnusson (Associate Dean (Postgraduate)), and Professor Don Rothwell (Pro-Dean (Teaching)) regarding allegations of academic dishonesty in *International Business Law*. Resubmission of essay permitted, unit of study result to be no higher than 50 PASS; no referral of the case to the Registrar (9 September 2004)

Case #6: Student attended hearing with Dr Brett Williams, Associate Professor Roger Magnusson (Associate Dean (Postgraduate)), and Professor Don Rothwell (Pro-Dean (Teaching)) regarding allegations of academic dishonesty in *Advanced International Trade Regulation*. Finding of academic dishonesty; award of FAIL grade; no referral of the case to the Registrar (9 September 2004)

Case #7: Student attended hearing with Dr Elisabeth Peden, Associate Professor Roger Magnusson (Associate Dean (Postgraduate)), and Professor Don Rothwell (Pro-Dean (Teaching)) regarding allegations of academic dishonesty in *Controlling Liability by Contract*. Finding of academic dishonesty; award of FAIL grade; no referral of the case to the Registrar (9 September 2004)

#### Assessment and Examination

There has been no formal amendment of the Faculty of Law's assignment or examination system, however, several lecturers are now favouring unseen forms of assessment as being an appropriate response to cases of plagiarism arising during essay and assignment writing.

#### Any Other Comments

The Teaching and Curriculum Committee of the Faculty is giving serious consideration to recommending the purchase of software to assist in the detection of cases of plagiarism. The office of the Pro Dean (Teaching) is also giving consideration to the provision of support to assist lecturers in detecting cases of plagiarism.

#### **Medicine**

##### Protocol – What are your procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty.

When a potential case of academic dishonesty is identified the unit coordinator discusses area(s) of concern with the student. If the student admits to the dishonesty: the student is informed that they will fail the unit of study; is cautioned about the seriousness of academic dishonesty; and is informed that documentation will be kept on a specially created file recording this instance of dishonesty. The incident and discussions are documented and the course coordinator is informed. If the student does not admit to the dishonesty, and dishonesty is still suspected, they are then referred to the Director of Teaching and Learning for further discussion.

Detection Methods – How is academic dishonesty detected?

In the marking of assignments the unit coordinators look for instances of plagiarism or copying between students.

The Faculty has experimented with EVE, a plagiarism detection software package, but many disciplines have found this package is not foolproof as it has reported many false positives. Other course coordinators find it useful and continue to use the package.

The School of Public Health checks one in every five assignments by extracting random paragraphs and running them through a Google search. This has produced some positive results and remains the preferred method of detection.

In addition to electronic detection methods, assignments are checked and further investigated where there is evidence that an assignment is presented with greater written clarity than the student has displayed during the course of the candidature.

Documentation submitted by students (eg medical certificates) in application for special consideration is checked by the unit coordinator for any evidence forgery or tampering. If necessary and with the permission of the student, the medical doctor signing the certificate is contacted to verify the certificate.

Treatment of Cases – Outline how each case was dealt with.

There was one identified instance of academic dishonesty amongst the Clinical Epidemiology students in 2004. In this instance the student missed an exam and submitted an application for special consideration which included a medical certificate that had been altered. The student was confronted with the unit coordinator's suspicion that the certificate had been altered and she admitted that she had indeed altered an old certificate. The student said she had not been to the doctor at the time of the exam but had been unwell for some time and had recently seen her doctor. She gave permission for her doctor to be contacted to discuss her current condition. The doctor confirmed she had seen the student recently but not at the time of the exam. The student was informed that she would fail the unit of study as she had failed to act honestly in her application for special consideration. The student was cautioned about the incident in writing by the School of Public Health, Director of Teaching and Learning. A copy of the correspondence is kept in a specially created misconduct file, with limited circulation.

Assessment and Examination – Has the Faculty's current assignment and/or examination system been amended as a result of item 3? If so, outline how.

The Faculty is currently updating a number of policies, including policy relating to Academic Dishonesty, so that academic staff can be kept aware of the recommended process.

**Nursing**  
Protocol

The Faculty of Nursing uses the procedures set down by the Academic Board without any variation to these.

Detection methods

Academic dishonesty cases within the Faculty revolved around plagiarism and copying of other students work. Detection was based on the academic staff member's familiarity with the literature and markers noting significant similarities in assignments.

Treatment of cases

In all cases students were counselled and advised of University policies on academic dishonesty. They were reminded that these were spelt out in the unit of study outlines as were the Faculty's referencing guidelines. Students were advised to become familiar with these policies. Students were also advised of the penalties associated with academic dishonesty and the seriousness with which the Faculty viewed such cases. Each case was assessed for intent and a fail mark forwarded to the Head of Department for approval.

The meeting was documented in a student file note and placed on their academic record. Both the student and lecturer signed the file note and the student was given a copy for their own record.

In one department there were three cases of plagiarism concerning postgraduate students where students had difficulty in understanding that they had committed a breach of University guidelines. They advised staff that their practices were no different from those they had operated under in their undergraduate degree and that their work had been deemed acceptable for their undergraduate degree. None of these students completed their undergraduate courses at the University of Sydney.

All three students were given a fail mark on the assignment, however a second meeting with the Head of Department was required with one student who failed the unit of study overall. One student withdrew from the course.

#### Assessment and examination

In one of the first year units of study students were required to submit an annotated bibliography as a minor assignment. A number of first year students used the auto summarise function in the word processing package and submitted the result of this. This form of assessment has now been removed from use.

#### Any other comments

The Faculty has no other comments.

#### **Pharmacy**

The Faculty adopts the procedures detailed in the *Academic Board Resolutions: Academic Honesty in Coursework* for dealing with all cases of academic dishonesty. Faculty detection methods are based on that which is detailed in both the above mentioned resolutions and those in the *Examination Supervision Manual, the Examinations Office, USYD*.

In 2004 we reported only eight cases of academic dishonesty with two allegations being dismissed by the University of Sydney Student Proctorial Board. In all cases, students were interviewed by the Faculty. Of the remaining 6 cases an outcome constituting page 10 section 3 (F) of the *Academic Board Resolutions: Academic Honesty in Coursework* was invoked. Please find attached to this letter a table summarising the cases of breaches of academic standards, the outcome of each case, and the relevant section of the Academic Board's *Academic Honesty in Coursework* policy invoked in each case. For reasons of confidentiality, student names and SID's have been removed.

In 2005, the Faculty of Pharmacy Teaching and Learning Committee will undertake an "Awareness Campaign on Academic Honesty in Coursework". This initiative aims to educate academic staff on correct procedures regarding allegations of misconduct.

#### **ACADEMIC DISHONESTY 2004**

##### **Student interviewed**

8 students interviewed

<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>INTERVIEW</b>	<b>UNIT OF STUDY</b>	<b>OUTCOME</b>	<b>DATE STUDENT ADVISED</b>	<b>RELEVANT SECTION OF POLICY</b>
1	13.10.04 With Proctorial Board	PCOL 2604	Allegation dismissed by the University of Sydney Student Proctorial Board	15/11/04	Page 10 section 3 (f)
2	13.10.04	PCOL 2604	Allegation	15/11/04	Page 10

	With Proctorial Board		dismissed by the University of Sydney Student Proctorial Board		section 3 (f)
3	5/10/04	PHAR 2614	Overall Grade of Fail for PHAR 2614	15/10/04	Page 10 section 3 (f)
4	5/11/04	PHAR 2614	Overall Grade of Fail for PHAR 2614	5/11/04	Page 10 section 3 (f)
5	16/11/04	PHAR 3601	No further action required after interview	25/11/04	Page 10 section 3 (b)
6	26/11/04	PHYSI 2605	Overall Grade of Fail for PHYSI 2614	26/11/04	Page 10 section 3 (f)
7	26/11/04	PHYSI 2605	Overall Grade of Fail for PHYSI 2614	26/11/04	Page 10 section 3 (f)
8	26/11/04	PHAR 5503	Overall Grade of Fail for PHAR 5503	14/01/05	Page 10 section 3 (f)

## Rural Management

### Protocol

The procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty are detailed in the *Faculty Handbook* and are as follows:

#### “4.6.2 Procedures

Where a lecturer suspects that academic dishonesty has occurred the lecturer is to seek an explanation from the student concerned. Following this, if the lecturer feels there was not an intention to deceive or otherwise act dishonestly then the lecturer may counsel the student and/or issue a warning to the student. If a warning is given then a written record of the consultation and outcome should be prepared, signed and dated by both parties. The student should be given a copy and the original forwarded to the Associate Dean who will attend to it being placed on the student file.

Where the lecturer believes the student acted with the intention to deceive, or was otherwise acting dishonestly, the matter must be referred immediately to the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning).

#### 4.6.3 Penalties

If after a fair hearing the Associate Dean may either dismiss the matter, issue a warning, impose an academic penalty or refer the matter to the University Registrar.

Where the Associate Dean believes a breach has occurred then any one or more of the following penalties may be imposed:

- i) determine that a zero or reduced mark be awarded for that task
- ii) require the student to undertake additional assessment in the unit
- iii) terminate the student's enrolment in the unit and award a Fail grade.

Where an academic penalty is imposed then the student is to be advised in writing and a copy be retained on the student's file.

#### 4.6.4 Appeal

An appeal against a penalty imposed by the Associate Dean may be made to the Dean of the Faculty. Any appeal must be lodged, in writing, within 10 working days after the notification of the penalty.”

#### Detection methods

Academic dishonesty is detected by the markers of assessment tasks. Currently detection software has not been used in this Faculty. Occasionally students have alleged to the Associate Dean (Teaching & Learning) that undetected plagiarism has been occurring in a specific unit of study.

#### Treatment of cases

Each case detected was dealt with according to the procedures specified (see section 1).

Number of units of study where academic dishonesty was detected = 8

Number of cases

- a) referred to Associate Dean (T&L) for action = 22
- b) dismissed = 0
- c) resulting in the issuing of a warning = 1
- d) where a zero or reduced mark for the task awarded = 20
- e) where the student was required to undertake additional assessment = 0
- f) where the student's enrolment in the unit was terminated and a Fail grade issued = 1
- g) where the matter was referred to the University Registrar = 0

#### Assessment and examination

There has been a concerted effort to protect the academic integrity of the Faculty's assessment processes. This has resulted in the modification or, in some cases, complete redesign of the assessment process in a number of units.

#### Other comments

The Faculty attempts to build a culture of academic honesty among its student body. A special session dealing with the subject of academic honesty is presented to new students as part of the first year experience program. Also in this program they participate in a special session on referencing and are assessed on their referencing skills. New students are also presented with a copy of the Faculty's *Guide to Referencing* booklet as well as a guidance sheet on 'Academic honesty: acknowledge your sources'. They have ready access to modules on Referencing and on Plagiarism in the Faculty's online Orange Aid resource package.

Staff are regularly reminded of the need to prevent academic dishonesty from occurring in their units, the procedures to follow when it does occur and to act when cases do occur in their units.

It is an area of considerable concern for staff generally and the assistance provided by detection software is likely to be welcomed in future.

#### **Science**

##### **Biological Sciences**

WCopyfind 2.5 has been used in all junior units of study to scan all assignments for evidence of cheating. This process has been advertised extensively in manuals and through presentations in lectures. The number of possible cases of copying between students decreased dramatically from 2003 to 2004.

##### **Chemistry**

Cases of copying from previous year's assignments were identified, and measures put in place for 2005 to minimise this possibility.

##### **Geosciences**

No response

### **History and Philosophy of Science**

Most cases involved copying from sources on the web or a lack of citation for assignments. The problem with inappropriate student use of web materials is increasing, despite increased emphasis on this in classes.

### **Mathematics and Statistics**

No response

### **Molecular and Microbial Biosciences**

No response

### **Physics**

There were very few cases of copying although there is an increasing "over-use" of web material, sometimes without accrediting it. This was taken as an indication that changes should be made to the assessment task for this unit for 2005.

### **Psychology**

Very few cases occurred in Psychology units.

### **School of Information Technologies**

No response

### **Postgraduate Coursework Units**

A few cases of plagiarism were reported involving one alleged theft of work, and a number of instances of very heavy use of published material with no citation. All students in the units concerned had been told about the university policy and its implications, but some students appeared to have little understanding of this.

## **OVERVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHAIR OF TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE**

### **1. Protocol : What are your procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty.**

All schools in the faculty adhere strictly to the Academic Board policy and provide links to this site from school or unit web pages. In addition each unit of study, where applicable, provides written instructions on avoiding plagiarism in written assignments, with many also conducting discussions or lecture presentations on the nature and significance of plagiarism. Each school has a published procedure for dealing with cases of suspected plagiarism with final decisions resting with the Head of School.

### **2. Detection Methods : How is academic dishonesty detected?**

Some units of study with large cohorts use plagiarism software to check for cheating between students, the most common problem in junior units, rather than for plagiarism for published sources. Otherwise markers recognise similarities between student assignments or with published materials and report them to unit coordinators. In some instances students have reported that they believed their work had been copied by another student.

We have tried in recent years to minimise the opportunity for copying between students by setting more assignments which require individual research and which change each year.

### **3. Treatment of Cases : Outline how each case was dealt with.**

There have been relatively few cases across the faculty in 2004, and these were dealt with as appropriate within schools. (See attached reports for details). One recurring problem,

### **4. Assessment and Examination : Has the Faculty's current assignment and/or examination system been amended as a result of item 3? If so, outline how.**

This will be discussed at the first Teaching and Learning Committee meeting in 2005.

## 5. Any Other Comments

The most frequently mentioned problem this year has been a perception that use of published material without citing in text is increasing despite more time and effort being spent in classes explaining plagiarism and giving examples. The faculty will be working in this area during 2005.

### SCHOOL OF CHEMISTRY

**1. Protocol:** All cases of academic dishonesty are dealt with in strict accordance with the relevant University of Sydney policy being "Academic Board Resolutions: Academic Honesty in Coursework, 1 January 2002:

**2. Detection Methods:** Detection methods vary depending on the assessment tool, but plagiarism is detected by observation of duplicated material and more frequently by finding students in possession of reports belonging to other students.

**3. Treatment of Cases:** Two students were informed that cheating in the form of copying from a report from a previous year had been observed. The Head of School was notified and the students were required to attend a meeting with the class coordinator and the Head. The students were informed that they were entitled to have a support person present, but in both cases declined. The charges were outlined to the students and in both cases they accepted their accuracy and expressed regret for their actions. The students were given zero mark fails for the report involved and informed that any further transgressions would lead to their failing the course. The meetings and their outcomes were summarised in a letter and all present signed to acknowledge its accuracy.

**4. Assessment and Examination:** The nature of practical reports is to be changed so that less benefit can be obtained from previous years reports.

### HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

#### 1. Protocol – What are your procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty.

Most UOS in HPS are assessed continuously, and in cases of plagiarism or other academic dishonesty with minor assessments, we award the assignment no marks, and meet with the student to discuss the problems, have him/her acknowledge in writing, and with a signature that an academic honesty violation occurred, and keep an internal record. For violations on major assessments or repeated violations, we report to the Faculty in writing.

For cases of undercitation or inadequate citation, in the first instance, we penalize the student's assessment by 5% and note the problem (intermediate), or allow the student to submit a revised assessment with full citations (senior).

#### 2. Detection Methods – How is academic dishonesty detected?

Most violations are plagiarism from web sources, detected using Google or other search engines. In addition, all intermediate short assessments in the second half of the semester were scanned with Eve, a trial web crawling program available via WebCT.

#### 3. Treatment of Cases – Outline how each case was dealt with.

Intermediate HPS: 8 cases of plagiarism from the web (large percentage of material), which were handled as described in item 1, 1 case of repeated plagiarism from the web (on two assessments), handled initially as described above, then referred to the Faculty 1 case of copying most of an essay assessment from another student by restoring a deleted file on a public workstation; details referred to the Faculty and to the IT administrators of the workstation as a security issue Senior HPS: none detected; numerous cases of undercitation Postgraduate Coursework: 1 case of plagiarism from the web (large percentage of material), handled as described in item 1

**4. Assessment and Examination – Has the Faculty's current assignment and/or examination system been amended as a result of item 3? If so, outline how.**

No.

**5. Any Other Comments**

(1) We continue to have increasing numbers of plagiarised essays from web material, despite extensive instruction to students in writing and tutorials about citation and academic honesty. The problem is particularly acute with ESL students.

(2) We are concerned about the amount of time that dealing with each case takes, as well as about the number of undetected cases (especially submission of duplicate assignments in large classes, for which there are not adequate detection methods).

(3) We would encourage adoption of a uniform, automated system for detection.

(4) We note that many students simply withdraw from UOS after a case of plagiarism is detected, so that no real penalty occurs even in cases of major violations. As most of our students are not our majors, we are concerned that repeated violations across the Faculty might not be detected if schools and departments do not follow uniform reporting procedures.

**SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY**

**Junior year:**

04s1 of Junior year

Dr Caleb Owens was the academic adviser for the First Year Psychology units in 04s1, please note the attached, it is a report prepared by Owens.

04s2 of Junior year

ZERO case

**Intermediate and Senior Year:**

1. For the Intermediate units, we have written assignments for classwork for all units, namely, 2111, 2112, 2113 and 2114.

a. We have ZERO case for 2111 PLN report, 2112 STA group project, 2113 COG report.

b. one case of "plagiarism" has been detected re the 2114 Personality essay. The component coordinator, Dr Simon Boag has interviewed the student and subsequently, the student received 20 marks deduction.

2. For the Senior units, we have written assignments for classwork for the following units:

3202, 3205, 3206, 3209, 3210 in 04s1

3201, 3203, 3211, 3214, 3215 in 04s2

a. We have ZERO case in 04s1.

b. Various tutors of the unit PSYC3203 (unit in 04s2) have detected four cases "plagiarism".

The unit coordinator, Dr Marianna Szabo has interviewed all four students, two got the "clear". One student has received 10 marks deduction and one was give a ZERO.

Honours year:

None

GDS units:

None

## **SCHOOL OF PHYSICS**

### **1. Protocol: What are your procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty.**

The director of Junior Physics has established a clear policy in relation to Junior Physics, where problems usually arise. This is *de facto* the School policy.

The School believes that it is important to recognise that not all students, especially in first year, will realise that what they are doing is unacceptable. The policy, therefore, needs to be as clear as possible up front.

A copy of the Junior Physics policy is provided below.

### **2. Detection Methods: How is academic dishonesty detected?**

In some units, we use essays or reports. Markers simply recognise the same response from different students. Also, surprisingly well written responses can be (remarkably) efficiently checked against web pages using Google. Again not all cases will be detected. This problem can be minimised by trying to ensure that the essay topic is not prone to simply regurgitating material - i.e. it requires synthesis of ideas.

### **3. Treatment of Cases: Outline how each case was dealt with.**

There were a very small number of cases in first year. In relation to regular assignments, a warning is issued and we find there is never a repeat offence detected..

The major problem arises where a single task is a major part of the assessment for the unit. In PHYS 1600 *Concepts & Issues in Physical Science*, one student was asked to see the Junior Physics Director to discuss an appropriate mark but never replied. In EDUF 1017 *Science Foundations 2*, many essays "over-used" web material, sometimes without accrediting it, but this was so widespread that it was taken more as a lesson in how the assignment needs to be improved next time.

### **4. Assessment and Examination: Has the Faculty's current assignment and/or examination system been amended as a result of item 3? If so, outline how.**

n/a

### **5. Any Other Comments**

No

## **Junior Physics Policy on academic honesty - March 2003**

The following describes current Junior Physics procedures for dealing with instances of students breaching usual standards of academic honesty. It is based on Academic Board Resolutions (<http://policy.rms.usyd.edu.au/000003f.pdf>).

### **1.**

All assignment cover sheets should have a brief statement on "academic honesty".

We encourage cooperation between students in completing assignments and allow 1, 2 or 3 students to hand in a single assignment. All students signing the assignment cover sheet certify that they have made a fair contribution to the attached work and are happy to receive the same mark.

We will NOT accept assignments that are simply copied. Copying the work of another person without acknowledgment is plagiarism and contrary to University policies on Academic Honesty in Coursework (see <http://policy.rms.usyd.edu.au/000003f.pdf>)

2.

A similar statement has been added to the JP resources web page and on all Unit and Module Outlines.

3.

When copying is detected on an assignment/report/essay:

(a) if an assignment, and it is the first instance:

attach the standard note (no letterhead) on "academic honesty" ( a version of the text above) to tell them what we expect.

no mark penalty.

mark the roll sheet to indicate copying detected. If possible, indicate which is the original and which is copied.

(b) if an assignment and it is a repeat instance

OR

if a major one-off assessment task a major body of work (i.e. an essay or project or lab book)

attach the standard letter on "academic honesty" (on letterhead), including a request for them to see the JP coordinator to discuss the result or offer a reason to vary this result.

give a "fair assessment" of the work they did do

possibly zero for minor assessment tasks (i.e. most assignments)

less likely to be zero for major assessment task

mark the roll sheet to indicate copying detected and a letter attached. If possible, indicate which is the original and which is copied.

if(!) they see the JP coordinator, the letter must be signed and filed.

Report from the School of Biological Sciences not included here - sent as hard copy to the Faculty.

**School of Biological Sciences**

**Procedures for dealing with Academic Dishonesty (Cheating) and Missed Assessments**

To be read in conjunction with the Academic Board Resolutions on Academic Honesty in Coursework (14 Nov 2001) <http://policy.rms.usyd.edu.au/000007x.pdf>

1. Responsibility

All decisions on appropriate treatment of cases of academic dishonesty must be made by or approved by the Head of School (Policy Part 3 item 2(4)).

2. Processes (Policy Part 3 item 3)

Upon detection of a case of suspected dishonesty ( directly or through another staff member involved in the unit), the UEO should arrange a meeting with the student(s), with another staff member present, to assess the seriousness of the case.

- (i) If the case is deemed to be not serious or was unintentional (see below) the UEO should counsel the student, and issue a written warning which both the student and the UEO should sign, date and receive a copy of. A copy of all detailed records should be forwarded to the HOS (Policy Item 3 (1)).

- (ii) If the case is deemed serious/deliberate the UEO should refer it to the HOS.

The HOS either refers the case to the Registrar as a disciplinary matter, or arranges a hearing with the student(s) as outlined in Policy Item 3 (2).

3. Outcomes

The possible outcomes in serious cases are outlined in Policy Item 3 (3).

#### 4. Definitions

The School should adopt some agreed uniform definitions of types of dishonesty and appropriate penalties which take into account level of unit, student experience and previous record, and importance of assessment item to final unit mark.

eg.

Type of case	Junior unit	Intermediate unit and Postgraduate Coursework	Senior unit
Failure to acknowledge sources, uncited direct quotations, $\leq 2$ sentences, first time, $< 25\%$ of unit marks	Non-serious, refer to Skills Book	Non-serious, Warning, rewrite with correct citations	Non-serious, Warning, rewrite; refer to Learning Centre
As above, second offence or larger uncited quotations, or $> 25\%$ of unit marks	Non-serious, Rewrite report with correct citations	Non-serious, Warning, rewrite; refer to Learning Centre	Serious; refer to HOS; deduct at least 50% of marks from assessment item
As above, 3 <sup>rd</sup> offence	Non-serious, Warning; Rewrite; request student undertake remedial work at Learning Centre	Non-serious, Require alternative assessment of item; request student undertake remedial work at Learning Centre	Serious; refer to HOS; deduct at least 50% of marks from assessment item
Copying parts of another student's report; using portions of written or illustrative material from a book, journal or the web without acknowledgement; collaboration on test	Serious; refer to HOS; first time deduct half marks for item, rewrite; subsequent offence deduct all marks for assessment item, issue strong warning	Serious; refer to HOS; first time deduct half marks for item, rewrite; subsequent offence deduct all marks for assessment item, require alternative assessment; issue strong warning	Serious; refer to HOS; first time deduct all marks for semester assessment item, warning under surveillance; subsequent offence deduct all marks for semester assessment
Substitute person for computer quiz; submission of ghostwritten report	Serious; HOS refer to Registrar (Fail unit?)	Serious; HOS refer to Registrar (Fail unit?)	Serious; HOS refer to Registrar (Fail unit?)

#### Missed Assessments

To be applied in conjunction with the University's policies on Special Consideration (see Manual for Examiners)

Assessments which are missed because of documented illness or other Special Consideration grounds may be assigned the student's average mark subject to not more than one third of total assessment marks being so treated; where possible work missed should be made up.

Where more than one third of practical/tutorial/seminar/field work is missed the student should discuss with the unit executive officer if and how this work may be made up; time extension for reports or deferring an exam may be recommended; if making up missed work appears impossible the student may be recommended to the Faculty for Discontinue Not Fail on Special Consideration grounds if applicable.

Students with chronic illness or disability should be referred to the Disabilities Unit so that more long-term measures may be put in place for them.

Absences for attendance at sporting or cultural events will only be accepted if for national, state or University representation and if arranged with unit executive officer in advance; arrangements should be agreed for missed work and assessments to be made up; generally the conditions outlined in 1. and 2. above should apply.

Employment pressures or employer's work requirements are not considered by the University as acceptable grounds for Special Consideration.

### **Veterinary Science**

The Faculty of Veterinary Science, through its Teaching and Learning Committee, has endeavored to adopt a common policy for dealing with issues of academic dishonesty in all Units of Study taught by members of Faculty. This policy is aligned with University policy as outlined in Academic Board Resolutions: Academic Honesty in Coursework.

In response to the Academic Board's request for an annual report on academic dishonesty from the Faculty, each member of staff was requested to submit individual reports regarding their Units of Study. These reports, together with the response of the Faculty's Teaching and Learning Committee, are collated below.

#### Protocol – What are your procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty?

In cases of suspected academic dishonesty the Unit of Study co-ordinators are encouraged to refer to Faculty/University guidelines as appropriate for the individual circumstances. Investigations into academic dishonesty within the Faculty are undertaken in accordance with Academic Board Resolutions - *Academic Honesty in Coursework: Part 2(5); Principles of Dealing with Cases of Alleged Academic Dishonesty* in that these processes are equitable, consistent, fair, timely, and effective. If a matter of academic dishonesty is pursued, the specific guidelines for Processes Relating to Academic Dishonesty (outlined in Part 3(3) of the University's policy) are used as a guide. If required, consultation with the student is arranged by the examiner and procedures 3.3 (b) - (d) are followed.

In addition, the Faculty of Veterinary Science has developed a number of policies and procedures to help discourage academic dishonesty within the curriculum. These policies/procedures help inform students as to what constitutes academic dishonesty and their responsibilities with regard to academic dishonesty. For example:

- a) Students are expected to familiarise themselves with the *University Policy on Academic Honesty* - a brief summary appears in each Unit of Study handbook, along with directions as to where further information can be obtained. Examples of academic dishonesty are discussed in context within individual Units of Study. Students are informed that the processes relating to academic dishonesty, as stated in the University Policy document, will be carried out upon detection of any cases of academic dishonesty.
- b) Students receive instruction *in class and in UoS handbooks* on the expectations for submission of work conducted as individuals, in pairs or in groups. When conducting extramural farm placements, students are advised that while they may attend practical work as pairs, and gather information together, but the written reports must be their own, particularly the critiques of property management. This recommendation has specific relevance to a case of Academic Dishonesty within the Faculty in 2004 (refer to additional report).
- c) The specific aim of a number of Units of Study within the curriculum is to increase students' understanding and awareness of good practice in academic writing, including appropriate

referencing and acknowledgements. To this end, students are given instruction *in class and in detailed assignment feedback* on the expectations for correctly acknowledging all sources of information, including diagrams, in assessment tasks. Students are challenged in several critical writing tasks to increase their skills and proficiency in discussing other academic writing and may fail these tasks if they do not reference/acknowledge properly. All written work is marked by the same examiner for each topic, facilitating detection of copied work.

- d) Each assignment submitted within any Unit of Study must be accompanied by a signed **Report/Assignment Cover Sheet**. This sheet refers students to the University website policy on plagiarism. In addition, the sheet states “I hereby certify that this assignment is my own work, based on my own personal study and/or research, and that I have acknowledged all material and sources used in the preparation of this assignment. I also certify that no part of the assignment has been previously submitted for assessment and that I have not copied in part or whole or otherwise plagiarized the work of others.”
- e) Unit of Study co-ordinators are encouraged to use different assignments for groups of students to discourage plagiarism. In addition, assessment tasks involving elements of choice are used to discourage copying between students.
- f) In the **Veterinary Teaching Hospitals**, all students are counselled on the requirement for accurate records of events from meetings to veterinary consultations. All students are also counselled on the need to attend and support colleagues during presentations and the manifest inconsistencies in attendance and records.

**If cases of academic dishonesty are detected, these are dealt with using the following guidelines:**

- a) Behavioural misdemeanours (unprofessional behaviour) are dealt with by counselling with the Unit of Study co-ordinator and Year co-ordinator and remedial activity by the student. For example, there were several incidences reported by Faculty as to the significant failure to acknowledge sources of information within an assignment which was handled through counselling and repeated submissions of this piece of assessment. In another example a final year intern was provided with written feedback regarding the poor use of in text referencing when completing a written report for an elective rotation. The intern was counselled by the two year coordinators and a third academic advisor as to the reasons for this feedback from the assessor and received remedial instruction in the methods and reasons for in text referencing.
- b) If plagiarism has been detected within an assignment or other written task, there is a requirement for re-submission of plagiarised work as a condition of fulfilment of requirements for completion of the Unit of Study. In addition, a penalty is included within the marks of the re-submitted work where usually no more that 50% of the original marks are possible.
- c) If the seriousness of the misdemeanour is considered sufficient, the Unit of Study co-ordinator will ask the Year coordinator, the Chair of the TLC, the SubDean for Student Affairs and the Associate Dean for Teaching & Learning for advice regarding the issue. In some instances an interview is organised with the student and additional independent academic observers. Notes of the meeting are made and given to the student to sign to acknowledge that they are a full and accurate account. If they are in agreement, the student is asked to sign these meeting notes. Subsequent action would be taken following further consultation with Assoc. Dean T&L and the Dean.

Detection Methods – How is academic dishonesty detected?

A number of techniques were reported by Faculty for identification of academic dishonesty. These included:

- a) Individual assessment tasks are marked by a single individual and examiners/markers are reminded to look for reports with similar or identical arguments or mistakes. In addition, markers are asked to identify assignments with written extracts of published work quoted verbatim with insufficient or no acknowledgment of the source (often detected by the authors themselves!). If these examples of academic dishonesty are detected they are confirmed by checking with another member of the teaching staff in the Unit of Study.
- b) Examination questions are changed every year and examinations are run independently.

- c) If questions within intra-semester assignments are repeated, or are similar, from year to year the same marker is used to detect plagiarism.
- d) Failure to meet the Faculty expectations in Professional Practice exercises may be reported to Faculty by Veterinary Practices to which students are sent.
- e) In Units of Study in which open book examinations are conducted, it was noted that the main way in which academic dishonesty could occur is for a student to obtain a copy of the assessment task before the assessment was undertaken. It would be very difficult to detect this type of dishonesty; though looking for a dramatic change of fortune would provide a possible clue, but this is very imperfect evidence.
- f) Midterm examinations are monitored closely by a number of members of staff and clear instructions are given at time of the examination.
- g) Academic dishonesty in group situations was detected in some Units of Study through student feedback, observations and record keeping. However, in a number of Units of Study where group work was used for summative assessment tasks, concerns regarding detection of "passengers" (students not contributing to the assessment task) were noted. One Unit of Study attempted to identify success or otherwise of group dynamics and evidence of "passengers", then counselled students if problems were detected.
- h) For the Unit of Study where students are required to undertake extramural training in animal handling, the administration staff within the Faculty organise extramural farm placements and monitors student's attendance to ensure the records they submit of extramural work are accurate. In addition, the Faculty has developed an online system and close relationships with the farmers who offer placements in order to detect students who cheat by not attending, only attending part of the time, or leaving early from placements. Fraudulent documentation of farm work is investigated by the Extramural Panel and is penalised if proven. Students may be required to resubmit written reports, write letters of apology and/or attend farm placements again if cheating is identified.
- i) In written reports submitted by the final year students (interns), evidence of plagiarism includes assignments submitted which are considered by the assessor to be of significantly different quality to a submission from another rotation and many sentences appeared to be from sources identified in the bibliography but not acknowledged within the text.
- j) Dishonesty in essays is usually detected on careful reading where chronological or other logical inconsistencies in the work indicate cutting and pasting. This can usually be confirmed by Web searches to identify the sources.
- k) For the Reports on extramural animal husbandry training, the same examiner was asked to mark reports for the same species from all students. They were particularly asked to compare those reports written about the same property. Examiners were asked to look for examples of copying, particularly in the written property critiques. They were invited to list all suspicious reports in 2004 and these were subsequently re-examined. These were evaluated by the Extramural Animal Husbandry Panel and a decision made on each case.

Treatment of Cases – Outline how each case was dealt with.

A number of specific examples of academic dishonesty were outlined by members of Faculty, including their response to these situations:

**VETS 1017, 1021, 2008, 3041 (Coordinated by the same person):** In cases where portfolio exercises were inadequate, they were returned for correction. Where unprofessional behaviour was reported the students were interviewed to investigate the complaint, and if warranted, the students had to devise the way in which they will improve the situation.

**VETS 3039- Professional Practice 3:** Students were required to provide minutes for group meetings which contained a list of those who did not attend and whilst there was significant discussion amongst some groups about non-attendance of meetings this was not reflected in the minutes.

Students attending lectures were required to provide feedback to another student group presenting on the day. The feedback was to be from all students present in their allotted group and the names of those not attending recorded with only those attending receiving a mark for this feedback. Despite 60-70% attendance of some lectures the feedback forms suggested very few absentees.

There are difficulties for the students to create group harmony and cohesion from one perspective but impact upon the mark of others from another. Student groups generally try to avoid conflict.

**VETS 2011:** The only case in 2004 was one where two students in the open book exam had some similar themes/structure to their answers (with a few common errors). Both were interviewed after the test and shown the similar sections. They were able to satisfy the concerns by showing their study notes, which they had developed as they study together. These were used (as it was an open book exam) in answering one part of the question- on visual processing- hence the similar themes (although not actual words) in their papers. Their work was graded in the same way as the remainder of the class after the consultation, as they demonstrated they had not cheated during the test (which was invigilated).”

**VETS1013/ 1018:** Following the initial interview and dependant on the severity of the case of academic dishonesty, the student was either counselled, provided with a written warning, or given a failure for that assessment task. This final decision was made by the Associate Dean T&L with consultation from the Unit of Study coordinator.

**Year V Elective Rotation:** There was one incident of significant failure to acknowledge sources of information within text which was handled through counselling and repeated submissions of this piece of assessment. The intern was provided with written feedback regarding the poor use of in text referencing when completing a written report for an elective rotation. The intern was counselled by the two year coordinators and a third academic advisor as to the reasons for this feedback from the assessor and received remedial instruction in the methods and reasons for in text referencing.

In other cases where plagiarism was suspected in written work based on either (i) obvious downloads of material from websites which are not acknowledged, or (ii) identical documents submitted when students are at a remote site in pairs; the former is managed by drawing attention to need to properly reference material; second case has required need to remind interns to seek permission to submit identical work if working together on a project, but to include a statement identifying individual contributions etc.

**ANSC 2002- Animal Science 2:** A number of cases of academic dishonesty were detected. These cases were treated as follows:-

- a. the examiner arranged a one-to-one consultation with the student. At the consultation the examiner discussed the matter with the student in order to ascertain whether the intention was to deceive.
- b. On both occasions, it was determined that the student(s) had not intended to deceive and so the student(s) was/were counselled by explaining referencing guidelines and providing a copy of the University guidelines on plagiarism.

The students who had similar written portions in their assignments were asked to re-submit. The re-submitted work was satisfactory.

Diary entries and photocopies of written work were kept as a record of the procedures described above.

**ANSC 3005 – Biotechnology:** There were no cases this year (2004). In previous years, students have been required to re-submit the work and have been given a maximum mark of 50% for a satisfactorily resubmitted work. Students also were counselled by the lecturer concerned.

**VETS 4331 - Animal Husbandry Extramural Practical Work Report:** A separate report has been provided for this Unit of Study due to a number of specific cases of academic dishonesty occurring in this Unit of Study in 2004. In this report the case has been outlined and the response by Faculty noted.

Assessment and Examination: Has the Faculty’s current assignment and/or examination system been amended as a result of item 3. If so, outline how.

The Faculty has in place a number of procedures that are directed at decreasing the opportunity for academic dishonesty. These have been outlined in sections 1-3 of this report.

In addition, a number of Units of Study have implemented further actions to promote academic honesty within the curriculum:

**VETS2009 Genetic and Biometry:** In this unit staff have activated a range of practices to decrease the opportunity for academic dishonesty, e.g. :

- all past assessments are made available to students, together with answers
- all assessments are open book under exam conditions, i.e. no take-home exams

- the mid-term assessment is conducted in a large hall with each student sitting at his/her own desk (rather than our earlier practice of conducting the assessment in the timetabled lecture theatre, which did create opportunities for copying)
- Regular assessable quizzes are held during lecture time. While opportunity might exist for academic dishonesty, it is emphasised to the students that these are conducted under examination conditions. Procedures were changed during the year to ensure this was adhered to, although I do not believe this has been a problem.

**VETS 3005 Biotechnology:** As a result of previous examples of academic dishonesty, the handouts specifying essay requirements have been re-worded to specifically warn students about cutting and pasting from web sources. Also students are now permitted to cite only a small number (3) web sources and must cite at least 6 refereed journals as sources of information. Students are also given verbal warnings about the ease with which blatant plagiarism can be detected

**VETS 3039 Professional Practice:** Although the importance of accurate record keeping and legal responsibilities were emphasised during the first lecture and again in a lecture on Complaints Against Veterinarians and the Veterinary Surgeons Act, the Unit of Study co-ordinator suspected some records of minutes were still inaccurate from feedback at the end of 2004. Therefore, for 2005, the individual mark for feedback will be dropped and quizzes based upon these student presentations will be used to reinforce attendance.

**ANSC 3001 Animal Nutrition:** The Unit of Study coordinator strives for a teaching and learning atmosphere of mutual respect and trust and hopes that this atmosphere actively discourages academic dishonesty. Other more pragmatic barriers to academic dishonesty include the following:

- Timetabling sessions for assignment work, group work etc into the unit of study class time to help ease workload pressures
- showing flexibility with respect to assignment submission times
- the selection of assessable material that encourages highly individualized responses, focusing on individual's critical evaluation and interpretation of problems
- allowing independent choice of topic/content in assessable tasks where appropriate
- spending a considerable amount of time giving students feedback on the difference between citing references, and plagiarizing chunks of text
- requiring students to complete and submit a signed statement of ownership of work for all assessable tasks
- making sure that the university policy on academic honesty is drawn to the attention of all students and that all students are aware of the expectations of the unit of study teaching staff with respect to academic honesty

**Year 5 Program:** Referencing guides are clear in earlier years and in the Year Five Handbook but I suspect not fully understood by many students. Rotations are under significant time pressures and I suspect in text referencing is poor due to incomplete knowledge and time pressures. I believe greater emphasis on developing these skills and their importance in earlier years is required and that assessors provide a consistent approach to in text referencing. This has been addressed by the Teaching and Learning Committee with a common referencing and assignment guide that has now been placed on the Faculty Website and is referred to in *EVERY* Unit of Study handbook.



# The University of Sydney

## **Teaching and Learning and Teaching Committee**

### **Purpose**

The ~~Teaching and Learning~~ Teaching and Learning and Teaching Committee advises the Academic Board about Resolutions, policy and procedures relating to the effective teaching, learning and examination and assessment processes within the University and works with the faculties and Colleges in fostering a strong and dynamic teaching and learning culture.

### **Terms of Reference**

1. To develop, recommend to the Academic Board and regularly review Resolutions, policy and procedures that support the University's strategic objectives in relation to teaching and learning and assessment and examination for coursework students.
2. To develop, oversee and monitor processes for the effective implementation of teaching and learning and assessment and examination Resolutions, policy and procedures and advise the Academic Board about ways of improving the quality and effectiveness of such processes within the University.
3. To advise the Academic Board about implications of changes in technology on teaching and learning.
4. To advise the Academic Board about measures needed to encourage and assist staff to develop skills in teaching and learning.
5. To monitor issues relating to quality in relation to teaching and learning and assessment and examination, and to make recommendations to the Academic Board as appropriate.
6. To obtain information or reports from any faculty, school or department, College or other academic unit on matters relating to teaching and learning.
7. To refer to other committees, as appropriate, comments or recommendations about matters concerning students learning.
8. To receive regular reports from, and provide advice to, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) on the development of Resolutions, policy and procedures relating to teaching and learning, including the development of policy and initiatives as they relate to the recognition and reward of teaching.
9. To receive regular reports from the Learning Centre and the Institute for Teaching and Learning and advise the Academic Board on the activities of bodies established to support teaching and learning.
10. To provide an annual report on its activities under its terms of reference to the Academic Board.
11. To consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Academic Board, the Vice-Chancellor or the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning).

## **Constitution**

### **Ex Officio Members**

1. the Chair of the Committee, appointed by the Academic Board
2. the Chair of the Academic Board, or nominee
3. the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)
4. the ~~Assistant Pro Vice-Chancellor (Information Technology)~~ Chief Information Officer, or nominee
5. the University Librarian, or nominee
6. the Director, Institute for Teaching and Learning
7. the Director, Student Services
8. the Head of the Learning Centre
9. the Chair of the Coursework Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee
10. the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning), or equivalent, of each faculty
11. the President of the Students' Representative Council, or nominee
12. the President of the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association, or nominee

### **Co-opted Members**

13. the Committee may co-opt up to four members. Co-opted members may be selected from the members of the Academic Board or the wider University community or may express interest directly to the Chair of the Committee, but must have an interest and/or experience in issues considered by the Committee. The term of office of members co-opted by the Committee shall be specified at the time of co-option and such members shall have all rights and privileges of other members.

### **Sub-Committees**

Library Sub-Committee

### **Frequency of meetings**

The Committee shall meet at least five (5) times a year.

### **Quorum**

A quorum for a meeting of the Committee shall be seven (7) members.

### **Approved/Revised**

Academic Board, 13 November 2002

### **Committee Secretary**

Ms Megan Kemmis, Secretariat and Corporate Information Unit